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Introduction

This book presents the results of the work groups’ activities during the European Summer School of Social cognition, part of the project “Social cognition in action” supported by the programme “Youth in Action”.

- The main goal of the project “Social cognition in action” is to stimulate the interactions between the students’ psychology associations in the European Union in order to overcome social isolation and social inclusion among the young people in Europe.
- The objective goal of the project is: psychology students from different EU countries to get basic knowledge in the field of the social cognition, to exchange ideas and experience, to make joint research projects. Thus they will improve their competence and contribute to the implementation of the social cognition for combating the social isolation among young people. Social Cognition” was chosen as a theme for the ESS and the project because it is a specific area of the cognitions. Social Cognition is the base of people’s effective inclusion in the society and a needed base for overcoming the differences, for the acceptance of others, for the efficient inclusion as individuals in the big system of the modern society.
- If young psychologists study the social cognition in details, that means that they can help more effectively to other young people to combat and overcome variety of social problems such as: social isolation, discrimination, cultural and ethnical intolerance, interpersonal conflicts and so on.

During the European summer school which was held in Bulgaria from 17 to 25 July 2010 35 students from 19 European countries participated in lectures, seminars and workgroup sessions to improve their knowledge of social cognition and to find out ideas and new projects for implementation of social cognition for overcoming the social inclusion of young people in Europe.

In this book are presented publications from each of the sixth work groups. At the beginning of the summer school the students were separated in six groups under the supervision of psychology Ph. D students, experts in social cognition. They discussed, analyzed and made research plans for future work in some very important areas of the young peoples’ social life. As a result of their hard work each group made publication on the workgroup topic. In each
publication you can find theoretical background, areas of focus, description of the purpose and methods, description of the results, future plans and ideas for implementation of the results.

This booklet could be a beginning of the real implementation of the ideas of each of the six groups.

Everyone who is interested in the topics and who wants to take part in the distribution of the ideas, the researches and the activities of Social Cognition in Action can join to the Facebook group/Social cognition in Action or to the website 4april.eu/social cognition.

Let’s help the ideas in this book to come to reality and thus, through Social cognition to help for resolving some of the essential problems of young people in Europe and help for their effective social inclusion!!!

*By the organizers of the ESS “Social Cognition in Action”*
DIVIDED EDUCATION IN EUROPE: EXPLORING THE SOCIAL IMPACT OF SEGREGATION IN SCHOOLS*

Supervisor: Kai Ruggeri
Team members: Flávio Augusto, Ciara Joyce, Indre Jurkeviciute, Simon Knight, José Piest, Britta Naber, Maris Vainre

Theoretical Background

In post-Cold War conflict situations, schools have regularly been at the forefront of social division, whether via segregation or used as a tool for reconciliation (Smith, 2005). The levels at which this has been done include differences in curricula and language, among others. However, the impact of these differences on social inclusion is not clearly known and must be measured to determine if such division leads to greater social problems.

A recent meta-analysis (Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006) on intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes identifies five different threat types which have a positive relationship with negative outgroup attitudes - realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotypes and group-esteem. Societies in which groups (ethnic or other) are not integrated and in particular post-conflict societies, are likely to have members who experience one or more of these threat types, with the related raised likelihood of negative outgroup attitudes.
One means to assess outgroup attitudes is the Implicit Association Test (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). This has been used to measure implicit – as opposed to explicit – attitudes to various things including ethnic groups. One recent study successfully demonstrated stronger implicit attitudes than explicit to Arab-Muslims in Sweden (Agerström & Rooth, 2009). Another found that implicit stereotypes (but not attitudes) were predictive – even when controlling for explicit attitudes – of more overtly harmful actions (Rudman & Ashmore, 2007). In societies with ethnic divisions, the groups people identify with, and identify around them will play a significant role in their attitudes towards their social world and communities. “Ingroup identification appears to have a weak, though statistically significant, effect on intergroup threat; high identifiers experience higher levels of intergroup threat than low identifiers.” (Riek et al., 2006, p. 345) – given this research will focus on group attitudes, a measure will be used to assess both group identification, and explicit attitudes towards ‘the other’ alongside use of the IAT.

Probable Areas of Focus

Within England, school ethnic segregation is higher than residential ethnic segregation – that is, the schools are more segregated than the society from which they draw their pupils (Johnston, Burgess, Wilson, & Harris, 2006). Burgess and Wilson (2005) found similarly high levels of segregation, although with varying levels in different ethnic groups. They raise the concern that “Mixed schooling has the potential to mitigate problems of physical separation and/or residential immobility. Our research shows that this doesn't seem to be happening, that levels of school segregation are generally high. If co-presence is a necessary condition for multicultural understanding, addressing ways of ensuring such habitual contact should be a focus for policy.” (2005, p. 23).

The Western European situation is fundamentally different to other places in that legally enshrined segregation is illegal, however de facto segregation is not uncommon, and for some groups self-segregation may occur (e.g. Muslim migrant parents preference for a Muslim education) (Denessen, Driessen & Sleegers, 2005).

With a focus on the role of education in conflict and post-conflict regions Smith (2005) raises two concerns. First, that lack of education leads to poorer and slower recovery. And second that, in particular in societies which are or become segregated, those segregations will lead to deep and lasting divides and potentially different outcomes for different groups. He cites the UNESCO position paper on language of instruction, which “advocates mother tongue instruction as a means of improving education quality and bilingual and/or multilingual education as a

---

3 See https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/demo/background/bibliotopic.html for a range of studies using the IAT
means of promoting social equality and understanding between different groups” (2005, p. 380). Given the ease with which one could advocate school separation by language, research needs to be done on the impact of such segregation on attitudes toward ‘other’.

While work has been done on desegregating and training teachers in post-conflict Balkan regions (e.g. in Kosovo (UN, 2007)) this work is incomplete, and its impact not fully measured. Segregated schools remain in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with ethnic minorities particularly receiving a seemingly lower level of education. This is exacerbated by the Two Schools under One Roof policy, which systematically drives this social division. (Risher & Kabil, 2010)

**Description of the Purposes & Methods**

Given the importance of education’s role in social inclusion, the main purpose of this research will be to determine if segregation on ethnic and racial lines drives and furthers division in young people. While the measurements used will deal heavily with identity and perceptions of self, group, and others, the aim is not to focus on those aspects, but on the differences found within and between the tested groups.

In order to test these aspects, the IAT will be modified to match a selection of final-year high school students in several countries. Only students in their final year will be used so as to measure the final result of the possible impact of division in education. Male and female results will be separated in the final analysis.

The selection of countries will be made based on criteria in research, levels of segregation in schools, and on the availability of access to testing in schools. Only state-funded schools within the defined city boundaries of national capitals will be used. This will be done so as to get as much consistency as possible in terms of the environment, funding, and background between the students.

**Description of the results of the workgroup during the ESS week**

The week in Bulgaria was a tremendous success. Aside from having a remarkably cohesive and compatible group, the standard of discussions and critical thought remained high from beginning to end. The team is very diverse and highly competent, consisting of members from Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal, Ireland, Great Britain, Serbia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and the initial gatherings were seamless.

