TITLE: ATTITUDES AND BIASES OF HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TOWARDS

COUNTRIES COMPETING IN 2002 WORLD CUP

AUTHORS: Serdar SAGLAM

PAGES: 237-250

ORIGINAL PDF URL: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/843344

ATTITUDES AND BIASES OF HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TOWARDS COUNTRIES COMPETING IN 2002 WORLD CUP

Dr. Serdar SAĞLAM

Hacettepe University, Faculty of Arts Department of Sociology

Abstract

This article is a study made on the attitudes and prejudice of university students directed towards the countries that had participated in the 2002 World Cup. A representative selection was made among the countries that had earned the right to participate in the 2002 World Cup tournament approximately fifteen days ago. The countries were determined as five types: first, countries that are effective in the world of politics; second, industrialized countries, but those that are less influential in the world of politics; third, developing countries; fourth, non- industrialized, underdeveloped countries or Middle-Eastern countries; fifth, Israel. In the study, thirty-eight countries that had not participated in the tournament were added as if they were competitors, in addition to the countries that had participated in the World Cup. Only one preference for the tournaments is required in the enquiry forms. The results of the questionnaire were analyzed by the SSPS programme.

Key words: 2002 World Cup, attitude, stereotype, prejudice.

2002 DÜNYA KAPASINDA ÜLKELERİN MİLLİ TAKIMLARINA KARŞI H.Ü. ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN TUTUM VE YARGILARI

Özet

Bu makale, üniversite öğrencilerinin 2002 Dünya Kupası'na katılan ülkelere yönelik tutum ve önyargıları üzerine yapılan bir çalışmadır. 2002 Dünya Kupası karşılaşmalarının başlamasından yaklaşık 15 gün kadar önce katılma hakkını kazanmış ülkeler arasından temsili bir seçme yapılmıştır. Bu seçmede 5 tip ülke belirlenmiştir. İlki, dünya politikasında etkili devletler; İkincisi, sanayileşmiş, fakat dünya politikasında etkisi daha az olan devletler; Üçüncüsü, orta derecede gelişmiş devletler; Dördüncüsü, sanayileşmemiş, gelişmemiş veya Orta - Doğu ülkeleri; Beşincisi ise, İsrail. Dünya Kupasına katılan ülkelerin yanında, katılamayan ülkelerden de ilaveler yapılarak hayalî 38 karşılaşma düzenlenmiştir. Bu karşılaşmalar için tek tercih yapılması istenmiştir. Anket uygulamalarının sonuçları, SSPS programında analiz edilerek çözümlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: 2002 Dünya Kupası, tutum, kalıpyargı, önyargı.

The aim of this article is to elicit the attitudes and biases of students at Hacettepe University, one of the most prominent academic institutions in Turkey, towards the countries that had participated in the 2002 World Cup. The study has been based on the analysis of surveys with students who take "Psychology", "Urban Sociology" and "Economic Sociology" courses, all of which are offered to students majoring in Sociology, in the faculty of arts, in the 2001/2002 spring term. Surveys were conducted during the second mid-term of the above-mentioned courses, and the results were analyzed with the help of SPSS, yielding frequency distributions and cross tables.

The Number of student who participated in the survey was 100, which enables the direct results to be represented as percentages without further processing.

Surveys were conducted on May 14-15, 2002, before the media have started campaigns on The World Cup. The reason for selecting these days is that, they would better elicit the preferences for winning countries, attitudes, perceptions and biases towards them, enabling the students to reflect their own approaches without the influence of the media. After commencement of the games, it is assumed that for audiences in various parts of the world, the impact of "attitudes towards countries on the basis of historical, religious and cultural features" would weaken, as factors such as sympathy for some players and performance of the team would dominate the initial preferences.

The World Cup

The World Cup is the most prominent football event. Organized every four years, it has been celebrated as a global football festival. The developments in communication technology and advances in media enhance the impact and attractiveness of the Cup.

The idea of a world cup occurred in the early 1900's and increasing numbers of people supported the idea thereafter. The idea was seriously considered during the Olympic Games in 1928 in Amsterdam, with the pioneering efforts of the secretary general of FIFA, Henri Delaunay. In 1929, in the Barcelona Meeting of FIFA, the organization of first world cup was decided upon with Uruguay being the candidate for the host country (Güley, Erden 2002: 131). Eventually, The World Cup was organized with the efforts of Jules Rimet and Henri Delaunay (Yiğitoğlu, 2002: 67).

