

Original Papers

Polish Psychological Bulletin
2012, vol. 43(4), 223-232
DOI - 10.2478/v10059-012-0025-2

Katarzyna Popiołek,*
Małgorzata Wójcik*

Psychologically based, anti-prejudice educational intervention – project.

Abstract: *The presented study explores the possibility of creating and implementing educational program which would reduce intergroup bias in realistic high school setting. The project was based on the assumption that there is the need of easily applicable, anti-prejudice intervention, which would be appropriate to introduce into foreign language course books, would be universal in terms of changing negative attitudes and would meet all methodological requirements of language lessons. Crossed categorization and the common ingroup identity model were used as theoretical basis for 30 English lesson scenarios on B2 level (upper-intermediate). It was shown that after the intervention there was a significant change in the students' attitude toward the outgroup and the outgroup members. The implications of these findings are discussed.*

Keywords: *stereotypes, prejudice, categorization, identity, ingroup, outgroup*

The presented study was inspired by the data showing that Polish high school students declare strong ethnic and national stereotypes toward Roma, Jewish, Russian, Romanian and other eastern European nations (Weigl, 2007; Weigl, Maliszkievicz, 1998). Although young people are ready to travel, study or work in other countries, they concentrate and favor their own group, perceived as family, class, peer group or own nation (Wilska-Duszyńska, 1993). Defavorisation of some social groups as homeless, poor, disabled or mentally ill can be noticed together with strong tendency to exclude prisoners (former prisoners) and drug addicts (Czapiński, 2009). Studies show that negative ethnic and national stereotypes are still present in our national consciousness causing intergroup conflicts, unrest and hostility. With this in mind psychologically based anti-prejudice intervention is becoming an urgent necessity. Research on the topic of prejudice, stereotype and discrimination has captured the interest of many psychologists but remedies to alleviate this social problem, however have not been as common (Katz & Taylor, 1988). The implementation of bias-reducing programs is rather neglected area of investigation as psychologists are more interested in understanding intergroup conflicts than in trying to alleviate the problems. The first program

to reduce intergroup bias was created by Allport in 1954 and since this early attempt social psychology has made essential progress in understanding the problem, testing for example contact hypothesis, especially Allport's technique called jigsaw classroom. The idea was to create interdependent atmosphere that makes each student in the class an important source of information so the success is dependent on the contribution of every child in the group. In this way children learn to value and respect each other. The evidence from the studies reveal that students show decrease in prejudice and stereotyping, in comparison with children in traditional classroom setting. They also declare liking for other students both within and across groups. This technique is efficient and improves intergroup relations in intergroup context but there is also the need to work on intergroup relations, decrease negative attitudes to outgroup members in the situation when every day contact with outgroup members in the classroom is not possible. Very interesting examples of such intervention were two studies carried out by Weigl and Lukaszewski in primary schools with the aim of changing negative ethnic and national stereotypes during regular lessons. In the first experiment (Weigl&Lukaszewski, 1992) various techniques as interaction, common fate, common goals and

* **University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty in Katowice**

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Katarzyna Popiołek University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty in Katowice, Kossutha 9, 40-844 Katowice, Poland. Katarzyna.Popiolek@swps.edu.pl, and MałgorzataWójcik mgolonka-wojcik@swps.edu.pl

personalization were chosen and used in lessons scenarios. After the program the opinion about tested national groups improved and declared social distance shortened. In the second experiment, (Weigl, 1999) “Multicultural educational program TAK” was created and carried with the aim of introducing culture of minorities living in Poland. The results were very promising, showing positive attitude change toward ethnic groups especially those who suffer stigmatization in Poland – Jewish and Roma. Although successful, both programs are difficult to introduce in school curriculum since they were implemented during different subjects as history, geography, music, art or native language lessons; they weren’t consistent with obligatory program content and required special training for teachers. Examples of educational actions designed to overcome prejudice, conducted by social psychologists, researchers, activists and educators since 1950s highlight the possibility for creating and implementing effective educational intervention. Intervention that would be tailored for Polish context and consistent with subject content. But mentioned examples also point to the fact that solutions are neither easy nor short term, readily available. Prejudice, intergroup hostility and discrimination are multiply determined issues involving psychological processes, individual differences, social experience and context.