After introductions and general discussion of the theories and current status of the involved issues, group members spent time researching the topic to determine which specific areas interested them. As the subject involves the social impact of education using psychological methods and measures, it is naturally quite broad. For that reason, each person selected primary areas to research as well as additional roles for the project. To date, those roles include EU education policy research, measurement validation, divided society theories, human rights
considerations, clinical impact of segregation, and social influences of education. Additionally, members have selected to be in charge of project management, translations, editing, and coordinating data collection. Though the team is quite strong in competencies and numbers, additional members have been added since the week convened. Primarily, this has involved including native speakers of languages in the Balkans, an expert on human rights, and host organizations in areas we expect to test. However, the bulk of the work remains with original members. Initially, the plan for the research was to compare one integrated system with a divided system. However, for a variety of reasons, more controls will be included, thus integrated and divided schools in all locations will be sought. To date, the plan will be to include at least one former Yugoslavian state with systemic segregation policies (e.g. Bosnia and Herzegovina) and at least one EU-state (e.g. France, Great Britain), but this would be the minimum. If the initial testing goes smoothly, additional testing will be done in each locations, but this will be based on research and access to schools, students.

**Future plan of the activities**
The most immediate step for the group is to complete a publishable review of the area with focus on the psychological topics. In order to seek peer review, support activities for social inclusion of the young people in Europe and provide clear dissemination of group work to YiA. This aspect is nearly completed and aside from editing and group review, should be finished within a fortnight. While members are finishing their writing duties, others are working on validating the modified IAT with the additional measure. This will be the next critical phase, and piloting the new version will be done as soon as possible. This task should be completed before the end of September, though possible issues of language validation are an anticipated issue. Using the literature review, group members, and hosting groups, funds to create an exchange in the testing locations will be sought from the YiA funding schemes. Because this topic approaches different schemes at many levels, the goal will be to promote exchanges, research network development, social/youth inclusion, and exposure to EU and non-EU regions. In whichever states will be tested, host organisations will be sought to enhance this experience, uniting the research team with local schools and young people. Ideally, these changes will coincide with data collection in order to allow the entire team to partake in that aspect and reduce variations in how testing is carried out. If possible, this will be done beginning in October and completed before winter holidays in December. However, that is speculative at this point. Using all the data, analysis and reporting will be a group task with one or two individuals in charge of each aspect. It is too soon to establish a definite timeline on this part, mainly because clear access to schools has not yet been obtained. However, as with its 2009 counterpart, the 2010 ESS Education team intends to
complete research, analysis, reporting and submit to conferences and journals within one year.

References
CONFLICT RESOLUTION STYLES AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS CONFLICT RESOLUTION
»CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN ACTION«

Supervisor: Ajda Erjavec
Team members: Anamaria Dorgo, Andrej Dudáč, Andrey Ganev, Marina Grancharova, Annaleena Holopainen, Jakub Lanc, Alenka Murgelj

Theoretical background of the topic

The work our research group carried out during the European Summer School of Social cognition was focused on the topic of conflict, conflict resolution styles and alternative dispute resolution methods. Our aim was to become aware of our personal conflict resolution style and to find a connection between this and our attitudes towards alternative dispute resolution methods. Before getting into the core of concepts like conflict resolution style or alternative dispute resolution, we need to get an insight of what conflict means. On a general basis, conflict is the interpersonal opposition of different needs, desires, interests, emotions and behaviors (Fritz Fischalek, 1977). Werner Michael Esser (1975) defines integral parts of every conflict (relation, source, behavior, motivation) while Fred Luthans (1989) writes about a traditional and a modern approach to resolving conflicts. The fist one promotes avoiding conflicts and the modern one sees conflict as inevitable and integral to every change.

Furthermore, every conflict is natural, inevitable, rational and irrational and it differs in intensity, disposition, frequency and salience. Referring to their functionality/ disfunctionality dimension, conflict can either be beneficial (by preventing stagnation, by stimulating interest and curiosity, by fostering cohesiveness and by invoking change) or destructive (by affecting the
relationships, by producing inflexible behavior or by decreasing communication) (Oetzel & Ting-Toomey, 2006).

The way conflicts appear, evolve and are solved or not, is a process in which communication is playing a very important role. This is the reason why we want to start our theoretical background motivation by addressing some current issues in the field of communication.

Bandler and Grinder (1979) developed a model to explain the way we process the information received from the world around us according to which our internal response generates our ongoing behavior. They state that our existing beliefs, attitudes, memories, prior decisions shape the external stimulus we receive from the environment. Our experience is therefore something we literally construct internally ourselves. In this context, we can agree that people perceive the world in infinity of ways, very different. If their perceptions are different, so is their personality, the way they communicate or the way they solve conflicts. The linkage between communication and personality can be explained by using Dilts’s neurological levels of personality: environment (Where? When?), behavior (What?), strategies, abilities (How?), values, beliefs (Why?), identity (Who?) and mission.

An important facet of communication, extremely useful into conflict resolution methods is achieving common meaning. This can be easily done addressing the strategic communication levels: calibrating (observation with no interpretation), pacing (non-verbal, verbal, para-verbal mirroring), rapport (understand, respect and value others interests - entering his world), non-verbal leading (reflection of body posture, mimics, motions, speed of speech), content leading (conveying to the objectives we want to achieve).

Before starting to point out the conflict resolution styles, two concepts remained to be addressed: offering feedback and active listening. Feedback is the trigger in every learning process. Due to feedback, people are able to give and receive responses to everything they do, in order to improve their skills and knowledge in all domains. During our work, we used the so-called “sandwich feedback” Seymour (1990) proposed: first we give positive feedback on strength, supported by examples, then the possible improvements based on weaknesses supported by examples and at the end a general positive impression. Active listening is all about asking the correct questions (that do not contain criticism or blame but are aimed to clarify and get the missing information from the other person) and paraphrasing (listening to words and thoughts behind the words, recognizing the meaning of the message). All this theoretical information together with rising questions using the GROW (goal, reality, options and will) and SPIN (situation, problem, implication, needs) models were found very useful for understanding the aspects and practical implication of our general topic.

Finally, our research uses the theoretical framework of the dual-concern model that explains the existence of five conflict resolution styles using a two-dimensional model of conflict behavior (Cosier & Ruble, 1981). The dimensions
are “concern for others” and “concern for self”, and the five conflict resolution styles identified are: competing (low concern for other, high concern for self), collaborating (high concern for others, high concern for self), compromising (moderate concern for others, moderate concern for self), avoiding (low concern for others, low concern for self) and accommodating (high concern for other, low concern for self).

**Purposes and methods**

The research aims to put more light on the connection between results of two questionnaires used in the practice of conflict resolution training. Conflict Mode instrument designed by Kilmann and Thomas (1977) and Diversity Icebreaker (Ekelund, 1998) both seem to study aspects of human interactions when faced with diversity, disagreement, conflict, etc. Therefore we decided to explore the connections between the instruments’ results in the student population. At the same time the experience of the whole ESS week convinced us about the efficiency of experiential learning in personal development and since both questionnaires can easily be used in training situations we also decided to research if there are any changes in the results of the questionnaires after a certain period of time has passed.

We decided the best way to research this issue is to measure the difference in results before and six months after participants will receive training on conflict behavior awareness and conflict resolution. Furthermore we will also compare effects of training time length since some participants will be included in short workshops and some in a few-day training.

The acquired results will consist of questionnaire measurements and qualitative data gathered through focal groups.

