MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

„Migration and Political Resocialization: Case Study of Immigrants in Austria"

verfasst von / submitted by

Daria Ekshmidt BA

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2024 / Vienna 2024

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1. Introduction

At the core of the understanding of people's perception of politics and democracy is the study of political socialization which addresses issues of when the political beliefs are developed, who are the agents engaged in this process and how these beliefs can be influenced or changed. There are many definitions of political socialization. At individual or micro level, political socialization set up "the patterns and processes by which individuals engage in political development and learning, constructing their particular relationships to the political contexts in which they live" (Sapiro, 2004: 3). Inkeles, for example, defines it as "the process where individuals acquire the personal system properties (…) which shape their adaptation to the physical and sociocultural setting in which they live" (Inkeles, 1969: 615-616). As a result of political socialization, individuals obtain knowledge about the political system and how it works. They internalize the political value system and ideology of the society they live in and come to an understanding of its rituals and symbols.

According to Eckstein, political orientations and beliefs are not acquired in automatically, but rather are obtained in a learning process of a specific political environment (Eckstein, 1988: 791). However, the political socialization does not exclude later learning and hence changes in political views and orientations, rather it is a continuing process in which attitudes and beliefs develop throughout lifetime and in accordance with experiences (Niemi & Hepburn, 1995). However, in order to occur, political resocialization requires "an exacting and unusually powerful social situation" (Sears, 1975: 135). And according to researchers, migration can be this exceptional and catalytic situation (Sigel and Hoskin, 1977; Sears & Levy, 2003). Major events as immigration may generate an opportunity for immigrants to re-evaluate their political opinions and incentives and cultivate new in the host country.

Moreover, according to previous studies, democracy is something that needs to be learned even for people originally born in democratic environment (Inglehart, 1988; Ichilov, 1990; Putnam, 1993). Perception of democracy and its support might be poor even among people who were grown up and politically socialized in democratic regime. So if people from democratic environment might experience difficulties in learning about this regime, individuals from non- and semi-democratic environment might then face even greater challenge after migration, because of dissimilarity in their and the receiving societies' understanding of politics and political orientations. In my master's thesis I would

like to examine whether and how change in political environments as result of migration from a non-democratic to a democratic country transforms political attitudes of individuals. Thus, the research question of this master's thesis is "How does the democratic environment of a host country influence the political attitudes and behavior of migrants from non- and semi-democratic political regimes?". Based on the theories of political resocialization described in chapter 2, I would like to find out whether there is a model of political democratic resocialization peculiar to each group of migrants, depending on the political regime of the country of origin.

The measures of political attitudes used to infer whether political resocialization has occurred are political trust and satisfaction with democracy and migrants' belief in their own efficacy within the political system of the host country. I am going to answer this question with the help of explanatory mechanisms described in chapter 3, which are: social networks and political discussion (being engaged in conversations about politics and political issues), political efficacy (subjective perception of ability to influence the government and the responsiveness of political system) as well as immigrant's personal experience related to prejudice, discrimination and deception in the host country. Three to four representatives of each political regime were selected for this research: democratic Austria as a new host country for immigrants from non-democratic Russia and semi-democratic Ukraine. The issues of identifying immigrants from non- and semi-democratic regime as well as methodological considerations are discussed in the chapter 4. Chapter 5 focuses on explanatory mechanisms and their constituents, aiming to analyze the degree of democratic resocialization among migrants. This involves assessing the impact of each mechanism and identifying the presence or absence of specific constituent elements. In chapter 6, the data analyses tool and questions for respondents are detailed, establishing the methodology for extracting insights from collected data. Chapter 7 delves into recruiting and sampling, outlining strategies to identify individuals with valuable insights for inductive qualitative analysis. Following data collection, chapter 8 explains the process of transcribing, paraphrasing, and analyzing interviews within an inductive framework. Chapter 9 presents the findings of each group of respondents, illustrating distinctive characteristics among respondent groups, relying on explanatory mechanisms and their constituent elements. Finally, chapter 10 serves as the conclusion, summarizing key findings, discussing implications, and providing recommendations to conclude the master's thesis cohesively.

2. Theories on political resocialization

Moving from a country with non-democratic or a hybrid regime, immigrants face opportunities and possibilities that could potentially influence the previously obtained political patterns and attitudes. Scholars point out that people facing demands of the current society need to cope with them and in result their patterns may change (Niemi & Hepburn, 1995; Ichilov, 1990). Social pressure increases proportionally to the extent of contradicting beliefs. So the more immigrants' political beliefs contradict those of the host society, the more intense is social pressure and encouragement for change. This change take form in the adjustments of different extents to receiving society. And process of adjustment is political resocialization (Sigel & Hoskin, 1977).

Theories of political socialization envisage potential scenarios that might happen to a migrant after changing the usual political environment: two are rather optimistic about the perspectives of immigrants' adaptation to new political realities, another one is quite pessimistic (White et al., 2008). The theory of exposure and of transferability presume that migrant's political views are flexible and able to adapt to new political environment of host country. A person is more likely to succeed in adapting to a new political environment after being exposed to it for a long period of time according to the theory of exposure. So it is important to emphasize the relevance of time when discussing the migrants' exposure to a new political environment. The transferability theory maintains the other perspective, that immigrant's adjustment is determined not only by new political regime or political system. Rather, migrants rely on the past experience acquired in the old environment, draw lessons from it and carry it with themselves to the new environment of receiving country (Black, Niemi, and Powell 1987; Black 1987; Finifter and Finifter 1989). Using the transferability hypothesis as an empirical basis, I would expect immigrants' attitudes and behaviors to be found to correlate with native-born populations' basic average demographic indicators. According to the previous studies, immigrants' political engagement appears to be heavily influenced by age, which captures cumulative political experiences regardless of how long they have lived in a new country (Khan, 2021). The previous interest in politics and participation patterns of immigrants in the new host country are expected to be found to be strong predictors of engagement regardless of the country of origin. The resistance theory is cross-referenced with the early political socialization theory, that specifies that the orientations and political beliefs obtained during person's formative years are not easily succumbed to change and tend

to be preserved. Consequently, migrants are not expected to adapt to new political environment right after migrating. During the formative years of a human life, political predispositions are expected to filter subsequent information and guide the incorporation of new knowledge in ways that conform to their existing orientations.

The political environment in which people are socialized is of significant importance since it provides individuals with a definite set of schemes with a unique understanding of politics. From this follows that people socialized in non-democratic regimes would obtain different patterns and political attitudes from people socialized in a democratic regime. According to Finifter and Finifter (1989), socialization of adults is greatly determined by earlier experiences and beliefs, and more specifically, political resocialization depends on views obtained in former country of socialization, what coincides with the transferability perspective. This suggests that attitudes received in the country of origin are transferred to the new host country and are kept at least some time at the beginning of assimilation process. So the change of political patterns acquired in the country of origin does not occur immediately, and people tend to continue to comprehend politics as they are used to even some time after migrating into new political environment. Accumulated in a democratic society experiences are thought to stimulate a change in political beliefs, rather than just the passing of time.

However, for immigrants from non- and semi-democratic countries the situation may be significantly different. Intuitively, one may expect to find a distrust to democratic political institutions among immigrants from countries with some extent of political repression. For immigrants with such background, the previous negative evaluations of political institutions might be thought to be sticky. However, having none or only some extent of democratic experience in their host countries, immigrants may form a picture of how function more or less perfect democratic institutions in well-established democracies like Austria. In this way, due to the lack of experience of 'good democratic government', immigrant may take well-functioning democratic country as a sample or model of ideal democratic regime. As showed study by Maxwell (2010), the political trust in Western European countries' democratic regimes among immigrants from non-democratic and hybrid regimes may be even higher than among native born citizens. This may be explained by the fact that immigrants from less democratic countries tend to evaluate political institutions in well-established democracies as trustworthy and reliable when comparing to their native country. This research aims to find if this is

true in the case of a such democratic country as Austria, that along with few other states has a worldwide reputation of being a well-established and well-functioning democracy, and thus may be regarded as a very likely case for a positive evaluation of its political regime among immigrants.

Also, a quite opposite scenario may happen as described by White and colleagues (2008), a scenario of resistance when people's political orientations turn out to be persistent and stable. In the case of resistance, an immigrant would reject the opportunities and possibilities that could potentially influence the previously obtained in non- and semi-democratic country political views and thus would resist the process of democratic change. Here, the political orientations obtained during the course of formative years are expected to play a crucial role in shaping political attitudes throughout life. Acquired in other political environment, political attitudes profoundly determine migrant's later learning and induce people to reject believes that are contradictory or incompatible with orientations formed in the process of political socialization prior to migration. Migrants are expected to face difficulties in adjusting to new political regime and political views that may be associated with it.

The emphasize of these theories is placed on different factors. For the exposure and transferability perspectives, the new environment of a receiving country itself is a key factor that influences the democratic resocialization process and makes immigrants to reevaluate their earlier obtained political beliefs. For the resistance perspective, on the contrary, prior political socialization formed during premigration period is crucial, and it determines one's political orientations. It is responsible for filtering of information after migration and preventing, or at least significantly slowing down, the process of democratic resocialization. However, to truly understand the premises and consequences of these three potential scenarios of what might happen to a migrant after changing the usual political environment, immigrant's political attitudes would be evaluated based on the presence or absence of changes in satisfaction with democratic regime and immigrant's trust in democratic institutions of the host country. In order to infer whether the changes in political attitudes, and thus political resocialization, have or have not taken place, immigrant's subjective experience will be deeply studied with the help of explanatory mechanisms described in the following section.

3. Theory and theoretical mechanisms

Political trust and satisfaction with democracy are important for democracy in several respects. The more specific indicators, which relate to confidence in specific political institutions or actors, such as parliaments and individual politicians, influence more diffuse aspects of political support, such as support for a democratic political system (Easton, 1975; Martin, 2010). It has been found that political trust has an effect on political participation, such as voting and law-abidingness (Marien & Hooghe, 2011). Satisfaction with democracy is generally understood as a measure or extent of regime performance and has been found to affect civic engagement (Linde & Ekman, 2003).

Although satisfaction with democracy is one the strongest predictors of trust in political institutions of a democratic country (Bilodeau & Nevitte, 2003), if you ask someone to evaluate and describe their level of trust in democratic institutions, it would be quite difficult to judge the answer, since there is no single appropriate or right answer to this question; the evaluation is based on a subjective experience and answer will differ depending on who you ask it to. In case of a person who was born and spent most of his/her life in well-established democratic system, which exists not first decade, this standard would be close to ideal or pure democracy. Although the notion of this theoretical perfect democracy is rather abstract and there is hardly any political institution that can be considered perfect in an absolute sense, yet the citizens of stable democracies would not expect that the actual political institutions in any other country would be much more reliable and trustworthy. This thought supports the study by Adman & Strömblad (2011) who found out that political trust of individuals from well-established democracies who immigrated to another democratic state do not change and migrants expect the political institutions of host country to work as well as in their native country.

Opinions upon the causal relationship between political trust and satisfaction are equivocal, since scholars have not found a consensus and usually tend to adopt one of three perspectives: (1) satisfaction leads to trust (Van Ryzin, 2007), (2) trust leads to satisfaction (Van de Walle & Bouckaert, 2003), or (3) both constructs reinforce each other reciprocally (Welch et al., 2004). In this research I follow the perspective of Welch et al. and assume that there is a reciprocal causation structure and that both causal directions may be simultaneously valid. Therefore, in this research these two constructs are addressed as one indicator which is formed under the influence of certain mechanisms or factors that shape immigrant's personal experience, and influence immigrant's subjective

perception of democracy and its institutions. There is a great variety of these influencing factors but in this research are included only such mechanisms as social networks and political discussion, political efficacy, personal experiences of prejudice and discrimination toward immigrants in the host country as well as experience of deception.

Explanatory mechanisms chosen for this research allow to get insights of the process of democratic resocialization and investigate the impacts of various social and political structures and practices on people's dispositions and behavior. As mentioned, they include some of those factors that form immigrant's personal experience and that influence immigrant's subjective perception of democracy, its institutions and their political engagement. These mechanisms enable us to make conclusions whether the democratic resocialization has or has not taken place among immigrants, under which conditions and why some migrants may experience adaptation and other rejection.

3.1. Social networks and political discussion

According to researches on political socialization and on social networks, it is the exposure to new information and beliefs that brings out a change in individual's beliefs. In a new political environment of the host country, migrants from non-democratic and hybrid regimes get acquainted with new people who can potentially have different political preferences and beliefs. Through interactions with these people at work, university or social occasions, immigrants get exposed to new predominant in this political environment beliefs, and are likely to adopt them. This process may be also referred to as social influence (Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1964; Latane, 1981; Bilodeau, 2004). Hence, a new surrounding political environment of the democratic host country should be an incentive for the immigrant, whose political socialization occurred in a country with non- or semi-democratic regime, to adapt and develop corresponding or similar to the host society democratic beliefs in order to fit into the new society and be accepted by it.

Individuals might seek to limit – consciously or unconsciously – their exposure to political beliefs or information that contradicts their existing opinions, but as Huckfeldt & Sprague point out, "(p)eople choose information sources subject to their own preferences, but they also take what is available" (1987:1198). In a new democratic political environment, immigrants from non-democratic and hybrid regimes might run into the limited accessibility of views similar to theirs as well as insufficient control over exposure to new political information. Moving to a democratic country, immigrants find

themselves in a dissonant political environment, and they are likely to become exposed to beliefs, views and information which they have been isolated from or which haven't been promoted on a sufficient level in their country of origin. So the key factor here is presence or absence of the accessibility to new political information and beliefs which are inherent to democratic society of the host country. Some researches underline that being part of social occasions, social networks and experiencing integration into new society of the host country might promote positive images of democracy and its principles, and thus speed up the process of democratic resocialization (Welch & Sigelman, 2000; Conway, 2001; Michelson, 2003).

The mechanisms through which immigrants exchange and are exposed to political information and beliefs are political deliberation and discussion, which are important ways for immigrants to participate in politics. Political (democratic) deliberation implies individuals' "[…] voicing rational reasons for their preferences, listening to one another, exchanging information and thereby moving towards decision making on the contentious issues facing society" (Conover et al., 2002: 23). However, the actual conversations that individuals have with each other nowadays are more spontaneous, do not carry such formal character as that assumes democratic deliberation and do not have a clear aim of decision-making or influencing the decision-making process. So a much better way to describe it is to call this political discussion, which is commonly a normal part of a daily life of the majority of modern people. We may for instance discuss news during dinner with our family or in our own time with peers and co-workers. Accordingly, we usually talk about politics or some political issues with the same people to whom we talk to about other issues (Klofstad, 2011).

According to Galandini and Fieldhouse (2019), political discussion lead to many benefits. Being a part of such a discussion, can bring to increase of political knowledge that, as discussed before, help form political attitudes, choices and behaviors about politics. Social networks and distribution of information through them could be immensely important for immigrants and their democratic resocialization. This is explained by the fact that immigrants usually have less access to socioeconomic and organizational resources compared to native-born people (Persson, 2021). One of the consequences is that immigrants may have more challenges in acquiring information needed for incorporation in the political system of the host country and, thus, democratic resocialization. Being an immigrant from a country of non-democratic or hybrid political regime and realizing own lack of information may lead one to the independent search of information through political discussions with native citizens.

Therefore, the social influence in the democratic host country is thought to intensify immigrant's exposure to democratic orientations in a way that it makes new political information and democratic beliefs for them more accessible and conspicuous, what facilitated immigrant's adaptation to democratic political environment of this country and thus democratic resocialization. Hence, the expectation is that both extending social networks in the democratic host country and carrying political discussions with natives lead to the migrants' adaptation to the new democratic environment and has a positive impact on immigrant's political resocialization.

However, according to resistance theory, immigrant's political orientations acquired in a non- or semi-democratic country may turn out to be persistent enough to reject any experience and any exposure to political information that might contradict with previously obtained political beliefs. Only that information would be consumed which finds some confirmations from the previous political non-democratic experience or existing political attitudes. In this case, a migrant's acquired political socialization may function as a filter that would accept or reject certain information and through which the new political reality of host country would be perceived (Vargas-Ramos, 2011). An immigrant would reject the opportunities and possibilities that could potentially influence the previously obtained in non- and semi-democratic country political views and thus would resist the process of democratic change. Therefore, it is expected that neither immigrant's social engagement nor participation in political discussions would have a visible positive effect on immigrant's political resocialization. In this case, the immigrant is expected to resist changes leading to democratic resocialization.

3.2. Political efficacy

Political efficacy is a key principle of a democratic political system and is a particularly important mechanism of identifying whether the democratic resocialization takes place. Political efficacy is a feeling that "individual political action does have, or can have, an impact upon the political process, i.e., that it is worthwhile to perform one's civic duties. It is a sense that political and social change is possible, and that the individual citizen can play a part in bringing about this change" (Campbell, Gurin and Miller, 1954: 187). Scholars usually distinguish two types of efficacy: internal and external (Lane, 1959; Balch, 1974). Internal political efficacy is the inner perception of each individual has own ability to impact the political process with own participation, while external political efficacy is the perception

that political system, parties and politicians in the first place, actually intend to take into consideration and include individual inputs to their decisions.