The reasons for intergroup hostility have been traced theoretically to numerous social forces including interpersonal (Wills, 1981), intergroup (Sherif&Sherif, 1969) and institutional (Feagin&Feagin, 1978). The nature of prejudice itself is complex and varied, the forms of discrimination have changed from direct and open to indirect and subtle, though equally harmful. Reducing them should not only focus on eliminating discriminatory behavior, but should also deal with something as fundamental as categorization – the perception of own group boundaries. It seems certain that interventions designed to diminish the effects of intergroup bias must be based on several mediating processes connected with the redefinition of group membership and the creation of common ingroup identity. As Wilder (1986) presented categorization into two or more groups is enough to cause intergroup bias. Allport (1954) stated that ingroup identity doesn’t necessary lead to outgroup hostility, but ingroup love and outgroup hate are closely related. Studies of ethnic and racial prejudice both in the United States and in Europe affirm that the reason of modern racism is not the presence of negative feelings toward ethnic minorities but the absence of positive attitude toward them (Dovidio&Gaertner, 1993). Common group identity model and crossed categorization techniques are introduced as means of reducing intergroup prejudice by factors that change perception of group boundaries from “us” and “them” to “we”. It may contribute to more harmonious intergroup interactions leading to the development of common group identity and indicating the category shared with a member of the outgroup (Gaertner, 1993). Much of

the research implemented those techniques separately and in laboratory studies which offered experimental control of the context of the intergroup contact. As Gaertner (2000) suggested survey studies increase the confidence that common ingroup identity model can be applicable in realistic context of complex intergroup setting. Also introducing multiple system of categorization seems promising because it constitutes a realistic reflection of intergroup relations. Combining those methods may bring interesting results as separately they show great potential for reducing prejudice and discrimination. The purpose of all psychologically-based lesson scenarios was to change students’ perception of group boundaries, to cause decategorization and recategorization, to prime the acceptance of more positive feelings and behaviors toward outgroup members.

Common ingroup identity model

Intergroup literature shows that degrading the salience of the representation of two-group categorizations should decrease intergroup hostile feelings (Brown & Turner, 1981; Cambell, 1958; Doise, 1978). Blurring the prior categorization scheme should cause recategorization which wouldn’t eliminate the prior category but move it to the higher level and make it more inclusive (Stephan, 1985). This process of reducing bias by forming a more inclusive one-group identity is based on two theories: social identity theory (Tajfel& Turner, 1979) and self-categorization theory (Turner, 1985). Intergroup bias could begin within group favoritism and group formation brings ingroup members closer to the self, distancing it at the same time from the outgroup members. Social identity contributes greatly to generating stereotypic thoughts and opinions toward outgroup members (Doliński, 2001). Thus, inducing one group representation extends all motivational and cognitive processes toward former outgroup member. It encourages open communication and self-disclosing interactions which can lead to personalization and individualization (Wilder, 1978). Here the second round of reducing bias can begin, as outgroup members are perceived as individuals closer to the self within the boundary of the ingroup. In the recategorized group, new members benefit in many ways. They are evaluated more favorably, awarded more generously, communicated more openly, helped more willingly. Moreover, information about former outgroup members are processed, stored and activated as if they were ingroup members (Deutsch, 1973). Recategorization can be achieved by introducing factors that are perceived as shared by members of two groups (e.g. common goal, common tasks, believes) so new subordinate identity is formed without abandoning former identities. Allport (1954) stated that concentric identities can enclose each other and two groups are perceived within one superior group. Furthermore, a revised common identity may be

generalized to outgroup members who are absent in the context of contact situations. This generalization is most likely to occur if the salience of the initial group identities is maintained within the superordinate common group identity (Gertner, 1994).

