**SLIDE 1**:

Well, hi everyone.

Im gonna present to you this study, on which we've been working on with Diego, Siu -both from MIDE as you know – and Ernesto.

We titled this as "It's not just your opinion. Authoritarianism of classrooms peers, classroom discussion and gender equality support"

**SLIDE 2**:

First of all, **why is it important to talk about gender equality?**

Gender equality is still present in various domains (as employment, domestic work, the political area, and so on). This, even when there has been a growth of the women’s presence in the public and political sphere.

Gender Equality is advantageous for a number of reasons: it’s good for the economy, fertility control, but specially because it’s necessary for [women’s wellbeing] the wellbeing of women (as persons).

And in this sense, in this study we followed a dichotomous treat of the gender concept (because we have methodological limitations).

**SLIDE 3**:

Another aspect to consider is the relationship between gender equality and attitudes.

Scholars say that there are structural characteristics that keep women in a secondary position in society, but also argue that traditional attitudes toward gender roles are also an important factor for the persisting inequalities between women and men.

And why is it important to study attitudes among youngers? Because they are spectators but also can reproduce these attitudes with their peers, who will be citizens in the future. **And, it is interesting as an analysis unit, because it allows us to understand it in the context of classrooms.**

**SLIDE 4**:

So, for this study we have a main research question and secondary research question.

* The main is Do students’ attitudes towards gender equality and sexism vary as a function of their own authoritarian beliefs, as well as those of their peers? (MODEL 1)

And the secondary is:

* What other variables can account for these differences? (MODEL 2)

**SLIDE 5**:

To begin with the theoretical perspective, it’s important to say that we are working under the social psychology theory. This area, by definition, see the subject in a context where there are others. as we can see in this quote …(READ THE QUOTE):

*Social psychology is the attempt to understand and explain how the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined, or implied presence of other human beings’ (G. W. Allport, 1954).*

*So, because of that, the purpose is to analyze how an ideology of others, or grupal ideology, can impact the Individual attitude or their personal attitude.*

**SLIDE 7:**

The first thing to consider is the conceptual distinction. There are some differences between attitude and ideology.

The attitude is directed to a specific target, it means that it has a defined objective. For example, you could discriminate against gays or lesbians. Or, you could have attitudes of discrimination towards people of color. It is in reference to a specific group of persons that share some characteristics.

On the other hand, Ideology is wider. It means that it doesn’t have a specific target. And, in this sense, an example of an ideology is the authoritarianism, it doesn't refer just to the position toward government -for example, but It could be in all the dimensions of the life. In other words, this means that if you are an authoritarian person, -probably- you would have authoritarian attitudes in different contexts, and about different targets.

**SLIDE 8:**

Another consideration are the relationships about which we already have some evidence. We have three groups of relationships between group’s attitudes and individual’s attitudes, between group’s ideological beliefs and individual’s ideological beliefs, and between ideological beliefs and attitudes.

**In the relationship between peer group’s attitudes and individual attitudes, we see** that the attitudes of the group are related with individual attitudes. There are some research that prove this:

* there are studies that discuss about attitudes towards ethnic minorities; others about socialisation of prejudice toward gay men and lesbian. This means that the group can socialize you into some attitudes.
* And there is, also, evidence from experiments about individual attitudes influenced by prejudiced attitudes of members of social reference groups.

At an **ideological level** there are some evidence about how peer groups can socialise individuals social dominance over time (this was an a longitudinal study)

**SLIDE 9**:

Finally, It is important to say that the ideology is the umbrella under which attitudes are developed accordingly. Some attitudes are consistent with one ideology. It means (READ QUOTE) "ideological beliefs represent broad abstract concepts that can be associated with a number of attitudes"

Specifically, about the right wing authoritarianism, it has been conceptualized as having 3 facets:

\* authoritarianism: the use of punitive and strict means of control.

\* conservatism: encouraging respect and obedience

\* traditionalism: a deference to traditional values and norms.

And, in this sense, authoritarianism it's a predictor of many prejudiced attitudes.

**SLIDE 10:**

On top of that, considering the previous relationships, the thing that we want to see is how the group ideology is related with individuals attitudes.

**SLIDE 11**: This relationship can be illustrated by some studies that have analyzed it. (READ EXAMPLES)

* For example Poteat et al, found that social dominance authoritarianism is related with Attitudes towards gay men and lesbians
* **SLIDE 12:** Thijs & Verkuyten found that multicultural beliefs are associated with ethnic attitudes
* **SLIDE 13:** Van Assche Et Al, found that right wing climate (it means by country and region) is associate with negative attitudes towards age-, ethnicity-, and gender-based outgroups.

**SLIDE 14:**

**And, what are we interested on, in the first model is**

"Do students’ attitudes towards gender equality and sexism vary as a function of their own authoritarian beliefs, as well as those of their peers?"

**SLIDE 15:** Our source of information (where we get the data base) is the ICCS of 2009, specifically Colombia.

READ ITEMS

Our sample was composed by 6350 students, they were about 14 years old from private/official rural/urban schools.