A true democracy requires citizens feel aware and competent to understand and participate in politics. Moreover, if lack of political efficacy is concentrated in a part of population with specific social characteristics like immigrants, it leads to a high risk of their political exclusion and strengthening of the social inequalities. Political efficacy may lead to increase in interest in politics and political participation among immigrants, adherence to democratic values and, hence, democratic resocialization (Anduiza & Martín, 2011). According to Warren (2001), social networks, membership in associations and participation in socioeconomic events as well as political discussions have an indirect influence, among others, on the sense of political efficacy. And thus, political efficacy is usually formed after the political discussions take place. By interacting with other members and with institutions individuals may develop both civic skills and the feeling that they can actually influence politics, and thus their subjective level of internal political efficacy may increase. The immigrant who is adapting to new democratic environment of host country experiences the increase of the internal political efficacy on the contrary to those immigrants who resist the process of democratic resocialization. Hence, the expectation is that immigrants undergoing a successful democratic resocialization would experience a heightened sense of freedom to participate in political discussions and openly articulate their political opinions. Moreover, the internal perception of political efficacy is expected to increase following their relocation to a democratic country.

3.3. Prejudice and discrimination toward immigrants

According to Minkenberg (2001), there has been a transformation in the concept of the 'people' where anti-immigrant parties exercise executive power. This leads to a shift from the encompassing demos to more exclusive ethnos. In other words, a shift from including democracy to politics of exclusion, what prevents immigrants from being a full-fledged part of democratic society.

Studies have shown that the presence of anti-immigrant parties increase the focus of residents and political parties on ethnicity and nationality (Rydgren 2003; Pirro 2015). In this way, the party presence indicates a legitimization of anti-immigrant attitudes in the political sphere as well. Focusing on the political integration, Just (2017) argues that there is a negative correlations between anti-immigrant party strength and satisfaction with democracy among immigrant non-citizens in Europe.

Researches point out that previous negative experience, related to the issues mentioned in this part, can negatively influence not only trust in but also the perception and satisfaction with democracy (Wilkes & Wu, 2019; Dinesen, 2010; Dinesen & Hooghe, 2010). The expectation here is that the negative experience of prejudice or discrimination of an immigrant in a host country might negatively influence the democratic resocialization process, because this negative experience would undermine immigrant's trust in democracy and its institutions. In the case of experiencing discrimination and prejudice, an immigrant may feel oneself a part of marginalized group and face complications with integration and adaptation to new democratic environment of the host country, what leads to the feeling of political exclusion and undermines immigrant's trust in democratic institutions. In other words, migrant's negative experience of discrimination and prejudice in the host country influences the democratic resocialization process in a negative way and leads to the rejection of new democratic environment.

3.4. Experience of deception in the host country

A number of individual-level studies have demonstrated that corruption affects governmental performance and consequently reduces trust in government's capacity to respond to citizens' demands. Such conclusions were drawn in different countries and regions including Western democracies (Della Porta, 2000) as well as the EU member states (Pellegata & Memoli, 2016).

The immigrants from countries that are more plagued by corruption than the average Western European country, namely ones with hybrid and authoritarian regimes, tend to express higher levels of political trust at democratic institutions of their new host countries (Röder & Mühlau, 2012). At the same time, Anderson & Tverdova (2003) argue the opposite view, that citizens coming from corrupt democracies showed less trust in public officials and less satisfaction with democracy. Although the democratic institutions of checks and balances, such as an independent justice system and police, an active civil society, independent media, often do not function as described in theory. The executive might use its influence over the legislature to seek selective interests; the police and the justice system might be not independent from the (political) elites; while the civil society is uninformed due to the lack of transparency and corruption in the media.

Numbers from the section four show that there is a chance that migrants directly or indirectly (their relatives or acquaintances) may have experienced or faced a case of corruption in a host country, they doubt that the decision-making is transparent or media is independent, or they got used to the thought that neither decisions are fair nor media is uninfluenced. Therefore, we can expect that the previous negative experience with corruption in a host country would negatively influence and decrease the immigrant's trust in democratic institutions and satisfaction with democracy, and thus would have a negative effect on the immigrant's democratic resocialization process.

4. Case selection, research methods and data

This master's thesis is an inductive qualitative research for which would be conducted interviews with open-ended informal questions. Using this method would allow to develop an in-depth and extensive understanding of the issue under consideration. To be able to check the veracity of the assumptions and to draw parallels, countries should have some distinguishing features and to be outstanding representatives of its category: Russia as a bright representative of non-democratic country, Ukraine of a hybrid regime (democracy in transition) and Austria as a representative of pure democracy. In this research I am following the exposure and transferability theories, which are different but both hold the optimistic view on the perspectives of immigrants' adaptation to new democratic political realities. All the factors mentioned in the section above influence the process of democratic socialization and hence their effect is considered during interviews with respondents.

To evaluate the democracy level, I refer in this research to the Freedom House measurements of democratization and to the results presented by the Economist Intellectual Unit (EIU) in the Democracy Index. Freedom House classifies regimes on two seven-point scales, one concerned with political rights associated with electoral participation and the other dealing with civil liberties associated with freedom from an oppressive state. The two scales correlate very highly and are usually combined to rank regimes ordinally on a seven-point scale, within which countries are labeled as free, partly free and not free. These three categories are often used as equivalent to being democratic, partly democratic or democratizing, and undemocratic. In year 2022 their rankings for Russia are 19 (not free), for Ukraine 61 (partly free) and for Austria 93 (free) out of 100 (Freedom House, 2022). The Economist Intellectual Unit, however, measures democracy in a more 'extended' way, which reflects

that state's political freedoms and civil liberties are not enough to encompass sufficiently features that determine how substantive democracy is. The EIU's Democracy Index, on a 0 to 10 scale, is based on the ratings for 60 indicators, grouped into five categories: electoral process and pluralism; civil liberties; the functioning of government; political participation; and political culture. The five categories are interrelated and form a coherent conceptual whole. The overall Index is the simple average of the five category indexes. The index values place countries within one of four types of regime: full democracies (above 8), flawed democracies (from 6 to 8), hybrid regimes (from 4 to 6) and authoritarian regimes (less or equal to 4). According to the EIU's index of democracy for year 2021, score of Russia is 3.24 (authoritarian), of Ukraine 5.57 (hybrid regime) while the score of Austria is 8.07 (full democracy) accordingly (EIU, 2022).

Based on the EIU's more advanced approach to democracy measurement, I provide here some of the features that are observed in each regime of this research. The country is a *full democracy* if not only basic political freedoms and civil liberties are respected, but in which a political culture is maintained. The functioning of government is satisfactory while media are independent and diverse. The system of checks and balances is effective, judiciary is independent and their decisions are enforced. The distinctive features of *hybrid regimes* are, most significantly, substantial irregularities of elections that usually prevent them from being free and fair. There are serious weaknesses of government functioning, political participation and political culture. Widespread evidence of corruption is evident while the rule of law tends to be weak. There is some evidence of pressure on journalists and the judiciary is not independent. In *authoritarian regime*, in its turn, state political pluralism is either absent or heavily restricted. Majority of countries in this category are outright dictatorships ю Some formal institutions of democracy may exist, but these have little or no influence. Elections, if occur, are not free and fair. Civil liberties abuses and infringements are disregarded. Media are typically state-owned or controlled by groups connected to the ruling regime. There is repression of criticism of the government and pervasive censorship and absence of independent judiciary (EIU report, 2022). The descriptions of these significant features show distinguishing characteristics of each regime and explain the choice of the case countries.

Previous studies on immigration point out that immigrants are usually slightly more satisfied with the democracy than respondents without migratory background (Dollmann, 2021). During interviews, I would take into consideration two additional factors: first, that the democratic regime may be judged

by immigrants not solely on its performance, but that the judgement may be rather influenced by the comparison with the old non-democratic regime, and secondly, that the evaluation may happen under influence of honeymoon effect.

Regarding the rise of far-right party and emergence of anti-immigration incentives in Austria some explanatory background information should be given to understand the influence on immigrants and their socialization. During the increase of support of Austrian Freedom party FPÖ in the end of 1990-ies, whose central positions were directed towards anti-migration attitude and policies, other parties feeling insecure due to the loss of votes, began to change their policies regarding migration. This was the case of ÖVP, whose members felt compelled to respond more forcefully on sociocultural issues and provided more restrictive approach towards migration (Dautović & Hafez, 2019; Steinmayr, 2016). Moreover, previously prevalent only among the far-right FPÖ, this discourse become mainstream and was mirrored even in the positions of anti-racist political parties such as SPÖ (the Social Democrats) and the Greens (Hafez, 2017). Immigration has become not only a political, but also a relevant socio-economic phenomenon. In 2017, when the former Foreign Minister Sebastian Kurz became the new party leader of the ÖVP, immigration to Austria was turned into the central issue during his party's national election campaign in 2017 (Hadj Abdou & Ruedin, 2022). The parties' movement, built mainly on the events of 9/11 and the migrant crisis, actively used such concepts as a "parallel society" and led a strategy of ostracization, and although this at first mainly concerned Muslims, this discourse ultimately led to such outcome that negative attitudes among Austrian population spread not only to this particular group of migrants, but in general to those immigrating from third countries to Austria (Hafez et al., 2019; Hadj Abdou & Ruedin, 2022).

As a result, some immigrants from non-EU countries have experience in Austria some form of discrimination or unfair treatment. The ENAR (2019) report stated that in Austria the number of cases of discrimination has increased and the police do not take reports of such crime seriously, they are judged as not important. Moreover, certain minority groups are, through stereotyping, associated with criminality, violence, dishonesty, and/or seen as a security threat (ENAR, 2013; ENAR, 2019). Except that, some researches argue that migrants in Austria face discrimination in everyday life, and are confronted with different forms of direct and indirect discrimination and structural barriers to equal participation in the labor market (ENAR, 2013).

Moreover, according to the Corruption Perception Index, which ranks the world countries by their perceived levels of public sector corruption and uses a scale from 0 to 100, where 100 is very clean and 0 is highly corrupt, Austria has a score of 74 (rank 13 out of 180 countries), while the score of Ukraine is 32 (rank 122) and of Russia is 29 (rank 136) (CPU, 2021). So this numbers allow to assume that immigrants in Austria may have directly or indirectly experienced or faced a case of corruption. If so, then they may doubt that the decision-making of the host country is transparent or media is independent, or they got used to the thought that neither decisions are fair nor media is uninfluenced.

To determine the presence or absence of the changes in political attitudes generally are used some before-after time points which can be referred to. Although the "before" - prior to the migration - reference point is not possible to be fully studied in this research, it would still be able to make an analysis of stated assumptions if two more elements would be included in the research: the political attitudes of people currently living in the non-democratic and hybrid regimes who have never immigrated abroad, as well as the political attitudes of native Austrians. I would interview 3-5 people who immigrated to Austria from Russia and Ukraine as well as native Austrian citizens to grasp what their political attitudes are. Due to the lack of independent sources in less democratic countries, I would also conduct interviews of people currently living in the non-democratic and hybrid regimes who have never immigrated abroad. This would be included as a reference point in this research and the interviews with immigrants from non- and semi-democratic regimes to a democratic one, would give the understanding what their political attitudes are and whether the political resocialization has or has not taken place.

Because political socialization is a cumulative learning process, immigrants who left their country of origin in early age are expected not to be able to reflect and compare political attitudes, norms and behaviors of different political regimes in the required for the study sufficient extent. It is expected that immigrants of early age are migrating together with at least someone of their family and although being one of the political socialization agents, family members who migrated to the receiving country may also have experienced political resocialization to certain extent and thus the children with high probability were also subjected to potential changes in political orientations of their relatives. As socializing agents and their influence on the political resocialization of migrants is not the object of study, the immigrants under the age of twenty would not be interviewed. This would allow to evaluate

the impact of the political socialization, formed prior to immigration in a non- and semi-democratic country, in a reliable way.

5. Explanatory mechanisms and their constituents

In order to better analyze the degree of democratic resocialization of migrants, each mentioned above mechanism and its impact will be assessed for the presence and absence of the following constituent elements.

1. Social networking and political discussion: social networking and political discussion are essential for democratic resocialization, which involves helping migrants connect and interact with the local community, promoting a sense of belonging and facilitating the exchange of ideas and viewpoints. This can occur through various means, such as community organizations, social media or informal meetings. By evaluating whether migrants are engaging in social networking and political discussion, we can better understand their level of integration and involvement in the democratic processes of their host country. The elements used for evaluation are:

- Cultural understanding: Immigrants must comprehend their new country's culture in order to excel in social networking in a new political environment. This implies being aware of social norms and values. Immigrants should be conscious of and appreciative of cultural differences.

- Social engagement: In a new political climate, social engagement is a crucial component of effective social networking. It is important for immigrants to participate in social events and to engage in social activities in order to integrate into a new society of a democratic host country.

Moreover, political deliberation and discussion may have result in immigrant's increase of political knowledge, which is essential for immigrants to understand the new country's political institutions, processes, and policies. It is also considered a key element in the democratic resocialization process. That is why, the following elements are also taken into account for evaluation of this explanatory mechanism:

- Familiarity with political system and terminology: In order to successfully integrate into a new country, immigrants should have a basic understanding of the country's political system, including the structure and functions of the government, the roles of different political institutions, and the relationships between the government and the people of the country. This information should assist immigrants in navigating the political system and taking part in social activities. In order to successfully adjust to a new culture, immigrants should become familiar with the political terminology used in their new country, including legal terms and phrases associated with the political system. With this information, immigrants can comprehend political news, participate in political discourse, and take part in social events.

- Knowledge of political issues: It is important for immigrants to have knowledge of the important political issues in their new country, including current events and policy debates. Thanks to this knowledge can engage in political discussions and acquire opinions on political issues.

- Awareness of political parties: The political parties in the new democratic country, their ideology, and their position on important political topics should be familiar to immigrants. This way immigrants are able to comprehend the political environment, take part in political discussions as well as engage in social activities.

- Media literacy: To critically evaluate and analyze political news and information, immigrants need to possess media literacy abilities. This involves being able to identify bias and comprehend how the media shapes public opinion.

2. Political efficacy. An essential component of immigrant political efficacy as they undergo political resocialization in a new democracy is the sense of awareness. Immigrants may feel confused and disoriented when they first enter a new political environment because they may not be familiar with the political institutions and processes. However, when individuals have a better understanding of the political system and its institutions, they can begin to develop a sense of internal political efficacy. The following are factors are taken into account:

- Clear opinion formation: An immigrant has an articulated opinion based on a thoughtful and informed assessment of information regarding a particular topic. It includes being able to articulate one's opinions and the reasoning supporting them.

- Linguistic uncertainty: Evaluation of an immigrant's use of words of uncertainty when expressing their position, to identify certain tendencies in their speech that indicate hesitation or lack of confidence in their beliefs or when expressing their opinion. In this case, is evaluated immigrant's use of words and phrases that express uncertainty, such as "maybe", "possibly", or "I'm not sure", "I don't know", "I am not proficient enough in this topic" etc. which indicate a lack of confidence that one is competent enough to express his/her position on some political issue and/or has a limited understanding of the topic.

- Sense of empowerment: Immigrants may feel more empowered if they understand the political system and how it works. Thus, they may have a higher confidence in their capacity to alter things for the better in their new country. It is important to trace the direction in which changes can take place, so the emergence or strengthening of a sense of empowerment in relation to the home country and the host country would be marked separately.

- Increased interest in politics: For immigrants in a new democratic nation, a key component of effective political efficacy is having a political interest. These immigrants are more likely to participate in political discussions and activities, follow current affairs and policy concerns. It also may occur that political interest would arise or increase only in relation to one region. Due to this reason, the interest in politics and political issues of host country and of native country would also be considered separately.

Although it may also happen that an immigrant would lose his/her interest in politics and political affairs. Such changes are also important and would be marked as well as the region towards which the interest was lost.

3. Prejudice and discrimination toward immigrants. In a newly democratic society, prejudice or discrimination towards immigrants from non- or semi-democratic nations can have a substantial detrimental impact on their degree of integration and democratic resocialization. Additionally, being the target of prejudice or discrimination can harm an immigrant's psychological health, resulting in stress, worry, and sadness. This may have an effect on their capacity and willingness to participate in social and political activities. As a result, prejudice or discrimination can also undermine or make it more difficult for an immigrant to integrate into a democratic society. As mentioned before, it's possible that an individual from non- or semi-democratic country has little familiarity with democratic

institutions, values and norms. In order to learn about the democratic process, the rights and the responsibilities they have in a democratic society, immigrants might need some support from the native population. However, experiencing prejudice or discrimination may lead to disillusionment or distrust towards the democratic system, making it more difficult for immigrants to accept democratic institutions and norms. The following are factors are taken into account:

- Discrimination or prejudice: Evaluating the extent of discrimination or prejudice experienced by immigrants from non-democratic or semi-democratic countries directly or indirectly in the new democratic society and the potential effect it may have on the immigrant's process or integration and democratic resocialization.

- Sense of isolation or exclusion: An immigrant's capacity to adjust to their new democratic environment in the host country may be negatively affected if they feel excluded or socially isolated in the host country.

- Political context: An immigrant acknowledges the right-wing parties' direct or indirect influence over them or the sentiments of native people of the host country, and admits the influence this might have on one's integration and sense of belonging to the new environment of the democratic host country.

