

**Individuals in Communities and
Communities in Cities – the ISA
(Identity Structure Analysis)
Perspective**

Viera Bacava and Peter Babincak

EURODIV PAPER 41.2007

DECEMBER 2007

KTHC - Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital

Viera Bacava and Peter Babincak, *Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Arts,
Presov University in Presov, Slovak Republic*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Series Index:
<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/EURODIVpapers/default.htm>

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei
Corso Magenta, 63, 20123 Milano (I), web site: www.feem.it, e-mail: working.papers@feem.it

The special issue on *Cultural Diversity* collects a selection of papers presented at the multidisciplinary and multinational Marie Curie project on “Cultural diversity in Europe: A series of Conferences” (EURODIV).

EURODIV focuses on cultural diversity in Europe and aims to understand the ways of dealing with diversity and its dynamics in the globalisation era. Its primary objective is to provide top-level training opportunities to researchers in the first years of their research career. EURODIV is a four-year project (2006-2009) co-ordinated by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM) and supported by the European Commission, Sixth Framework Programme, Marie Curie Conferences and Training Courses (contract no. MSCF-CT-2004-516670).

Schedule of Conferences:

- **First Conference “Understanding diversity: Mapping and measuring”**, 26-27 January 2006, FEEM, Milano, Italy. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it
- **Second Conference “Qualitative diversity research: Looking ahead”**, 19-20 September 2006, K.U.Leuven, Leuven, Belgium. Contact person: Maddy Janssens, maddy.janssens@econ.kuleuven.ac.be, and Patrizia Zanoni, patrizia.zanoni@kuleuven.ac.be
- **Third Conference “Diversity in cities: Visible and invisible walls”**, 11-12 September 2007, UCL, London, UK. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it
- **Fourth Conference “Diversity in cities: New models of governance”**, 16-17 September 2008, IPRS, Rome, Italy. Contact person: Raffaele Bracalenti, iprs.it@iprs.it
- **Fifth Conference “Dynamics of diversity in the globalisation era”**, 15-16 September 2009, FEEM, Milan, Italy. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it

EURODIV goes in parallel with SUS.DIV, the Network of Excellence on sustainable development in a diverse world. For further information on EURODIV and SUS.DIV, please visit the web site: www.ebos.com.cy/susdiv.

This batch of papers has been presented at the Third Conference “Diversity in cities: Visible and invisible walls”

Individuals in Communities and Communities in Cities – the ISA (Identity Structure Analysis) Perspective

Summary

The study involves members of three different types of voluntary communities living in the two cities of Eastern Slovakia: religious, environmentalist and motorcyclist. We use the Identity Structure Analysis (ISA) perspective to conceptualise identity and identification patterns of the community's members. While illustrating commonalities (indicating permeable boundaries between the groups), the results also demonstrate the differing identity processes of the groups (indicating diversity). We have found community differences in the evaluation of entities, and in degrees of empathetic and idealistic identification with own and other communities as they relate to the ascertained differences in community members' value systems. The empirical data obtained and presented in this paper can serve as an illustration of how the ISA both as the theoretical framework and research tool can reveal the unique value systems and various facets of identification with (or not with) other people in community members living in cities.

Keywords: Voluntary Communities, Values, Identifications

We are grateful to Peter Weinreich for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper and helpful suggestions. Work on this paper was made possible thanks to the support of the Grant Agency of the Ministry of Education and Slovak Academy of Sciences, Slovak Republic, Grant Project No.1/2523/05 titled "Quality of life psychological dimensions and social capital development". The authors wish to thank Zuzana Makovska and Jana Pircakova for their help in data collecting.