Crossed social categorization

Following the findings of social psychology we can notice an impressive number of experiments supporting the theory that the mere fact of categorizing people into two groups with distinct boundaries is sufficient enough to trigger intergroup discrimination i.e. favoring the ingroup at the expense of the outgroup (Brewer, 1979; Rabbie, 1982). Clarification of those processes which link categorization with ingroup favoritism and outgroup discrimination comes from two theoretical frameworks: social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and Doise's theory (Doise, 1978). The first states that individuals want to achieve positive self-concept which could come from positive evaluation of their own group. This positive evaluation can be gained after having compared their own group with relevant outgroups. When this comparison is favorable for the own group it will bring positive self-concept for the individual, but as a consequence will cause discrimination against other groups. Doise's theory points out that intergroup categorization accentuates perceived differences between the groups and similarities within the groups.

Modern theory of crossed categorization starts with the assumption that if category boundaries are not convergent, but cross each other the position of outgroup member will divert from "out" to "in". (Vanbeselaere, 1987; Crisp & Hewstone, 2001). Crisscrossing category memberships form new sub groups composed of ingroup and outgroup members. It changes the pattern of who is "in" and who is "out". This may lead to decategorization-perceiving outgroup members as individuals, reducing earlier categorization scheme and emphasizing similarities. According to Vanbeselaere (1978) crossed categorization may lead to convergence between categories and divergence within categories. Doise (1978) states that this process will reduce or eliminate discrimination, but it hasn't been proven so far. Research exploring the effect of crossed categorization on inter-group bias hasn't provided conclusive answers whether it could be an effective way to reduce intergroup bias. Some results are promising (Diehl, 1990; Crisp, Hewston & Rubin, 2001) and show that if categorization is performed within five or more categories, decategorization, convergence and divergence can be achieved.

Method

The aim of the study was to design, carry out and see the results of anti-prejudice educational intervention. The assumption of this intervention was its universal character in terms of negative attitude change and its possible

easiness in introduction into Polish educational system. The study adopted a pretest/posttest comparison group design. The study participants were 60 boys and girls (n=60) aged 16/17. They were all students of the Secondary School of Fine Arts in Katowice – class A and B. Students of class A were the subjects of intervention (the experimental group) while class B was a control group with no intervention being carried out.

Procedure

Quasi-experimental research design was chosen to evaluate the effects of the educational program. There were no random assignments to the groups, participants were students of two classes A and B (30 students in each class). There were 13 girls, 17 boys in class A and 16 girls, 14 boys in class B. It was not possible to control confounding variable as the intervention lasted five months so mass-media, parents and peers influence couldn't have been controlled. Independent, side variables such as background were also not controlled. Pretest/posttest design was chosen to compare the final posttest results between the experimental and control group. Two independent variables were introduced: X1 – application of intervention program and X2 – regular curriculum English language program. Dependent variables: *Prejudice against(...)*, *Openness Toward Others* and *Distance Toward Others* were measured. Pretest was administered in the first week of September immediately followed by the opening of the intervention program. The program consisted of 30 lesson scenarios and was carried out within one semester (September to February), one out of three lessons a week was devoted to anti-prejudice scenario. One week after the programs completion, posttest 1 was administered to both groups to assess short-term effect. Eight months after programs completion, posttest 2 was administered to assess long-term effect. (see Table 1).

Pretest and posttests were administered by the English teacher (co-author). Students were asked to complete Bogardus Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1959) in the version developed by Barbara Weigl and Wiesław Łukaszewski (Weigl, Łukaszewski, 1992), and two part scale of Openness Toward Others and Distance Toward Others developed by Barbara Wilska-Duszyńska (1993). The Bogardus Social Distance Scale measured dependent variable *Prejudice against (...)* and was used to assess students' willingness to participate in contact with members of four groups: German, Roma, Ukrainian, Italian. The scale is based on the assumption that with the intensification of bias/prejudice the tendency to avoid the subject increases, so the greater the prejudice the larger distance declared. Students were asked to declare how close they would like to live to a particular member of the tested groups by choosing the tent. With low intensity of prejudice students chose the tent next to outgroup member, when intensity increased students distanced themselves from outgroup

Table 1 Quasi-experimental research design.