The first World Cup was organized in Italy in 1934. Subsequent Cups have been in: 1938 France, 1950 Brazil, 1954 Switzerland, 1958 Sweden, 1962 Chile, 1966 United Kingdom, 1970 Mexico, 1974 Germany, 1978 Argentina, 1982 Spain, 1986 Mexico, 1990 Italy, 1994 United States, 1998 France and 2002 Japan and South Korea.

Started on 31 May 2002 with the opening game between Senegal and France, in the capital of South Korea, Seoul, the 2002 Cup ended in Yokohama in Japan, with the closing game between Brazil and Germany.

The teams competing in The 2002 World Cup are:

Group A: France, Denmark, Uruguay, Senegal

Group B: Spain, Slovenia, Paraguay, South Africa,

Group C: Brazil, Turkey, China, Costa Rica

Group D: South Korea, Portugal, Poland, United States

Group E: Germany, Ireland, Saudi Arabia, Cameroon

Group F: Argentina, Sweden, United Kingdom, Nigeria

Group G: Italy, Croatia, Ecuador, and Mexico

Group H: Japan, Russia, Belgium, Tunisia (Çakır, 2000: 170)

The Concept of Attitude

The concept of attitude is one of the fundamental points of social psychology. Murphy and Newcomb wrote: "Probably no other concept in the entire field of social psychology has covered more area on its own" (Freedman, Sears, Carlsmith 1998: 337). Each traditional definition of attitude emphasizes a different aspect of the concept.

Attitude, being a thought process of wide scope, has numerous different definitions. Hence, relation of attitude with the other thought processes varies from one author to the other, and according to the subject. For instance, concepts of ideology, judgment, bias and attitude are used almost synonymously by many authors (Tolan, İsen, Batmaz 1991: 260).

According to G.W. Alport, an attitude is a state of neural preparation, which is formed by the life experiences and which has a guiding effect of on the behavior of individuals towards all the objects and situations that individual is exposed to (Freedman, Sears, Carlsmith 1998: 267).

According to Muzaffer Şerif, attitude is the opinion of an individual about people; institutions and various issues, and like all the other motives, it defines a characteristic and selective style of reaction (Şerif, 1996: 499).

Eagly and Chaiken defines attitude as a psychological tendency, which is manifested in the positive or negative evaluation of an object or phenomenon to a certain extent (Sakallı, 2001: 116).

According to the recent definitions, attitude consists of evaluation of an object which the individuals are aware of. Attitudes are the positive or negative evaluations of objects, while these evaluations are stored in the mind.

To Katz, attitude is having positive or negative biases towards the world. Two core features are visible in the fundamental structure of attitude: 1. Sensation (perceptive dimension) and 2. Cognitive dimension (beliefs) (Tolan, İsen, Batmaz 1991: 260)

Examining these definitions, it is possible to come to a conclusion with the four core features of attitudes. The first feature is readiness for reaction. Attitude towards an object (a person, group, place, item, idea, situation, food, etc) manifests a readiness for behavior. Secondly, attitude has the power to motivate. A powerful positive or negative attitude towards an object would cause one to behave accordingly. Thirdly, attitudes have a stationary nature. People do not like to change their attitudes. For instance, a young man in his twenties who supports a certain political party has the tendency to continue supporting the same party when he is fifty years old. The fourth and final feature is that attitudes include evaluation. Anything may be liked or disliked. Behaviors about an object are reflections of attitudes towards that object (Sakallı 2001: 106).

Besides attitude, Muzaffer Şerif refers to the concept of social attitude. According to him, a social attitude has the fundamental attributes of a motive. Such an attitude causes a person to favor or dislike certain events. Social attitude determines what is preferable, what is desirable and what is expected. It determines the things to avoid and things

which are not desirable. An attitude is in line with its aim when it causes change in behavior of people. Hence, it would not be misleading if we refer to social attitudes as social motives.

An individual develops attitudes towards people, events or groups during her/his personal development. Once they are developed, these attitudes cause the individual to react in the same characteristic way towards similar people, groups or events (Şerif, 1996: 491)

According to Donald T. Champbell, a social attitude is the consistency of reactions towards social objects. Obviously, consistency of reaction which reveals a social attitude is seen not only in an individual, but in all other members of the group or society (Şerif, 1996: 491).

According to Katz, attitudes have four characteristics. The first is instrumental or adaptation function, which enables the individual to adjust to their work environment. Second is the ego-defensive function. Third is value-expressive function, which is built upon the fact that an individual will perceive certain rules that are dominant in her/his environment and develop a relevant judgment. Attitudes towards an event or situation will develop under the influence of this judgment (Silah 2000: 395).