Address for correspondence:

Viera Bacova
Presov University in Presov
17.novembra No.1
08001 Presov
Slovak republic
Phone: +421517570810
E-mail: vbacova@savba.sk

Individuals in communities and communities in cities – the ISA (Identity Structure Analysis) perspective ¹

Viera Bacova, Peter Babincak

Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Arts, Presov University in Presov, Slovak Republic

Key words: voluntary communities, values, identifications

There are not only isolated individuals or broad statistical categories of people living in cities, but various and manifold communities which increase human diversity in the city and give “flavour” to the city life regarding their specific needs and reputations. Members of various communities are not only the users of city, but contribute to shapes, forms, conflicts, and debates about the city. In the plethora of urban problems (Wallman, 2003) the community development and functioning in the city play an important role. In the presented research study we concentrate on empirical data on voluntary community members’ identifications with other persons, communities and large groups. Our research study has been done on the assumption that these identifications are based on the values to which members of voluntary communities subscribe.

Voluntary communities and voluntary community identity

There are communities that are “given” to individuals in that sense that people are born into them – typical family and ethnic communities. There are other communities that individuals choose voluntarily in the course of their life (Dalton, Elias, Wandersman, 2001).

We consider voluntary communities interconnected groups of people that share similar value systems. The shared values influence prospective members to choose and join a particular community and participate in it; they underpin community activities, and help to create group norms recognised by most community members. Compared to ethnic, familial, gender identity, etc., where the origin, antecedents, tradition etc. play a role, we consider the values and beliefs that voluntarily community members “confess”, or hold to, to be more important for the basis of identification of members with others within and outside the community.

We can refer here to the concept of core values that was originally proposed by J. Smolicz in his studies of minorities in Australia in the 1980s. According to Smolicz, core values can be regarded as one of the most fundamental components of a group’s culture. They provide the indispensable link between the group’s cultural and social systems; in their absence both systems would suffer eventual disintegration. It is through core values that social groups can be identified as distinctive ethnic, religious, scientific, or other cultural communities. The similarities in core values give a sense of cohesion and solidarity; an inner cohesion is absent in a random cultural aggregation (Smolicz, 1981).

There are some other city inhabitants' types of identification which are based on urban territoriality – place identity; or on the particular local places of interest – buildings, architecture constructions, parks, transport and other artefacts in a city (for a very interesting study on this issue see Saunderson, 2003). Compared to this, the members of voluntary communities are not physically, residentially separated in a city; their networks may be spread all over the city. The members of those communities do not need to be deprived or disadvantaged (usually they are not), they are often mixed regarding age, education, income etc. They differ in their “ideology” – set of values and beliefs that bridge over the other differences between the individuals. The members of voluntary communities usually have the skills and confidence to take independent action to improve things. We define the community identity here as the sense of oneself as a voluntary community member. It is the “portion” of self-identity that focuses on relatively conscious, personally held beliefs, interpretations and evaluations of oneself and others, in accordance with one's value system.

Identity Structure Analysis conceptual framework

In our approach to voluntary community value systems and community/urban identity we have adopted the ISA conceptual framework developed by Peter Weinreich in 1989 (for a more detailed review see Weinreich & Saunderson, Eds., 2003).

This paper reports findings from a study that employed Identity Structure Analysis as a research tool by elaborating the ISA instrument for empirical “measurement” value aspects of a specific portion of community and urban identity as a type of value-laden identity, through which the voluntary community members perceive other individuals, group and subpopulations in and outside the urban area.

METHOD

Identity instrument

The ISA identity instrument used in this study was custom-designed for the research on social capital, trust and subjective quality of life in university students (n=154): in that research study we focused on those students who subscribed for membership in voluntary communities (Babincak, 2007). In the second stage we used the same ISA identity instrument to acquire data directly from members of the voluntary communities in their settings. The main global results of the second stage of the study are presented in this paper; we use the preceding investigation results obtained from the larger sample of the university students to compare the results obtained from members of the three voluntary communities with those of university students.

An ISA identity instrument consists of *entities* – self-image, other people, social institution, emblems, etc. by means of *bipolar constructs* – discourses which the participants use to talk about, describe and interpret themselves and their social environment.

Constructs

The discourses of interest in our ISA instrument are in the first place about values. We consider the values to represent the content (or the attributes) of internal (own group) and external (other group) types of identification, enabling core and conflicted evaluative dimensions of identity to be assessed for each individual. Therefore we have designed the ISA identity instrument to incorporate as constructs the values from Schwartz' Basic Human Value Scale (which also appeared in the second round of ESS; Schwartz, 2005), and some other constructs expressing social trust, openness of the community and judgment of quality of life (Table 1). Each participant in the study appraised the entities using one bipolar construct at a time by way of centre-zero bipolar rating scales (see Appendix).