	Pretest	Independent Variable	Posttest 1/short term effect Posttest 2/long-term effect
Experimental group	Dependent variables measurement: Prejudice against German, Roma, Italian, Ukrainian Openness Toward Others Distance Toward Others	X1 Application of intervention program	Dependent variables measurement: Prejudice against German, Roma, Italian, Ukrainian Openness Toward Others Distance Toward Others
Control Group	Dependent variables measurement: Prejudice against German, Roma, Italian, Ukrainian Openness Toward Others Distance Toward Others	X2-Regular curriculum English language program (no intervention applied)	Dependent variables measurement: Prejudice against German, Roma, Italian, Ukrainian Openness Toward Others Distance Toward Others

member by choosing further tent. The results were reduced to a single score on a scale.

The first part of Scale of Openness Toward Others and Distance Toward Others was to measure dependent variable *Openness Toward the Others*. It evaluated the tendency to identify oneself with communities larger than family, friends or own ingroup. Students were asked to declare whether they perceive each group as “my group”, “difficult to say”, “not my group”. There were 11 groups given: my family, my friends, my class, students from my school, inhabitants of my city, inhabitants of Silesia, people of the same religion, Polish people, Slavs, European, people of the world.

The second part of the scale was to measure dependent variable *Distance Toward the Others*. It evaluated restricted self-identification. Students were asked to declare whether they perceive each group as “outgroup”, “difficult to say”, “not outgroup”. There were 11 groups given: students of another class, students of another school, people who are richer or poorer than oneself, people of a different background, people of different opinions, people from different city, people living in a village, people of different religion, people who speak a different language, people from another country.

Intervention program. The overall goal of the intervention program was to emphasize outgroup members diversity and intergroup similarity. In order to achieve it thirty lessons scenarios were designed with different English language activities. As indicated earlier, crossed (multiple) categorization was applied as a baseline for fifteen lesson scenarios in the first part of the intervention

program. Previous work has established (Crisp & Hewstone, 2001) that in crossed categorization context we may expect positive effects of the category combination on intergroup phenomena, such as stereotyping and prejudice (Brewer, 1999). Following Crisp, Hewstone and Rubin's (2001) findings text, exercises and activities based on crossed categorization were created in order to weaken students' representation of intergroup context and trigger the process of reducing bias. Some scenarios aimed at visualizing the idea that social, national and ethnic categories cross each other. By drawing web of connections between different categories and placing themselves in it students saw that they belong to the same category as people who seem very different and socially distant. By imagining and describing everyday activities of different outgroup members students realized how social categories overlap and saw outgroup members as similar to the own group members in many dimensions. By analyzing and discussing photographs students noticed that belonging to separate groups is not synonymous with being different or distant, that the outgroup members have a lot in common with the own group members and that they are as different from each other as ingroup members. Some scenarios were to induce the idea of segmental participation in multiple groups – students were asked to indicate group memberships that are important to their sense of identity. The outcome of this task was surprising for the students as multiple, complex, cross-cutting identities turned out to be very common among them.

Taking into consideration the fact that the common ingroup identity model is derived from a social categori-

zation approach to intergroup behavior (Brewer, 1979; Brown&Turner, 1981) the second part of intervention was based on the idea that intergroup bias and conflicts can be diminished by lesson scenarios which will encourage the transformation of students' cognitive representation of the memberships from two groups to one group. In order to achieve it, positive effect of cooperative interactions was emphasized and tasks were designed to bring the idea of interdependence in pursuit of common goal. Created context brought about the positive evaluation of outgroup in order to bring trust so students could see the potential benefits of mutual cooperation. Students were asked to imagine and describe possible advantages coming from cultural, national or ethnic diversity; analyze tasks of global actions organizations or plan cooperation with different out group members. In that way redefinition of group boundaries could appear. Each lesson/scenario was unique, but they all shared a common goal of reducing intergroup bias, none of them mentioned groups measured in pretest and posttest, but introduced a number of other social, ethnic and national groups. It is crucial as the idea of the research was to evaluate the possibility of reducing intergroup bias by the introduction of universal programs which could influence general perception of ingroup/outgroup and by this modification change the extent to which students would be accepting of any outgroup members. It is important to note that although scenarios were not included in students' course book they resembled regular language lessons in terms of exercised skills, introduced activities and conducted evaluation. Both scenarios and regular lessons were taught by the same person – a co-author who was an English teacher. Since it was difficult for the students to perceive the difference between course book lessons and intervention scenarios, after second posttest they were informed about the purpose and the results of the intervention they had participated in.