Attitudes tend to resist change. They do not generally change with the introduction of new facts. In this respect, attitudes are more complex compared to knowledge. People do not change their attitudes without resisting or without facing substantial pressure to do so. The distinction between knowledge and attitude is important to note. Although it is hard to separate them with solid lines, characteristics of attitude include such features as evaluation and the main distinction is the resistance of attitudes to change once they are developed (Freedman, Sears, Carlsmith 1998: 320).

Beliefs and attitudes are often used interchangeably, whereas, in fact, they have notable distinctions. What attitudes have in common with beliefs is that they both act as integration agents between fundamental psychological processes and behaviors. More clearly, an attitude is a continuous organization of motivation, perception and thought processes (Krech, Crutchfield 1980: 180).

Under certain circumstances, the object of an attitude is regarded as a desired movement or action which has a predetermined target. A French person who has an anti-German attitude would regard a German as evil (Krech, Crutchfield 1980: 180).

In some situations, tensions that are inherent in attitudes enable the attitude and the object of the attitude to be favored by the individual. While beliefs are unbiased, attitudes are "pro" or "anti" something. It is possible to mention a pro-English or anti-Russian attitude. However, when talking about beliefs about the shape of the Earth as a sphere, there is no "pro" or "anti" approach (Krech, Crutchfield 1980: 181).

The fundamental feature that makes a person a liable member of her/his reference group is her/his attitudes related to the group. Characteristic features of a culture or a group that an individual belongs to, when examined from the framework of psychological units, are manifested in attitudes that the individual presents in real situations. The reason for this is that these attitudes are merely the psychological consequences of socialization (being a French, an Eskimo, an American or Chinese) of the individual. Briefly, socialization of an individual is reflected in the attitudes of the individual that she/he forms about the values or norms of the reference group or groups (Şerif 196: 492).

According to Muzaffer Şerif, features of attitudes can be classified as follows: 1) Attitudes are not intrinsic, rather, they are developed in relation to certain people or groups or they are learned. 2) Attitudes are literally more or less stable and permanent. That means they are learned. 3) Attitudes always contain a subject-object relationship. They can be determined for a person, an object, an institution, a topic or an event. The relationship of an individual to a group or institution, the political standing of the individual or opinions about other topics reveals her/his attitudes in these contexts. This object-subject relationship in the formation process and functioning of attitudes, relates the attitudes to social values, norms or institutions, groups or certain topics (political, economical, religious, etc). 4) The scope of the object of an attitude may cover a few or more items. The object may be a single item or may be composed of several items under a category. If the idea that "nation X is aggressive" is conveyed to a certain group, millions of X nationals will be regarded as aggressive. A thought that covers millions of items can only emerge with a generalization of concepts. This naturally brings the generalization process which is the fundamental process of conceptualization. 5) Attitudes have motivational or emotional features. This feature distinguishes attitudes from the other learned features of the psychological construct of a person. 6) All the above five features distinguish attitude from other internal conditions or factors. All the attitudes are motives that are acquired in relation to certain objects, people or events (Şerif 1996: 494-496).

Stereotypes and Biases

Stereotypes are beliefs about the dispositions of members of a certain group. Forecasts of stereotypes may emerge in the form of individual opinions or collective ideas (Lord 1997: 299).

Biases and stereotypes are components of social interaction, as they are tools of social life which are based on shared perceptions. They strengthen the shared reality of a group with their distortions on reality (Bilgin 1994: 183).

A stereotype, whether just as a pattern or a cliché, is a frame that effects perception, memory and representation, while bias is an *a priori* judgment which is held before the experience, and is a starting point for opinions. In other words, while stereotypes rest on the perception level, biases, which emerge in a further phase, are related to conceptualization. In this regard, stereotypes make a base for biases. In the sense that Lipman uses, stereotypes are images in our minds. These images, just like the real features of the perception objects, help to perceive the object that they denote (Bilgin, 1994, 173).

Stereotypes are beliefs related to a social group, distinguished by features such as gender, minority, ethnic group, age, etc. Stereotypes are attributes that a social group evokes. These attributes may be cognitive, emotional, behavioral features or evaluations, which may not reflect reality. Though stereotypes are a type of cognitive pattern, they are not confined to the mind; rather they do have behavioral results, even discrimination towards members of distinct groups (Hortaçsu 1998: 229). Stereotypes tend to be stable once they are settled in the group (Şerif 1996: 654).

