

LUBLIN

2.3. Research and Mapping

Include the information regarding the mapping, and the identification of rumours and the data/information to counter them.

2.3.1. Mapping

All the necessary information needed to begin antirumours activities were gathered by a carefully selected external employee cooperating with the Municipality of Lublin for the purpose of C4i project. Mapping and selection of potential partners within the Local Network was conducted as well.

For the purpose of mapping, the list of potential partner organizations was created, including the areas of the biggest concentration of migrants (as described in point. 2.2 – Basic Information), which are:

- 1) Maria Curie-Skłodowska University Campus – Wieniawa
- 2) Medical University Campus – Śródmieście
- 3) Neighbourhood of Centre for Foreigners (asylum seekers) in Lublin - Bronowice

The organizations we were looking for were:

- cultural institutions/NGOs
- NGOs working with specific groups of people, i.e. youth
- universities or students associations
- NGOs working for/on behalf of migrants
- organizations/institutions with networks across the city (providing easy access to neighbourhoods)
- schools
- sports organizations/institutions

We were also open for individuals wanting to cooperate in the process of creating anti-rumours campaign – this is why we invited volunteers to work with us during specific activities carried out by Local Network.

2.3.2. Research

Identifying of rumours as a three step process begun in July 2014. It consisted of:

- (a) focus group interviews with 2 independent groups of Lublin citizens: experts (consisting of both „internal” and „external” profiles, as explained by the „C4i Identifying Rumours Methodology” document provided by the Council of Europe) and 'high street' sample (representatives of cultural organizations, universities, business owners, students and parents)
- (b) questionnaire interviews with a sample of 30 people
- (c) review of existing documentation and data (both statistical, provided by institutions, as well research that was previously conducted).

This is how the preliminary and final list of rumours was created and data to counter them (or leave the matter open) gathered.

(a) Focus group interviews

The research was held by a sociologist affiliated with Catholic University of John Paul II in Lublin, expert in qualitative research, dr Małgorzata Szyszka.

“High street” sample group met on the 7th of July in the City Hall in Lublin. The group consisted of 14 persons, 7 men and 7 women between 20-43 years of age. Vast majority of them were persons employed; only four of the attendants were still students (two of which worked and studied at the same time). The group was very unified when it comes to their educational background – only two of the group members declared secondary education, the rest of them declaring tertiary education level (universities graduates). An important variable in this focus group was having or not foreign friends/acquaintances. It turned out that 12 out of 14 group members declared friendly relations with people of different nationality.

Tab. 1. Friends/acquaintances among foreigners (N=14)

A foreigner is:	YES	NO
Someone who lives in my neighbourhood	10	4
My neighbour	4	10
My work colleague	7	7
A person I work with	4	10
My friend	12	2
My family (close or distant)	2	12

Attendance register of the group is a part of Administrative and Financial Report (point 3.4.)

„Expert” group gathered on the 10th of July in the City Hall in Lublin. The group consisted of 6 persons, out of which 4 were women and 2 men between 25 and 36 years of age. All of them were university graduates, representing The Municipality Of Lublin (4 persons), NGOs (2 persons). Unfortunately, due to summer and vacations plans of most of the persons invited to take part in the meeting, only 6 of them eventually showed up. All of the experts who took part in the meeting declare having friendly relations with foreigners:

Tab. 2. Friends/acquaintances among foreigners (N=6)

A foreigner is:	YES	NO
Someone who lives in my neighbourhood	4	2
My neighbour	3	3
My work colleague	5	1
A person I work with	3	3
My friend	6	0
My family (close or distant)	2	4

Attendance register of the group is a part of Administrative and Financial Report (point 3.4.)

The main goal of the two meetings was identifying the rumours. This task was divided into three steps: 1) spontaneous sharing the rumours heard by participants 2) creating the list of 10 most commonly heard rumours by each participants 3) creating a shared list of 10 most commonly heard rumours about foreigners in Lublin. The results of both groups are presented below:

Tab. 3. Rumours about foreigners identified during focus group interviews

Group I – “high street”	Group II – experts
Gypsies – thieves Russians – drunks Americans – stupid Italians – ‘mama’s boys’, lazy Ukrainians – promiscuous (of women) Jews – stingy French – arrogant English - rude, arrogant Blac people – dirty Arabs/Muslims - terrorists	Jews – rule the world Gypsies – thieves Ukrainians – ‘easy’, cleaning ladies (of women only) Russians – drink a lot Americans – stupid, fat Blacks – dirty Arabs – dirty Germans – invaders Spanish – loud, lazy Chechens – live on social benefits

Representatives of both groups identified ethnic groups that are the targets of rumours the most frequently:

- 1) Gypsies
- 2) Russians
- 3) Jews
- 4) Ukrainians (women!)
- 5) Americans
- 6) Arabs
- 7) Blacks
- 8) Germans
- 9) French
- 10) Spanish
- 11) Italian
- 12) Chechens
- 13) Asians

It is very important to underline, that – as seen in the table above – the rumours are in fact nothing more than stereotypes and prejudices not based on any specific information or data (except maybe for the Chechen community in Lublin). Some of the stereotypes are really easy to address: one of the pieces of information gathered during the meetings is the commonly functioning conception of Ukrainians being uneducated, which – according to the data from Lublin universities – is not true, considering the fact that most of foreign students in Lublin (see point 2.2. - basic information) are Ukrainian nationals.