**Results of the team work during the ESS week**

The purpose of our research group during ESS was to get to know the methods of resolving conflicts and also our personal style of conflict resolution. The whole research was focused on the connection between our own conflict management style and our attitudes towards alternative conflict resolution methods. Workshops with role-play, feedback and group facilitation, all based on experiential learning, were carried out to raise our awareness towards individual conflict behavior. The reactions, discussions and information shared during the research group meetings, all served as useful insights for the idea of our further research.

Each theoretical peace of information described above, meaning models, techniques, tools, concepts, all were supported by exercises that implied a great level of experiential learning. This way, we were able to apply the gained knowledge to real life situations, to problems that matters to us, therefore our degree of involvement and motivation to understand and retain as much as possible from the information received was very high.
Next, we want to briefly share with you the way these exercises made us feel, learn, develop, and also find an interesting research issue to address in our further work as a team.

For example, we used Dilts’s neurological levels of personality in order to find the level at which a personal problem is situated, and then to propose strategies to solve this problem. This exercise was completed in pairs. While one person identified a problem that bothers them and wants to find a solution to it, the other person guided them through all the stages of the model, actively listening to them, asking questions, guiding and supporting the other person to find the level at which the problem is situated. Strategies to solve the problem were also searched for together in the same manner of cooperation. Then, the participants changed places and repeated the process with the other person’s problem. This is one of the feedbacks after completing this exercise: “I feel released… I’m more aware of the problem now than before; I’m like outside the problem, not involved in it. I can wait to test the solution the next time I encounter this issue!”

During the first days, we used exercises to understand the strategic communication, the “sandwich feedback”, the active listening process and most important, to see how different we are when it comes to negotiate, to stand for an opinion, to solve a conflict. Wanting to see more clearly the individual differences when it comes to conflict resolution styles, we used the “Thomas- Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument” and “Style of Negotiating Questionnaire” and we discussed the results in terms of: “Are you surprised by these results?”, “You expected something else?”, “How different are the results of these two questionnaires?”, “What are the implications of this results?”. Afterwards, we used a series of exercises that allowed us to propose individual future action plans in order to transform our weaknesses into strengths.

If we speak in terms of results of our work during the ESS week, we can describe them on two “axes”:

- Results towards our personal development as group and as individuals;
- Results regarding the research topic of our work group.

First of all, the nature of the knowledge gathered during the sessions, and more precise, the way this knowledge was gained (through experiential learning) raised the cohesion of the group by helping us feel we have the same purpose even if we are so different regarding the conflict resolution styles, by giving us the opportunity to really know each other, to support each other in order to be able to work as group of individuals from different cultural backgrounds. Basically, the way these meetings were designed and the nature of the exercises we made worked as ice- breakers in the first place and as “glue” afterwards. Beside the so obvious positive impact at the group level that we all felt, our work during that week influenced our personal views, knowledge and ways of understanding. Having the opportunity to be faced with our personal conflict style and to understand the implications this one brings to ones relationships/ interactions
broth a great level of self-awareness, self-acceptance, motivation to improve/change things in the way we react toward and within conflict resolution, all this at a personal level. As one of us stated: “It is amazing how involving myself in this exercise just because I want to complete it well, brings to light so many things about me and about who I am that I was not really aware before, together with a strange, strong feeling of wanting to do better in other situations.”

Experiential personal statements like the one above were the basis of our results in respect to our future research topic. Very impressed by the effect of the workshops on us, we raised the following research question: “What is the influence of a conflict resolution training based on experiential learning on the personal conflict resolution style of the participants involved?” During the week, we have also received instructions how to carry out the same exercises with our future potential participants, and therefore we are also able to perform as trainers in our own research where we can track the effect of various techniques and exercises in facilitating conflict resolution.

One of the most important results is also our future plan of research and training activities.

**Future plan of the activities**

Our research time has set three major objectives that are actually interdependent – to put our knowledge into practice of education and training delivery in the field of conflict resolution, to find an optimal, efficient way to train others to resolve conflicts in a constructive way and to explore the scientific evidence that support or deny the effects of experiential learning. Therefore we decided to carry out a project that will hopefully also be supported by Youth in Action. We plan further development as trainers and counselors in the field of conflict resolution and using our skills on groups of participants that will also participate in our research study as subjects.

Since this requires a lot of preparation, we plan to have two live training meetings before delivering the training to participants. After delivering the trainings each group will have a 6-month follow-up to get feedback on the training effect.

We plan to finish an article on our research in spring 2012 and to publish it in a peer-reviewed journal afterwards.
EVOLUTION OF BEAUTY.
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ATTRACTIVENESS,
ESTIMATION OF PERSON ON PHOTOS AND IN REALITY.

Supervisor: Michal Andrzej Golombek
Team members: George Zacharaopoulos, Anne Christensen, William Steel, Annika Kettunen, Asta Medisauskaite, Nina Chrobot

Theoretical Background of the topic
Beauty, attractiveness, what do we know about it? Already in 43 B.C famous poet Ovid wrote „Let no rude goat find his way beneath your arms…” Also in the British Museum we can find a woman’s cosmetics box, dating about 1400 B.C. Kings’ painters were sent to visit their future matrimonial prospects and brought back portraits of them and Elizabeth I refused to marry anyone she couldn’t see. Nowadays 1,484 tubes of lipstick are sold every minute[1] The value of the cosmetic market in Poland (2009) was worth 20 billion PLN (to compare, the value of budget for science in Poland 2009 was 4,6 billion PLN). Conclusion - beauty was, is and will be required. And what does the psychology science know about beautiful people? We assign more desirable features to attractive people[2]. Attractive people are seen as more sociable, dominant, intelligent[3]. Attractive students get better grades at school
Conclusion? The same - beauty is required! We can use several techniques to improve our own beauty, for example: cosmetic make-up, plastic surgery, and also in nonpersonal contact photo retouch. In this study the major question is about the difference between estimation of person on photos and in reality. Why do I assume that difference will appear? Firstly because of the knowledge the conclusion above. Second because of the contrast effect. We know for example that people give different notes on attractiveness, depending on the season of year[5] And also the attractive easement of beauty is different if their look at good looking wiremen before[6]. Simply there are different standards for attractiveness on photos and in real life. Also the availability heuristic could be an explanation of the effect[7]. We are exposed in all kind of media mostly with presents of beautiful people. Therefore our judgment of the possibility that pictures can be retouch will increase. And last there is a possibility that the real person is just more available for me, she can talk, even hurt me. I can also see her, she fells more real for me. That’s why I would give her different notes because of some kind of relation, that isn’t available in the picture condition.