**SLIDE 16:**

* The items used to measure right wing authoritarianism were the Students’ endorsement of authoritarian government practices. For example, two of the items used were:
  1. It is better for government leaders to make decisions without consulting anybody.
  2. People in government must enforce their authority even if it means violating the rights of some citizens.

And the scale used in ICCS is very similar to the original scale of Altemeyers right wing authoritarianism.

**SLIDE 17:**

* The items used for measuring gender equality and sexism was the scale named by ICCS as “ Students’ endorsement of gender equality”
* Daniel Miranda found that the bidimensional model has a better fit in all the countries when compared to the unidimensional one.
* It means that, in reality, we have 3 items related to gender equality (for example, Men and women should have equal opportunities to take part in government) and 2 items related to sexism (for example, Women should stay out of politics).

**SLIDE 18**:

We want to see the contextual effect.

So, first, we have here the **individual** correlation between sexism and authoritarianism which is positive.

**SLIDE 19:** here, we have the correlation at classroom level, between sexism and authoritarianism (positive too).

**SLIDE 20:** we have the two previous slopes**.** The individual correlation and the classroom correlation. This is the contextual effect (illustrated as the distance between the classroom slope to the X axis). This is the student differences, illustrated as the distance between the individual correlation slope and the X axis. And that we want to see is this (SHOW), the contextual effect. It is necessary to subtract the student effect to obtain the contextual one.

That difference must be tested if it is significant

**SLIDE 21:** This is the conceptual model.

**SLIDE 22:** However, we must bear in mind that there are two levels of authoritarianism: between classrooms, and within classrooms.

**SLIDE 23:**

As it can be illustrated here, there is an effect from authoritarianism towards gender equality and sexism that cannot be explained only by individual levels. We have also a significant relationship between authoritarianism at a classroom level and gender equality and sexism.

This same pattern of results was found in all the countries in 2009

**SLIDE 24:** The next question is how these contextual effects can be explained by other variables

Openness in classroom discussion was added. The hypothesis with this is, authoritarianism implies adherence to norms, little questioning of authority (submission), therefore there would be little discussion in classes.

Among covariates we have: gender (women have better attitudes, low level of sexism because they are victims of these attitudes), Mother’s educational level (higher educational level, greater adherence to equitable attitudes), Home literacy is used as a proxy of socioeconomic level, and civic knowledge.

**SLIDE 26:**

So we have this covariates at both levels.

**SLIDE 27 (occulta)**

**SLIDE 28:** here only appear the relationships that were significant.

The contextual effect was significant for sexism but not for gender equality. It means that classroom authoritarianism affects levels of sexism above the levels of individual authoritarianism.

As a result, the effect over gender equality disappears. So, one of the covariates could explain this contextual effect of the classroom authoritarianism towards gender equality.

**SLIDE 29**: Open discussion has a significant and positive relationship with gender equality at a between (or classroom) level. This could explain why the contextual effect of authoritarianism disappeared.

But, open discussion doesn’t have a significant relationship with sexism.

**SLIDE 30:** Regarding gender, we have that if there are more women in a classroom, there will be less sexism at a classroom level. And also at an individual level.

**SLIDE 31:** we have that positive and significant relationships between civic knowledge and gender equality. More civic knowledge, more support to gender equality.

**SLIDE 32:** mother’s education was not significant

**SLIDE 33:** Andbooks are related marginally with sexism

**SLIDE 34:**

To sum up these preliminary results, we have that:

* With model 1 It is possible to say that we have significant contextual effects of authoritarianism on gender equality and sexism
* With model 2 we can say that:
* Only the contextual effect on Sexism was significant.
* The authoritarianism contextual effect on Gender equality became non significant when openness in classroom discussion was added to the model.
* And the next step is test for a mediation, but we’re not sure already.

**SLIDE 35 & 36 HIDEN**

**SLIDE 37:** To conclude,

* Students’ sexist attitudes are not only a reflection of their own personal authoritarian beliefs, but also a reflection of the authoritarian beliefs of their peers.
* It is important to analyze peer groups in adolescence. It’s an important life stage that could be decisive. And, as it was already mentioned, they will be citizens some day.
* These results emphasize the importance of the normative social context and socialisation in the development of attitudes
* And it’s important also because today Right-wing authoritarian governments have been elected and there is a Salience of extreme right wing movements

**SLIDE 38:**

Finally, about the limitations and strengths of this study,

* + There is correlated data: between ideologies and attitudes. But, we already know that Ideological beliefs are more prescriptive than attitudes (Thijs & Verjuyten, 2013). And, also, there are previous investigations/studies that used these two concepts
  + Among the strengths, we think that one important thing is the ecological validity because we’re using classroom as peer groups.
* there is no homophily (you do not select your group). On the contrary, there would be a socialization (that is, the group modifies your attitudes so that you look like the group)

**SLIDE 39:** Thank you for your attention!