Biases are negative dogmatic opinions about a certain external group. Biases contain pre-announced, premature, prejudices without prior evidence, towards groups rather than towards individuals. When biases are reflected in behaviors, it is possible to

mention discrimination. In other words, biases are attitudes, while discrimination is a behavior (Bilgin 1994: 172-173).

In literature, biases refer to negative opinions about an outsider group. Group bias may be defined as the negative attitudes of the members of a group, which emerge from the mature norms about the members of another group. As biases contain attitudes originated from group norms, they may be distinguished from personal dislikes towards some individuals in the routine daily interactions. Nevertheless, like the other attitudes that an individual develops towards the outsider group in accordance with its norms, bias towards an outsider group may become such an innate part of the ego system that the individual may perceive this attitude as a personal preference (Şerif 1996: 649).

Biases have two components: The first is the negative feeling towards a group or individual, and the second is judging individuals as members of a group before knowing them, in other words stereotyping. Hence, biases contain attributes both related to emotions and thoughts. Under the influence of these two features, the individual behaves in a distinguished style of her/his own (Cüceloğlu 1991: 543).

Alport has reviewed various points of view on biases, and has distinguished six approaches. The first one, which may be identified as the *historical approach*, regards biases as tools that serve to conserve and legitimize the socio-economic advantages of a social group. A *socio-cultural approach*, referring to the culture and sub-cultures of a society, regards biases as reactions to social change. An example may be anti-Semitism, which may be regarded as a reaction to urbanization. A *conditional approach* relates biases to various influences that the individual confronts, such as learning and conditioning practices. A *psychodynamic approach* explains biases with reference to personality patterns and dynamics. A *phenomenological approach* emphasizes the subjectivity and the individual's perception of the subjects of biases. A *stimulus-object approach* strives to understand biases with reference to the disposition of the target groups. It is assumed that, besides the features that are attributed to the target ethnic group, biases are based on some realistic features, holding some degree of reality. This approach makes the hardest core of biases that is difficult to eliminate (Bilgin 1994: 174).

It is possible to classify various approaches that aim to explain the origins of biases as follows: 1) Biases are learned during early childhood. 2) Biases are components of personality. This approach claims that that there are specific authoritative personality types that promote biases. 3) Biases are natural consequences of group membership. Hehri Tajfel argues that there is an innate tendency in individuals to classify or categorize other people. This categorization causes grouping between people. "We" and "they" approaches emerge as a result. Tajfel has assigned people to randomly formed and randomly named groups and observed that members identified themselves with the group and started to judge the other groups. According to Tajfel, we tend to favor the group that we belong to and regard the other groups as "evil". 4) Degree of perceived similarity is a basis for bias. Referring to the research outputs in the field of interpersonal attractions and changes of attitude, Rokeach argues that biases are based on perceived similarities and differences. We tend to like those who are similar to us and find them attractive, while we develop negative attitudes towards those who are dissimilar. Intensity of biases increases with the degree of unlikeness (Cüceloğlu 1991: 544-545).

Reviewing the literature for research about the attitude patterns towards various national groups gives an idea of how attitudes develop and how they become stable. Findings

cover in brief the following: 1) Attitude patterns start developing at early age. 2) Various political, economic, historical, cultural factors are effective in the development process. 3) Attitude patterns are fostered with knowledge that is available through word of mouth or hearsay. Information obtained in such ways, fills the gaps of knowledge related to reality and eventually forms the reality. 4) Attitude patterns present emotional rather than rationalistic features. 5) Attitudes that became rigid as a result of these factors are hard to change and they do tend to remain stable over time (Kağıtçıbaşı 1999: 1339).

The main considerations in preparation of the surveys and selection of countries

The surveys included questions about the gender, class, department, education level and profession of parents.

By the time the surveys were conducted, the fixture of the World Cup 2002 had not been announced. Hence, hypothetical competitions are arranged between the country teams. As the emphasis of the research is on determining which country is known in what way, what attitudes are dominant towards which country, countries which are thought to have low representability are eliminated from the survey.

Numerous criteria have been used in the selection of countries included in the survey. Initial countries are selected among the ones which have substantial impact on the world economy or on world politics, such as the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Japan, Russia and China. The second group of countries is selected among those which have certain effects in world politics, such as Denmark, Portugal, Sweden and Belgium. The third group consists of semi-developed countries which are not effective in world politics, hence about which less is known in Turkey. The countries selected include Mexico, Uruguay, Argentina, South Africa, Cameroon and Croatia. The fourth group is selected from among Islamic Middle-East countries, most of which are neighbors of Turkey. Although Turkey has strong geographical, historical, cultural and religious ties with these neighboring countries, conflicts are often encountered in numerous issues. Therefore, the attitudes and biases of students towards these countries are thought to be worth investigating. The fifth group consists of only one country, Israel. Israel has a special position regarding its location among Islamic Middle East countries, the Palestinian conflict and the impact of Jewish people on world politics.