**Description of the purposes and methods**

This study would be conduct with use of the experiment method. The first group will estimate the attractiveness of person in the flash, and the second group would estimate the attractiveness of the person, but only from the photo. The stimuli which will be judged are two female models. The models will be selected in a pre-experimental study from a small pool of females in their early twenties. In the pre-experiment around ten subjects will rate the models on photos and the models with the least variance in the judgments of their attractiveness will be chosen for the main study. The procedure in this pre-experiment will mimic the procedure of the main study described below. The questionnaire for the study will be programmed in SuperLab to gather apart from the answers on the scale, also the reaction time. Time reaction will be treat as a measure of the confidence of the response[8]. The answers will be given mostly on a nine point scale using a laptop. Also in the pre-experiment we will check if the subjects understand the questions as expected and to check the intercorrelations between the judgments. Important is, that the pilot study will be hold in each country. After this study the questions for the main study will be chosen. Photos of the models will be taken right before the main part of the study or the day before it. We will ask the models to have enough sleep and be well rested. During the shooting of the photos they will be asked to hold a neutral facial expression (with relaxed facial muscles) which they can easily repeat during the live sessions. The photos will be taken with the models sitting and from the same viewpoint that the subjects in the live condition will be looking. The participants for the study are going to be students from the local university. Every participant would be randomly assign to one of those two groups. After that the experimenter will read a general introduction. The rest of the instructions and the questionnaire will be given on the computer. After answering the questions about the model participant will be asked to answer some
general questions about himself. Afterwards, he would escorted outside with these words: *Thank you for your participation and please do not tell your colleagues about this study for at least X days (depending on how long the study will last). This is to ensure the experimental procedure works.*

The main benefit from the study is knowledge for both science and also the local communities. The knowledge, if there is any difference in attractiveness estimation between people depending on the condition. (In the flash, photo). If this study would give a positive answer to this question, the attractiveness judgment relation could be used, for example in some self-presentation strategy. The results of this study could also give some answers to the cultural diversity between the judgment of attractiveness. The “Evolution of beauty” project is also in his formal way, a project which provide social inclusion, by simply giving to other people opportunity to take part in the study. And again the conclusions could be used, to help people with fewer opportunities, because if the suggested difference appear, there is no economic or social barrier in using the knowledge. Implementation of the created knowledge I would like to get by promoting the publication from this study, also by taking part in science conferences and symposium, but also thru popularization in the local journal, to send this “know-how” directly to the young people. What can this study give to the science? Much studies in psychology are made with use of picture or live people. If there is a difference between this two we should be more careful conducting them.

**Description of the results of the workgroup during the ESS week**

The first research session was used for integration games and task, the purpose of it was to bound the whole group together for the whole research project, and also to learn a little about cultural differences, to avoid future possible problem in this area. We also played some creativity task’s to open our mind for new ideas. The second meeting was used to present the research problem. Aldo the participant’s where familiarized with the main idea, in the presentation was more information about the inspiration for the study, more about the theoretical background and also more about the concept of research method. We also extract the personal skills of individual useful and relevant to the project. The next meeting was used to prepare the research design for the study. Discussed were the individual possibilities of the participants in each country. We selected also some demographic questions with we think are important for the study. We talk about the scale length, the sample size, what kind of question’s could we ask apart from the question about attractiveness. We took also under consideration number of models that we will use in the study, and also their gender. We also meditate some time on the technical details of the study, like the amount of time that will be given to the participants, to see the model, also the position from the model that will be seen or photographed. After that we went back to the discussion about the theoretical background of the study and concern the match of the theory to our project and also we tried to find some more theoretical explanation for the main effect we expect. We discussed also the possibility that we won’t gain a
statistically significant difference between those two group. We decide also to run a pilot study in each country. On the few last research meetings we talk about the procedure weakness, and we wrote the project schedule. The last meeting was used to prepare a presentation for the whole European Summer School group. In the work during the whole week we were working both as individual, pair or small groups. This was dependent on the amount of work that needed to be done, on the particular part of the study. We used also parallel work for the same problem to see if we came up with some different solutions.

**Future plan of the activities**

We decided that each participant from the project will do a study in his country. Agreed was also that we would like to learn from each study, therefore we plan the study in each country at different time. We are aware that seasonality can distort our results, but the benefits to improve the next study are for us more important. The order was matched to the time availability of each participant. The first country where we will conduct the study is Lithuania, the second is Denmark, third is Cyprus fourth would be Poland, after that Croatia and the last country in the row is Finland. We will do some more theoretical background checking, trying to find some more studies related to the project we are going to undertake. As the supervisor of the group I will also apply for governmental found. If possible we would like to meet with the whole group again after we will have the results from the whole study. To keep bound with the study we meet on Skype and discuss the problematic questions about the project. We also use several files sharing method (goggle sharing, dropbox) so everyone has direct and unlimited access to all data. In future there will be a web site containing the whole agreements, actual study progress, and also the results from prior study’s. The group is also obligated to write a monthly report with the progress of their work.

**References:**


DIFFERENCES IN THE EXPRESSION OF PREJUDICE TOWARDS THE HOMO-SEXUALS:
THE EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL AND CONTEXTUAL FACTORS

Supervisor: MARIA IOANNOU
Team members: Anna Zvetkova, Christina Nolte, Emilia Veresan, Jakub Lanc, Johan Jaquet, Marcin Niepeklo

Theoretical Background of the Topic

Prejudice and Expressions of Prejudice

Prejudice is a widely studied construct in the field of social psychology and intergroup relations in particular. It is thought to encompass three aspects, the affective one (emotions), the cognitive one (stereotypes) and the behavioural aspect (discrimination) but it is often used interchangeably with negative attitudes. Prejudice is directed towards an individual or a group of individuals who belong to a group outside one’s ingroup (i.e. an out-group).

Although prejudice has been addressed and tested as a uniform construct, distinctions between different types of prejudice are found in the literature. Pettigrew and Mertens (1995) for example made a distinction between blatant and subtle racism a distinction which could be applied to other forms of prejudice outside racism. Blatant prejudice is understood as the out-spoken and straightforward expression of prejudice whereas subtle prejudice is a milder form of prejudice expression which is often a result of political correctness and social desirability concerns.

Another, perhaps more useful distinction, is the one between the explicit and the implicit prejudice or attitudes (see, Greenwald & Banaji, 1995) or as Devine (1989) originally put it, differences between the controlled and associative...
components of prejudice. One of the main differentiating characteristics between the explicit and the implicit prejudice is that the former is based on propositions or beliefs. Following from that, explicit attitudes are in fact judgments that are drawn based on propositional information which is available to individuals. As such, beliefs are therefore controlled and as a result of that they are more malleable and easier to manipulate and even feign. On the contrary, implicit prejudice is based on associations, the greatest number of which is formed entirely at a sub-conscious level. These associations are well-learnt and robust and they are being frequently activated. They are therefore easily recalled in the presence of the relevant cue (e.g., a target out-group) and this activation is automatic which means that no control can be imposed on what is recalled (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006).

The implicit and the explicit prejudice are often used complimentary to each other, especially when used to measure changes in attitudes. Although, they have been reported to correlate highly with each other in many studies (see Banse, Seize & Zorbas, 2001), these findings for high positive correlation are not systematic. Hence, there is an ongoing debate on whether the explicit and the implicit prejudice are two different constructs instead of two different forms of prejudice (see Nosek, 2001). In other words, it is not yet clear whether the explicit and the implicit prejudice or attitudes are two different types of prejudice or whether prejudice is there as a uniform construct and implicit and negative attitudes are two facets of it.

Prejudice Towards the Homosexuals

A rise in homophobia was observed in the 60s especially after the formation of the gay rights movement. The term homophobia was coined in 1969 and along with or in opposition to it, the term heterosexism was used mostly in order to describe an ideological stance that opposed homosexuality (see Herek, 2000). Homophobia is what is normally studied in prejudice researches which are more interested in the negative attitudes towards homosexuality as a trend and to homosexuals as a group of individuals.