A sample lesson scenario. A unit entitled “Poverty and Homelessness” represents the first part intervention lesson. During this exercise, students read about three homeless people - one in India, one in the United States, and one in Poland. The lesson included activities that were similar to traditional language instruction except for the social content. There are some examples of introduced activities:

Activity 1. Before the students read about the three homeless people, they were presented with new vocabulary words such as „homeless” and asked to match the words with definitions. This activity prepared students to understand the subsequent text.

Activity 2. The students were given brief descriptions of three homeless people, and were informed by the teacher that the stories concerned real people. The students were then asked to read the text and answer simple questions. For the purpose of this article one text is quoted:

Kiren is 47 years old and lives in Delhi in India. At one time she lived with her husband Ray in a nice house in the

suburbs of Delhi. Ray was an engineer. He worked for a French company and earned a good salary. Kiren managed their home and was well-educated. She loved literature and read a lot; she also cooked traditional Indian food, which her husband loved. They didn't have children, but they helped orphans. That's why they didn't save much, and when Ray died unexpectedly, Kiren was left with nothing. After one year she lost her house and all of her furniture. She couldn't get a job because she was over 40 and had no job experience. Moreover, unemployment is high in India. Now 47, alone with no means to live, she is homeless and feels extremely unhappy. The worst thing for her is the way the other people look at her. She is in a horrible situation, but she hopes that one day she will have her own place and a better future.

Activity 3. Students reread the descriptions more carefully and completed the table designed to highlight two important themes:

(1) Outgroup member diversity - homeless people are very different from one another. They have different histories, interests, hopes, and problems.

(2) Intergroup similarity - homeless people are similar to other people in many ways.

This theme helped students see characteristics that they shared with homeless people, such as enjoying poetry, literature, and nature, dreaming about being famous, or quarreling with parents. According to cross-categorization theory, these similarities should foster recategorization and personalization.

Results

The chi-square analysis indicated that immediately (posttest 1) and eight months after (posttest 2) the intervention, the students from the experimental group included a greater number of groups to category “my group” (“we”). Differences in distribution of dependent variable *Openness toward the others* in pretest and posttests are significant, there is an increase of groups perceived as ingroup (see Table 2).

Differences in distribution of dependent variable *Distance toward the others* in pretest and posttests are significant, the decrease in the number of groups perceived as “outgroup” (they”) was noticed both as a short term and long term effect (see Table 3). In comparison with control groups, it can be seen that the students from the experimental group included more groups in category “my group” and less groups in category “outgroup” than did the students from the control group both immediately and 8 months after the intervention (see Table 4 and 5). Immediately after the intervention program students from experimental group declared reduced distance toward Roma and Ukrainian (see Table 6 and 7). Nations which students intended to avoid by declaring the largest distance in pretest. No changes occurred in declared distance toward German and Italian (see Tables 8, 9). It is important to note

Table 2 Experimental group according to opinion about openness toward 11 social groups

Students' opinion about	Pretest	First posttest	Second posttest
openness toward 11 social groups	%	%	%
My group	46,7	59,2	59,7
Difficult to say	27,9	25,2	30,6
Not my group	25,5	15,8	9,7
total	100,0	100,0	100,0
Pretest/First posttest	Chi-square=23,99	df=2	p=0,000
Pretest/Second posttest	Chi-square=45,08	df=2	p=0,000
First posttest/Second posttest	Chi-square=11,62	df=2	p=0,003

Source: own research

Table 3 Experimental group according to opinion about distance toward 11 social groups

Students' opinion about	Pretest	First posttest	Second posttest
distance toward 11 social groups	%	%	%
Outgroup	30,3	18,5	13,9
Difficult to say	36,7	34,8	36,7
Not an outgroup	33,0	46,7	47,0
total	100,0	100,0	100,0
Pretest/First posttest	Chi-square=34,09	df=2	p=0,000
Pretest/Second posttest	Chi-square=48,57	df=2	p=0,000
First posttest/Second posttest	Chi-square=4,01	df=2	p=0,135