Regarding the above classification, variety and number of country teams that participate in the 2002 World Cup are thought to be insufficient. Therefore, countries which do not participate in the Cup, but which are found eligible in terms of their ability to be represented for the purpose of this research are included in the surveys. These countries are Iraq, Iran, Syria, Israel, Azerbaijan and Afghanistan. Hypothetical games among these countries are classified under a different heading such as "If they were able to compete in the World Cup 2002, in the hypothetical games presented below, which country would you like to win?" to distinguish these from the countries which really participate in the World Cup 2002.

Thirty-eight hypothetical games that are arranged between these countries are presented in the form of questions in the survey. Participants are asked to select one country in each question.

Turkey is not included in the thirty eight game pairs. As being the team of the home country of many participants, Turkey would be preferred to other countries and this would lead to a trivial result as far the aim of the research is concerned. However, this is not the only reason for excluding Turkey from this research. An outcome of a survey

that includes Turkey and receives many answers that do not favor Turkey's winning, would deserve further research to determine the reasons for such a fact.

Survey results about the profile of the participants' Analysis of survey forms reveal the following facts:

61 of the participants are female and 39 are male

All the participants are Turkish nationals

55 of the participants are majoring in Philosophy, 27 of them Sociology, 16 Psychology and 12 History.

55 of the participants are third-year students, 29 are in their fourth year, 13 are irregular students, 2 are sophomores and 1 is a freshman.

As far as the profession of fathers is concerned, 29 of the participants stated that their father's profession as civil servant, 23 as free lancer, 11 as architect/engineer, 10 as teacher, 8 as craftsman, 6 a worker, 4 as technician, 3 as businessman, 3 as soldier, 2 as farmer. One participant did not answer this question.

When asked about the profession of their mothers, 65 of the participants answered as housewives, 13 as civil servants, 12 as teachers, 5 as technicians, 2 free lancer, 1 worker, 1 architect/engineer and 1 craftswoman.

The educational level of parents is assumed to be an indicator in the analysis of biases and attitudes of participants. In a scale ranging from illiteracy to undergraduate level, participants are asked to mark the education level of their mothers and fathers separately. As far as the education of fathers is concerned, 40 of the participants answered as college/university graduate, 31 as primary school graduate, 18 as high school and 11 as secondary school. As for the mothers, it is worth noting that the education level drops dramatically. Thirty-nine participants marked their mother's education as primary school graduates, 23 a college or university, 22 as high school, 12 as illiterate and 4 as secondary school graduate.

Analyses of the results reveal that the country preferences for winning do not have a noteworthy correlation with the profession of parents, nor with the educational level of parents. Further, inclusion of these data introduces complexity to the analysis, and the number of participants is not sufficient for this kind of analysis. Hence, these data are presented only to give an idea to relate the preference results with the profile of the participants.

Survey results about preferences

Questions structured as "Which country team would you like to win in the following hypothetical games that would be played in 2002 World Cup?" are answered as follows:

Would you like France or Senegal to win? 21 of the participants preferred France and 78 preferred Senegal winning, and 1 participant did not answer. Senegal is an Islamic country in western Africa. Little is known about Senegal and it has an image of an oppressed country.

Would you like Uruguay or Denmark to win? 58 of the participants favored Uruguay winning and 41 favored Denmark. 1 participant did not answer this question. Uruguay, though not well-known in Turkey, is supported against a European country, Denmark.

Would you like Germany or Saudi Arabia to win? 58 of the participants favored Germany winning and 42 favored Saudi Arabia. Preference of Germany over Saudi Arabia is noteworthy.

Would you like Cameroon or Saudi Arabia to win? 80 of the participants answered as Cameroon and 20 as Saudi Arabia. Cameroon is known as an oppressed African country, while Saudi Arabia is an oil-rich and a strong supporter of United States.

Would you like Cameroon or Germany to win? 68 of the participants favored Cameroon and 32 favored Germany. It is interesting that while Germany was supported against Saudi Arabia and Cameroon was strongly preferred to Saudi Arabia, Cameroon was preferred to Germany. This result reveals how Saudi Arabia is perceived.