- Sentiments of natives: Immigrant admits the certain (positive/negative) sentiments of native population of the host country and the influence it has on one's integration into the new society.

- Increased political trust: Democratic resocialization of an immigrant can lead to an increased political interest in either both the host and native countries or in only one region. As migrants actively participate in civic and political activities, they become more knowledgeable about the political landscape, policies, and issues of their host country. This interest may also be extended not only to the host country but also to their native country, especially if they maintain strong connections there.

While the process of democratic resocialization can lead to increased interest for some immigrants, it can also result in a decrease of political interest for others. This drastic change in the level of political interests comes from a variety of factors that influence how people respond to and interact with the new political environment. When considering this and the above mentioned element, the direction of the potential change and the regions of immigrant's political interest would be also separately marked.

4. Experience of deception. Cases of deception in the host country can have a significant negative influence on the political resocialization of immigrants. Such instances erode trust and worsen sentiments of alienation among immigrants, hindering their integration into the new society.

- Corruption: Corruption might be regarded as an essential factor of evaluation when determining the factors that might have an impact on their degree of integration and democratic resocialization. This is due to the fact that corruption may undermine immigrants' trust in democratic institutions and processes, which consequently can affect the extent of their participation in and integration into society of a new country. when a case of corruption surfaces within the political system of the host country, it may reinforce existing prejudices and undermines immigrants' faith in the integrity of the democratic process, what might make their political resocialization a difficult task.

- Transparency evaluation: The lack of transparency in both the host and native country's media further compounds the problem and may prevent a democratic resocialization, as immigrants struggle to discern reliable information from biased or manipulated sources. In such cases an interview subject would admit insufficient transparency in media and by political decision-making.

In order to establish the extent and direction of potential change for the two groups of migrants, there is a need to establish a basis for comparison in order to make a conclusion whether the democratical resocialization has taken place. This basis for comparison will be the general indicators of the theoretical mechanisms social networks and political discussion and political efficacy and their constituent elements mentioned above as well as sentiments of groups of native Ukrainians, native Russians and native Austrians in their views and positions on these elements.

6. Data analyses tool and questions for respondents

MAXQDA was selected as the optimal software program for analyzing interview data in this master's thesis based on its exceptional data management capabilities. The software enabled the creation of a multi-level coding system that aligns with the research objectives and theoretical framework. This flexibility allowed for the development of a coding system that can capture the diverse aspects of democratic resocialization experienced by immigrant groups, encompassing wide variety of themes

mentioned above. Moreover, the hierarchical structure enabled a nuanced analysis by allowing for both broad and specific codes, facilitating in-depth exploration of the data. The coding system used in this research was constructed based on the previously described constituent elements. These elements serve as the building blocks for explanatory mechanisms, which in turn are employed to analyze the complex process of democratic resocialization among immigrants.

The questions for individuals currently residing in non-democratic (Russia) and hybrid regimes (Ukraine) who have never immigrated abroad, along with native Austrians, are crafted to capture the perspective "before" their potential move to a democratic country. These questions aim to uncover their political views, perceptions of the political landscape in their home countries, and their personal agency in influencing political issues. The inquiries also delve into their experiences with promoting political views domestically, their assessment of the government in their native country and the factors influencing their trust in political regimes. Additionally, the questions explore the dynamics of discussing politics both within their home country and with people from other nations. This approach enables a comprehensive understanding of their political perspectives and engagement prior to any potential immigration experience.

The interview questions for migrants from non-democratic and hybrid regimes were designed to gather comprehensive insights into their experiences, perceptions, and attitudes following their relocation to Austria. The questions cover a range of topics, including initial impressions of Austria, reflections on leaving their native country, regrets or happiness after moving, views on integration into society, personal experiences influencing outlook, perceptions of social and political exclusion, awareness of issues in their home country, and the ability to influence those issues. Additionally, the interview explores their political views, factors shaping those views, identification of role models, dynamics of political discussions with people from their home country and Austria, perspectives on the Austrian government and political system, and their assessment of the direction in which Austria's government is developing. The interview concludes with an opportunity for migrants to share any additional thoughts or information. These questions aim to provide a nuanced understanding of the political, social, and personal dimensions of the migrants' experiences in a democratic setting.

7. Recruiting and sampling

Recruiting participants for inductive qualitative analysis involves identifying individuals who can provide valuable insights and experiences related to the topic under consideration. Several strategies were used to recruit participants for this study. First of all, a purposeful sampling strategy was employed due to the necessity of gathering comprehensive and information-rich data for the study and provide diverse perspectives (Creswell, 2018). Initially, individuals relevant to the study were recognized and requested to seek out additional valuable informants, so initial participants recommended others who might be suitable for the study. Hence, the strategy of snowball sampling was also employed. Moreover, the recruiting process included the usage of online media platforms in order to engage with potential participants who expressed interest.

Overall, ten face-to-face interviews with native Austrians and migrants from Russia and Ukraine were conducted, and six remote interviews with the participants belonging to the groups native Russians living in Russia and native Ukrainians living in Ukraine.

The characteristics of the sample are presented in table 1.

Table 1. Sample characteristics

ID	sex	age	nationality	current place of residence
E01	female	25	Austrian	Austria
E02	male	34	Austrian	Austria
E03	female	28	Austrian	Austria
E04	male	42	Russian	Russia
E05	female	35	Russian	Russia
E06	male	27	Russian	Russia

E07	male	28	Ukrainian	Ukraine
E8	male	41	Ukrainian	Ukraine
E09	female	25	Ukrainian	Ukraine
E10	female	25	Russian	Austria
E11	female	29	Russian	Austria
E12	male	28	Russian	Austria
E13	male	36	Russian	Austria
E14	female	35	Ukrainian	Austria
E15	male	29	Ukrainian	Austria
E16	female	25	Ukrainian	Austria

The interviews were carried out with the help of an open-ended informal questions. The interviews were available within two types of documentation, including audio recordings and transcripts. Before the interview, all the participants signed an informed consent. Data collection took place in a real-world setting to minimize the impact of an artificially created situation. Therefore, the setting was chosen by the participants, depending on which place was more convenient for them. The remote interviews were conducted via Skype or Zoom programs.

8. Transcribing, paraphrasing and analyzing

After the data collection, the interviews were transcribed and paraphrased within an inductive approach. Therefore, categories were built by summarizing the data into increasingly abstract units until a comprehensive set was achieved (Creswell, 2018). The relevant paraphrases were allocated to the categories and analyzed with the software MAXQDA using the explanatory mechanisms and their

constituents describe above. Before beginning with the analysis, the field access was established, sampling decisions were taken and the data was recorded and transcribed. The data analysis has only begun after the data collection and preparation were completed. Linguistic material was classified and interpreted in order to make implicit and explicit statements (Flick, 2013).

9. Analyzing Distinctive Characteristics and Comparisons Among Respondent Groups: Findings

In this part of the master's thesis, I will begin with outlining the distinctive characteristics inherent in each group of respondents relying on the explanatory mechanisms and the presence or absence of the chosen constituent elements, as well as the factors and characteristics which I found remarkable.

As previously outlined, to evaluate the potential success and extent of political resocialization in a democratic environment, will be carried out a comparative analysis of migrants who have relocated to Austria from countries characterized by non-democratic or hybrid political regimes. Their political positions, interests, and other relevant positions according to the previously explained mechanisms, will be compared with the average positions based on corresponding factors among members of the local population in their countries of origin with non-democratic and hybrid political regimes. This comparative analysis aims to identify distinctions and similarities in their political positions, providing insights into their political views and engagement before migration. Additionally, these migrants' political positions will be contrasted with the average positions of the local population in Austria based on similar factors. This comparative approach will help to identify potential changes or the absence of them, in the political perspectives of migrants after their relocation to the democratic environment. The goal is to comprehensively understand the political dynamics before and after migration, underlining the potential transformative impact of a democratic environment on migrants.

9.1. Native Austrians

During the interviews conducted for this study, a recurring theme among native Austrians was the cultural distinctiveness of Austria and its potential impact on the integration process of immigrants.

Native Austrians openly acknowledged the presence of this cultural specificity and how it might create challenges for newcomers from other countries. They described their own behavior and actions as reserved, which could sometimes be interpreted by immigrants as "coldness." This cultural difference often necessitated more time for immigrants to adapt and fully integrate into Austrian society. Consequently, respondents acknowledged the risk of exclusion faced by immigrants due to these cultural disparities, making their socialization process more difficult:

> Well I would say that in other countries, in developing countries, the culture is a lot more welcoming, people are made a lot more welcome be than in Austria. It's difficult to integrate in Austria, because I think that the culture is very individual, i.e. you focus a lot on yourself. (…) And that's why I would say that the Austrian culture would be perceived as very isolated, because the people are more or less focused on themselves, you don't approach the people so much, and yes, well I find them cooler. And not very welcome when comparing to other countries. (Interview with Laura)

> In terms of mentality I would describe Austrians, I would say, a bit more closed than people in the south or in the east. (…) Yes, on the one hand, a bit cold, on the other hand, when you get to know them, we are really good people. (Interview with Emil)

Some respondents underline that sometimes migrants could be even excluded from the society because of specific factors like a knowledge of language:

> One of the reasons why for immigrants is difficult to integrate in Austria is the language, i.e. German. (…) I see that by the people who are in my environment. And I see that people (Austrians) sometimes look at the migrants who are learning the German language very, kind of, strangely. And I find that these people are excluded from the society because of the language, because you somehow think that the person, so immigrant, is not good at German and then you somehow may not think much of the person… Well, I don't think like that myself, but I notice that others often treat you differently if you don't speak German very well. (…) This means that this barrier damages integration even more (Interview with Laura)

Political Engagement and Empowerment

Majority of the native Austrian respondents articulate their thoughts and political views clearly, demonstrating a well-defined and well-reasoned point of view that reflects their quite deep involvement in political life. Not only those respondents who claim to be interested in politics, but also those who cannot characterize themselves in this way are able to express their political opinions accurately and clearly demonstrate a strong political culture that values effective and constructive political communication. All native Austrian respondents had neither direct involvement in politics such

as through work or education, nor practical experience in political activities. Despite the absence of direct engagement of such kind, they displayed a remarkable willingness to express their criticisms regarding government actions and decisions as well as laws. Moreover, the majority of respondents not only pointed out the issues they believed required change but also proposed some concrete solutions for improvement.

Among all the respondents, only one individual actively engaged in political action by participating in a street rally, while the rest voiced their opinions on various political topics but refrained from taking part in other forms of active political engagement, except taking part in elections. It shows that individuals have different approaches to participating in the democratic system, and these approaches might be influenced by factors such as perceived effectiveness, safety considerations, and the belief in the power of discourse.

All respondents from this group share the same attitude towards elections, regardless of their real interest in politics. Moreover, it is worth underlining that even if person admits they are not highly interested in politics, they responsibly approach their right to choose and the opportunity to vote.

> I read online news but basically not that much. If something happens, then we would find out anyways and everything else is always so much talk I think. If it goes in the direction of the elections, then I deal more with the topics, so I read what they want to do and plan to do. Then yes, then I give more of my attention to the politics and political topics. (Interview with Johanna)

Informal Political Discussions

Furthermore, during interviews it became evident that the majority of respondents were frequently engaged in informal political discussions with friends and family. These conversations served as main channels for individuals to express their political views and opinions. The presence of (active) political discussions within social circles underlines the significance of informal spaces for political participation and expression.

The prevalence of informal political discussions highlights how individuals can actively contribute to shaping the political landscape outside of formal political structures. It also points out the deep interconnectedness of social and political life within the Austrian context.

> I'm generally politically active, so very often. Maybe 2-3 times a week, so often enough. In my circle of friends, politics is always the topic. So yes... with friends, with fellow students, with family. Well,

I'm interested in this sphere, in political topics generally, and that's why these discussions happen very often in my life. And always about both international relations and Austrian politics. (Interview with Laura)

Surely, I see my friends often more than once a week, and politics is usually one of the topics we discuss. But it always depends on the topic. (…) Now the discussions on politics happen really often, mainly about international news. (…) Regarding the discussions on Austrian politics, if there are no elections or I don't know some major events then not so often, so not every day. It's really dominated by the themes, but still quite often I would say. (Interview with Emil)

Media Influence on Political Discourse

Media played a significant role in shaping respondents' political discussions and priorities. Highly publicized issues received the most attention, what highlights the media's power to influence public discourse, agenda as well as social perceptions of political issues. Some of the respondents acknowledged that media plays an important role in shaping their opinions and in determining the issues they consider as significant.

But it always depends on the topic. If the topic dominates, as I said, as it is now with war, then of course we talk about it more and more often. But it [the topic] flattens out a bit and always depends on the media, what information you get and what you don't get. Or how it was now with the federal presidential election, also highly discussed. When something like this is pending, when the topics are pending, then you talk about it more often. (Interview with Emil)

Issues of Racism and Corruption

During interviews, respondents not only highlighted the economic challenges resulting from the external or international political decisions and actions, but also pointed to domestic systemic imperfections in Austrian politics. For example, the topic of corruption and racism was mentioned by all native Austrian respondents as a prominent issue, affecting both governmental and business sectors. Respondents acknowledged corruption is possible due to the insufficient accountability, loops in the laws and factors inherent to the Austrian culture. Respondents were unanimous in their desire to contribute to addressing these challenges and creating a more inclusive society in their homeland. Their collective will to address discrimination, racism and corruption demonstrates a desire for social change and active participation in shaping their new society. Their shared vision of a fairer Austria illustrates their active participation in bringing about positive change in the country.

I don't like that the VPÖ is the party that scolds foreigners and I find that negative because it is passed on to the media and hatred towards foreigners is stirred up in Austria. (Interview with Johanna)

Austria in general has a bit of a corruption problem, so there are ongoing investigations into certain parties. Maybe also this party donation system too, so private people invest a lot. It's even worse in America, but it's the same in Austria. Now for example a big company supports ÖVP with money and when the ÖVP come to power then, for example, they lower taxes for such companies. It is also a kind of corruption, but not this green washing, but so "*Reingewasch*", so laundering money. (…) The problem of corruption exists everywhere, it's not differently in companies, i.e. internally in companies. So not only in this "big order", I think. In companies, when people help each other in some way, but for their own interests, that happens everywhere, and this kind of *Freunderlwirtschaft*, among other things. But in politics it's even worse because it affects us all. (Interview with Emil)

I can't judge what's going on behind the scenes in the government, but from what you're reading in the press now, you understand that Austria now have corruption problems, because such things are happening that the general public has no idea about. But I don't know enough to tell you to what extend is Austria corrupt, or how bad it looks behind the scenes. But subjectively I can say that the Austrian government in general has a problem with corruption (Interview with Laura)

Moreover, respondents with non-traditional Austrian names or names uncommon in German-speaking countries shared experiences of different treatment to them from the side of other native Austrians. Despite being born in Austria and living there for whole lives, respondents reported instances where their names influenced how they were perceived and treated by other Austrians. Respondents form this group pointed out that their negative experience brings attention to issues of racism and discrimination based on nationality in democratic and multicultural Austria.

I mentioned racism because I have personal experience... For me... it wasn't any kind of *that* bad stuff... Well, by appearance you don't notice that my roots are from somewhere else. But it's happened more than once, like, for example, when I was working somewhere and I had a badge with my name on it, and as long as you're not watching the badge and just talking to me, everything's great, and somehow it's happened to me often, that people then look "Ah, what's your name?", and then you realize that… ah, OK. It might be a bit of a banal example, but happens a lot. (Interview with Emil)

Trust in Democracy and Institutions

Despite recent corruption scandals negatively affecting respondents' trust in political institutions and parties, native Austrians' faith in Austrian democratic political institutions remained at the medium closer to high level. The corruption scandals which we mentioned by all respondents of this group seem to be perceived by some as a one-time situation not likely to happen again, while for the majority this

issue is rooted deeper and many situations are taking place behind the scenes. It is important that all respondents have condemned the involved political party and political leaders, and criticized the fact that such scandals happened in Austria. It might be that cultural norms and social values influence the perception of trust in democracy and specific political actors. So for example, Austria with a culture that places high value on democratic principles may encourage trust in the system as a whole, even in the face of political corruption.

> Yes I do have trust in political institutions in Austria, but I have to say that trust is not as high now as it used to be, mainly because of the recent scandals in the government, because of the Ibiza scandal and because of the Covid-19 management. (…) My political trust has fallen as a result of the scandals, but I don't think that all institutions in Austria are bad, so I continue to trust in them, but my trust isn't as high as it used to be. (Interview with Laura)

> The most recent example of what has undermined my trust in political regimes and political institutions in Austria would be with the ÖVP-FPÖ government, 3-4 years ago, for example this Ibiza scandal… It wasn't surprising, but if something like that comes out, how can we say about trust. (Interview with Emil)

> I think that trust goes down there when you hear about corruption scandals in the media and also about such a story that Russia pays lobbyists from VPÖ. It is well known that every politician gets money from Russia, and all this in the middle of the Russia-Ukraine war. And my confidence is therefore down. And for example, these corruption stories and that the party took taxpayers' money… And I think to myself, we pay taxes, taxes, taxes and in the end they all steal this money for some things that just aren't agreed upon, for their needs or some projects that don't existing. (…) And of course that influences the trust of Austrian people and my trust as well! And this Freundlwirtschaft in Austria is very widespread. (Interview with Johanna)

As mentioned here, despite the disillusionment with specific political figures in power, it seems that there are other factors that contribute to trust in Austrian democratic institutions and helped to remain respondent's political trust in the end at the still high level.