Source: own research

Table 4 Control group according to opinion about openness toward 11 social groups

Students' opinion about	Pretest	First posttest	Second posttest
openness toward 11 social groups	%	%	%
My group	47,0	47,3	44,2
Difficult to say	34,5	32,7	35,8
Not my group	18,5	20,0	20,0
total	100,0	100,0	100,0
Pretest/First posttest	Chi-square=0,73	df=2	p=0,693
Pretest/Second posttest	Chi-square=1,07	df=2	p=0,585
First posttest/Second posttest	Chi-square=1,57	df=2	p=0,457

Source: own research

Table 5 Control group according to opinion about distance toward 11 social groups,

Students' opinion about distance toward 11 social groups	Pretest %	First posttest %	Second posttest %
Outgroup	27,6	30,3	29,1
Difficult to say	25,2	25,8	22,1
Not an outgroup	47,3	43,9	48,8
total	100,0	100,0	100,0
Pretest/First posttest	Chi-square=1,71	df=2	p=0,424
Pretest/Second posttest	Chi-square=1,64	df=2	p=0,440
First posttest/Second posttest	Chi-square=3,62	df=2	p=0,164

Source: own research

Table 6 Experimental group according to declared prejudice toward Roma.

The Prejudice intensity toward Roma (Chosen tent on a camping site)	Pretest %	First posttest	Second Posttest
1 st tent	10,0	6,7	10,0
2 nd tent	20,0	10,0	10,0
3 rd tent	6,7	3,3	3,3
4 th tent	3,3	53,3	53,3
5 th tent	26,7	26,7	10,0
6 th tent	33,3	0,0	13,3
total	100,0	100,0	100,0
Pretest/First posttest	Chi-square=237,33	df=5	p=0,00
Pretest/Second posttest	Chi-square=133,73	df=5	p=0,00
First posttest/Second Posttest	Chi-square=3,63	df=5	p=0,605

Source: own research

Table 7 Experimental group according to declared prejudice toward Ukrainian

The prejudice intensity toward Ukrainian (Chosen tent on a camping site)	Pretest %	First posttest	Second Posttest
1 st tent	30,0	36,7	36,7
2 nd tent	20,0	10,0	16,7
3 rd tent	20,0	40,0	33,3
4 th tent	13,3	10,0	10,0
5 th tent	3,3	3,3	3,3
6 th tent	13,3	0,0	0,0
total	100,0	100,0	100,0
Pretest/First posttest	Chi-square=12,9	df=5	p=0,032
Pretest/Second posttest	Chi-square=7,53	df=5	p=0,184
First posttest/Second Posttest	Chi-square=1,67	df=5	p=0,893

Source: own research

Table 8 Experimental group according to declared prejudice toward German

The prejudice intensity toward German (Chosen tent on a camping site)	Pretest %	First posttest	Second Posttest
1 st tent	36,7	40,0	23,3
2 nd tent	10,0	10,0	16,7
3 rd tent	3,3	3,3	16,7
4 th tent	13,3	3,3	30,0
5 th tent	26,7	20,0	6,7
6 th tent	20,0	23,3	6,7
total	100,0	100,0	100,0
Pretest/First posttest	Chi-square=2,71	df=5	p=0,745
Pretest/Second posttest	Chi-square=29,50	df=5	p=0,000
First posttest/Second Posttest	Chi-square=89,65	df=5	p=0,000

Source: own research

Table 9 Experimental group according to declared prejudice toward Italian

The prejudice intensity toward Italian measured in three moments (Chosen tent on a camping site)	Pretest %	First posttest	Second Posttest
1 st tent	53,3	63,3	53,3
2 nd tent	43,3	33,3	33,3
3 rd tent	3,3	3,3	6,7
4 th tent	0,0	0,0	3,3
5 th tent	0,0	0,0	3,3
6 th tent	0,0	0,0	0,0
total	100,0	100,0	100,0
Pretest/First posttest	Chi-square=1,25	df=5	p=0,940
Pretest/Second posttest	Chi-square=1,69	df=5	p=0,890
First posttest/Second Posttest	Chi-square=1,47	df=5	p=0,916

Source: own research

that declared distance toward Italian and German was short in pretest and posttest, as students chose tents close to the members of those groups.