Even though in some countries like the U.S.A the attitudes towards non-heterosexual individuals have become less negative (Herek, 2000), homophobia is still prevalent and in certain occasions it is expressed even more blatantly especially when issues like gay marriage, homosexual couples’ rights to adopt children, and anti-gay discrimination practices are discussed. Also studies which have included implicit measures of prejudice find a strong positive correlation of implicit and explicit prejudice of heterosexuals towards the homosexuals (e.g., Jellison, McConnell, & Gabriel, 2004 and Banse, Seize, & Zerbes, 2001).

Although gender, age, education and other differences were explored with regards to anti-gay attitudes, Herek (2000) reports that there is rather little empirical research examining racial and ethnic differences. Also, since most studies were contacted in the U.S.A, little is also known on how attitudes towards the homosexuals differ within European countries. Some data about the prevalence of sexual prejudice in European countries are available from the
European Values Studies. The 2000 European Values Survey for example shows that in the EU’s 15 older states there was substantially more acceptance of homosexuality with comparison to the enlargement states. These cross-national differences are of interest especially when it comes to the implementation of the European Union’s policies regarding non-discrimination towards various groups, including the homosexuals (see Gerhards, 2010).

**Factors Predicting Prejudice Towards Homosexuals**

Social psychological studies often aim to explore the factors that relate with or predict a phenomenon. When it comes to these factors we can distinguish between individual factors and contextual factors although they are unavoidably interlinked given that individuals live and act within contexts. Individual factors include personality traits, prior experiences and contact with homosexual people, perceived feelings of threat from the out-group, political orientation, and religious beliefs. In fact the aforementioned were factors that have been investigated in previous studies. There is a convergence in findings showing that high Social Dominance Orientation, high Right Wing Authoritarianism, high political conservatism, stronger religious beliefs, low prior contact, high symbolic threats and strong identification with the heterosexual identity are all factors that predict more negative attitudes towards the homosexuals (see Herek, 2000). The same factors are very likely to relate to implicit sexual prejudice as well.

Social psychological studies, however, pay less attention to contextual factors predicting attitudes possibly because contexts refer to a picture that is bigger to the picture social psychology is normally interested in. Despite that, when it comes to the study of cross-national differences in the expression of out-group prejudice contextual characteristics might be interesting and potentially insightful to take into account.

**Cross-national studies: Taking Contextual Factors into Account**

As said before individuals live and socialise within contexts, with context defined as ‘a set of material realities, social structures, patterns of social relations and shared belief systems that surround any given situation’ (Ashmore, Deaux, Mclaughlin-Volpe, 2004). Therefore attitudes towards anything within the social sphere is affected by the context. Explicit and implicit attitudes equally are products of long-term socialisation and personal experiences within contexts.

A cross-national study in prejudice towards homosexuality can take into account both individual factors in order to explain the picture within each context and contextual factors in order to explain the differences between or across contexts (in this case, states). Contextual factors are of course hard to pin down especially when the context is as large and complex as a state. It was, in fact, a task of our research group to think on contextual factors that could potentially explain systematic differences or similarities between the states under study. A recent study by Gerhards (2010) studied modernization (eg economic welfare and
level of education) and religion as contextual factors that could explain the differences in the attitudes towards homosexuals across 27 European states finding support for both accounts. We would suggest that other contextual factors with predicting abilities in this context could be the extend to which homosexuality is openly discussed publicly and with which valence, the degree to which a country has been exposed to the notion of ‘political correctness’, and individualism vs. collectivism.

A cross-national study could shed some light on the way the explicit and the implicit prejudice are related. Even though a strong positive correlation has been reported in within contexts samples there might be different patterns of relations observed in different countries. Since explicit attitudes for example are shown to be vulnerable to social desirability expectations, in more modernized and ‘politically correct’ countries like the 15 older European homosexual prejudice may be existent but in a different form, ie. the implicit. It will be interesting to see also the scores in implicit measures in countries in which prejudice towards homosexuals is blatantly explicit.

**Description of the purposes and methods**

**Current Research: Research Questions**

We have designed a cross-national research in our aim to study the expression of prejudice towards the homosexuals in 6 European countries, Czech Republic, Holland, Poland, Romania, Sweden, and Switzerland (and potentially Cyprus). The composition of the countries is an ideal one as we have a balanced mixture of old and new EU member states as well as Switzerland.

As seen from the EVS 2000, the enlargement states (including Romania, Poland, and Czech Republic) had more negative attitudes towards homosexuality and homosexuals in comparison to the old member states (like Holland and Sweden). In fact Romania was one of the countries with the most negative scores followed by Poland whereas Czech Republic was the country approaching the old states the most. No data are reported for neither Cyprus nor Switzerland but in hindsight Cyprus is expected to be more likely to cluster with the Romania and Poland group whereas Switzerland is typically thought to be closer to Holland and Sweden.

The research questions we are planning to address are the following:

- Are there any differences across the 6 countries with regards to: a) explicit prejudice and b) implicit prejudice levels?
- Are there cross-national differences in the way the implicit and explicit prejudice relate to each other (ie. is there a strong positive correlation in all countries or does the relationship between the two scores change from country to country or from a group of countries to group of countries)?
• What are the predictors of prejudice in each context? ie. Which individual factors (eg. Social Dominance Orientation, prior contact with homosexuals) significantly predict explicit and implicit prejudice within contexts?

• Given that there are differences in the way prejudice is expressed in different contexts, which of the contextual factors we take into account (eg. individualism/ collectivism) can better explain these differences?

Methods

In order to address the research questions we will measure the explicit and the implicit attitudes as well as variables which were in previous studies found to predict homosexual prejudice of nationals of the participating countries. Apart from variables tapping into individual characteristics we want at the same time to take into account a set of contextual factors that could in our opinion explain any emerging systematic differences or patterns in the expression of prejudice across counties.

The implicit prejudice will be measured with the use of the Implicit Association Test (IAT) (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998) for homosexuality. The IAT is a test of implicit associations that are thought to be indicative of implicit negative attitudes towards the examined out-group. IAT homosexuality was designed to measure implicit (negative) associations towards homosexuals.

The explicit prejudice will be measured with a set of scales that are yet to be agreed on. Traditionally, negative attitudes have been examined with measures like the feeling thermometer (rating how warm or cold one feels about the out-group) and the semantic differential scale (rating how one sees the out-group in bipolar scales eg. bad vs good). There is a scale especially constructed for addressing attitudes towards homosexuals and lesbians called the Attitudes Towards Lesbians and Gays scale (ATLG) originally proposed by Herek (1988) which can be also used.

The majority of the individual factors to be included in the study will be derived from previous researches. Although the list of these factors has not been finalised yet, from as much as we discussed factors which are likely to be included are: prior contact with homosexuals, Social Dominance Orientation, Political Conservatism or Right Wing Authoritarianism, and perceived symbolic out-group threats. As these variables have been used in past researches scales are available to copy and use.

The contextual factors are yet to be specified in the sense that some of the factors we have been contemplating to include like political correctness for example are yet to be operationalised. It is also left for us to decide on whether we want to measure these factors through our samples, ie. ask the participants to what extent they think political correctness is promoted in their countries or whether
we want to derive these information from existing databases like the EVS. For the time being, the contextual factors we have been discussing about, include individualism vs. collectivism, religiosity or religious orthodoxy, and modernization (see Gerhards, 2010).