Participants were also asked to determine the source or reason of the existing rumours. In their opinion there are several sources of such opinions:

- 1) lack of knowledge: most of the stereotypes are repeated and spread among the people who never met a representative of a given nationality or ethnic group

- 2) history: mostly in relation to Jewish community (not present in modern Lublin – the population of people with Jewish origins is less than 10 persons in Lublin; before the WWII, in 1931, there were over 34% of Jews in Lublin), to the Germans and, in some cases, Ukrainians and Russians
- 3) socialization process, school and family upbringing: if you repeat a lie 10 times, it becomes true
- 4) a cure for people's own self esteem: it is a way for people to feel better about themselves
- 5) need to simplify the complex reality: it is easier to remember a negative information than a positive one
- 6) cultural differences magnified by the lack of contact and situations in which they can be explained
- 7) globalization and the fear of losing national identity

Another subject of discussion within both groups were positive and negative outcomes of foreigners choosing to live in Lublin. This is the point of view that – in theory – should broaden the perspective in which migrants are viewed by both groups' participants. Interestingly, this is the part where their opinions were the most general and disconnected to specific nationalities or minorities groups. In their opinion, **the negative outcomes of migration in Lublin are:**

- 1) taking away jobs and stimulating lower pays on the labour market
- 2) foreigners live on welfare and do not have to do anything, they get paid just for being here and get a lot of money while Polish people have to work; foreign students get better scholarships and grants as well as better dorms/take a way places in dorms
- 3) they are a threat to the nation in terms of demographics
- 4) They are a threat to Polish identity
- 5) More foreigners in Lublin means more anti-immigrants movements in Lublin (but also: intercultural integration is a must in order to prevent social conflicts)
- 6) increase of criminal activities
- 7) the necessity to adjust Polish law to the needs of migrants

The positive outcomes of migration in Lublin are:

- 1) development of economy (cheap labour force, business and trade relations; increasing number of foreign students boosts local economy as well)
- 2) getting to know other cultures, broader perspective, mutual learning – only in contact with other culture/perspectives/points of views new ideas are created
- 3) enriching Polish culture through diversity
- 4) learning foreign languages but also new words in Polish language – for example foreign names given to children
- 5) direct contacts that broaden possibilities and perspectives – we can travel, we can see new places, children in mixed couples can be richer when it comes to possibility to learn from two cultures, not just one.

Thanks to the question asked in a non-direct way (what are the positive and negative outcomes), the most comprehensive list of rumours was created. The list of positives can also be used as a great tool to influence the general public and inform them about diversity advantage.

Counteracting rumours

The researcher defined another goal of the meetings which was to determine the most efficient ways of counteracting rumours in the eyes of participants. There are three types of actions mentioned during the interviews:

- 1) **education and integration:** one needs to have a chance to meet different foreigners to be able to really have an opinion about them, therefore creating possibilities for people to meet and interact is crucial. Giving specific information as an “anti-rumour defence system” as well as educating children from the youngest age possible. Very important tool: creating common spaces where people of different culture spend time, such as schools, neighbourhoods and others.
- 2) **awareness raising social campaigns:** showing the positive outcomes of migration in Lublin, explaining what it actually means, helping foreigners but at the same time explaining to the host community why it is important to do that.
- 3) **media:** very important tool in counteracting rumours are the media, unfortunately in many cases, instead of counteracting rumours, they repeat them!

The whole report from the focus group interviews (in Polish) is attached to Lublin Interim Report.

(b) Questionnaire Interviews

The research was conducted in a form of individual questionnaire interviews at

lowered standardization level. Due to the nature of research it was decided to allow a bigger than usually share of open questions. The reason was the need of as many as possible spontaneous responses, not influenced by the set of defined answers to choose from. The questionnaire “Rumours about Migrants and Ethnic Minorities in Lublin” was addressed to people who had a chance to encounter such rumours in their life, thus pre-selection was made to rule out potential respondents without any experience in this area. Question 1 in the questionnaire was therefore of typically control nature.

The questionnaire consisted of three parts and each of them referred to one rumour mentioned by a respondent. It was assumed that each respondent had a chance to encounter more than one rumour. It was in fact the case, as within 30-persons sample, 53 rumours were identified. The interview was conducted by a researcher who instructed respondents about what was expected of them during the interview.

The sample was selected out of 14 neighbourhoods (districts) of Lublin, selected randomly from 27 existing on the map of Lublin. The group consisted of 50% males and 50% females from 22 to 68 years old. Unfortunately within the sample, there is an under-representation of people with primary education level. This was the result of saying no to the researcher by representatives of this group. In this group, especially among older people, the connotation of the word ‘rumour’ is very negative and the response was always ‘I do not pass any rumours on’ or ‘I don’t know any rumours’

Tab. 4. Most targeted ethnic/national groups:

No	Nationality / ethnic group	Frequency	Percent
----	----------------------------	-----------	---------

1	Ukrainians	13	24,5
2	Romani	13	24,5
3	Jews	10	18,9
4	Arabs	6	11,3
5	Chechens	4	7,5
6	Asians	4	7,5
7	Americans	1	1,9
8	Russians	1	1,9
9	Foreigners	1	1,9
Total		53	100

Tab. 5. The rumours were categorized into 5 different groups based on the sphere/area of life they describe:

No	Category	Frequency	Percent	Example
1	Lifestyle	23	43,4	The turks only come here to find a wife of to exploit girls
2	Earning money	17	32,1	Chechens are known for extortions and dealing used cars from abroad
3	Attitude towards the Polish	6	11,3	The ukrainians were extremely cruel towards polish people before and during wwii
4	OTHER	5	9,4	The gypsies are extremely rich.
5	Work	2	3,8	Ukrainians steal jobs from the polish in agriculture, construction work
Total		53	100	

Based on both types of research, a preliminary list of rumours was created and sent to C4i project team. This was the first list, based on first draft of reports from research.

The whole report from questionnaire interviews research is attached to Lublin Interim Report.