The particular coexistence of trust in democracy, trust in Austria as a democratic country (trust in Austrian's democratic system), and distrust in specific political actors arouses the interest. This might be explained by the fact that respondents may make a clear distinction between the democratic system itself and the specific individuals or parties within that system.

Ambiguity in Political Interest

The research findings revealed an ambiguous and unclear relationship between political interest and political engagement among native Austrians. While all respondents displayed a strong ability to

identify pressing political problems and challenges, articulate critiques and acknowledged political topics are a frequent topic of conversation in their social circles, not all claimed to have a genuine interest in politics. The majority of respondents read news and engaged in political discussions primarily to stay informed, rather than out of a deep-seated interest in political affairs.

Table 2. Overview of Social and Political Dynamics Among Native Austrians

Analyzing Factors	Native Austrians
1. Social Networking and political discussion	Acknowledge the presence of the cultural specificity among native population and that it might create challenges for newcomers from other countries during their process of assimilation
	Social networking include all representatives of native population uncluding migrants
	Actively engage in political discussions with friends and family
	Knowledge of current political issues but frequently mention highly mediatized topics
	Admit to read news and engage in political discussions to stay informed, rather than out of a deep-seated interest in political
2. Political Efficacy	Respondents, regardless of their initial interest in politics are aware of political issues and willingly express their opinion on these issues
	Expressing their opinions and critique towards corruption and state apparatus problems
	Articulate their thoughts and political views clearly, demonstrate well-reasoned point of view
	Are aware of their role in driving political transformations within the country
	Trust in democratic political institutions is high, although observed decline due to mediatized political scandals
	Disillusionment with specific political figures in power
	No justification of the political regime and politicians in power and made political decisions
	Mention corruption and racism as an important domestic and global issue

In addition to the qualitative insights provided above, a comprehensive understanding of the respondents' experiences in the context of social networking, political discussion, and political efficacy can be further supplemented by the following Table 2. The table presents a structured overview of key

observations, illustrating the interplay between various factors and their constituent elements in shaping the native Austrians' perspectives and behaviors.

9.2. Respondents from Russia

Considering the prevailing political climate in the Russian Federation, it was important for me to ensure that the interviews were conducted in a comfortable and trusting atmosphere. This was essential to guarantee the receipt of truthful and comprehensive responses during the interviews.

During the data collection phase involving this specific group of respondents, I faced certain challenges. These difficulties primarily revolved around my attempts to approach potential respondents from the Russian Federation who have not personally known me. Upon approaching these individuals and asking whether they would be open to participating in a brief interview, with the assurance of complete anonymity, the sole response I encountered was a prompt and unequivocal refusal. Their refusal is understandable to me: they did not know me and were hesitant to engage in such interactions with a stranger.

I came to the realization that conducting interviews with individuals with whom I had no personal connection or whose family members or acquaintances cannot vouch for me would be impractical if I want to preserve a comfortable and conducive atmosphere for the interviews. Consequently, I had to adopt a different approach. I opted to reach out to Russians living in Austria and who had acquaintances or family members in Russia and whom I can approach. I hoped that given my connection with someone who these potential respondents knew, would make them more inclined to accept the invitation to participate in an interview. Ultimately, this strategy proved to be effective. Moreover, to ensure the data's validity, the people I asked for help in finding contacts did not take part in this study.

The Influence of Media on Political Discourse and Public Opinion

At the beginning of my research, I understood the importance to familiarize myself with the media landscape within the Russian Federation. This involved a thorough examination of the subjects, topics, and recurring themes that consistently featured in Russian media. My aim was to gain a comprehensive understanding of how media in Russia shapes political discussions and influences public opinion.

What immediately stands out is that individuals in the Russian Federation often discuss highly politicized topics that are regularly featured in the media. These topics may not always be as relevant when compared to international events. Additionally, when asked about the most important issues in the Russian Federation, respondents tend to mention these media-driven topics and often use arguments that are commonly found in news sources.

During interviews with all respondents from Russia, it became evident how significant the role of national media is in shaping their opinions and views. In these interviews, all respondents consistently referred to topics covered by the media. Notably, they frequently used the same phrases and verbal expressions as used in news sources. It's worth noting that only one respondent acknowledged the potential negative influence of media and propaganda on their thoughts and perspectives. Many of the responses referred to television broadcasts as their primary source of information. So Television and its content, was often cited during own discussion.

There is a clear division of respondents into two groups with diametrically opposed approaches to politics and engagement in it.

Diversity of respondents' opinions

The majority of respondents, constituting the first group, tend to respond to questions with generalized statements, avoiding detailed elaboration. Even when asking to provide more clarifying answers, they often refrain from providing comprehensive information or their fully articulated opinion. Additionally, respondents frequently revisited their opinions and made efforts to moderate or soften them.

> Well… there is something a little bit, probably, from a non-democratic state… I mean why there are so many police here… In addition to the police, there is also the National Guard… So, the government is afraid of something if it hires so many people, or what? You begin to ask yourself why there are so many police and the National Guard… These are the disadvantages, but they are trying to be better. (…) Well, there is something positive, they are striving to the best. (Interview with Gena)

> Well has undermined my trust, of course, well… let's call it aggression… Well, someone thinks that this is not aggression, that this is aimed at the right thing… To save the nation, so that the nation is not destroyed, to protect its interests. Well, how this was with Crimea. It is clear that little green men came in and seized the Crimea. Well, you can argue a lot whether it is Ukrainian or Russian, but let's say it is Slavic. It is not that important who possesses it, but it was very important that the Crimea would not be given to NATO countries… because, well, NATO bases have already started to appear there… (Interview with Gena)

Well, in principle, I assess my trust in as quite OK. I wouldn't say all here is the best, it is just quite good. (Interview with Ruslan)

Well... It's a difficult question... I don't know what I like and don't like... There are probably some good and bad sides... It's hard to say now... Well, like everywhere else... We [Russia] are no ideal, we just strive... But it's hard for me to say. (…) The country is after the collapse of the USSR and is just young as Ukraine, they are trying to get to their feet, to develop. Not everything works out perfectly. (…) In general, order is maintained in country… so they strive. There are many reforms, I just don't really go into it. (Interview with Gena)

Well, I would not say that it is bad, the country is still developing for the better, they try. (Interview with Ruslan)

During the interviews, the role and influence of the media on the lives and opinions of the respondents was clearly observed, some even confirmed this by bringing up the topic themselves.

(…) And you still fall under this propaganda gradually, because if you are said something for 24 hours, you begin to believe in it (Interview with Gena)

Well, I don't like that many people now confuse patriotism, not knowing what patriotism is. It's on TV right now… (…) I don't even know if I like or dislike in the government of Russia… You need to watch it on TV, what the government is doing there, to delve into it (Interview with Ruslan)

Collective Perspectives Over Individual Insights

Furthermore, there exists a tendency of the respondents of this group to shift the focus away from their personal considerations towards the broader society. For instance, when asked for their opinions on various topics, respondents tended to frame their responses not in terms of personal perspectives and individual viewpoints, but rather in alignment with prevailing societal sentiments. It appears that they avoided expressing their own viewpoints. Distinctive is the use of "they" in conversation and when responding to questions requiring some personal opinion.

Russia is a multinational state, they are afraid of… how to say, they are afraid of collapse or they are afraid of these discords, strife among themselves and the loss of unity. They are afraid that the country may fall apart into separate entities, and this will not lead to good. (…) Here they still call it a special operation, but this is still a war and it divided many into two or three camps, where someone says yes, it is needed, someone says it is not needed, and there are still others who are hesitant, who believe that it is both needed and not needed. (…) Well, they think that they are freedom fighters and they move in this direction, that everything they do is right. (Interview with Gena)

To compare, the word "they", "them" and "their" was used 68 times during these interviews in responses that assumed a personal opinion, compared to 15 times when the word "I", "me" and "my" was used.

Shifting Responsibility and political apathy

Moreover, many respondents, whether intentionally or unintentionally, appear to transfer the responsibility for current affairs and societal issues onto others, on some external parties, instead of taking responsibility for what is happening and actively engaging and trying to change or influence the situation themselves.

Also, despite acknowledging the importance of advocating for their own interests, the respondents of this group do not take any action in this regard. They even refuse to participate in elections, because they don't think it makes a difference. The lack of political interest led to almost complete political apathy, with no desire to participate in any political activity. Moreover, they justify this lack of desire by claiming that trying to bring about change is useless.

> In order for something to start to change, it is necessary to get connected with other people, to strike... How many people went on strike, and nothing has changed. So it's useless. (Interview with Ruslan)

Members of this group have rarely, if ever, actively expressed their political or civic positions, neither in action nor in word. Moreover, during our conversations, when respondents of this group brought up certain people who have actively expressed their views and tried to make a difference by taking part in protests, demonstrations or going to the polls, those in this group frequently criticized them, characterizing them as imprudent and implying that they should not have taken any action, as their efforts appeared to have no meaningful impact and were seen as pointless.

> They came out, stood, shouted something and that's it. (…) No, I have never participated in strikes. Just watched on TV. (Interview with Ruslan)

Family influence

Conversely, the second group of Russian respondents displayed distinct characteristics. Their responses were characterized by higher clarity and structure, what stands in stark contrast to the often observed linguistic uncertainty of the first group. These respondents demonstrated a genuine interest

in political affairs, both within the Russian Federation as well as on the global stage, they enjoy sharing their point of view, articulating their thoughts clearly and without linguistic insecurity.

> The government today is a collection of retrogrades, of people of age, these are minuses. The government is made up of older people who live in the past and are focused on the past, nostalgic for the past and trying to orchestrate it in the present. It is formed from people who achieved power in the 1990s, which was the time of the ascent of people as cunning and resourceful as possible, which was necessary for survival in the 90s, but 30 years have passed and so far, the course has changed. These people live in their own bubble, do not look out of it and support each other in it, do not see how their decisions affect society, the country and the economy, and do not allow people into their circle who can tell them about it. (Interview with Karin)

They actively followed current events and participated in political discussions, not limiting themselves to mere discussion, but taking part in rallies and voting processes. They also tended not just to share their point of view, but to defend it with some explanations and clarifications. Distinguishing feature of the respondents of this group is that they admitted politics to become a (significant) part of their interactions with family from the very early age. This behavior was brought to the later (adult) life allowing them to build a network of like-minded people around them who are unafraid to speak up and take a stand.

> And it also helped me that my father is a professional military man, he always approaches all issues very critically, he taught me how to use sources and we used to often discuss with him what we heard or saw on news. We actually do so even now. (Interview with Karina)

It is noteworthy that the second group explains their political activity and political attitude by the presence of political discussions in the family and early exposure to different points of view. Conversations with family members allowed them to gain insight into political processes and events from an early age. They are interested in both national and international politics, constantly referring to various national and international sources of information. It is important to note that they approach information with a certain degree of caution, realizing the existence of fake news and propaganda. Moreover, corruption within and outside the country was also a frequent subject for this group.

These respondents have shown and continue to show interest in improving their country, they do not hesitate to criticize the political regime, the current situation and government decisions. Although after

the experience of active political engagement, these group of respondents became disappointed in politics as a whole and now lacks faith that they can make a difference through their own efforts.

> At the current moment, not a single individual neither alone or as part of a group, can do anything. Civil society can only influence when it was originally intended that it would have some influence. There where the apparatus of repression has been building for 10 years, this is impossible (Interview with Karina)

> I witnessed the uprisings of 2011, the Snow Revolution [the 2011-2013 Russian protests], it's unforgettable. I don't know how much it was broadcasted on TV and in news in the West, but there were tens of thousands of people with flags, with posters. And you need to understand that it's not the people who have become doormats in these 10 years. And we were shown this in 2019, when there were the most severe suppressions. People are still in prison, this is called the Moscow case. In 2021, when Navalny was imprisoned, there were huge protests again, and in 2022. But in 2022, it was no longer comparable with the previous ones, because people, knowing the example of previous years knew to where it all goes... It is incomparable... We went to take friends from the detention center, called lawyers, witnessed the cruelest treatment... (...) So, now, no, we cannot influence. I don't believe that without impulse we as a civil society could change things on our own. But the problem is that everyone who could give this impulse is already in prison or killed. Could we have done it sooner? I feel guilty because I think *yes*, we could. (Interview with Karina)

In general, the first group of respondents showed limited interest in politics, often could not clearly articulate their position and demonstrated a perceived lack of political empowerment.

> Well... maybe I could somehow personally influence... You see, well, yes... Here in Russia, someone says that there is no democracy, there is no transparency and publicity, but... A difficult question... (...) I don't even know... I mean what is so special about politics that I would be interested in it. (Interview with Gena)

> Well... If I could somehow influence these moments myself... I think not, hardly. (...) I don't even know if I like or dislike in the government of Russia... You need to watch it on TV, what the government is doing there, to delve into it. And I do not know so *globally*. (...) I'm not fond of knowing what laws came out, what has changed, I'm not interested in it. I work at job, and if something directly concerns me, they at the work will acquaint me with these laws. (Interview with Ruslan)

Their indifference to political issues could be explained by a fundamental disinterest and deep frustration, what led to a lack of political engagement and political discussion. They have a minimal sense of political empowerment and a conscious or unconscious unwillingness to take on the political responsibility. The low sense of empowerment might also be one of the factors why respondents of this group tend to avoid articulating their political position.

> Well, I don't even know what to answer here… I don't know whether something has strengthened or undermined your trust in the political regime and political institutions… I just didn't have such a situation (Interview with Ruslan)

Among other aspects, when expressing their position, a certain tendency was identified among these respondents which points to the respondents' lack of confidence and hesitation when expressing their any opinion. For example, such verbal expressions of uncertainly as "well", "maybe", "possibly", or "I'm not sure", "I don't know", "I am not proficient enough in this topic" etc. were used by the respondents of the first group 43 times compared to 6 times used by the second group.

Moreover, the second group is characterized by having a clearer and more structured position. They were deeply disillusioned with the current political system due to their past active political participation, which had not brought about the desired changes. While maintaining a theoretical desire to influence and improve the situation in the country, they nevertheless noted the impracticability of these changes. Their political engagement is now reduced to trying to enlighten others through political discussions. Their sense of own political power is nevertheless higher than that of the first group.

9.3. Respondents from Ukraine

The key difference between respondents of this group and the group of respondents from Russian Federation is that the individuals from group considered in this part, regardless of the level of their interest in politics, are aware of the political issues of the country and are ready to take an active part in political life of the country. All respondents constantly touched upon the issue of corruption and problems in the state apparatus, criticized certain actions of politicians and the government, advocating radical changes and improvements. Since all subjects had more or less one level of interest to politics and sense of own political empowerment having readiness to take stand up for their political views, there was no point in dividing the respondents into several groups according to their political behavior.

Personal responsibility in political engagement

It should be underlined that each respondent belonging to this group did not only criticize the state apparatus, politicians and decisions made by them, but also realized their role in the political process. The majority of respondents expressed an opinion that on a global scale a single individual cannot initiate significant changes on his or her own (this point of view was also voiced by the participants of the second group in the Russian Federation). Nevertheless, all respondents agree and acknowledge that in the political and civic spheres, the process of change must start from within. They emphasize the need for personal change, so the change starting with oneself, as evidenced by the following statements:

> First of all, I try to behave in a certain way, that is, to change the system, starting with myself. (…) The situation has to change starting with each person individually. (Interview with Alex)

> Well, of course I can influence these issues! In general, each person in his/her place can influence, you always need to start with yourself. In terms of honest performance of their official duties at the workplace, active participation in public life, a clear formulation of their life positions in communication with other people... Each person in his/her place can do something to make it better, because the state consists of separate of people. (Interview with Anatolii)

Desire for a change and political awareness

Respondents of this group of different age groups have equally noted that a big problem of the country's modern politics is the presence of older generation politicians in power, who are characterized by conducting politics in a specific "old" manner, adherence to corruption and Soviet thinking. They emphasized the need for younger representatives to come to power, who have the necessary experience, education and knowledge gained in Western countries. A similar position was voiced by the respondents of the second group of respondents from the Russian Federation.

> Apart from the war, the big problem is that no matter how things move for the better, many still have the thinking of the Soviet Union. Most likely, because the generation has not yet changed and there are people in power who still have that mindset. The generation in power does not change, this is a problem. Our new generation also has something of the way of thinking like under the Soviet Union, so we also have room to change and room to grow, but this is not the same as the older generation. (Interview with Alex)

> I like the fact that our government is trying to change something in the country for the better, corrupt authorities are fired and changed, and the first changes are already visible. But I don't like the fact that in all instances, especially in the government, positions are transferred from generation to generation, from father to son and to close relatives. Or that you can just pay money

and take a certain position. It's slowly changing, it is being slowly disappearing, but there's still a lot left. (Interview with Alex)

It seems to me that several years ago the government was more passive and so "typical" Ukrainian… These constant phrases "this year was difficult, next year will be difficult, year after that even more difficult" and like this from year to year. But now they try to take more into consideration the Western experience and are oriented towards the West, and make corresponding changes within the country in different directions. (Interview with Dana)

In general, they were able to justify and explain their position, give more comprehensive information in case of clarifying questions from the interviewer's side. However, linguistic uncertainty and sometimes confusion in their own words also appeared among some of the respondents, which indicates insufficient depth of their political knowledge. Although they expressed their opinions with more willingness and enthusiasm (than previous group of respondents) and none of the questions asked remained unanswered.