Table 1 Voluntary community members identity instrument: constructs

No.	<i>Left pole</i>	<i>Right pole</i>
1	want/s to live safely	want/s to have an exciting life
2	is/are not useful for people around	is/are useful for people around
3	value/s good job foremost	value/s good relationships foremost
4	is/are able to enforce the things which consider/s important	is/are not able to enforce the things which consider/s important
5	think/s for most people money is very important	think/s that for most people those things money can't buy are important
6	devote/s time to the family and close friends	spend/s a lot of time without the family and friends
7	think/s you can't be too careful in dealing with people	think/s it is right to trust others
8	is/are satisfied with their own life	is/are not satisfied with their own life
9	is/are not able to resist when pressured into dishonourable behaviour	is/are able to resist when pressured into dishonourable behaviour
10	like/s to do things their own way	do/es what his/their friends approve
11	easily accept/s new people in own community	it takes a long time to accept new people in own community
12	is/are reliable	is/are not reliable
13	submit/s to others	want/s to rule others
14	believe/s an individual can succeed in implementing good things	believe/s more people can accomplish more
15	do/es not live a good life	do/es live a good life

Entities

In our ISA identity instrument we customise the targets of appraisal (*entities*) that include the mandatory entities (current self, past self, ideal self, admired person and disliked person); members of family and the best friend; own community; members of other communities; (most) people living in the city; local city councillors; (most) people in Slovakia; (most) Roma people and (most) university students (Table 2)

Table 2 Voluntary community members identity instrument: entities

<i>Category</i>	<i>Entity</i>
Mandatory entities	Me as I am now (current self)
	Me as I used to be five years ago (past self)
	Me as I would like to be (ideal self)
	A person I admire
	A person I dislike
Voluntary communities	(most) members of the motorcycling community
	(most) environmentalist communities
	(most) members of religious communities
People in city	(most) people living in my city
	local city councillors
Other groups in Slovakia	(most) people in Slovakia
	(most) university students
	(most) Roma people
Family and close friends	My father
	My mother
	(most) members of the family in which I grew up
	My best friend

Participants in the study

The presented research study involved the members of three different types of voluntary communities living in two medium-sized towns of East Slovakia: Kosice and Presov (approximately 250 and 100 thousand inhabitants; the second and the third biggest towns in Slovakia respectively).

Kosice and Presov are nearby towns (distance between them around 30 km), with similar ethnic (and religious) composition. They have deep historical roots and both towns are regional, administrative and cultural centres of East Slovakia. Their inhabitants are similar in socio-demographic structure.

We selected three voluntary communities: motorcycling, religious (Salesian youth) and environmentalist, as we assume that the communities of these types can be found in most towns and cities everywhere. Compared to voluntary communities that are more or less organised, university students might not be labelled as a community but as a statistical category of people associated only temporarily, although their position and status can lead to some shared perception of others and common attitudes. We use the data obtained from the university students here to give a broader framework because the numbers of voluntary community members are relatively small (18, 25, 20 respectively). The characteristics of the participants are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

The data in communities were gathered by two psychologists and by one psychology student who have been members of “their” community² at the community meetings (Salesian youth)

or individually (motorcyclists and environmentalists). The university students filled in the ISA instrument during their course.

Table 3 Participants in the study: demographic characteristics of voluntary communities and university students

<i>Participants</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M / F</i>	<i>Mean age</i>	<i>City</i>
motorcyclists	18	13/5	25.5	Presov
religious community: Salesian youth	25	13/11*	21.4	Presov
environmentalists	20	8/10*	23.8	Kosice, Presov (small number from other East Slovakia towns)
university students (the first stage of the research study)	154	26/125*	21.6	Kosice, Presov and other East Slovakia towns

* There were some missing values.