Would you like Portugal or the United Kingdom to win? 78 of the participants answered as Portugal and 22 as United Kingdom. Though Portugal has a long past as an imperialist like the United Kingdom, a reason for this preference may be that Portugal ceased its imperialistic activities some time ago.

Would you like Portugal or France to win? 82 of the participants answered as Portugal and 18 as France. The preference of Portugal against France is stronger than against The United Kingdom.

Would you like Argentina or the United Kingdom to win? 86 of the participants answered as Argentina and 14 as the United Kingdom.

Would you like Argentina or Sweden to win? 63 of the participants preferred Argentina while 37 favored Sweden. The difference is not as high as the one in the Argentina-United Kingdom question. A factor for Argentina's preferability may be that Argentina is a well-known country with its superior institutional capability for football.

Would you like Italy or Croatia to win? 54 of the participants preferred Italy while 46 preferred Croatia. The difference in preferences is relatively small compared to the other questions. Croatia is a small and developing European Country which is not well-known in Turkey.

Would you like Italy or Mexico to win? 65 of the participants preferred Mexico and 35 favored Italy.

Would you like Japan or Belgium to win? 59 of the participants preferred Japan, 40 preferred Belgium and 1 participant did not answer this question.

Would you like Japan or Russia to win? Same answer as the Japan-Belgium question: 59 of the participants preferred Japan, 40 preferred Russia and 1 participant did not answer this question.

Would you like Japan or Tunisia to win? 51 of the participants preferred Japan, 48 preferred Tunisia and 1 participant did not answer this question. The three questions that include Japan reveal that this country has a positive image and is favored. Especially its preference over Tunisia, which is thought to be supported against any developed country, can be interpreted as a sign of this positive attitude.

Would you like the United States or Italy to win? 78 of the participants preferred Italy while only 22 preferred United States.

Would you like the United States or Germany to win? 72 of the participants preferred Germany, 27 preferred the United States and 1 participant did not answer this question.

Would you like the United States or Russia to win? 75 of the participants preferred Russia, 25 preferred the United States.

Would you like the United States or Saudi Arabia to win? 61 of the participants preferred Saudi Arabia, 37 preferred United States and 2 participants did not answer this question. The result reveals that the participants who did not support the United States against other countries such as Italy, Germany, Russia, tend to support it against Saudi Arabia. This result is interesting as it shows the negative attitude towards Saudi Arabia.

Would you like the United States or China to win? 78 of the participants preferred China while 21 favored the United States and 1 participant did not answer this question. Preference of China over the United States is strong.

Would you like the United States or South Africa to win? 83 of the participants preferred South Africa while 17 preferred the United States. This is the strongest support that is provided to a country against the United States.

Would you like Russia or China to win? 53 participants favored Russia, 46 favored China and 1 participant did not answer this question.

Would you like Mexico or Saudi Arabia to win? 74 participants favored Mexico, 25 favored Saudi Arabia and 1 participant did not answer the question.

Would you like Uruguay or Saudi Arabia to win? 75 participants favored Uruguay, 24 favored Saudi Arabia and 1 participant did not answer the question. Uruguay is strongly supported against Saudi Arabia.

Would you like Tunisia or Saudi Arabia to win? 79 participants favored Uruguay, 20 favored Saudi Arabia and 1 participant did not answer the question. Tunisia is also strongly supported against Saudi Arabia. Though Saudi Arabia is an Islamic country, it is not preferred over other countries such as Uruguay or Mexico also. This is a noteworthy point.

For the countries that actually do not compete in the World Cup 2002, such as Iraq, Iran, Syria, Azerbaijan and Afghanistan, the question is structured in the following pattern: "If they were able to compete in the World Cup 2002, in the hypothetical games presented below, which country would you like to win?"

In a possible game between the United States and Iraq, which country would you like to win? 64 of the participants preferred Iraq while 36 preferred the United States. It should be noted that at the time the surveys were conducted, Iraq was not invaded by the United States.

In a possible game between the United States and Israel, which country would you like to win? 66 of the participants preferred the United States while 29 supported Israel and 5 did not answer this question. Among all other questions, this is the only one that the United States is supported against a country, and 5 is the highest number of leaving a question unanswered. Answers to this question are also interesting.

In a possible game between the United States and Iran, which country would you like to win? Strikingly close results answers are received for this question: 50 of the participants preferred the United States, 47 preferred Iran and 3 did not answer this question.