Respondents' Perspective on Politics and Future Change

Although most respondents in this group say that they are not "big fans of politics", they are nevertheless quite knowledgeable about current political issues and the political system in general, make comparisons and speak quite confidently, showing confidence in their abilities and a desire to change something to achieve better results.

Despite this, the majority of respondents of this group clearly understand how they see their future country and their life in it. They not only criticize the country's leadership and some of its decisions, but also have a clear idea of what and how to change. Although all the respondents from this group do not follow the news equally often, but they are mostly aware of the news and the reforms that are taking place, and, in addition, they have their own opinion about them, and some of the respondents even have an opinion about how the situation can be improved and what else should be changed. It is evident from the interviews that the majority of respondents follow political changes in the country (not only related to military actions), follow the difference, what happened in the government, in the state apparatus during several years, and can compare the situation under different governments. This shows that they do analyze the situation and follow the current affairs.

Justification of Political Regime and Decision-Making

However, most respondents of this group (unconsciously) justify the regime and politicians in power and made political decisions. Just like the respondents from the Russian Federation, they used such phrases as: "more time is needed, etc.", "they are trying", "they are working on it", "there are no decisions without mistakes". Here are the examples of justification of the authorities and some degree of confusion and internal conflict expressed in a conversation with a respondent from Ukraine:

> They are trying. What they in government do, doesn't always work out, but they try. They lie, but not so often. Now, in the conditions of war, I understand why they keep something back so that people do not panic, so that people do not leave the country en masse, ordinary people do not need to know everything. (Interview with Alex).

> They are constantly doing something for people, I see changes, they ennoble the territory, build centers, roads, and so on. Of course, there are some mistakes that the authorities make, but those who do nothing do not make mistakes. Ukraine is a very young country, and this time of mistakes must pass in order to understand how and what to do. (Interview with Dana)

This justification is inherent in the majority of respondents from Ukraine as well as in the majority of respondents from Russia as described before.

Agents of Political Socialization

Most of respondents also did not name a single situation in which they would mention their family members with whom they watched or discussed news in childhood or teenage years. According to the interviews, the political discussions with closest family members became more frequent later, in early adulthood. It can be concluded that in the case of this group of respondents, their political socialization was mainly forming during their adolescence and those years played a major role for their current political behavior (and political views). The situations mentioned by these respondents referred, for example, to their social environment, i.e. friends with whom they discussed and continue to discuss political issues as young adults or adults, as well as school and teachers with whom they participated in demonstrations together and with whom their first experiences of active political participation and political advocacy were related.

The Impact of the 2022 Invasion on Political Engagement

It is important to note that the majority of respondents acknowledged that they used to be less interested in politics than they are now. The full-scale invasion in February 2022 made them pay more attention to politics than before. In comparison, while respondents used to read or watch the news at

most 2 times a week, they now tend to do so every day. All respondents admit that they read news from both foreign and Ukrainian sources. The situation is similar with political conversations and discussions which became more frequent with the start of the war.

> Well, if we move away from the topic of the war, then I don't even know what to answer, everything faded into the background. The war is the biggest our problem now. (…) Well, in general, many problems have faded into the background and you pay less attention to them. (Interview with Dana)

Comparing Political Perspectives: Ukraine and Russia

As a whole, it could be said that the political beliefs and perspectives of the second group of respondents from Russia and those from Ukraine align on several matters. If we consider the aggregated position of Ukrainian respondents, they tend to be more open to existing and possible changes, support democratic changes, and are ready to actively participate and make efforts to implement them. They are also more interested in politics and give knowledgeable and more informative answers. The average political position among Ukrainians is similar to the minority opinion among Russian respondents, in particular the second group of Russian respondents.

However, a significant distinction arises when we consider that while Ukrainians are more inclined towards the Western world, seek inspiration from it, and aspire to implement reforms, Russian respondents tend to be less influenced by Western political culture, are more resistant to changes, and are uncertain about the path to such changes since they are unsure what their desired changes are.

Respondents from the Russian Federation have a clear and strongly expressed position that politics and their lives are two separate aspects, and they do not want these two to intersect, do not want politics to interfere in any way in their lives. Among respondents from Ukraine, this position can also be traced, but it is close to the minority of respondents from Ukraine.

9.4. Respondents from Russia migrated to Austria

The next section examines the complex dynamics of assimilation, political transformation and process of socialization of Russian immigrants in Austria. It sheds light on the diverse experiences and opinions of these migrants as they navigate the complexities of the new cultural and political landscape. Here

are examined the impact of factors such as discrimination, corruption, political knowledge and the role of socializing agents on shaping their political socialization. This complex analysis reveals two distinct groups of immigrants and their paths to either democratic resocialization or resistance. By exploring these cases, I was able to gain valuable insights into the dynamics of the attitudes of people moving from a non-democratic country to a democratic one.

Influencing on Assimilation in Austria factors

One of the similar features for all respondents of this group is admitting the differences in culture and behavior between Austrians and Russians, and claiming that to some extent they experienced difficulties with assimilation after moving to Austria. The majority of respondents admitted that they had experienced a "special" attitude of Austrians towards them in a negative sense, they give this "special" behavior towards them the name "discrimination" and mention the feeling of being excluded from society. They claim that this negatively affected and slowed down their assimilation in the new society.

> It seems to me that any immigrant can feel unwanted in the country from time to time… (…) Also, when you see that the same authorities treat locals and immigrants differently. And when it's hard to make friends from the local population and you don't have any long-term friendship, and then you feel that it's more because of your nationality. At such times, you may feel unwanted. I know this from personal experience. (Interview with Kate)

> I know for sure that in other cultures this is not at all the case, nowhere will you be treated like that. Here you are even somehow excluded from all the others, I would even say some kind of discrimination. Why this is so, I don't know. I try not to get concentrate on those things and just prefer to think that the society here is just so conservative that Austrians don't want other people to come to their country… I prefer to think this is not personal although it feels so. It is, of course, strange that for some reason they have such an attitude towards you. Now I'm just used to this behavior and try not to pay attention. (Interview with Marta)

> Oh, I felt being unwanted in Austria, of course. Such situations happened several times to me that if people heard that I was speaking in some other than German language, they would shout out *Scheiß Ausländer* in response. This is what it means to feel unwanted. You just understand that no matter what you do, you still remain an outsider for them. (Interview with Marta)

> To feel unwanted is about a special relationship, special in a bad way. For example, when they ignore you, they treat you less respectfully, when you are not a person who they want to ask for help… Well, even small details are like that. When, for example, they want to ask for help, and seeing that you are a foreigner, either by your appearance or simply knowing you, they decide to talk to someone else… When you handle some things in government institutions and… For immigrants, this is always a big process, there are always a lot of barriers created, probably created

to regulate the flow of people… Well, again, this is simply a discrimination. Ignorance, yes, it's very unpleasant. And you can feel and sense it. (…) Not that it bothered me very much, but I feel that I often do not have common grounds with the local population. (…) I used word "discrimination" because the word tolerance does not fit here. (…) For my friends I am "one of them", and for the rest people in Austria I am just a foreigner. And at the university, from the very beginning, I noticed that this was some kind of exclusion from the group, because they too, apparently, are more comfortable taking their own language and being with their "own" people. (Interview with Oleg)

However, there is a discrepancy in their decisions on how to deal with this difficulty. The second group of respondents, despite accepting the fact of difference, was ready to accept some "traditions" and change their behavior in order to "resemble" Austrians more and not stand out so much compared to them. The social circle of this group of migrants consists of Russian-speaking migrants (to a greater extent), but also of Austrians. They even admit that they prefer to communicate on political topics with Austrians rather than Russians. This is one of the behaviors that are characteristic of migrants who are in the stage of acceptance and adaptation to a new political environment. Their democratic re-socialization goes more smoothly. These respondents feel themselves quite satisfied and assimilated to the society in the new country.

Well, communication is very different with Austrians, and I prefer to discuss such topics with them rather than with Russians, because there are much more adequate people here. It is very comfortable to discuss politics with them, because our views converge in many ways, especially with regard to the war. And even if the views differ, then people do not aggressively prove their point of view and try to prove that I am wrong. They just explain why they think that way and the conversation is mostly very calm and much more comfortable. (Interview with Marta)

The first group of respondents does not want and (yet) is not ready to adapt and adjust to the norms of another country, they experience significant problems in adapting and establishing their life in Austria, although they find reasons for this in the form of insufficient knowledge of the language and other factors like subjectively improper behavior of native population. Most respondents admitted that they share a sense of commonality only with people who share a common language and culture with them, who contributed to their assimilation and integration in Austria. Social networking and political discussions are mainly taking place with other Russian-speaking migrants. The networking is limited to individuals from the same cultural and language background. They recognize that in the first stages after the migration they were assisted to assimilate in Austria by other Russian-speaking migrants, who are still their closest friends.

> I feel most comfortable talking about politics with the guys from Russia, who are now in Vienna. Because I know that they have experienced similar situations and we have approximately the same views and similar… reactions. (…) It helped that I happened to get to know some people in my student hostel, who studied with me at the same university, and who also spoke Russian, who were of about the same culture as me… They are actually the only friends I have here. I can't say that I have any Austrian friends in Vienna (…) (Interview with Oleg)

It should be added that the respondents from the second group had moved and lived in Austria for more than 4 years at the time of the interview, while the respondents from the first group had lived in Austria for up to 2 years at the time of our conversation.

Except that, in this research one of the factors potentially influencing assimilation in new country is direct or indirect influence of corruption and deception. Although the majority of respondents have mentioned being directly in indirectly faced with corruption in Austria, it seems to have no impact on their socialization.

Political Knowledge

Interestingly, all respondents to different extent but have a familiarity with political system and political terminology as well as knowledge of political parties both in Russia as well as in Austria. Although it could not be said their political knowledge, especially in Austrian political system and awareness of current events is very deep or wide, since the majority of mentioned topics were highly mediatized. Nevertheless it confirms that respondents were following news and/or discussing current political issues with family or friends after their moved to Austria.

Evolving Political Opinions

Respondents have a clear opinion formation and the verbal uncertainty during our conversations was much rarer, than by the respondents from Russia (who are currently living there). Respondents have expressed critique towards Russian and Austrian government and politicians in a much more open way and more willingly. Although some respondents who lived in Austria less than 2 years (first group) were still rather accurate with their words and usually added some justification of regime or explanation that was meant to «soften» their stance. This is one of the characteristics that have already been described as distinctive for the first group of respondents from Russia. It is important to note that after moving to a democratic country, all respondents from Russia felt more free to express their political

opinions and critique. Although the huge factor here plays the amount of time which the migrant from non-democratic country spent and lived in the democratic country.

Division in Political Interest and Trust

However, there is a more complex situation with political interest and trust in the political system of the respondents from this group. Here is also observed a division of respondents into two groups. Before moving to democratic Austria, all the respondents had to a certain extent political interest in domestic issues, they watched or read news at least once a week and engaged in political discussions with either family members or friends. After moving to Austria, respondents got separated into two groups. One group of respondents, the majority of them, either stayed with the same – rather high - level of political interest or experienced an increase of interest in political issues which expanded also to non-domestic issues, and it expresses now by reading news from different sources and taking part in political discussions with friends. Hence, the interest in politics manifests itself through the keeping up with political news and political discussions with other people. These respondents acknowledged that their trust in democratic political institutions has also increased after they have moved to democratic Austria.

> Well, when I did discuss it before, it was maybe once a week or so, and conversations were devoted to some basic or very relevant points, out of context. It was in Russia mostly... well, here too, but mostly with Russian-speaking friends. (…) Well, the recent years I talk about politics almost every day and mostly with family, with Russian-speaking friends, also with Austrian acquaintances, with people of other nationalities who speak English. Especially since the beginning of the war political discussions occur even more frequent. Mostly we talk about current events, about the world dynamics, about when the war will end and how it can end. (Interview with Kate)

While other group of respondents, although having initially a relatively strong interest in politics, experienced a decrease of it after moving to democratic country. The decline in interest in politics has been accompanied and triggered by the disappointment in political system of both Austria and Russia. The emergence of this political apathy was caused by the inability to change anything for better neither in Russia nor in Austria (they justify themselves by the fact that in order to participate politically in Austrian affairs, a migrant must possess the necessary documents). Apart from elections, they see no other means of expression of political will or influencing the political situation. These group of

respondents are contradicting themselves when it comes to direct participation and influence on the political situation.

> Before moving to Austria I often talked about political topics with friends, also when we were going to drink beer in a bar, we always discussed some political issues. We talked a lot about such things with my family as well. (…) As always, we started with the national politics and ended with the international one. We used to discuss a lot, it was interesting. (…) Well, since I moved there is no one to go to bars with, this has changed after my move here. And anyways, you can communicate more openly at home, in your native language. (…) Yes, I'm fine, I don't feel any lack of these conversations. On the contrary, I feel calmer when there are no such conversations. It won't change anything in your personal life. The fact that you talked about the domestic and world politics does not change anything. And what?.. (Interview with Vitalik)

> Well, I went to the polls, I never missed the elections... If from this point of view, then maybe I influenced... But nothing else. I am for the economy, politics is disgusting. (Interview with Vitalik)

On the one hand, they admit they are able to influence the political situation by their own by joining social movements, on the other hand, they claim social movements have no power. Respondents from this group see no changes in political systems between Russia and Austria and it is better/easier for them to watch from the sidelines and not to participate. Politics is perceived as a distraction that can hinder the achievement of economic goals, it is not worth being distracted by. Their trust in political institutions of both Russia and Austria has either stayed the same or has decreased after they moved to Austria. To this group of respondents belong migrants who have moved to Austria less than two years ago.

Moreover, the political apathy and political disillusionment are indications that the migrants of the first group are currently at a stage of rejection of the democratic political resocialization. Except the time factor, the other influencing on this factors are that the respondents of these group have little or no foreign friends or friends from native Austrians, their communication and social network is limited mainly to the other Russian-speaking immigrants in Austria from CIS countries whose homelands are also either non-democracies or of hybrid regimes, and they report to have had difficulties in integrating into the new society. These respondents also avoid social meetings and discussions which potentially can face them with people who have other opinions. Their social circle consists mainly of young people from their homeland. During some occasional conversations about politics they tend to prove their opinion and suppress others, and are not interested in the position of other people. Also a notable

characteristic is that they have unconscious defending mechanisms in the form of making fun of someone and laughing at someone else's opinion. This characteristic is also inherent to the first group of respondents from the Russian Federation, whose sense of political empowerment is minimal or very limited and the disappointment in politics high.

For respondents in this group, the time spent in democratic Austria as well as the political and social experiences they have gained were not sufficient enough to make them democratically socialized. Taking into account the described behavior and political sentiments of the immigrants of the first group from non-democratic country indicate that they were less exposed to the new environment of the new democratic country than the immigrants of the second group in the sense that they minimized their social circle in new country and limited the ability to communicate with different people, in the end not helping themselves to integrate into new society and resisting the democratic resocialization.

For those individuals who deliberately limit their interactions and maintain a limited social sphere, the process of democratic resocialization is jeopardized. This not only prevents their integration into the host society, but also reinforces pre-existing political beliefs, potentially hindering the transformative impact of exposure to the new democratic environment.

The results of the research confirm that conversely for those people who actively participate in a variety of interactions and develop a broad social network without limiting themselves to communicating with other Russian-speaking migrants, the potential for successful democratic resocialization increases. Such an active approach not only facilitates their integration into the host society, but also creates opportunities for a deeper transformation of political beliefs. Exposure to a wide range of perspectives and experiences in a new democratic environment becomes a catalyst for changing pre-existing perceptions, and contributes to a better understanding of democratic principles.

In fact, the degree to which individuals are exposed to the social structure of the host country plays a key role in determining the success of democratic resocialization. Openness to diverse interactions and willingness to accept the democratic values of the new environment contribute to a more dynamic and adaptive integration process. Such active participation contributes to a deeper internalization of democratic ideals, thereby facilitating a more complete transformation of political attitudes.

It is important to emphasize that the participants in the first group are of an older age compared to those in the second group. The age difference between respondents in the first and second groups

highlights a crucial factor that can significantly impact the democratic resocialization of migrants. The older age of the first group may contribute to the challenges they face in integrating into the new society.

These migrants, who have lived part of their lives in a different political and cultural context, may find it more difficult to adapt their views and social behavior in accordance with the democratic values prevailing in the host country. Their established social circles comprised of individuals from similar linguistic and cultural backgrounds, may act as a barrier to diverse interactions and exposure to new ideas.

Moreover, bring with them deeply ingrained political beliefs and habits from their home country, makes it harder for them to undergo a process of resocialization.

On the contrast to them, younger migrants of the second group are in a more formative stage of life might be more adaptable to change and open to forging new social connections. They showed themselves to be more willing to accepting democratic values and integrating into the society of the new host country.