The explicit attitudes, the demographics as well as the individual and possibly the contextual factors examined will be integrated in a questionnaire to be filled in by participants. Demographics will include gender, age, religious affiliation, and sexual preferences.

Procedure

The tools will be first constructed in English which is the common language of the group. Following the finalisation of the tools’ content and wording the team members will have the task of translating and back-translating the questionnaire in their native tongues. It will be the task of each team member also, to check with their universities on what kind of steps have to be made with regards to securing approval from ethic committees. A common participation consent form as well as a common recruitment and debriefing letter will be constructed and translated in the team members’ native language.

Data will be collected from the 6 aforementioned countries. The target group will be University students, males and females in equal numbers who are heterosexuals and who are nationals of the respective country under study. The number of participants was provisionally set at 50 (25 males, 25 females). Recruitment will be done in a number of ways varying from announcements to be disseminated by departmental or faculty secretaries to invitations for participation send through network groups in internet.

The data collection will be completed in two faces. In one of them the participants will be given the Implicit Association Test for homosexuality in a controlled environment (eg. the computer or psychology lab of the university) and in the second face the participant will be asked to complete either a paper and pencil or an electronic version of a questionnaire which will be comprised of explicit attitudes measures, measures of individual and contextual factors, and demographics. The completion time for both IAT and the questionnaire should not exceed the time of one hour. We have not discussed about participation fee which seems rather unlikely unless we find the funds.

Description of the results of the workgroup during the ESS week

In the first sessions with the group a general overview of the project idea was presented to the team members and the basic terms/ concepts which made up the proposed study were also presented and explained. These introductory sessions focused on: a) discussing prejudice towards out-groups in general and types of prejudice in particular. Special emphasis was given on implicit and explicit prejudice’s theoretical differences as well as differences in their measurement, b) identifying factors relating to prejudice, c) exploring how
prejudice and its expression can be context-specific, d) identifying contextual factors that could explain cross-national differences in prejudice and the way it is expressed. These factors were discussed within the group in light of each group member’s experiences in their home countries.

When the concepts were made clearer and the group members formed an idea of what the project was about we started to think more specifically on the project by agreeing on an out-group that would be appealing for all countries involved. The group of homosexuals came up since it is a more neutral group in comparison to various ethnic groups for example and because it was of equal academic interest to all team members. Also, the homosexuals are a group of people which is met in every country in more or less similar numbers which is something that is in a sense qualifying the particular group as a truly ‘common’ (as in similar) out-group.

Upon agreeing on an out-group the next step was to agree on the measures to be used in the study and on what to include in each measure. We have thought for example of alternatives of the IAT in case we met difficulties in running the test in each and every country and we spent time thinking which explicit measures we should include. An even more rigorous attempt was to reach an agreement on the individual and contextual factors we wanted to include and on how to measure them.

In parallel to the construction of the measures we also went over the procedure of the study. We more specifically spent time discussing how the measures would be administered, we considered the benefits of counterbalancing their order, and we tried to come up with ways in which we could have the measures administered in more controlled environments (eg. non-distractive environments). Also, issues regarding the recruitment of participants, advertising the study, the participant selection criteria, instructions and consent forms given to participants, and debriefing letters among others were raised and addressed.

Last but not least we drafted a timeplan of the project and we split the group into two main teams one of them assigned to focus on the IAT measure and on alternative implicit measures and the other team was agreed to work on the explicit measures and on operationalising and finding ways to measure the factors we are interested in. Provisional tasks were assigned to each group’s members and ways of keeping in contact and staying committed were proposed.

**Future plan of the activities**

As mentioned earlier the team has already agreed on a provisional course of action in order to facilitate the implementation of the study. According to the drafted plan the first half of the coming academic year will be spent to finalise the tools we are going to use and to arrange any technical problems come up with regards to the use of the IAT and possibly the electronic version of the questionnaire.
Once the questionnaire as well as the IAT are finalised then they will have to be translated and back translated in the native languages of the countries involved. The advertising of the study as well as the recruitment period was assigned to be the beginning of the new calendar year and data collection will take place between February and May 2011. All the data collected will be analysed together.

Given that we are successful in collecting a good amount of data, the analyses will be done in June and the rest of the summer will be spent in writing the report. All communication within the group is for the time being planned to take place through internet via emails and an internet discussion group.

There is an idea of making use of the Youth in Action funding potentials once the study is completed. The thought is to use YiA funds to organise a conference in which we will present the report of our study and use it as a trigger for further academic as well as empirically directed discussion. The conference, as we have it in mind will target a wide audience including psychology and other social sciences students, GLBTQ groups’ representatives, police makers, and media specialists among others.

**Selected Literature**


ATTITUDES TOWARDS AND SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF YOUNG PEOPLE

Supervisor: Stanislava Stoyanova Ph. D,
Members: Özlem Eylem, Birgit Veskioja, Edward McDermott, Dimitar Bozhilov, Steliyan Slavov, Karina Voetmann

Theoretical background

One of the important challenges when attempting to study the attitudes towards and social representations of young people is to define who the young person is and similarly what the lower and upper age range is in order to be a young person. The reason for that is the lack of agreement in regards to the definition of a young person [25].

There are many different words that could define a young person: children (it could have the same or a different meaning), adolescent, teenager, juvenile, and youth.

In an on-line dictionary (freedictionary, 2010), youth is defined as the period between childhood and maturity, especially adolescence and early adulthood whereas, juvenescence is a term that is used in the context of sociology and stands for young people collectively. Lastly the term teenager stands for the rising generation between the ages of 13 to 19 years old [9].

The Convention on the Rights of the Child defines children as being human beings below the age of 18 [5]. On the basis of this, a person who is over 18 could be considered as a young person. A team from Washington State University (2008) claims that youth are young people and they are aged from 5 to 19 years old (the age groups from 5 to 8, from 9 to 11, from 12 to 14, and from 15 to 19 years old) [28].
There are other proposals to clarify the age range for young person in the present literature. Some of them are perhaps too inclusive compared to the others. For example according to Bolzan (2003) young people are aged 12 to 25 years [4]. Anderson, Bromley and Given (2005) suggest that young people are aged between the ages of 11 and 24 [1] and similarly Knibbe, Oostveen and Van De Goor (1991) define the age range as 16-25 years [15]. On the other hand European Youth Portal suggests that young people are aged between 16 to 30 years [6] and Ward (2005) considers that young people of voting age represents the age group of 18–30 [31].

Overall there are various terms for defining young person and contradictory proposals about the age range used to define young person in the literature. In addition to this, cross-cultural differences in perceiving who the young person is complicate the above issue more [14].

Another important challenge in studying attitudes toward and social representations of young person is the absence of commonly accepted definition of the term “attitude” [8; 13]. There have been different models proposed in defining attitudes [13]. The unidimensional or causal chain model suggests that behaviours, affect and cognitions are either distinct antecedents or consequences of the attitude itself [8; 13]. Fishbein & Ajzen (1975) maintain that attitudes are an overall evaluative summary response [8]. In contrast, the tripartite model of attitudes described by McGuire (1986) deals with attitudes as possessing cognitive, affective, and conative response tendencies [18]. The cognitive components of the attitudes are the beliefs that can be defined as a person’s knowledge or information about an attitude object. A person’s attitude may be related to a set of intentions to behave certain ways toward an attitude object – this is the conative components of the attitudes [19].