Table 4 Participants in the study: characteristics of voluntary communities and university students according to psychologists -- data collectors and members of the community

	<i>Communities</i>			<i>university students</i>
	<i>motorcyclists</i>	<i>religious: Salesian youth</i>	<i>environmentalists</i>	
<i>Community aims</i>	leisure time, independence declaration	missionary work, spiritual growth	environment protection and sustainable society	qualification accomplishment
<i>Community activities</i>	Motor tourism, motor meetings	educative work with children and youth	environmental and global education	individual study activities
<i>Interaction – frequency</i>	regularly weekly and at community actions	regularly weekly	occasionally at community events; regularly as an informal group	daily during terms
<i>Members: age and education</i>	<i>young adults (from 21), high school and college education</i>	young adults, high school and college prevail	young adults, college education prevails	young adults, university students
<i>Leadership</i>	elected representative	formal leader (external authority)	without a formal leader	without a formal leader
<i>Openness</i>	closed (specific rules of entry)	relatively open	open	open

RESULTS

1. Core values of identity -- structural pressure on constructs

Within the ISA framework, “structural pressure on constructs” (SP) refers to the degree of stability with which the people use a construct (or portion of discourse) to appraise self and others in their social world – it expresses an assessment of cognitive-affective compatibilities (positive pressures) and incompatibilities (negative pressures) occurring in the individual’s appraisal of self and others (Weinreich, 2003).

High structural pressures indicate discourses that represent *core evaluative dimensions of identity*. Low or negative structural pressures indicate *ambivalent or conflicted dimensions*, when vacillation or distress is implicated through the undermining of positive – *stabilising* – pressures by negative – *destabilising* – ones (Weinreich, 2003, 126).

1.1 Common core values in communities

The consonant value discourses across the three voluntary communities evidence great commonality (Table 5). The communities strongly endorse the two values (we could denote them moral values) on the first places: *resistance when pressured into dishonourable behaviour* and *reliability*. Also the following order of constructs – the core evaluative dimensions -- is very similar in the three voluntary communities, as well as in university students.

Construct 11 expresses directly the openness / closeness of a community: *easily accept/s new people in own community* versus *it takes a long time to accept new people into own community*. The majority of members of all communities “vote” for openness, although this openness does not correspond with construct 7 about their trust of other people (see part 1.2 Conflicted values in communities) and with the evaluation of and identification with own and other groups (see part 2. Identification patterns of the community’s members).

We have also tried to capture *quality of life* in communities in the constructs 8 and 15: *is/are satisfied with own life* versus *is/are not satisfied with own life*; *do/es not live a good life* versus *do/es live a good life*. The results indicate that in all samples the global judgment about the good life of someone, including oneself, is a more stable evaluative dimension than the assessment of satisfaction with one’s own life (satisfaction can vary in various domains of life).

Table 5 Community members' core evaluative dimensions of identity (*one way ANOVA across three groups*)

No.	Favoured pole of values	motor cyclists n=18		Salesian youth n=25		environ mentalists n=20		Differences between communities	university students n=154
		SP	N	SP	N	SP	N		SP
9R	resistance when pressured into dishonourable behaviour	71.2	17	71.8	24	67.2	19	$F=0.25$ $p= .777$	64.8
12L	reliable	68.1	18	65.8	25	64.2	19	$F=0.20$ $p= .822$	62.8
4 L	able to enforce the things which one considers important	66.0	18	46.1	25	51.3	18	$F=5.99$ $p= .004$	55.8
2 R	useful for people around	65.7	18	63.4	25	59.1	19	$F=0.64$ $p= .531$	64.4
15R	do live a good life	61.6	18	65.1	24	60.2	20	$F=0.45$ $p= .642$	59.8
10L	to do things in own way	60.0	18	54.1	25	56.1	20	$F=0.30$ $p= .740$	62.5
11L	easily accept new people in own community	56.0	15	52.7	24	45.7	18	$F=0.72$ $p= .491$	43.6
8 L	satisfied with own life	55.7	17	49.5	25	44.9	18	$F=1.14$ $p= .327$	51.0
5R	important those things that money can't buy	47.7	16	60.5	21	50.6	19	$F=1.10$ $p= .342$	41.2
6L	time to the family and close friends	45.9	18	47.3	23	51.1	19	$F=0.17$ $p= .844$	47.8
3R	good relationships foremost	41.9	12	43.9	23	38.4	15	$F=0.19$ $p= .831$	38.5