Change in Perspective and Acceptance

Respondents of the second group admit that before they had a somewhat false perception of their native country, the majority of respondents in this group admit that moving from Russia to Austria allowed them to see the situation from a different perspective, to see aspects that they were unable to see before, to understand and analyze events both at home and abroad in a different way. Thus, having freed themselves from the prism imposed by the state regime, the respondents were not afraid to perceive the new information revealed to them, were able to accept it and change something in their perception of world and domestic politics and in their political behavior. This is also an evident indicator of the stage of acceptance and successful democratic resocialization.

> When I was in Russia, due to the lack of any political education or general understanding of many things ... Let's just say, I probably understood a little bit of some part of what is happening in regards with propaganda, but I, of course, could not evaluate the overall political picture and where it leads. But then again, seeing certain signs and influence of this oligarchic society ... yes, I already understood in Russia that there was a discrepancy... And yes, such... if it continues like this, then there will be no economic or political improvements. There was nothing for me to expect... so I

decided to move… Over time after I moved, many aspects, like a puzzle, joined this very very general understanding of what happened and what is happening… (Interview with Kate)

The respondents who moved to Austria less than two years before were less successful in accepting new political culture. It is interesting that during conversation, these respondents have several times repeated phrases that are consistently used in the Russian media as propaganda. It shows that they still look through the old and familiar to them prism. A common element of these migrants from Russia is that even being surrounded by pure democracy which Austria represents and in the presence of political freedom, they find it difficult to express directly their political opinion and political position. They do not enjoy the benefits of democracy and do not know what to do with them. What is notable, both the presence and manifestation of some of the typical features of democracy still fascinate them, although they doubt whether they're actually effective or rather illusory and do not really work.

Role of Parents in Political Socialization

The both group of respondents from Russia who moved to Austria have a similar characteristic – their parents have explained them and discussed with them political issues, they watched news together and political discussions with parents were present from the early age. For the second group of respondents, parents were also the ones who insisted on the respondents' moving to another country and who explained the importance of this decision due to their political and social well-being, or to whom the idea of moving to Austria for "better future" belongs. For the respondents of the first group the main motivating factor for moving was financial considerations. Irrespective of the respondent's age, they all emphasized the significant role played by their parents in shaping their lives.

For the second group of migrants from Russia for whom the democratic socialization was more successful, the moving to democratic Austria played a role of a "missing puzzle" to start putting things together and understand more about their domestic as well as world politics. These migrants have shown themselves to be willing to accept information and political norms different from those to which they were exposed previously, and have expressed a willingness to accept them and adapt. Although these respondents spoke about the difficulties they faced after moving to the country, the discrepancies between their political realities in the country they grew up in and the political realities

in democratic Austria, spending time in a social circle that was not limited to Russian-speaking migrants, they were willing to open up to the new political democratic culture and adapted to it.

For the first group of migrants, even after moving to Austria and getting to know how democratic regime works, their previous political opinions put by their socializing agent parents turned out to be too deeply rooted to be changed and now function one-sidedly: only as a confirmation of pre-existing views. The existing political experience and political views function as a filtering prism in terms of people with whom they communicate in new country, how they spend time, how they politically behave and what topics they discuss. For these migrants, the experience of moving to a democratic country has the consequence of disillusionment with the democratic regime and politics as such, and political apathy. Political conversations are avoided, and if they do occur, a defense mechanism is invoked in the form of either teasing the person they are talking to or trying to suppress their opinion.

It is important to realize that in the case of migrants of the first group, despite the fact that their parents had political discussions with them from childhood and adolescence, they did not advocate moving as a means of achieving a better life. On the contrary, according to the statements of respondents, the driving force behind the decision to move was solely the pursuit of personal material gain.

In addition, it should be noted that after the data collection was completed, one fact that directly relates to the topic of this paper was discovered some time later and therefore should be mentioned. After the completion of this phase of the research, it emerged that one respondent from the first group of migrants, originating from a non-democratic country, had returned to their home country with no intentions of returning to Austria.

It implies that despite exposure to political discussions, the influence of the democratic environment and the extent to which an immigrant was exposed to democratic principles in Austria might not have been strong enough to solidify a commitment to democratic values for the immigrants with non-democratic background.

The potential influence of the political landscape in the respondent's home country should also be considered. The decision to return may be indicative of a perception that the non-democratic environment aligns more closely with the individual's political values or expectations. Alternatively, it could reflect a complex blend of personal, familial, or cultural ties that outweigh the impact of the democratic principles experienced in Austria.

Despite the ambiguity in the obtained data and the acknowledgment of difficulties related to discrimination and injustice by respondents of both the first and the second groups, these factors while present in their lives either directly or indirectly, did not emerge as decisive influences on the success of democratic resocialization. The complexity lies in the fact that, despite facing these challenges, migrants in the second group showcased a significant ability to navigate and overcome these challenges, suggesting that the impact of discrimination alone was not determinative.

On the contrast, the results underline that for migrants of the first group, the experience of discrimination and prejudice and deception played a more significant role. The data suggests that the presence of direct or indirect cases of mentioned issues had an effect on their overall resocialization process. Unlike the second group, migrants in the first group, confronted with such challenges, tended to show a more defensive response, limiting their social interactions and narrowing their social circles to mitigate exposure to potentially conflicting opinions.

While both groups faced similar challenges associated with discrimination, the significant difference lay in the coping mechanisms employed. For the second group, the presence of discrimination did not prevent their democratic resocialization. Instead, other factors, such as social activity and engagement in the new country, served as factors that facilitated and smoothed the resocialization process. The respondents in the second group demonstrated resilience and adaptability, allowing them to integrate into the democratic political landscape more effectively.

Moreover, the respondents from Russia who moved to Austria and for whom a democratic resocialization was a success, do have a lot similar characteristics to the characteristics of the second group of respondents from Russia, which were described in the section before. The reported initial political behavior and views, so before they moved to Austria, coincide with the political behavior and views of the second group of the respondents from Russia who were born there and never changed the country of residence. It could be concluded that those respondents whose parents played a major role in their political socialization, with whom they watched different news from childhood, with whom they had their first political conversations and political analyses, who explained to them the necessity and importance of changing the country of residence, as a result have better political resocialization results, they adapted more easily to new political realities, feel socialized into Austrian society and have higher satisfaction and trust in the democratic political institutions.

The constant overlappings and similarities in the behaviors and attitudes of respondents from the Russian Federation and those who moved from the Russian Federation to Austria can reveal how political behavior has changed and in what cases and in the presence of what factors democratic resocialization occurs or does not occur. Summing up, the two groups of immigrants to Austria from Russia experience different processes. The immigrants who do not want to adapt to cultural norms, have limited their social circle to only other Russian-speaking migrants in Austria, got decreased level of interest in politics and have also level of trust in political institutions of Austria the same as in Russia or has decreased. These respondents are currently on the stage of rejection of democratic resocialization. In contrast to them, those respondents who have adapted to the new society and have a wider social circle feel more integrated into Austrian society, their level of political interest stayed on the same relatively high level or got increased, and their trust in political institutions of Austria are higher than they are in political institutions of Russia. These respondents are currently on the stage of successful exposure of democratic political resocialization.

The political views and political behavior of this second group of respondents largely coincide with the second group of respondents from Russia. Similarly, the initial data before the move of the first group of respondents coincide with the political views and political behavior of the first group of respondents from Russia. Thus, we can generalize and conclude that respondents with political views and political engagement like the first group from Russia, when moving to democratic Austria and having same political behavior as the migrant respondents of the first group in Austria, experience and face the same challenges and undergo a process of political resocialization in a similar way as the first group of migrant respondents in Austria. Similarly, conclusions can be drawn about the second group of migrant respondents from Russia, whose reported political views and political involvement coincide with the political views and political involvement of the second group of respondents from Russia who currently live there.

In other words, the political views and behavior of the migrant respondents in Austria closely align with their corresponding groups in Russia. The first group of migrants, prior to their move, exhibited political inclinations mirroring the first group of respondents in Russia. Likewise, the political views and involvement of the second group of migrants from Russia coincided with those of the second group of respondents currently residing in Russia.

The Table 3 below illustrates a comparative analysis of the political characteristics of two distinct groups: native Russians and Russians who have migrated to democratic Austria. The focus lies on exploring the similarities in political views and behavior between these migrant respondents and their counterparts in Russia, both before and after relocation.

The findings suggest a pattern of continuity in political orientation and behavior, indicating that respondents who move to democratic Austria experience a process of political resocialization similar to their counterparts in Russia. This resocialization is evidenced by the challenges faced and behaviors exhibited in their new political context, which closely parallel those of the original group in Russia.

In essence, this comparative analysis enables us to generalize that both groups of migrant respondents, upon relocating to democratic Austria, confront analogous challenges and undergo political resocialization akin to their respective groups in Russia.

As we focus on examining the impact of factors such as prejudice and discrimination, and experiences of deception on the political resocialization of migrants, these elements have been omitted from the table detailing information about respondents from Russia.

Table 3. Comparative Analysis of Political Characteristics between Native Russians and Russian Migrants in Democratic Austria

Analyzing Factors	Russians in RU		Russians in AT	
	Group A	**Group B**	**Group A**	**Group B**
1. Social Networking and political discussion	Rarely, if ever, actively expressed their political or civic positions	Actively participate in political discussions with family members and friends, defend their political position	Admit differences in culture and behavior with Austrians and report to have experienced difficulties with assimilation after moving to Austria	
	Politics is perceived as something not worth spending time on	Admit politics as a significant part of interactions from an early age	Difficulty in adapting to Austrian norms and life	Were ready to accept some "traditions" and change their behavior in order to "resemble" Austrians more
	Respond to questions with generalized statements, refrain from providing comprehensive information	Demonstrate genuine interest in political affairs globally	Do not feel assimilated into the society of new host country	Feel satisfied and assimilated into the society of new host country
	Observable role and influence of the media, no filtering of received information	Knowledge of political issues expands to the global stage	Networking and social circle mainly limited to Russian-speaking migrants	Social circle consists of Russian-speaking migrants, but also of the Austrians
		Approach information with caution, realizing the existence of fake news and propaganda	May engage in political discussion, but do not seek them out	Political discussions take place rather often with Russian-speaking friends and with native population
			Difficulty expressing political opinions and utilizing democratic benefits	Prefer to communicate on political topics with Austrians
			Familiarity with the political system and terminology of both their native and in new host country	
			Knowledge of current political issues but frequently mention highly mediatized topics	
			Admit politics as a significant part of interactions from an early age, an interest to politics cultivated from childhood by parents	
			Before moving, all the respondents had to a certain extent political interest in domestic issues, watched or read news at least once a week and engaged in political discussions with either family members or friends	
			Follow news max. once a week or rarely, try to limit themselves to news exposure, both world and domestic	Follow news up to several times a week or often
2. Political Efficacy	Transfer responsibility for current affairs onto others.	Express clear opinions and critique towards political regimes.	Political participation is limited to taking part in elections in the past, after moving no political participation as they do not see sense in that	
	Lack of political interest leads to political apathy.	Respondents show higher clarity and structure in responses	Experienced disappointment and distrust in domestic political system	
	Justify a lack of desire to participate in political activity.	Mention corruption as an important domestic and global issue	Experienced disappointment and distrust in political systems of both Austria and Russia	Perception of world and domestic politics changes
	Respondents tend to shift their focus from individual considerations to collective perspectives.	Actively follow current events, participate in political discussions, and engage in rallies and voting processes	Trust in political institutions decreased	Trust in democratic political institutions has stayed the same or increased
	Frame responses in alignment with prevailing societal sentiments.		Find it difficult to express critique and utilizing democratic benefits	Feel free to expresses critique towards Russian and Austrian governments
	Revisit opinions and make efforts to moderate or soften them.		Were rather accurate with their words and added some justification or explanation that was meant to «soften» their stance	
	Justification of the political regime and politicians in power and made political decisions			
3. Prejudice and discrimination	-		Experienced a special attitude of Austrians towards them in a negative sense, Have feeling of being excluded from society	
4. Experience of deception	-		Mentioned being directly in indirectly faced with corruption in Austria	

9.5. Respondents from Ukraine migrated to Austria

In this section I will turn the focus toward the experiences and perspectives of Ukrainian migrants who migrated to Austria. Within this context, I will conduct a comprehensive examination of their political dynamics. Through illustrative instances, I will compare the experiences of Ukrainian and Russian migrants in order to clarify the differences in their journey and, consequently, the differences in their political resocialization in a democracy.

Contrasting Initial Perceptions of Relocation

The first difference between migrants from the Russian Federation and Ukraine that I would like to mention is their reaction to their move from their home country to another country: migrants from the Russian Federation have a different first reaction to their move, most of them associate the move with positive changes and they have an excitement, while for most respondents from Ukraine their first associations are related to problems due to moving to another country and difficulties in obtaining the necessary documents.

Agents of Political Socialization

Unlike the previous group - migrants from the Russian Federation - none of the respondents in this group said that their parents were the ones who initiated the move from Ukraine and insisted on it. These respondents perceived the idea of moving as an interesting new experience (temporary) rather than an opportunity to leave the country in search of a "better future". In addition, it is interesting that none of the respondents in this group from Ukraine talk about their childhood or growing up experience of watching or discussing the news with their parents, but all respondents mention that family, especially parents, play an important role in their lives. However, they associate discussions of political topics more with teachers at school and university and with friends. Interestingly, not parents, but schools and friends were the objects that initiated the (initially temporary) move to Austria. Thus, we can conclude that the main agents of political socialization among migrants from Ukraine are agents of a wider range - educational institutions, such as schools and universities, and their social environment, especially friends.

It appears to me that this is a confirmation of the fact that the level of democracy in Ukraine, as a country that was chosen for this work as a representative of a hybrid or transitional democratic regime,

is higher than in Russia, which was chosen as a representative of a non-democracy: migrants from Russia received their democratic socialization from one rather "narrow" type of agents - their parents, who also were the ones who initiated their move to another country, also due to the political situation in the Russian Federation, while migrants from Ukraine were politically socialized under the influence of a wider/diverse type of agents - educational institutions and friends. (perhaps this is a confirmation that the number of democratically (more democratic) politically socialized people is higher in Ukraine than in Russia).

Depth of Political Knowledge

Every respondent demonstrates a significant depth of political knowledge and a strong sense of confidence in their understanding. They articulately expressed their perspectives on every issue that has been raised, providing detailed comparisons of their preferences and dislikes since relocating to Austria. They are able explain and defend their viewpoints, and left no room for ambiguity in their responses. Respondents have sufficient knowledge and experience to draw parallels between the state systems and political structures of Austria and Ukraine. They openly acknowledge that Ukraine, in many respects, falls short of being an ideal state.

Moreover, they engage in an analysis and side-by-side evaluation of the political systems in Austria and Ukraine, justifying their point of view with concrete examples. They readily voice their criticisms of politicians in both countries and the decisions made by them. In comparison to the other respondent groups, this particular group distinguishes itself through the ability to carry out a political analysis of events and the wide range of political topics discussed, covering both Austrian and Ukrainian contexts.

The depth and diversity of political knowledge can be explained by the outbreak of a full-scale war in Ukraine in February 2022, and some respondents openly note that this has influenced, for example, such a factor as the amount of time they now spend keeping up-to-date with current events in the world. Although this was observed only among the respondents of this group.

> I must sincerely say that until a certain age, I was also very far from any understanding of politics. And even after moving, at some point I understood the politics of Austria more than the politics of Ukraine. Because I moved to Austria at the age of 22, and before moving, I was not particularly interested in the politics of Ukraine. Yes, I knew who the president was and so on, but more specifically, what was what and why, I did not delve into it. Of course, a lot of interest is caused by

the war, this is a big shock for all of us. I began to delve more into politics, into world politics, not only the politics of Austria and Ukraine. (Interview with Anna)

Challenges during the Process of Adaptation

During the phase of social adaptation, prior to attaining their current level of integration, they encountered a sense of marginalization - a feeling of being the odd one out. All respondents unanimously expressed this sentiment. However, they all acknowledged a recognition that they needed to exert effort, even potentially stepping beyond their comfort zones, to change this situation.

But they still admit that they continue to face problems of prejudice and discrimination, even now, while feeling socialized and integrated into Austrian society. Significantly, respondents concede that their integration into society would have occurred more rapidly if they had been perceived differently by the native population in the new country after the move. In advance could be said that this is also common between the respondents from Russia and Ukraine, who successfully undergo democratic resocialization.

> It's the worst feeling when you feel like you're not wanted here. Of course, you want to leave somewhere else, to quit everything. Nothing can be worse than feeling unwanted, and this is in every way: at work, in personal life, in the country, everywhere. (…) Of course this feeling is familiar to me. This is very familiar to me, because I think the Austrians very often let me felt it. I was very often in a situation where I felt unwanted, I had the feeling that certain things were done or not done just because I was a foreigner. (…) There are many situations where I go somewhere by myself to solve something, and they "push me away", they somehow treat me differently than the others. And if I go with my Austrian husband, the attitude towards me is completely different. And it is so always, in any situation. And, of course, the question arises, why so? If I go alone – it is one attitude, if I go with my Austrian husband, it is immediately another attitude and all issues are resolved quickly. (Interview with Anna)

Of particular significance is the fact that a majority of respondents in this group brought up for the first time the issue of political isolation they experience and the lack of political engagement in the new host country.