On the basis of the tripartite model, the attitudes towards youth include the image of a young person, the intentions to interact with a young person, and the beliefs related to the young people [26]. What distinguishes the attitude from its related terms (e.g. beliefs, opinions and intentions) is the evaluative component [19]. In other words the attitude is a person’s favorable or unfavorable evaluation of an object and this evaluation is accompanied by affective component toward that object. An attitude toward a person or object is appropriately measured by having an individual place an object on a bipolar affective or evaluative dimension [8].

Formation of attitude is such a complex process in a sense that it is influenced by many factors. A necessary condition is that the individuals possess a shared social representation about the object [20]. The term 'social representations' is part of our cultural and national acknowledgement [22; 13]. The social representations refer to conventional and prescriptive classification systems of categories and names [21]. Media plays an important role in creating, changing and distributing some social representations [22]. The social representations have a central component that is very stable (shared by a lot of individuals) and peripheral components that could be more easily changed [20].
Categories are potentially important elements in the process of forming attitudes. Categories are fuzzy sets of characteristics that resemble each other [13]. They help us to deal with huge amount of social stimuli by putting them into categories.

In an experimental study, when participants were asked to rehearse their attitudes toward dairy products, yoghurt was more likely to cue dairy products. However, if attitudes towards health food had been experimentally enhanced, and therefore made more accessible in memory, yoghurt was more likely to cue as a health food [27]. The results of study provide support to Roskos-Ewolsen and Fazio (1992) [24] and hence suggest that the more accessible attitude attached to a particular object, the more likely it is that that object will be categorized accordingly.

Mechel and McGlynn (2004) demonstrated that inter-generational programmes that bring children and older people together, promote more positive attitudes about each other and hence challenge their existent categories about young age and old age. Although there are contradictory findings about the efficacy of such programmes in literature, this randomised-controlled trial and the use of attitude and stereotype measures consistent with the theoretical constructs offers distinct advantages compared to the previous studies [19].

Together these results provide suggestive evidence for the bi-directional relationship between attitudes and categorisation. Categories perhaps have orienting effect on our evaluations about people and objects in a way that is consistent with the existent categories. The change in attitudes may also modify the existing categories.

When we categorize people, we implicitly classify them as belonging to the same social group as us (in-group) or as belonging to a different group (outgroup). Thus social categorization divides the world into “them” and “us.” People in an out-group are generally perceived as having less favorable attributes compared to one’s own in-group [29]. Furthermore, the out-group is perceived as being more homogenous than one’s in-group [12]. Younger individuals perceive their elders to be more homogenous than their own age group, while older age groups perceive themselves to be more heterogenous [19].

The out-group homogeneity effect is not a constant, but instead it varies due to power and knowledge. People lacking in knowledge about an out-group perceive its members to be homogeneous. This ignorance about another group may be caused by lack of contact, which is more likely for members of the majority. Not only are members of a minority more likely to encounter members of a majority, but majority group members are also likely to be more powerful and have higher status in society. Therefore, minority group members are typically more motivated to develop detailed knowledge structures to help them in dealing with the more powerful majority. The out-group homogeneity effect (seeing out-group members as all the same) will be stronger in the majority group than in the minority group [19].
To sum up, categorization is a part of the attitude formation process. It’s an adaptive strategy to deal with the massive amounts of social stimuli we are subjected to in daily life. Furthermore it is a basis for the identification of oneself with a particular social group [29; 13]. Too much categorisation however, leads to context dependent perceptual distortions (e.g. seeing out-group members as all the same) and therefore this brings about stereotypes and discrimination against out-group members or minorities [13].

**Purpose and methods**

Aims and Rationale:

The present research aims to study the attitudes toward young people in each of the researchers’ home countries by relying on Fishbein and Ajzen’s (1975) model [8]. Another aim is to study the social representations about young people in media by using content analysis method.

Too much categorisation based on age differences adversely affects the interactions between young person and old person in the society [13: p.364]. This potentially follows frustration, discrimination against young or elderly people in short term. In long-term, discrimination might lead to young person’s disengagement with the society, unemployment, conduct problems and other mental health problems [11]. Similarly a report of Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2010) states that secure and satisfactory employment offers young people not only financial independence but also a sense of control, self-confidence and social contact. In contrast, unemployment is associated with adverse health effects, such as, lower levels of general and physical health, and higher rates of anxiety and depression, suicide and smoking, both among young people and adults. Another finding is that young people who are not fully engaged in study or employment are more likely to experience financial stress, and these young people are more likely to be socially disengaged, to feel dissatisfied with their life and to experience poorer health outcomes [3]. Thus this research is relevant especially when the resources are limited and the consequences of such social issues are detrimental to societies economies in long-term.

This research topic will contribute to the more opportunities to be found for improvement of young people’s realisation and social inclusion by means of disseminating the findings about the different attitudes and representations of youth in several countries. Cultural differences in youth’s social inclusion will be revealed and good practices will be exchanged between the researchers from different countries in Europe. Additionally the results of the study will enhance the participants’ knowledge and research skills about social inclusion of young people by conducting follow-up projects in this area.

In this study, given all these different definitions of young person, after a discussion, the research group decided to study the attitudes towards young people who are teenagers (13-19) and towards young people who are from 20 to 25 years old. In spite of the suggestive evidence in line with the unidimensional model of
attitudes [19], this study adopts Fishbein and Ajzen’s (1975) model of attitudes in developing and scoring the attitude scale [8]. The reason is the advantages of the model. This model offers a definition for attitude and a way to study the link between behavior and attitudes. Also the model has been improving and elaborating other variables which are potential moderators for the attitude behaviour link [13].

Method:

This research is designed as a cross-sectional survey and as a content analysis. The sample will be recruited from each research members’ home countries. Those counties are: Cyprus, Bulgaria, Ireland, Denmark and Estonia. The ideal sample size for the preliminary studies is recommended as 100 [23]. In the present study, 30 people from each country will be recruited to reach the ideal sample size. Additionally for the content analysis, 2 daily newspapers from each country will be selected.

The potential participants will be approached either personally or by e-mail in order to introduce the idea of participation to the research. They will be given information sheets and consent forms to help them with making informed decisions about their participation in the study. Then the consenting participants will be administered the attitude scale.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Age 13-25 (inclusive)
- No upper age limit for elderly participants
- Daily newspapers which are considered to be relevant with representations of young person in media

Exclusion Criteria

- Gross reality distortion due to psychosis or inebriation
- Severe risk of violence or suicide and known moderate to severe LD (Learning Disability).
- Daily newspapers which are considered to be irrelevant with representations of young person in media

Developing the Attitude Scale:

i. Item generation:

A systematic literature search was carried out in order to find most common stereotypes to define young people across cultures in the first instance. Then initial pool item list of stereotypes was prepared mainly based on Bolzan’s research findings [4]. This list was discussed among research team members in research group meetings. Thomas and Alaphilippe (1993) suggest that 13 items are not an exhaustive list for an attitude scale [30]. In keeping with this, 13 items from the pool item list were selected on the basis of expert agreement. To avoid
researchers bias as much as possible, research team members rated the importance of the each item on a 7 point scale where -3 means that the trait does not define such people and +3 means that the trait does define such people. Then the most consistently rated items were selected to be included in the first draft. The first draft included more positive stereotypes compared to negative stereotypes. Consequently five more items from the pool item list were added to balance the positive and negative items and to measure more aspects of the attitudes toward young people in the final scale. These items were added on the basis of the same procedure which is described previously. To avoid respondent bias, positive and negative items were put in a sequential order in the final scale.

ii. Description of the Attitude Scale:

The present attitude scale was designed to assess both young and elderly people’s attitudes toward young people. It consists of 18 stereotypes about young people which are common in the present literature. The sample item for a positive stereotype is “hard-working” and the sample item for a negative stereotype is “selfish”. Respondents are required to indicate how positive or negative is each item to them on a 7 point scale (-3=extremely negative ; +3 =extremely positive). Scoring of the scale is based on the formula developed by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) which is $A=\sum(b*e)$. In this formula, $A$ stands for the attitude, $\sum$ is sum, $b$ is how typical is the belief, $*$ is multiply and $e$ stands for how positive or negative is the quality [8; 7: p.394].