SP refers to the ISA index of structural pressure. Scale range: -100 to +100:

"Core" evaluative dimensions of identity:

**** Above 80

*** 70 to 79

** 60 to 69

* 50 to 59

"Secondary" evaluative dimensions of identity:

+++ 40 to 49

++ 30 to 39

+ 20 to 29

"Conflicted", inconsistently, or non-evaluative dimensions of identity: -20 to +20

Consistently incompatible evaluative dimensions: Large negative.

The discourses in bold highlight those with SP 50 and above that represent the "core" evaluative dimensions of identity.

N is the number of respondents who endorse the indicated pole of the bipolar discourse and contribute to the mean SP.

The communities do not differ in structural pressures on the values; the only significant difference is found in construct 4 (left pole): *able to enforce the things which they consider/s important* (F-ratio 5.99; p=0.004). This result indicates that the motorcyclists have a greater propensity to evaluate their social world in terms of being able to carry out actions considered to be important (construct 4: SP=66.0) than the Salesian youth do (SP=46.1).

1.2 Conflicted values in communities

Some discourses can represent conflicted evaluative dimensions of identity that signify “emotionally confused” identity aspirations, qualities towards which one might aspire in some frames of mind and from which one might wish to dissociate at other times.

Table 6 Community members’ conflicted dimensions of identity

No.	Constructs with both poles	motor cyclists n=18		Salesian youth n=25		environ mentalists n=20		university students n=154	
		SP	N	SP	N	SP	N	SP	N
1	R: have an exciting life	<i>10.6</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>16.2</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>12.4</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>15.3</i>	<i>83</i>
	L: live safely	47.7	<i>8</i>	45.0	<i>13</i>	<i>29.9</i>	<i>6</i>	49.0	<i>70</i>
7	R: it is right to trust others	<i>25.3</i>	<i>8</i>	45.0	<i>19</i>	<i>32.5</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>21.8</i>	<i>64</i>
	L: can’t be too careful in dealing with people	<i>34.9</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>-3.6</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>37.1</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>35.9</i>	<i>86</i>
13	R: rule others	<i>32.6</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>8.9</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>8.3</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>23.3</i>	<i>103</i>
	L: submit/s to others	<i>38.5</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>29.7</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>9.9</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>19.8</i>	<i>49</i>
14	R: more people accomplish more	58.4	<i>4</i>	<i>33.7</i>	<i>6</i>	51.7	<i>7</i>	48.3	<i>48</i>
	L: individual can achieve a good thing	41.8	<i>14</i>	<i>39.7</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>31.0</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>35.7</i>	<i>104</i>

The discourses in bold highlight those with SP 40 and above which represent the “secondary” (bold italic) and “core” (bold) evaluative dimensions of identity. Discourses in italics highlight the “conflicted” dimensions of identity – SP below 20.

N is the number of respondents who endorse the indicated pole of the bipolar discourse and contribute to the mean SP.

In constructs 1, 7, 13 and 14 the members of all three communities inside their community (and also university students) do not agree about preferring the construct polarity. Most of these constructs with low structural pressure are “an arena of stress” (Weinreich, 2003) for participants, as Table 6 shows.

A greater proportion of all three groups relish the independence of individual action over cooperative or collective action (construct 14: 77 % motor cyclists; 76 % Salesian youth; 60 % environmentalists) [students 67 %].

In other respects, the three groups differ in specific ways as follows.

Motorcyclists

More of the 18 motorcyclists aspire to 'ruling others' (13) than to 'submitting to others' (5), and to being cautious in their dealing with others (10) than to trusting them (8). Compared with Salesian youth and environmentalists, more motorcyclists endorse ruling others (72 % cf. 44 % Salesian youth and 40 % environmentalists) [students 67 %] and more subscribe to being cautious with others (56 % cf. 24 % and 25%) [students 56 %]. Propensities to rule others and to *not* trust others predominate among motorcyclists, as we also find among the student population.