Emphasis on Self and Proactive Attitudes

A shared characteristic observed in respondents from Ukraine, both prior to and following their move, is the central emphasis on self and the measures one can and should undertake to attain the desired outcomes. This self-centered approach extends to various aspects of life, encompassing not only the political sphere, where respondents are actively involved in shaping the country's policy by pushing for changes in leadership and specific policy choices, but also in non-political spheres. For example, respondents in this group have taken meaningful steps since moving to Austria. Rather than relying on external factors or making excuses based on these external factors, these respondents realized the significance of their own actions.

For example, although they spoke about cases of discrimination and prejudice by the local population against themselves or their friends and acquaintances, they refrained from seeking excuses or fixating on external influences as impediments to their effective assimilation into Austrian society. Instead, they took active steps to overcome emerging obstacles: they worked to master the language, expanded their circle of acquaintances and friends in the new country, and made deliberate efforts to develop an active social life. They recognized the importance of integration, social adaptation, and adjusting to the culture of the new country. In the end, the respondents admitted that an active social life and certain adaptation to the culture of the new country facilitated their faster socialization and integration into Austrian society.

As for the political sphere, both prior to and after their relocation, respondents emphasize the significance of engagement and personal endeavor. They manifest this commitment by actively voicing their political standpoint, joining protests, and participating in elections. These respondents are fully aware of their role in driving political transformations within the country. They comprehend that they have two options: they can either remain passive bystanders, accepting the situation as it is, or they can exercise their rights and actively articulate their political stance through both words and actions.

It can be concluded that after the migration this focus on their involvement, their active contribution and the necessity of their proactive participation to change the situation played an important role in determining how successful the re-socialization of migrants from Ukraine was.

As mentioned, none of the respondents in this group mentioned or emphasized the influence their parents had on their political upbringing. This sense of their own political power and ability to influence the political situation themselves was present in their lives even before moving to Austria.

I believe that every citizen can influence any political decision. I was 18 years old and I was on the Maidan, and despite the fact that people were dying because of the authorities at that time, people still withstanded and we were able to change the situation. It is always one plus one, plus one more and there will be millions… Yes, I *can* change. And I can change even more even after the war. I can go home, rebuild, pay taxes, and so on. I can change the situation. I can even stand with a gun and defend my land as a citizen of Ukraine, or I can take medical courses and be a nurse. I can change everything, I can change the course of events at the front, I can save someone's life. And if I would have stand every day near Stefansdom with a poster, then everyone would already know me, that is, I can change a lot of things and provide society a support: humanitarian, informational, etc. (Interview with Ivan)

Influence personally? Yes, I can. It may be relatively small-scale impact, but I definitely can. So, all these questions, the terrible corruption, that the system does not work well. (…) If we continue to be a democracy and we don't get annexed, I mean, it's all really in our hands. One of the "*positive*" sides what we got after the war in Crimea, is that our youth is now much more… firstly, we have educated youth, we have youth that has access to and is using the Internet… (…) And everything is in our hands. We do not want corruption? Okay, so we go and we make sure that *we* are chosen, *we* will not be corrupt representatives of our country. We will go to the Rada, we will go there. It's quite real to be done. I have always tried my best to be heard and to express my position: I always took part in elections and even went to rallies. It is important for me to know that I did everything on my part, no matter where I live - in Ukraine, here or in another country. (…) *We*'ll rebuild it. If you want the infrastructure to work, the roads are repaired, if you want to live well, then you will need to work on it. (…) So *yes*, as a person, I can influence this. (Interview with Vita)

In Ukraine I always went to the polls, this is the most important thing, it all starts with this, that you need to at least raise yourself up and go to the polls. I had so many times that I was simply not on the lists, and I wrote a statement, then in the next elections I was not on the list again. But I brought it to the end until finally I appeared on the list, because my voice just really could be stolen, I understand that my voice just really went somewhere. And I achieved that I *was* included in the lists, I was even able to vote for Zelensky. Therefore, I think it is important to be interested, we should go to the polls. It is important to understand that the future of your country depends on your choice. You need to choose the right politicians. (Interview with Anna)

This is confirmed by the fact that respondents from Ukraine, who have never migrated from their home country, also declared their interest and willingness to be actively involved in the political life of the country, and even their relevant personal experiences such as participating in elections, rallies and demonstrations. We can conclude that moving to Austria hasn't discouraged migrants from hybrid political regime to actively take part in politics, rather on the contrary, the sense of own political empowerment has stayed the same or even got higher, as those migrants who haven't participated in demonstrations and rallies before, took part in them.

Evolving Political Engagement

Moreover, the importance of political participation is realized even by those respondents from Ukraine who cannot be characterized as having a high level of interest in politics: they read the news on average at least once a week, but they regularly take part in political elections. The same is true for those who moved from Ukraine to Austria: those migrants who before moving to Austria speak about their average or relatively low interest in politics still participated in elections and occasionally read/watched the news.

It is important to note an existing trend - those migrants whose interest in politics before moving to Austria was not high and was limited to participation in elections and occasional reading of the news, speak about growing interest in politics after moving to Austria. In addition, those migrants in this group of respondents who were interested in politics before moving to Austria maintained their interest in politics after the move, i.e. after the move, the interest in politics among migrants from Ukraine either remained at a fairly high level as it was before the move, or increased among those who had a much lower interest in it before. In addition, all respondents recognized that moving to Austria was one of the factors that influenced their current interest in politics.

> I must sincerely say that until a certain age, I was also very far from any understanding of politics. And even after moving, at some point I understood the politics of Austria more than the politics of Ukraine. Because I moved to Austria at the age of 22, and before moving, I was not particularly interested in the politics of Ukraine. (…) I did not delve into it. Of course, a lot of interest is caused by the war, this is a big shock for all of us. I began to delve more into politics, into world politics, not only the politics of Austria and Ukraine. (…) I had, firstly, a subject at the university, where we studied the political system of Austria, we were taught the history of Austria. This was the first time I had to get in touch with the political system of Austria, what it consists of, how the Bundespräsident, the Bundeskanzler are chosen, about the elections and so on… I didn't have a TV for a long time, and therefore it was difficult for me to be very interested in politics, because I didn't watch the news, and I didn't read newspapers much. Well, that's why I was far away from that. But probably from the moment I got a TV several years ago, my interest in politics has increased enormously. I started watching the news, reading about politics more and more. (…) Now I talk about politics almost every day, plus, my husband is very interested in politics, we often go to work and only talk about politics. Before the war, we have also quite often discussed Austrian and world politics. But with the start of the war political discussion take place probably every day, but now we also talk a lot about Ukraine. Most often with my husband, sometimes with friends. (Interview with Anna)

Role of Social Circle in Integration

All respondents of this group recognize the importance of a diverse social circle for successful integration into Austrian society, i.e. social networking that would include not only Ukrainians but also representatives of the local population. They speak about a wide circle of friends of different nationalities with whom they feel comfortable discussing political topics and exchanging opinions. This factor, among others, testifies to the successful democratic socialization of migrants from Ukraine.

So comparing with the migrants from non-democratic regime, the political interest of the migrants from hybrid regime hasn't been decreased or lost, their willingness to take active part in political life has stayed at high level or even increased and induced some to get their first experience of participation in political rallies or demonstrations.

The table 4 delves into a comparative analysis of the political traits exhibited by two distinct groups: native Ukrainians and Ukrainians who have migrated to democratic Austria. Unlike the Russian respondents, our exploration of Ukrainian respondents did not necessitate categorization into multiple groups due to the relative similarity in political views and the level of political involvement observed in both contexts.

The primary emphasis of this comparative table involves several factors significant to this research, such as social networks, political discussions, and political efficacy, along with due consideration of their constituent elements. In line with Table 3, the factors prejudice and discrimination and experience of deception were not taken into account when examining the group of Ukrainians residing in Ukraine, as the corresponding data is irrelevant for this study. Consequently, this table presents data on these factors for respondents who are migrants from Ukraine.

Table 4. Comparative Analysis of Political Characteristics between Native Ukrainians and Ukrainian Migrants in Democratic Austria

Analyzing Factors	Ukrainians in UA	Ukrainians in AT
1. Social Networking and political discussion	Actively engage in political discussions	Admit getting interest in politics in early adulthood, major political resocialization actors are educational institutions, family and friends
	Criticize actions of politicians and advocate for radical changes and improvements	Were ready to accept some "traditions" and change their behavior in order to "resemble" Austrians more
	Respondents are quite knowledgeable about current political issues, follow political changes and reforms	Recognize the importance of integration, social adaptation, and adjusting to the culture of the new country
	Due to comprehensive political knowledge are able compare situations under different governments	Social networking include not only Ukrainians and Russian-speaking migrants but also representatives of the local population
	Actively follow news from both foreign and Ukrainian sources, indicating media literacy in seeking diverse perspectives for a more comprehensive understanding of political issues	Feel equally comfortable discussing political topics and exchanging opinions with other Ukrainians as well as with representatives of the local population
	The full-scale invasion in February 2022 significantly increased respondents' attention to politics, reflecting heightened interest.	Admitted active social life in new host country and adaptation to the culture facilitated their faster socialization and integration into the society
	Admit getting interest in politics in early adulthood, major political resocialization actors are educational institutions, family and friends	The respondents demonstrate a significant depth of political knowledge, are able to provide comparisons between political systems and structures of their home and new host countries
		Feel satisfied and assimilated into the society of new host country
		The outbreak of a full-scale war in Ukraine in February 2022 influenced their time spent keeping up-to-date with current events in the world
		Regardless their average or relatively low interest in politics before moving to Austria, always participated in elections and occasionally read/watched the news
		Admit the move to Austria has positively impacted their interest and involvement in politics or increased them among those who had lower interest before

2. Political Efficacy	Respondents, regardless of their initial interest in politics are aware of political issues and willingly express their opinion on these issues	Respondents readily voice their criticisms of politicians in both Austria and Ukraine
	Expressing their opinions and critique towards corruption and state apparatus problems	Demonstrate a clear opinion formation
	Participate in the political process by regularly taking part in elections, also rallies and demonstrations	No ambiguity in their responses
	Emphasize the need for personal change and the initiation of change from within, starting with oneself	Emphasis on self and the measures one can and should undertake to attain the desired outcomes
	Phrases indicating linguistic uncertainty are present	Are aware of their role in driving political transformations within the country
	Justification of the political regime and politicians in power and made political decisions	Stress the significance of engagement and personal endeavor by actively voicing political standpoint, joining protests, and participating in elections
	Mention corruption as an important domestic and global issue	Trust in democratic political institutions has stayed the same
		No justification of political regime and made decisions
3. Prejudice and discrimination	-	Express a sense of marginalization
		Experience political isolation and the lack of political engagement in the new host country
		Experienced a special attitude of Austrians towards them in a negative sense, which they
4. Experience of deception	-	Corruption in Austria is a frequently mentioned topic, however, not personally experienced

The choice not to categorize Ukrainian respondents into distinct groups arises from the alignment noticed in their political perspectives and political involvement, both pre- and post-migration to democratic Austria. This consistent uniformity facilitates a more direct comparative analysis, providing insights into the political dynamics and resocialization experiences of Ukrainian migrants within a democratic context.

In addition, it is important to acknowledge the significant impact of the country of origin and the political regime under which individuals were raised. The surrounding conditions during one's formative years play a significant role, as some individuals as we see on the example of migrants from non-democratic regime may continue to face challenges in openly expressing their opinions, even after residing in a democratic environment for an extended period. This highlights the enduring influence of past experiences and prevailing conditions on people's willingness to fully accept and exercise their democratic rights. Understanding these factors complicates the analysis and highlights the interactions

between subjective personal background, political culture, and the ongoing process of political adaptation within a democratic framework.

10. Conclusion and future directions

The complex process of democratic resocialization among migrants from non-democratic and hybrid regimes in Austria has revealed a multifaceted picture of experiences, perceptions, and adaptations, shedding light on the multifaceted journey towards democratic resocialization. The findings presented the nuances of Russian and Ukrainian migrants' responses, examining the impact of time, social networks and personal experiences on their democratic resocialization.

The trajectories of political assimilation among migrants from non-democratic political regime revealed a spectrum of responses, reflecting the diverse influences as well as adaptive and resisting strategies. The impact of time spent in a democratic environment emerged as a critical factor, with a noticeable shift in political expressions and critique becoming more open as the duration of stay increased. However, a subset of migrants, primarily those restricting social interactions, displayed resistance to democratic resocialization, underlining one of the decisive roles of social networks and social interaction with native population in shaping political beliefs.

The division of non-democratic migrants into two distinct groups post-migration outlined contrasting paths. One group sustained or enhanced their political interest, reporting a simultaneous increase in trust in democratic political institutions. Conversely, the other group experienced a decline in political interest, explaining it with disillusionment with both Austrian and Russian political systems. This disillusionment manifested as political apathy, with a perception that political participation offered limited opportunities for meaningful change.

The assumption made on the base of works of Welch & Sigelman (2000), Conway (2001) and Michelson (2003) stated that being a part of the social networking is a significant factor influencing the success of political resocialization. This research confirmed the crucial role and importance of migrants taking part in and being part of social occasions and social networks what helped migrants in the period of post-migration to integrate into new society of the host country and promoted positive images of democracy and its principles, and thus speeded up the process of democratic resocialization.

One of the mechanisms through which immigrants were exposed to political information and democratic beliefs was political discussions with native population. Hence, the expectation that both extending social networks in the democratic host country and carrying political discussions with natives would lead to the migrants' adaptation to the new democratic environment and would have a positive impact on immigrant's political resocialization has been confirmed. Moreover, migrants with social circle limited to mainly other migrants who speak the same language either resisted the process of democratic resocialization or found it challenging to integrate into Austrian society. As described by White and colleagues (2008) and Vargas-Ramos (2011), the previous political beliefs acted as a filtering prism, hindering exposure to diverse perspectives and resisting democratic resocialization.

Confirming the Anduiza & Martín (2011) and Warren's (2001) point of views, during this research was found out that during or after political discussions were taking place, migrant's political efficacy was formed. It was found out that while by interacting with native population and adapting to new democratic environment of host country, migrants have experienced the increase of the internal political efficacy on the contrary to those immigrants who resisted the process of democratic resocialization.

Moreover, in contrast to their Russian migrants, Ukrainian migrants, being representors of a hybrid political regime, showed a proactive and self-driven approach to democratic resocialization. Educational institutions and friends played major roles as key agents in their political socialization. Parental influence, unlike for the Russian migrants, played a minimal role, highlighting a broader range of influencing agents contributing to the adaptive integration of representatives of hybrid regimes.

Prior to their move, some migrants of hybrid regime displayed either pre-existing interest and/or political engagement of different extent with their native political life or none at all, but in both cases their sense of political empowerment persisted and strengthened after relocation. Their focus on personal agency and active participation in Austrian political and social life facilitated a smoother integration process. Respondents from hybrid regime demonstrated a willingness to adapt, engage, and actively shape their new political environment, marking a departure from the passive apathy observed in some migrants from non-democracy.

A comparative analysis illuminated stark differences in political resocialization patterns between migrants from non-democracy and hybrid political regime. Migrants from non-democratic regimes

exhibited a continuity in political orientation and behavior, mirroring their counterparts in Russia before the relocation. This pattern suggested a resistance to transformative change, with established political beliefs acting as enduring filters. Although the longer these migrants live in a democratic environment and the more diverse their social circle is, the more visible are the political changes taking place in them and adaptation to new political realities.

On the other hand, migrants from hybrid regime displayed a more dynamic and adaptive integration process, emphasizing self-driven efforts, active participation, and a willingness to engage with the democratic values of democratic Austria. The age factor continued to play a crucial role for both groups of respondents. In their researches Khan (2021) and Vargas-Ramos (2011) point out that the age factor captures cumulative political experiences regardless of how long migrants have lived in a new country, and that their previous interest in politics and participation patterns of immigrants in the new host country are expected to be found to be strong predictors of engagement regardless of the country of origin. Age has been confirmed as an important factor influencing political activity post-migration and political resocialization. In the course of this study, it was found out that older migrants, after moving to democratic country, found it more difficult to adapt their views and social behavior in accordance with the democratic values prevailing in the host country due to a number of reasons, however it was observed that time spent in the democratic environment of the host country had a positive effect on their political resocialization. In contrast to them, younger migrants showed to be more adaptable to change and more willing to accept democratic values and integrating into the society of the new host country. with older migrants facing challenges in adjusting to the democratic milieu, while younger migrants demonstrated a greater openness to change and new social connections.

While this study provides valuable insights, several avenues for future research beckon. A longitudinal examination of democratic resocialization, tracking changes in political beliefs over an extended period, could offer a more nuanced understanding of adaptation dynamics. Moreover, taking into account the important role of migrant's social interaction with native population, it would also be interesting to track the role of social media and online social platforms and their influence on political resocialization in democratic host country.

In conclusion, the democratic resocialization of migrants is a multifaceted process influenced by individual, social, and contextual factors. This study, while shedding light on these complexities, sets

the stage for future researches that delve deeper into the evolving dynamics of political adaptation in diverse migrant populations. The findings underline the need for nuanced, context-specific approaches to facilitate successful democratic resocialization among migrants in democratic host countries.