As being different from the previous research, two questions about life satisfaction were included on the basis of the suggestive research evidence [19] and expert agreement about the link between life satisfaction and attitudes toward young people. Those questions are rated on a seven point semantic differential scale where 1 means unsatisfied and 7 means satisfied. From this scale of measurement low scores means not satisfied with the life and high scores means satisfied with the life. Furthermore questions about demographic information which are relevant to the purpose of the study were included in the end of the questionnaire.

iii. Description of the Content Analysis Matrix:

The draft content analysis matrix was prepared on the basis of content analysis matrices and results from previous studies [2; 16; 31; 4]. The first draft was modified on the basis of discussion among team members during research group meetings. The inter-coder agreement was tested in order to see the level of agreement among team members in coding information from articles. Six online articles about young people were coded in one of the team meetings. As a result 81% agreement was found on how the information should be coded whereas 85% agreement was found on which information should be coded. These scores represent good inter-coder agreement - some researchers believe that more than
50% will suffice [10]; and others believe that 80% or greater than 80% is acceptable in most situations [17].

**Future plan of activities:**

The main future objective is to complete the validation of the new attitude scale in a representative non-referred community sample from each participating countries.

Provisionally data collection will start in September 2010 and will be completed by the end of December 2010 when the aimed ideal sample size is reached. Furthermore for the content analysis, the coding process of selected articles will start early in September 2010 and will be completed by the end of September 2010. Data analysis will be carried out from the beginning of January 2011 till the end of March 2011. Finally findings of the research will be disseminated and prepared for a publication by the beginning of the April 2011 till the end of June 2011.
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WORKGROUP 6
RISK FOR THE SELF AND RISK FOR THE OTHERS AS PREDICTORS OF PUBLIC POLICIES RESTRICTING DRINKING AND DRIVING

Supervisor: Martin Zlatev
Members: Lorenz Jäger, Anna Hartman, Luis Tojo, Zorana Zupan, Carolin Wirth

Theoretical background
Driving under the influence of alcohol is still a major problem in Europe [1]. Various initiatives tried to combat this problem. For example, mass media campaigns have been launched to inform the public about the dangers of drinking and driving. In addition, measures were implemented enforcing tougher penalties of drunk driving and securing stricter control over existing policies. However, introducing legislation restricting drunk driving might be quite controversial and there is usually a public debate on whether and how such legislation should be enforced. Public opinion on such policies is often influenced by the perception of the risk the specific policy aims to restrict. However, perceived risk might be rated differently depending on whose risk exactly people are asked to evaluate. Research has shown that people tend to view themselves as less at risk as other people same age and sex [2]. This effect has been labeled unrealistic optimism [2], comparative optimism [3], or unique invulnerability [4]. This difference between perceived risk for the self and perceived risk for others is reminiscent of the distinction between egotropic and sociotropic threats in the social and political sciences [5]. According to Davis and Silver [6] a sociotropic threat could be defined as ‘a generalized anxiety and sense of threat to society, the country as a whole, or the region where one lives;’ whereas egotropic threats reflect a ‘sense of threat to oneself or one’s family’ (p. 34). Again, findings indicate that the so
called egotropic treats are rated lower than the sociotropic treats. Since the own person is considered less vulnerable to various risks than the others, which of the two risk perceptions is associated to the support for public measures restricting the risks? Research has shown that the perceived risk for other persons is a better predictor of restrictive public policies than the perceived risk for the self, e.g. regarding gun control [7], mobile phone technology [8], smoking restrictions [9], and censorship of pornographic media [10]. However, no study so far has investigated this in relation to support for policies aimed at curbing accidents due to drunk driving. The main objective of this survey is to examine this gap in the research. It is hypothesized that the estimated risk for other people driving under the influence of alcohol to be involved in an accident will be a better predictor of policies restricting drunk driving than the risk to be involved in an accident for the self. This is important because results might indicate how effective messages informing the public on drunk driving could be framed. Since this research is planned to take place in different European countries (Bulgaria, Germany, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, and Switzerland), cross-cultural differences will also be explored.

Description of the purposes and methods

An anonymous structured questionnaire will be used to examine the hypothesis. Multiple regression analyses will be applied to test the hypotheses. The recruitment of participants will take place in institutions where driving licenses are issued and renewed. Contact with employees at these institutions willing to assist will be sought.

The first page of the questionnaire contains the introduction and instruction informing about the rights of the participants. More specifically, it gives a very general view on the aim of the survey and informs that participation is voluntary, that participants are not obliged to disclose any personal information, that they can withdraw from participation at any time of the survey, that responses are anonymous and will be treated confidentially, and that participants can submit their e-mail or residential address on a separate sheet of paper in case they are interested to receive a brief summary of the results. Finally, the contact details of the team member responsible for organizing the survey in the specific country are also provided in case additional questions arise.

Results of the team work during the ESS week

Members of our team are (in alphabetical order): Anna Hartman, Lorenz Jäger, Luis Tojo, Carolin Wirth, Zorana Zupan, and Martin Zlatev (supervisor). During the first meeting we started with a very general idea to investigate risk for the self and for others in relation to the support of policies restricting risks. We searched for the relevant literature and we chose driving safety as topic of interest among various environmental, national security, and public health policies. Regarding driving safety we narrowed our interest on drunk driving, since it is a
relevant issue in all the countries team members come from. On the basis of previous research [11], we formulated items and built the first draft of the questionnaire. Then, we gave this first draft to randomly selected participants at the Summer School who completed the questionnaire and gave feedback. This feedback was incorporated in the test instrument. On the last day of the summer school we presented the progress of our work and took notice of comments regarding theory and methodology.

**Future plan of the activities**

First on the list in our action plan for the upcoming months is refining the measures and constructing the last version of our test instrument. On a second step, questionnaires will be translated and back translated. The translations will be presented to a small sample of participants from each country who will report whether they understand the questions. After this stage, data will be collected in the selected institutions and statistic analyses will be performed. We aim at publishing the data in a peer-reviewed journal and present our results in a conference. Every member is designated a part of the paper s/he has to complete. Dissemination of the results to specific authorities is also envisioned especially those concerned with safe driving of younger people, since drunk driving is a problem involving especially younger generations.
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2 Because of the huge interest, in the activities of the European Summer School 5 participants from non-project partner-countries took part – from: Sweden, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Switzerland and Serbia. They covered their expenses during the ESS on their own. They were active participants and also were included in the workgroups and they will also work for multiplication of the project results.