Salesian youth

A significantly larger number of the 25 Salesian youth operate from the perspective of trusting others (19) than of being cautious in their dealing with others (6), the latter being highly conflicted over this matter ($SP = -3.6$). Compared with the motorcyclists and environmentalists, more Salesian youth foreground living safely than having an exciting life (52 % cf. 44 % cyclists and 30 % environmentalists) [students 45%] and submitting to others (56 % cf. 28 % and 40 %) [students 32 %]. To sum up, a greater number of Salesian youth endorse trusting others, living safely and submitting to others.

Environmentalists

A greater proportion of environmentalists endorse having an exciting life (60 %) [students 54 %] and trusting others (75 %) [students 42 %].

Especially with the conflicted dimensions of identity we consider the results of a larger university students' sample very helpful – they show that our participants share common as well as conflicted evaluative dimensions of identity with university students. The identity parameters of university students work here as a sort of reference point around which the results of specific communities vary.

2. Identification patterns of the community's members

From the identification parameters we present the results on three parameters: evaluation of entities (Table 7), empathetic identifications with entities (Table 8) and contra identifications with entities (Table 9).

Within the ISA, a person's evaluation of a given entity is defined as one's overall assessment of that entity in terms of the positive and negative evaluative connotations of the attributes one construes in that entity, in accordance with one's value system (Weinreich, 2003, 47).

Table 7 Evaluation of entities in participants (*one way ANOVA across three groups*)

<i>Entities</i>	<i>members of communities</i>			<i>F-ratio</i>	<i>university students n=154</i>
	<i>motorcyclist n=18</i>	<i>religious n=25</i>	<i>environment. n=20</i>		
<i>Voluntary communities</i>					
Environmentalists	<i>0.05</i>	<i>0.17</i>	0.57	13.577***	0.31
Motorcyclists	0.51	<i>0.05</i>	<i>0.11</i>	11.007***	0.17
Religious communities	<i>0.08</i>	0.45	0.33	6.082*	0.31
<i>People in a city and in Slovakia</i>					
People living in my city	<i>0.06</i>	<i>-0.04</i>	<i>-0.19</i>	2.086	-0.04
Local city councillors	<i>0.12</i>	<i>-0.14</i>	<i>-0.11</i>	3.609*	0.03
People in Slovakia	<i>-0.02</i>	<i>-0.10</i>	<i>-0.15</i>	0.623	-0.13
<i>Parents and family</i>					
My father	0.50	0.41	<i>0.26</i>	2.267	0.39
My mother	0.63	0.56	0.40	3.773*	0.54
My family	0.62	0.41	0.36	3.676*	0.50

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Evaluation scale range: -1.00 to + 1.00

Very high: Above 0.70

Moderate: 0.30 to 0.70

Low: -0.10 to 0.30

Very low: Below -0.10

Significant differences and high evaluations are highlighted (0.70 and above).

Low and very low evaluations are in italics (below 0.30).

The empathetic identification index provides the degree of perceived similarity between self and the various entities, and reflects the degree of similarity between the qualities one attributes to each entity, whether “good” or “bad”, and those of one’s self-image.

Table 8 Empathetic identifications with entities in participants (*one way ANOVA across three groups*)

<i>Entities</i>	<i>members of communities</i>			<i>F-ratio</i>	<i>university students n=154</i>
	<i>motorcyclist n=18</i>	<i>religious n=25</i>	<i>environment. n=20</i>		
<i>Voluntary communities</i>					
Environmentalists	0.53	0.55	0.72	5.749**	0.58
Motorcyclists	0.71	0.47	0.39	12.162***	0.49
Religious communities	0.47	0.67	0.54	4.773*	0.59
<i>People in a city and in Slovakia</i>					
People living in my city	0.49	0.43	0.31	3.929*	0.44
Local city councillors	0.54	0.39	0.34	7.081**	0.45
People in Slovakia	0.44	0.46	0.37	1.222	0.40
<i>Parents and family</i>					
My father	0.69	0.65	0.59	0.864	0.66
My mother	0.75	0.71	0.66	1.152	0.73
My family	0.75	0.70	0.64	1.415	0.73

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Empathetic identifications scale range: 0.00 to 1.00

Significant differences and high empathetic identifications are highlighted (0.65 and above).

