XXIV NAUČNI SKUP

EMPIRIJSKA ISTRAŽIVANJA U PSIHOLOGIJI

23 – 25. MART 2018. FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET, UNIVERZITET U BEOGRADU



INSTITUT ZA PSIHOLOGIJU LABORATORIJA ZA EKSPERIMENTALNU PSIHOLOGIJU FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET, UNIVERZITET U BEOGRADU



XXIV NAUČNI SKUP

EMPIRIJSKA ISTRAŽIVANJA U PSIHOLOGIJI

23 – 25. MART 2018. FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET, UNIVERZITET U BEOGRADU



INSTITUT ZA PSIHOLOGIJU



LABORATORIJA ZA EKSPERIMENTALNU PSIHOLOGIJU FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET, UNIVERZITET U BEOGRADU

BEOGRAD, 2018



SADRŽAJ

Odbori	3
PLENARNA PREDAVANJA	5
SIMPOZIJUMI	8
Okrugli sto	22
PERCEPCIJA	24
KLINIČKA PSIHOLOGIJA	36
PSIHOLOGIJA UMETNOSTI	47
KOGNITIVNA PSIHOLOGIJA	62
PSIHOLOGIJA OBRAZOVANJA	85
RAZVOJNA PSIHOLOGIJA	105
SOCIJALNA PSIHOLOGIJA	121
PSIHOLOGIJA LIČNOSTI	153
PSIHOLOGIJA RADA	184
FOND KATARINA MARIĆ	188



PROGRAMSKI ODBOR

prof. dr Orlando M. Lourenço

dr Kai Ruggeri

prof. dr Claus-Christian Carbon

prof. dr Agostini Tiziano

dr Milica Vukelić

dr Ivana Stepanović Ilić

prof. dr Dejan Todorović

prof. dr Sunčica Zdravković

doc. dr Iris Žeželj

doc. dr Zoran Pavlović

prof. dr Zvonimir Galić

dr ir. Kirsten E. Bevelander

prof. dr Dušica Filipović Đurđević

prof. dr Slobodan Marković

dr Jérémy Lemoine

dr Dragica Pavlović Babić

doc. Dr Ksenija Krstić

prof. dr Jasmina Kodžopeljić

prof. dr Dražen Domijan

dr Ljiljana Lazarević

doc. dr Oliver Tošković

prof. dr Pavle Valerjev

Prof. dr Denis Bratko

doc. dr Petar Čolović

dr Janko Međedović

dr Anja Wertag

doc. dr Dragana Stanojević

doc. dr Maja Savić

dr Nataša Simić

prof. dr Goran Opačić

prof. dr Aleksandar Kostić

prof. dr Nenad Havelka

dr Kaja Damnjanović (predsednica)



ORGANIZACIONI ODBOR

dr Ljiljana Lazarević, naučni saradnik prof. dr Slobodan Marković Olga Marković Rosić Tamara Popović dr Ivana Stepanović Ilić, naučni saradnik doc. dr Oliver Tošković Marko Živanović dr Kaja Damnjanović, naučni saradnik

Lektura i prelom: Ksenija Mišić



Statistically significant difference was found between two extreme groups (based on the score of LSRS) of participants regarding their autonomy, (F(1,110)=7.010; p<.01), competence (F(1,110)=14.000; p<.01), as well as relatedness (F(1,110)=7.000; p<.01), as hypothesized. This hypothesis suggests that the young adults who have good relationships with their siblings have higher scores on satisfaction of the basic psychological needs than young adults who have bad relationship with their siblings. Furthermore, another hypothesis suggested that younger siblings have higher satisfactory level of the basic psychological needs than older siblings. However, results showed no significant statistical difference between older and younger siblings regarding basic psychological needs (t(183)=0.58, p>.05). Results regarding the final hypothesis suggest significant interactive effect between participant's and sibling's gender (F(1,181)=4.000; p<.05), meaning that females with brothers had higher scores on BPNS, compared to females with sisters, while males with sisters had higher scores on BPNS, compared to males with brothers.

All of the hypothesis are based on empirical studies which provide explanation of this complex relations. Even though there were several weaknesses recognized, this research paper tries to examine the meaning of the sibling relationships for the young adult's personality dynamics.

Keywords: sibling relationship, basic psychological needs, young adults

CAN WE MEASURE SUBTLE DISCRIMINATION OF HOMOSEXUALS? THE EFFECTS OF LEARNING PERSONS' SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND APPEARANCE ON INTERACTION INTENTIONS

Milica Ninković

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade | milicadninkovic@gmail.com

Dunja Paunović

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade

Katarina Vulić

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade

Sofija Vojvodić

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade

Iris Žeželj

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade

Although members of LGBT community are often faced with overt discrimination, they report being even more frequently exposed to subtle discrimination – non-obvious, often unintentional, however biased treatment. Due to its subtle nature, it is difficult to detect. One of its forms might be presuming gender-atypical appearance (feminine males or masculine females) to



be a predictor of homosexual orientation, as well as the behaviour that emerges from this biased presumption. Having in mind that deviations from male gender roles and typical appearance are more severely sanctioned than deviations from female roles, males could be more exposed to this type of bias.

In the current research, we focused on how (a) gender-atypical appearance and (b) information about sexual orientation (SO) affect the willingness to cooperate with the persons concerned. To test this, we devised a within-subjects design -2masculine/feminine) x typicality: 2 (sexual hetero/homosexual), with interaction intention as a dependent variable assessed before and after exposing SO. Gender-typicality of appearance was operationalized via photographs depicting the stimulus-persons in typically masculine or feminine sitting postures, while their SO was provided via short profiles. Firstly, the participants' task was to specify the extent to which they were willing to cooperate with the stimuli-persons regarding their physical appearance, and afterwards to provide the same estimation by combining the information about their SO. Willingness for cooperation was assessed on the 7point Likert scale.

Drawing from a convenient sample of 41 heterosexual men, aged 19-47 (M=21.463, SD=4.382), we demonstrated that subjects initially preferred cooperation with people depicted in masculine posture as opposed to those in feminine posture (M(m)=4.213, SD(m)=0.914; M(f)=3.567, SD(f)=1.095; F(1,40)=16.106, p=.000, η^2 =.287). As expected, after being provided with information about stimuli person's SO, subjects increased ratings of those who were pictured in feminine posture but labelled as heterosexuals (M1=3.567, SD1=1.095; M2=4.232, SD2=1.230; F(1,40)=14.179, p=.000, η^2 =.262).

We interpreted this change as a subtle way of discriminating homosexuals – or to put it differently, of favouring heterosexuals. Their robustness needs to be further backed up with evidence, however, the paradigm we designed seems suitable to detect this type of bias.

Keywords: LGBT, gender identity, subtle discrimination, masculinity/femininity of appearance, sexual orientation