In a possible game between Israel and Iraq, which country would you like to win? 72 of the participants favored Iraq, 27 favored Israel and 1 participant did not answer this question.

In a possible game between Israel and Iran, which country would you like to win? 69 of the participants favored Iraq, 29 favored Israel and 2 participants did not answer this question.

In a possible game between Israel and Syria, which country would you like to win? 73 of the participants favored Iraq and 27 favored Israel. It is not surprising that Islamic countries of Middle-East are supported over Israel.

In a possible game between Israel and South Africa, which country would you like to win? 87 of the participants favored South Africa, 11 favored Israel and 1 participant did not answer this question.

In a possible game between Iran and Iraq, which country would you like to win? 61 of the participants favored Iraq, 38 favored Iran and 1 participant did not answer this question. It is interesting to see that majority of the participants supported Iraq over Iran.

In a possible game between Iran and Syria, which country would you like to win? 58 of the participants favored Syria, 40 favored Iran and 1 participant did not answer this question.

In a possible game between Iran and Azerbaijan, which country would you like to win? 91 of the participants favored Azerbaijan, 8 favored Iran and 1 participant did not answer this question. 92 is the highest number of participants supporting a country.

In a possible game between Afghanistan and Azerbaijan, which country would you like to win? 75 of the participants favored Azerbaijan and 25 favored Afghanistan. The number of supporters for Azerbaijan though dropped still is the majority.

In a possible game between Afghanistan and Iran, which country would you like to win? 61 of the participants favored Afghanistan, 38 favored Iran and 1 participant did not answer this question.

In a possible game between Afghanistan and Iraq, which country would you like to win? 58 of the participants favored Afghanistan, 41 favored Iraq and 1 participant did not answer this question.

In a possible game between Afghanistan and Saudi Arabia, which country would you like to win? 65 of the participants favored Afghanistan and 35 favored Saudi Arabia.

Conclusion

This study is based on the analysis of survey results which were conducted on 14-15 May 2002, before the World Cup 2002. Surveys have been conducted with 100 participants, who were students of Hacettepe University, Faculty of Arts, majoring Sociology, Psychology and Philosophy of History.

Surveys are analyzed by using SPSS as the software. A major finding is that, under-developed or developing and oppressed countries are strongly supported more than developed countries. Likewise, semi-developed countries are supported over the industrialized countries which are influential in world politics. Country-level findings are as follows:

Germany, while being supported over the United States, is not supported against Cameroon. Average preference for Germany is 45.

The United Kingdom is not supported against Argentina and Portugal. The preference average of the United Kingdom is 18, which shows that this country does not have a positive image.

Japan is supported against Belgium, Russia and interestingly Tunisia. The average preference of Japan is 56.3, which is high enough to imply that the attitude towards this country is positive. The development process of Japan has been attracting Turkish intellectuals. Further, the nuclear attacks that it has encountered during World War 2 enhanced sympathy in Turkey for Japan beyond that which is available for any other developed country.

The United States is not supported against any country other than Israel. Italy, Germany, China, Russia, South Africa, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Iraq are all strongly supported against the United States. Nine hypothetical games including the United States are presented as questions and the average preference of the United States revealed in these questions is as low as 33.1, which may mean a reaction to this country. The average is raised by the support given to the United States against Israel by 66 participants. The result shows that the attitude of participants towards the United States is quite unfavorable.

Saudi Arabia, which is a rich Islamic Middle-East country is supported only against The United States. In all other hypothetical games with Germany, Cameroon, Mexico, Uruguay Tunisia and Afghanistan, these countries are preferred to Saudi Arabia, leaving the country with a preference as low as 32,4. Preference over The United States by 61 participants raises the average. Saudi Arabia is the least supported country in all the Islamic countries. The main reason may be that it is an oil-rich country which strongly supports the United States in The international arena, and which is not perceived as an oppressed country.

Israel is the only country that is not supported against any country in all the questions. In five hypothetical games with the United States, Iraq, Iran, Syria and South Africa, The average preference for this country is 24.6. The least preference is over South Africa: as low as 11 participants. This low a preference shows the dominant negative attitude and biases towards this country. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Israel's location in The Middle-East, Zionism and lastly Israel's role in the region which recalls United States, may be the reasons for this bias.

Iraq is preferred by 64 participants against the United States, 72 against Israel and 61 against Iran. It has an average preference about 35.5 for the hypothetical games with Israel, the United States, Iran and Afghanistan. It is important to note that Iraq is not only supported against Israel and the United States, but against Iran, also. This may be due to the concerns about Iran's potential threat against the Turkish secular regime.