The reduced distance toward Roma remained in the second posttest as students continued to declare the will to live closer to Roma (see Table 6). The reduced distance toward Ukrainian proved to be unstable in the second posttest (see Table 7). The results concerning control group indicate no change in declared distance toward four out-group members. Roma, Ukrainian, German, Italian. The results show that there was no significant difference in declared distance toward four nations in pretest between students from experimental and control group (Roma $p=0,64$; Ukrainian $p=0,90$; German $p=0,76$; Italian $p=0,86$).

Discussion

Taken together, the results of psychologically based educational intervention carried during English classes in secondary school show that it is an effective way of changing group boundaries perception and diminishing intergroup bias. Observed changes in "we"/"they" categories indicate that divergence, convergence and recategorization had appeared, the social category had been defined on a more inclusive level and the superior group identity had become visible. It created structural precondition for reducing intergroup bias as students exhibited significantly less social distance toward Roma and Ukrainian. The changes seem crucial as those two minorities are stigmatized in Poland and often suffer social exclusion.

According to Geartner (2001) recategorization gives possibility to initiate the chain of positive changes as personalized behavior, openness and readiness in intergroup contact. It also influences information processing, non-stereotypic data internalization and fosters further positive changes. It could be assumed though that after the intervention program students became more open toward outgroup members they could encounter in real, complex intergroup settings. While the intervention program cannot be regarded as a panacea for solving intergroup bias it shows a very promising change and could be treated as one of multilateral actions. Firstly it clearly prompted positive intergroup changes and secondly it is applicable in naturalistic, language lesson settings, which gives wide possibility for attitude change intervention. Methodology of language teaching emphasizes the necessity of practicing certain skills and using language as a tool of communication. By its very nature, language instruction requires text and speech with some kind of content, so why not use content that promotes diversity, outgroup personalization, cooperation and other pro-social values. Perhaps the best thing about such program is its flexibility as it can be used with any ingroup or a set of outgroups, and any foreign language (or native language). Moreover, this sort of pro-social language instruction is very easy to implement as teachers do not require any additional training, class setting remains unchanged and lesson activities meet all methodological requirements. There are certainly potential pitfalls of such program. Students need to be prepared in terms of language skills which is not always the case. They have to be given relevant vocabulary and language training so that they are able to understand the texts and participate fully in activities and discussions. If language competence of some students in the class is below required standard, it could be disruptive as discussions lapse into Polish or students lose their interests in presented issue.