The extent of a person's contra-identification with the various entities is defined as the similarity between the qualities one attributes to each entity and those from which a person wishes to dissociate.

Table 9 Contra identifications with entities in participants (*one way ANOVA across three groups*)

<i>Entities</i>	<i>members of communities</i>			<i>F-ratio (Chi-square)⁺</i>	<i>university students n=154</i>
	<i>motorcyclist n=18</i>	<i>religious n=25</i>	<i>environment. n=20</i>		
<i>Voluntary communities</i>					
Environmentalists	0.43	0.34	<i>0.15</i>	11.346***	0.28
Motorcyclists	<i>0.17</i>	0.41	0.30	9.985***	0.34
Religious communities	0.41	<i>0.18</i>	<i>0.23</i>	(10.994)**	0.27
<i>People in a city and in Slovakia</i>					
People living in my city	0.38	0.49	0.51	1.635	0.42
Local city councillors	0.36	0.55	0.47	4.705*	0.39
People in Slovakia	0.38	0.53	0.54	2.761	0.48
<i>Parents and family</i>					
My father	<i>0.20</i>	<i>0.23</i>	0.31	2.041	0.24
My mother	<i>0.17</i>	<i>0.18</i>	0.25	1.628	0.21
My family	<i>0.13</i>	<i>0.21</i>	<i>0.24</i>	2.153	0.17

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

⁺In entity 15 the Kruskal-Wallis test was used because of non-normal distribution of contra identification values.

Contra identifications scale range: 0.00 to 1.00

Significant differences and high contra identifications are highlighted (0.45 and above).

Low contra identifications are in italics (below 0.25).

Three communities demonstrate common identification patterns in these identification indices.

Members of all three communities highly positively evaluate and perceive themselves very similarly to their *own community* (high empathetic identification). They evaluate *the other communities* more critically and empathetically identify with them significantly less when compared to their own community.

Members of all three communities highly positively evaluate their *parents and family* and highly empathetically identify with them.

Regarding evaluation and identification with *other people in a city and Slovakia*, all community members evaluate *people living in their city, local city councillors, and people in Slovakia* lowly and empathetically identify themselves with them to a moderate degree.

The three communities differ in evaluation of and in identification with entities as follows.

Motorcyclists evaluate *my family*, *mother* and *local city councillors* entities more positively than the other groups – with the latter they also identify more and contra identify less than the other groups).

Salesian youth compared to motorcyclists evaluate environmentalists more positively and evaluate *my family* entity less.

Environmentalists evaluate parents and family less positively than the other groups; they perceive themselves to be less similar to *people living in my city* than the other groups.

The global image of our participants from the specific motorcyclist community indicate that the motorcyclists -- in spite of their stereotypical image as rebels -- appear to hold more conservative attitudes compared to the members of other communities. With respect to the motorcyclists' identification with their parents and family, there is the possibility that their parents and family are themselves somewhat different from others (close empathetic identification with them is in terms of sharing characteristics).

The high contra identification and also the low evaluation of *local city councillors*, *people living in cities* and *in Slovakia* in members of all three communities is rather surprising, mainly in religious community members. This would deserve special attention. These analyses, however, would take up more space than is available within this paper.

The highly positive evaluation of and highly empathetic identification with their own community in all three communities indicate that they share a common perspective and points of view. While illustrating commonalities (indicating permeable boundaries between the groups), the results also demonstrate the differing identity processes of the groups (indicating diversity).

CONCLUDING COMMENT

The value systems and identification patterns of city communities belong to “community capital”. Community capital exists in the relationships between individuals and it is often defined as the ability of people to work together in groups, communities and organisations -- similarly to social capital (Kearns, 2004). Both have to be studied alongside social relations between individuals and groups and their social settings in order to make efficient urban social policy.