The average preference of Iran is 51.6 in five hypothetical games with the United States, Israel, Iraq, Iran and Azerbaijan. Iran is supported only against the United States and Israel, by 50 and 69 participants respectively. It is noteworthy that the support against Israel is greater than that against the United States, which denotes the enhanced negativity in attitudes towards Israel. Another important point is that Iran is supported against the United States; this support is not so strong. Further, it is surprising to see that the United States receives the second highest support in this example, by 47

participants, highest being the 66 participants that supported the United States against Israel.

Syria competed in two hypothetical games, where it gained the support of 73 participants against Israel and 58 against Iran. The Average of preference is 65.6, which does not give much idea about the biases.

Questions about Azerbaijan covered games with Iran and Afghanistan in which Azerbaijan is supported by 91 and 75 participants against the rivals respectively. The average preference is as high as 83. The main reason may be Azerbaijan's Turkish origins. Even two competitions revealed the preference of participants.

The average preference for Afghanistan is 52.3 in hypothetical games with Azerbaijan, Iran, Iraq and Saudi Arabia. In all the games except for the one with Azerbaijan, Afghanistan is preferred over other countries. The participants' preference for Afghanistan in games with these countries may be due to the perceived oppressiveness of Afghanistan and its neutral stance against Turkey as well as the biases and negative attitudes towards other countries.

The above findings reveal that students of Hacettepe University as participants of the survey, tend to support developing or semi-developed countries against developed and industrialized countries which have a substantial impact on world politics. In other words, students have positive attitudes towards oppressed countries. Besides, historical, cultural and geographical factors are thought to be in effect over the attitudes of students.

The implementation time of the surveys and The World Cup are far before the time the United States invaded Iraq and important terrorist attacks following 11 September have occurred. Therefore, it should be noted that after these prominent events, preferences and attitudes towards some countries may differ drastically.

REFERENCES

BILGIN, Nuri. (1994), Sosyal Bilimlerin Kavşağında Kimlik Sorunu, Ege Yayıncılık. cup2002.cjb.net.geocities.com/eleme 2002

CÜCELOĞLU, Doğan. (1991), İnsan ve Davranışı, Remzi Kitabevi.

ÇAKIR, Ahmet. (2002), Millî Takım ve Dünya Kupası, Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi, İstanbul.

Dünya Atlası 2005, (2003), Boyut Yayın Grubu, İstanbul.

Dünya Kupası, (2002), İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.

FREEDMAN, Jonathan I., SEARS, David O., CARLSMITH J. Merrill. (1998), Sosyal Psikoloji, İmge Kitabevi, 3. Baskı, İstanbul.

GÜLEY, Erden. (2002), "Futbol Bizim Dünyamız", Top Bir Dünyadır, Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.

HORTAÇSU, Nuran. (1998), Grup İçi ve Gruplar Arası Süreçler, İmge Kitabevi.

KÂĞITÇIBAŞI, Çiğdem. (1983), İnsan ve İnsanlar, Beta Basım/ Yayım Dağıtım, 5. edition.

KÂĞITÇIBAŞI, Çiğdem. (1999), Yeni İnsan ve İnsanlar, Evrim Yayınevi, 10. edition.

KIVANÇ, Halit. (2002), Kupaların Kupası - Dünya Kupası - 1930'dan 2002'ye, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul.

KRECH, David CRUTCHFIELD, Richard S., Sosyal Psikoloji - Teori ve Problemler, Ötüken Yayınları.

KUPER, Simon. (1996), Futbol Asla Sadece Futbol Değildir, Sabah kitapları.

LORD, Charles G. (1997), Social Psychology, Harcourt Brace & Company, Orlando (in Florida), USA.

OKYAY, Sevin. (2002), Gol Atan Kaleye, Phoenix Yayınevi.

SAKALLI, Nuray. (2001), Sosyal Etkiler – Kim Kimi Nasıl Etkiler, İmge Kitabevi.

STEMMLER, Theo. (2000), Futbolun Kısa Tarihi, Dost Kitabevi Yayınları.

ŞERIF, Muzaffer; ŞERIF, Carolyn. (1996), Sosyal Psikolojiye Giriş I - II, Sosyal Yayınları.

TOLAN, Barlas; İSEN, Galip, BATMAZ, Veysel. (1991), Sosyal Psikoloji, Adım Yayıncılık.

VOIGHT, Dieter. (1998), Spor Sosyolojisi, Alkım Yayınları.