

ЮРИДИЧНА ТА ПОЛІТИЧНА ПСИХОЛОГІЯ

Baliuta V.V.

Postgraduate Student,

*Institute of Social and Political Psychology
of NAES of Ukraine*

HOW DOES REFERENCE GROUP RADICALIZE YOUTH POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR

Features of political process taking place in our society at present are quite uncertain and determine absenteeism and low levels of political participation, on the one hand, and this uncertainty provokes two divergent consequences, on the other hand. The first process of two lies in strengthening legitimacy of political power, and the second one lies in determining dissatisfaction with ineffective policy and the law violation. All these cause the revealing of so-called «street democracy». So the problem of citizen participation in political life of our country is one of the most important at present. Citizen's political behaviour, including the electoral one, is determined by the combination of factors, which are social and personal ones.

Psychological science has elaborated lots of different definitions of what radicalization is. But factually most of them can be treated as socio-psychological differences of believes, feelings, and behaviour. And radicalization of political behaviour is of the greatest interest and practical concern and well as radicalization of youth political behaviour is quite an evident thing nowadays.

Radicalization of youth political behaviour is a non-stop process, and all of us can whiteness it now. C. Sunstein, P.M. Fernbach, K. Grönlund, K. Herne, C. McCauley, P.M. Sloman, P.W. Linville, J.S. Fishkin, Y.O. Vasylychuk, T.R. Gurr, M. Afanasiev, and other researchers have already studied some features of this problem and some specifics of its revealing, but still many new reasons for it occur quite often, and they are manifested in nearly all the spheres of life.

The group of youth includes all the typical qualities of any other typical large social group. The most common personal traits of young people can be listed as perfectionism, emotional lability, and irritability. Sometimes they

depend much on some opinion which they consider as very ex cathedra and important. And sometimes they are not skilled enough to resolve some important problems, so that they may act quite rudely or even radically as well. Young people have lots of contacts. So that different groups are the places, where all the important issues are discussed and deliberated. Such group deliberation may determine the way of one's behaviour, including the political one. And there is a need to study the factor of deliberation and group influence on radicalization of youth political behaviour.

In our paper we are *aimed at* studying and analysing how deliberation in the group of young people effects radicalization of their political behaviour.

In our study we use the M. Steenberg's definition of deliberation, which the author defines as communication based on the merits of arguments, such as the sophistication of justifications and the generalizability of some important principles [1, p. 23]. R.E. Goodin claims that deliberation involves both intersubjective processes of exchanging arguments and internal processes of reflection based on these arguments [2, p. 94]. But the question is what is happening in the group of like-minded young people as the grouping process often runs on the basis of common ideas, attitudes, beliefs values, etc.? However, the term «enclave deliberation» has been increasingly launched in the literature, and it refers to discussion among like-minded people.

C. Sunstein addresses the problem of «group thinking» which may arise when like-minded people discuss among themselves. It may lead to group polarization and an amplification of cognitive errors [3, p. 183]. We suppose that group thinking can also affect people's beliefs and their behaviour as a matter of fact.

In our study we analyse the influence of group composition and deliberation in this group between its members on the outcomes of such discussion and how it influences their political behaviour. So, we compare the results of deliberation in the groups of like-minded young people (aged from 18 to 35 years old) with the groups, where participants had different opinions about political issues and their views were divided (young people aged from 18 to 35 years old). The analysis is based on the results obtained after the carried out experiment, where young people were invited to deliberate on some urgent political issues.

We test our *hypothesis*, which is recorded as deliberation in the group of like-minded young people tends to radicalize their political views and induces their radical political behaviour.

56 participants took part in this experiment: 35 participants formed the experimental group (19 men and 16 women), and 21 participants formed the control group (12 men and 9 women). Each group was split into sub-groups of 7 participants each, so that the experiment included 5 equal experimental like-minded groups and 3 equal control mixed groups. The topics of experiment were three political issues: 1) inefficient anti-corruption fight, 2) unfavourable situation for young people in the labour market, and 3) financial problems in society. The assignment to the group was made on the basis of pre-experimental testing.

Participants noted their opinions and potential ways of political behaviour twice – before and after deliberation. After deliberation participants noted the result of their group discussion, which was supposed to be some group solution on how to resolve each of three issues through their political behaviour.

The first part of our study showed that the effect of deliberation on group polarization was done. According to Wilcoxon t-test there were statistically significant changes for all the three topics of discussion in the experimental group ($p \leq 0,05$), and the mean values were¹: for ‘inefficient anti-corruption fight’ the level increased from 3,20 to 3,69, for ‘unfavourable situation for young people in the labour market’ it increased from 3,80 to 3,97, and for ‘financial problems in society’ it also increased from 3,80 to 3,91. On the contrary, there were no statistically significant differences in the control group of participants for all three topics.

After this we checked if deliberation had influenced youth political behaviour. There were statistically significant changes in political behaviour in order to resolve all the three political issues before and after deliberation among the participants of the experimental group (according to Wilcoxon t-test, $p \leq 0,05$). The level of radicalism of political behaviour of the participants of the experimental group was recorded as follows²: for ‘inefficient anti-corruption fight’ it increased from 1,71 to 2,06, for ‘unfavourable situation for young people in the labour market’ – increased from 1,34 to 1,77, and for ‘financial problems in society’ it increased from 1,43 to 1,94 as well. And again the statistically significant differences were fixed only in the experimental group.

The results show that the level of group pressure while deliberation was lower in the experimental group (1,60 points out of 3), and the control group

¹ The values were ranged from 1 to 4.

² 1 pointed low level of radicalism; 2 pointed middle level of radicalism; 3 pointed high level of radicalism.

showed a bit higher level of it (2,07 points out of 3). So, it means that it's easier to come to a group solution for like-minded people.

The results of our experiment showed that young people become more confident about their ideas after communication with like-minded others. They infected other people with their enthusiasm, which was enforced with the one of other people. Such group becomes more homogeneous, and discussion by like-minded young people fuelled greater radicalism of thoughts and behaviour.

So that group deliberation can be treated as a factor of radicalization of youth political behaviour, and determine the way of one's political behaviour.

References:

1. Steenbergen M. R. Measuring political deliberation: A discourse quality index / M. R. Steenbergen, A. Bachtige, M. Spordli, J. Steiner // *Comparative European Politics*. – 2003. – 1. – P. 21–48.

2. Goodin R. E. Democratic deliberation within // R. E. Goodin // *Philosophy & Public Affairs*. – 2000. – 29(1). – P. 81–109.

3. Sunstein C. *Republic. com 2.0* / C. Sunstein. – Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Позняк Т.Р.

студентка,

Науковий керівник: Алексєйчук В.І.

кандидат юридичних наук, доцент,

Національний юридичний університет

імені Ярослава Мудрого

ПСИХОЛОГІЯ ПЕРЕХРЕСНОГО ДОПИТУ

У змагальному процесі допит у суді – це один з найважливіших засобів дослідження доказів. Допит у суді – складний процес спілкування між особами. Таке спілкування здійснюється гласно, відкрито. У психологічному плані допит являє собою інформаційно-психологічне спілкування осіб. Це процес обміну інформацією, процес взаємодії, взаємосприйняття учасників. Допит у суді має певні особливості. Як такі можуть бути названі: 1) розширене коло учасників судового допиту; 2) ускладнений інформаційний обмін між учасниками