Diversity management in cities comprises the negotiations among a plethora of groups, communities and bodies that participate in social and civic life in an urban setting. Many of the negotiations are significantly influenced by socio-economic status, health, age and other demographic characteristics of individuals, however, many of them are influenced as well by membership in voluntary communities as these mediate not only the perception and attitudes

of individuals, but also loyalty to their city and ways of participation of their members in the city life given that they are pursuing related but different objectives.

The empirical data obtained and presented in this paper can serve as an illustration of how the ISA both as the theoretical framework and research tool can reveal the unique value systems and various facets of identification with (or not with) other people in community members living in cities.

NOTES

1 We are grateful to Peter Weinreich for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper and helpful suggestions.

Work on this paper was made possible thanks to the support of the Grant Agency of the Ministry of Education and Slovak Academy of Sciences, Slovak Republic, Grant Project No. 1/2523/05 titled "Quality of life psychological dimensions and social capital development".

2 The authors wish to thank Zuzana Makovska and Jana Pircakova for their help in data collecting.

References

- Babincak, P. (2007): Satisfaction with life as a psychological dimension of quality of life. (Spokojnosť so životom ako psychologická dimenzia kvality života.) Dissertation Thesis. Presov University in Presov.
- Dalton, J. H., Elias, M. J., Wandersman, A. (2001): Community Psychology: Linking individuals and Communities. Wadsworth: Thomson Learning.
- Kearns, A. (2004): Social Capital, Regeneration and Urban Policy. Retrieved June 30, 2007, from <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/sps/cnrpapersword/cnr15pap.doc>.
- Saunderson, W. (2003): The city, gender, and identity. In: Weinreich, P., & Saunderson, W. (Eds.): *Analysing Identity. Cross-Cultural, Societal and Clinical Contexts*. London: Routledge, 235 -- 254.
- Schwartz, S. (2005): Human Values. Retrieved March 5, 2007, from <http://essedunet.nsd.uib.no/opencms.war/opencms/ess/en/topics/1/index.html>
- Smolicz, J. (1981): Core values and cultural identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol 4, No 1, 75 –90.
- Wallman, S. (2003): The Diversity of Diversity: Implications of the Form and Process of Localised Urban Systems. Retrieved March 1, 2007, from Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index: http://www.feem.it/web/attiv/_wp.html
- Weinreich, P. (2003): Identity exploration: Theory into practice. In: Weinreich, P., & Saunderson, W. (Eds.): *Analysing Identity. Cross-Cultural, Societal and Clinical Contexts*. London: Routledge, 77 -- 110.
- Weinreich, P., & Saunderson, W. (Eds.) (2003): *Analysing Identity. Cross-Cultural, Societal and Clinical Contexts*. London: Routledge.

Appendix

The first page of the ISA instrument: five-point centre-zero scale used to obtain a community member's construal of entities

1	... chce/ú žiť v bezpečí		niečo medzi tým	... chce/ú mať vzrušujúci život	
Ja teraz...	2	1	0	1	2
Rómovia – väčšina z nich...	2	1	0	1	2
Moja matka...	2	1	0	1	2
Väčšina obyvateľov mesta, v ktorom žijem...	2	1	0	1	2
Človek, ktorého najviac obdivujem...	2	1	0	1	2
Väčšina dobrovoľných ochranárov prírody...	2	1	0	1	2
Môj/a najlepší priateľ/ka...	2	1	0	1	2
Predstavitelia mesta, v ktorom žijem...	2	1	0	1	2
Vysokoškolskí študenti...	2	1	0	1	2
Môj otec...	2	1	0	1	2
Väčšina motorkárov (ľudia, ktorí jazdia na motocykloch)...	2	1	0	1	2
Človek, ktorého nemám rád/a...	2	1	0	1	2
Ľudia na Slovensku – väčšina z nich...	2	1	0	1	2
Ja, aký/á by som chcel/a byť...	2	1	0	1	2
Väčšina ľudí, ktorí sa združujú v náboženských spoločenstvách...	2	1	0	1	2
Ja pred 5 rokmi...	2	1	0	1	2
Väčšina členov mojej rodiny, v ktorej som vyrastal/a...	2	1	0	1	2