In conclusion, this study showed that there is possibility of changing intergroup perception and reduce bias by introducing psychologically based anti-prejudice intervention in realistic school setting. Much remains to be done as wide implementation of such program is still far future.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Aronson, E., & Bridgeman, D. (1979). Jigsaw groups and the desegregated classroom: In pursuit of common goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5, 438-446.
- Allport, A. (1980). Attention and performance. In G. Claxton (Eds.), *Cognitive psychology: new Direction*, (pp.112-153). London: Routledge.
- Bogardus, E.S. (1959). *Social distance*, Yellow Springs, OH: Antioch Press
- Brewer, M.B.(1979). Intergroup Bias in the minimal group situation. A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 307-324.
- Brewer, M.B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 429-444.
- Brown, R.J. & Turner J.C. (1981). Interpersonal and intergroup behavior. In J.C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.) *Intergroup Behavior* (pp.33-64). Chicago, IL The University of Chicago Press
- Brown, P.M. & Turner, J.C. (1998). Making different background theories accessible: the impact on judgment of prototypicality and stereotype content. *Paper presented at the new Zeland meeting of the Society of Australian Social Psychologist*. Christchurch, New Zeland
- Cambell, D.T. (1958). Common fate, similarity and other indices of the status of aggregates of persons as social entities. *Behavioral science*, 3, 14-25
- Crisp, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2000). Crossed categorization and intergroup bias: The moderating roles of intergroup and affective context. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 357-383.
- Crisp, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2001). Multiple categorization and implicit intergroup bias: Differential category dominance and the positive-negative asymmetry effect. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 45-62.
- Crisp, R. J., Hewstone, M., & Rubin, M. (2001). Does multiple categorization reduce intergroup bias? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 76-89.
- Czapiński J., Panek T. (2009). Warunki i jakość życia Polaków. Raporty (2009). *Diagnoza społeczna* Retrieved from www.diagnoza.com
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Diehl, M. (1990). The minimal group paradigm: Theoretical explanations and empirical findings. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (pp. 263-292). Chichester, UK: Wiley
- Doise, B.J. (1978). *Groups and individuals: Explanations in social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Doliński D. (1995). They are not different from us, they are our opposite and they are similar to us. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 26, 189-196
- Doliński, D. (2001). Tożsamość społeczna jako generator stereotypowych sądów o innych. In M. Kofta i A. Jasińska-Kania (Eds.), *Stereotypy i Uprzedzenia, uwarunkowania psychologiczne i kulturowe*. Warszawa. Wydawnictwo naukowe Scholar
- Dovidio, J.F. and Gaertner, S.L. (1993). Stereotypes and evaluative intergroup bias. In D. Mackie & D. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press
- Feagin, J.R., & Feagin, L.B. (1978). *Discrimination American Style: Institutional Racism and Sexism*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Gardner R.C. (1994). Stereotypes and consensual beliefs. In M.P. Zanna, J.M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium*, 7, (pp. 1-31); Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common ingroup identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of social Psychology*, 4 (p.1-26).
- Gaertner S.L., Dovidio J.F. (2000). *Reducing Intergroup Bias: The Common Ingroup Identity Model*. Philadelphia, PA, US: Psychology Press.
- Katz, P.A. & Taylor, D.A. (1988). *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in controversy*. New York: Plenum
- Rabbie, J.M. (1982). The effect of intergroup competition and cooperation on intra-group and intergroup relationships. [In V.J. Derlega & J. Grzelak (Eds.), *Cooperation and Helping Behavior: Theories and Research* (pp.128-51). New York: Harper & Raw
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C.W. (1969). *Social Psychology*. New York: Harper & Raw.
- Stephan, W.G. (1985). Intergroup relations. In W.G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 3 (pp. 599-658). New York: Addison Wesley
- Tajfel, H., Turner, J.C. (1979). An intergrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relation* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Turner, J.C. (1985). Social categorization and self-concept : A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In E.J. Lawler (Eds.), *Advances in Group Processes* (pp.77-122) Greenwich, CT: JAI Press
- Vanbeselaere, N. (1987). The effects of dichotomous and crossed social categorizations upon group discrimination *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 17, 143-156.
- Vanbeselaere, N. (1991). The different effects of simple and crossed categorizations. A result of the category differentiation process or of the differential category salience? In W. Stroebe and M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology*, 2. New York: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Weigl B., Łukaszewski W. (1992). Modyfikacja stereotypów i uprzedzeń etnicznych u dzieci. In Chlewiński Z., Kurcz I. (Eds.), *Stereotypy i uprzedzenia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Psychologii PAN.
- Weigl B., Maliszewicz B. (1998). *Inni to także my. Mniejszości narodowe w Polsce: Białorusini, Cyganie, Litwini, Niemcy, Ukraińcy, Żydzi*. Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne
- Weigl B. (1999). *Stereotypy i uprzedzenia etniczne u dzieci i młodzieży. Studium empiryczne*
- Weigl B. (2007). *Romowie 2007. Od edukacji młodego pokolenia do obrazu w polskich mediach*. Academica, 2008
- Wilder, D.A. (1986). Social categorization: Implications for reduction of intergroup bias. In L. Berkowitz (Eds.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 19 (pp.291-355). Orlando, FL: Academic Press
- Wilder, D.A. (1978). Reduction of intergroup discrimination through individuation of the out-group. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 1361-74
- Wilska-Duszyńska B. (1993). „My” i „oni”- młodzież wobec etnicznie obcych. In M. Jarzab-Mrozicka (Eds.), *Tolerancja i uprzedzenia młodzieży (raport z badań)*. Warszawa: Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii PAN
- Wills, T.A. (1981). Downward comparison principles in social psychology. *Psychological Bulletin* 90, 245-71