List of References:

Adman, P., & Strömblad, P. (2011). Utopia becoming dystopia? Analyzing political trust among immigrants in Sweden. In *Arbetsrapport* (2011:10; Arbetsrapport). Institute for Futures Studies. https://ideas.repec.org/p/hhs/ifswps/2011_010.html

Anderson, C. J., & Tverdova, Y. V. (2003). Corruption, Political Allegiances, and Attitudes Toward Government in Contemporary Democracies. *American Journal of Political Science*, *47*(1), 91–109. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5907.00007

Anduiza, E., & Martín, J. S. (2011). Political Efficacy and Confidence among Migrants. In L. Morales & M. Giugni (Eds.), *Social Capital, Political Participation and Migration in Europe: Making Multicultural Democracy Work?* (pp. 198–218). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230302464_9

Balch, G. I. (1974). Multiple Indicators in Survey Research: The Concept 'Sense of Political Efficacy'. *Political Methodology*, *1*(2), 1–43.

Bilodeau, A. (2004). Learning democracy: The political re-socialization of immigrants from authoritarian regimes in Canada. PhD diss., University of Toronto.

Bilodeau, A., & Nevitte, N. (2003). Political Trust for a New Regime The Case of Immigrants from Non-Democratic Countries in Canada.

Black, J. H. (1987). The practice of politics in two settings: Political transferability among recent immigrants to Canada. Canadian Journal of Political Science, 20, 731-54.

Black, J. H., Niemi, R. G., & Powell, G. B., Jr. (1987). Age, resistance, and political learning in a new environment: The case of Canadian immigrants. Comparative Politics, 20, 73-84.

Campbell, A., Gurin, G., & Miller, W. E. (1954). *The voter decides* (pp. xiii, 242). Row, Peterson, and Co.

Conover, P. J., Searing, D. D., & Crewe, I. M. (2002). The Deliberative Potential of Political Discussion. *British Journal of Political Science*, *32*(1), 21–62.

Conway, M. (2001). Socialization and Attitudes Toward Government Among Asian Americans. *American Political Science Association Meeting*, San Francisco, CA.

Corruption Perceptions Index 2021—Explore the results. (2021). Transparency.Org. Retrieved 9 June 2022, from https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2021

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (Fifth edition). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://books.google.co.nz/books?id=J4w5DwAAQBAJprintsec=frontcoverdq=Research+design+:+qualitative,+quantitative,+and+mixed+methods+approacheshl=ensa=Xved=0ahUKEwjzpZS2mIHaAhUJybwKHa-

JDvwQ6AEIJzAA#v=onepageq=Research%20design%20%3A%20qualitative%2C%20quantitative%2C%20and%20mixed%20methods%20approachesf=false

Dautović, R., & Hafez, F. (2019). Institutionalizing Islam in Contemporary Austria: A Comparative Analysis of the Austrian Islam Act of 2015 and Austrian Religion Laws with Special Emphasis on the Israelite Act of 2012. *Oxford Journal of Law and Religion*, *8*(1), 28–50. https://doi.org/10.1093/ojlr/rwy013

Della Porta, D. (2000). Social Capital, Beliefs in Government, and Political Corruption. In S. J. Pharr, & R. D. Putnam (Eds.), Disaffected Democracies: What's Troubling the Trilateral Countries? (pp. 202-27). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dinesen, P. T. (2010). Upbringing, early experiences of discrimination and social identity: explaining generalized trust among immigrants in Denmark. *Scan. Polit. Stud.* 33, 93–111. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9477.2009.00240.x

Dinesen, P. T., & Hooghe, M. (2010). When in Rome, do as the romans do: the acculturation of generalized trust among immigrants in Western Europe. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 44, 697–727. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-7379.2010.00822.x

Dollmann, J. (2021). The Political Integration of Immigrants: How Pre- and Postmigration Contexts Matter. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-021-00867-5

Easton, D. (1975). A Re-Assessment of the Concept of Political Support. *British Journal of Political Science*, *5*(4), 435–457.

Eckstein, H. (1988). A Culturalist Theory of Political Change. *The American Political Science Review*, *82*(3), 789–804. https://doi.org/10.2307/1962491

Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU). (2022). *Democracy Index 2021: The China challenge*. Economist Intelligence Unit. Retrieved April 21, 2022 from https://www.eiu.com/n/campaigns/democracy-index-2021/

ENAR. (2013). ENAR Shadow Report. Racism and related discriminatory practices in employment in Austria. *European Network Against Racism*. https://www.enar-eu.org/wp-content/uploads/austria.pdf

ENAR. (2019). Shadow Reports on racism in Europe. *European Network Against Racism*. https://www.enar-eu.org/shadow-reports-on-racism-in-europe-203/

Escobar, G. (2006). The optimistic immigrant: Among Latinos, recent arrivals have the most hope for the future. Washington DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from http://pewresearch.org/pubs/28/theoptimistic-immigrant

Finifter, A. W., & Finifter, B. M. (1989). Party Identification and Political Adaptation of American Migrants in Australia. *The Journal of Politics*, *51*(3), 599–630. https://doi.org/10.2307/2131497

Flick, U. (2013). The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis. SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243

Freedom House. (2022). *Freedom in the World 2022*. Freedom House. Retrieved April 21, 2022 from https://freedomhouse.org/countries/freedom-world/scores

Galandini, S., & Fieldhouse, E. (2019). Discussants that mobilise: Ethnicity, political discussion networks and voter turnout in Britain. *Electoral Studies*, *57*, 163–173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2018.12.003

Hadj Abdou, L., & Ruedin, D. (2022). The Austrian People's Party: An anti-immigrant right party? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *48*(2), 385–404. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2020.1853904

Hafez, F. (2017). Debating the 2015 Islam law in Austrian Parliament: Between legal recognition and Islamophobic populism. *Discourse & Society*, *28*(4), 392–412. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926517703223

Hafez. F., Heinisch, R., & Miklin, E. (2019). The new right: Austria's Freedom Party and changing perceptions of Islam. *Brookings*. https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-new-right-austrias-freedom-party-and-changing-perceptions-of-islam/

Huckfeldt, R., & Sprague, J. (1987). Networks in Context: The Social Flow of Political Information. *The American Political Science Review*, *81*(4), 1197–1216. https://doi.org/10.2307/1962585

Ichilov, O. (1990). *Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy*. Teachers College Press.

Inglehart, R. (1988). The Renaissance of Political Culture. *The American Political Science Review*, *82*(4), 1203–1230. https://doi.org/10.2307/1961756

Inkeles, A. (1969). Social Structure and Socialization. In D.A. Goslin (ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research (pp. 615-632). Chicago, II: Rand McNally.

Just, A. (2017). The far-right, immigrants, and the prospects of democracy satisfaction in Europe. Party Politics, 23(5):507–525.

Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1964). *Personal Influence, the Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications*. Transaction Publishers.

Khan, A. (2021). *Resocialization of Immigrants*, IJLMH 4 (2), 516 – 523. http://doi.one/10.1732/IJLMH.26091

Klofstad, C. (2011). Civic Talk: Peers, Politics, and the Future of Democracy. *Bibliovault OAI Repository, the University of Chicago Press*.

Lane, R. (1959). Political life: Why people get involved in politics? Glencoe: The Free Press.

Latané, B. (1981). The psychology of social impact. *American Psychologist*, *36*(4), 343–356. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.36.4.343

Linde, J., & Ekman, J. (2003). Satisfaction with democracy: A note on a frequently used indicator in comparative politics. *European Journal of Political Research*, *42*(3), 391–408. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.00089

Marien, S., & Hooghe, M. (2011). Does Political Trust Matter? An Empirical Investigation into the Relation Between Political Trust and Support for Law Compliance. *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF POLITICAL RESEARCH*, *50*, 267–291. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2010.01930.x

Martin, A. (2010). Does Political Trust Matter? Examining Some of the Implications of Low Levels of Political Trust in Australia. *Australian Journal of Political Science - AUST J POLIT SCI*, *45*, 705–712. https://doi.org/10.1080/10361146.2010.517184

Maxwell, R. (2010). Evaluating Migrant Integration: Political Attitudes Across Generations in Europe. *International Migration Review*, *44*(1), 25–52. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00797.x

McLaren, L. (2012). Immigration and Trust in Politics in Britain. *British Journal of Political Science*, *42*(1), 163–185. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123411000251

Michelson, M. R. (2003). The Corrosive Effect of Acculturation: How Mexican Americans Lose Political Trust. *Social Science Quarterly*, *84*(4), 918–933.

Minkenberg, M. (2001). The radical right in public office: Agenda-setting and policy effects. West European Politics, 24(4):1–21.

Niemi, R. G., & Hepburn, M. A. (1995). The Rebirth of Political Socialization. *Perspectives on Political Science*, *24*(1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/10457097.1995.9941860

Pellegata, A., & Memoli, V. (2016). Can Corruption Erode Confidence in Political Institutions Among European Countries? Comparing the Effects of Different Measures of Perceived Corruption. *Social Indicators Research*, *128*(1), 391–412. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-1036-0

Persson, E. (2021). *We Need to Talk: About How Frequency of Political Discussion Vary Between Immigrated and Native-born People in Sweden.* http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-431832

Pirro, A. (2015). The Populist Radical Right in Central and Eastern Europe: Ideology, Impact, and Electoral Performance. Routledge.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). What makes democracy work? *National Civic Review*, *82*(2), 101–107. https://doi.org/10.1002/ncr.4100820204

Röder, A., & Mühlau, P. (2012). Low Expectations or Different Evaluations: What Explains Immigrants' High Levels of Trust in Host-Country Institutions? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *38*(5), 777–792. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2012.667986

Rydgren, J. (2003). Meso-level reasons for racism and xenophobia: Some converging and diverging effects of radical right populism in France and Sweden. European Journal of Social Theory, 6(1):45–68

Sapiro, V. (2004). NOT YOUR PARENTS' POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION: Introduction for a New Generation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *7*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.012003.104840

Sears, D.O. & Levy, S. (2003). Childhood and adult political development. In D.O. Sears, L. Huddy & R. Jervis (Eds.), Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology (pp. 60-109). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sears, D.O. (1975). Political socialization. In F. Greenstein & N. Polsby (Eds.), Handbook of Political Science 2 (pp.93-153). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Sigel, R.S. & Hoskin, M.B. (1977). Perspectives on adult political socialization — Areas of research. In S. Rensho (Ed.), Handbook of Political Socialization: Theory and Research. New York: The Free Pres.

Steinmayr, A. (2016). Exposure to Refugees and Voting for the Far-Right: (Unexpected) Results from Austria. IZA Discussion Papers 9790, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA).

Sticker, M. (2008). Sondermodell Österreich?: Die Islamische Glaubensgemeinschaft in Österreich (IGGiÖ). Drava-Verlag.

Vargas-Ramos, C. (2011). Migration and Political Resocialization: The Impact of Political Environment Change on Political Orientations among Puerto Rican Return Migrants. Centro Journal, vol. XXIII, núm. 1, 2011, The City University of New York New York, Estados Unidos, pp. 125-161.

Warren, M. E. (2001). *Democracy and Association*. Princeton University Press.

Welch, S., & Sigelman, L. (2000). Getting to Know You? Latino-Anglo Social Contact. *Social Science Quarterly*, *81*(1), 67–83.

Wilkes, R., & Wu, C. (2019). Immigration, Discrimination, and Trust: A Simply Complex Relationship. *Frontiers in Sociology*, *4*. https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fsoc.2019.00032

White, S., Nevitte, N., Blais, A., Gidengil, E., & Fournier, P. (2008). The Political Resocialization of Immigrants: Resistance or Lifelong Learning? *Political Research Quarterly - POLIT RES QUART*, *61*, 268–281. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912908314713

Appendix A: Abstract in English

This master's thesis explores the democratic resocialization of migrants from countries with non-democratic and hybrid regimes in Austria. The research question focuses on how the host country's democratic environment and the country's population influence the political attitudes and behavior of migrants from non- and semi-democratic political regimes. Using measures like political trust and satisfaction with democracy, the study employs explanatory mechanisms—social networks, political discussion, political efficacy, and personal experiences—to analyze resocialization.

Migrants from non-democratic Russia and semi-democratic Ukraine in democratic Austria serve as subjects. The findings reveal the decisive roles of time and respondent's age, social networks, and personal experiences on for the adaptive or resistant strategies of democratic resocialization. Key findings reveal that non-democratic regime migrants exhibit varied trajectories, with social networks and age playing a crucial role in adaptive or resistant strategies for both groups, while migrants of hybrid regime demonstrated overall a more proactive approach and higher openness to adapt to democratic milieu.

A comparative analysis highlights differences between migrants from non-democratic and hybrid political regimes regarding their adaptivity to new democratic political environment and political resocialization. The study concludes by underlining the multifaceted nature of democratic resocialization, emphasizing the need for nuanced, context-specific approaches in facilitating successful adaptation among migrants in democratic host countries.

Appendix B: Abstract in German

Diese Masterarbeit beschäftigt sich mit der demokratischen Resozialisierung von MigrantInnen aus Ländern mit nicht-demokratischen und hybriden Regimen in Österreich. Die Forschungsfrage konzentriert sich darauf, wie das demokratische Umfeld des Aufnahmelands und die Bevölkerung des Landes die politischen Einstellungen und das Verhalten von MigrantInnen aus nicht- und halbdemokratischen politischen Regimen beeinflusst. Anhand von Faktoren wie politisches Vertrauen und Zufriedenheit mit der Demokratie werden in der Studie Erklärungsmechanismen - soziale Netzwerke, politische Diskussion, politische Wirksamkeit und persönliche Erfahrungen - zur Analyse der Resozialisierung herangezogen.

Die Studie untersucht Migranten aus dem nicht-demokratischen Russland und der halb-demokratischen Ukraine, die in das demokratische Österreich umgezogen sind. Die Ergebnisse zeigen die entscheidenden Rollen von Zeit und Alter der Befragten, sozialen Netzwerken und persönlichen Erfahrungen für die adaptiven oder resistenten Strategien der demokratischen Resozialisierung. Die wichtigsten Ergebnisse zeigen, dass Migranten aus nicht-demokratischen Regimen unterschiedliche Verläufe aufweisen, wobei soziale Netzwerke und das Alter für beide Gruppen eine entscheidende Rolle für adaptive oder resistente Strategien spielen, während Migranten aus hybriden Regimen insgesamt einen proaktiveren Ansatz und eine größere Offenheit für die Anpassung an das demokratische Milieu zeigen.

Eine vergleichende Analyse hebt die Unterschiede zwischen Migranten aus nicht-demokratischen und hybriden politischen Regimen hinsichtlich ihrer Anpassungsfähigkeit an das neue demokratische politische Umfeld und der politischen Resozialisierung hervor. Die Studie schließt mit der Betonung des vielschichtigen Charakters der demokratischen Resozialisierung und unterstreicht die Notwendigkeit nuancierter, kontextspezifischer Ansätze zur Erleichterung einer erfolgreichen Anpassung von Migranten in demokratischen Aufnahmeländern.

Appendix C: Interview guide for native respondents

1. What does it mean for you to be an Austrian/Russian/Ukrainian?
2. What do you think are the most important issues facing Austria/Russia/Ukraine today?
3. What do you think you personally can do to influence those issues?
4. Can you describe when was the last time you tried to promote your political views in your home country? What was it about?
5. How would you describe the government in Austria/ Russia/Ukraine? How do you feel about that?
6. What are the qualities that a (the perfect/an ideal) government should possess?
7. What were the situations that undermined (strengthened) your trust in political regime and its institutions in your country of origin?
8. How is it when you discuss politics with people from your home country?
   How does it differ from that when you discuss politics with people from other countries?
9. Thank you for all that valuable information, is there anything else you'd like to add before we end?

Appendix D: Interview guide for migrant respondents

1. Can you tell me something about what it was like when you moved to Austria?
2. What associations do you have about you living in (moving to) Austria?
3. What thoughts do you have about you leaving your native country?
4. Can you tell about something what you regret about/ what you are happy about after moving to Austria?
5. Can you tell about something what you regret about/ that makes you happy about leaving your home country?
6. What does it mean for you to be integrated into society?
7. What personal experience might lead you to the thought that your life might be different from what you have just described?
8. What does social and political exclusion mean for you? How do you think, what does it mean for an immigrant to feel unwelcome in country?
9. What do you think are the most important issues facing Russia/Ukraine today?
10. What do you think you personally can do to influence those issues?
11. How would you describe the direction in which your home-country's politics is developing? What do you think you personally can do to influence those issues?
12. Can you tell me what your political views are? How do you understand that?
13. What were the factors/people/situations that formed or influenced your political views?
14. Could you tell me who were your role models or people who you take example of?

15. How is it when you discuss politics with people from your home country?
    How does it differ from that when you discuss politics with people from Austria?
16. Thank you for all that valuable information, is there anything else you'd like to add before we end?

Appendix E: Transcripts of the interviews with migrants and native population

The transcripts were uploaded to the Austrian Social Science Data Archive (AUSSDA). Should there be any inquiries regarding the transcripts, individuals are encouraged to contact me directly for assistance.