European Journal of Social Psychology
Eur. J. Soc. Psychol. **40**, 635–651 (2010)
Published online in Wiley InterScience
(www.interscience.wiley.com) **DOI**: 10.1002/ejsp.745

Special issue article

Cultural values and outgroup negativity: A cross-cultural analysis of early and late adolescents

DAVID SCHIEFER[1]*, ANNA MÖLLERING[1], ELLA DANIEL[2], MAYA BENISH-WEISMAN[2] AND KLAUS BOEHNKE[1]
[1]*Jacobs University Bremen, Germany*
[2]*Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel*

Abstract

Based on Schwartz' theory of cultural values, the present research tested whether the level of outgroup negativity among adolescents is influenced by the preferred values shared by the individual's cultural group. Furthermore, it was expected that this correspondence increases during adolescence, due to (individual and social) identity development in that age period. Measures of cultural values as well as derogatory attitudes towards outgroups were administered to young (age 9-12) and older (age 15-18) adolescents in Germany (Native Germans, Turkish and Former Soviet Union immigrants) and Israel (Native Israelis, Former Soviet Union immigrants, Arab Israelis). Data were analysed on both the individual and the group level. Results confirm the hypothesis that cultural values are associated with outgroup negativity, especially for the culture-level value dimension of hierarchy versus egalitarianism. Both the degree to which a cultural group prefers one value and the degree to which the individual accepts this value for itself are influential for the level of outgroup negativity. On both levels of analyses, our data show that the relationship between the culture-level value dimension of hierarchy versus egalitarianism and outgroup negativity is stronger among older compared to younger adolescents. Our data imply that the cultural context an individual lives in needs more attention when examining origins of outgroup negativity among adolescents. Furthermore, it is argued that relationships between outgroup negativity and relevant predictors undergo crucial changes during adolescence. Copyright © 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

The general phenomenon of outgroup negativity has been widely examined in psychological research. Previous work demonstrated a large number of factors that might explain why members of ethnic or cultural groups tend to derogate outgroups (see, Augoustinos & Reynolds, 2001; Brown, 1995; Kessler & Mummendey, 2008). In recent years, the emergence of derogatory intergroup attitudes have also been approached from a developmental perspective (*cf.* Levy & Killen, 2008), knowing that understanding its developmental basis is of high importance to the early prevention of intergroup hostility. Studying outgroup negativity in childhood and adolescence provides an opportunity to explore its ontogenetic development and its relationship with other variables across an age span where identity, social relations, and cognitive abilities are rapidly developing (Aboud & Amato, 2001; Levy & Killen, 2008; Nesdale, 2001).

BEYOND CHILDHOOD: THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUTGROUP NEGATIVITY IN ADOLESCENCE

Most of the theoretical and empirical work has focused on childhood, offering important insights into the complexity of intergroup attitude development (Aboud, 1988, 2003; Aboud & Amato, 2001; Abrams & Rutland, 2008; Augoustinos &

*Correspondence to: David Schiefer, Jacobs University Bremen, Campus-Ring 1, 28759, Bremen, Germany. E-mail: d.schiefer@jacobs-university.de

Received 30 June 2009
Accepted 19 January 2010

Reynolds, 2001; Bennett & Sani, 2004; Bigler & Liben, 2007; Fishbein, 1996; Hoover & Fishbein, 1999; Katz, 1976; Levy & Killen, 2008; Nesdale, 1999a, 2004). However, while research on the development of intergroup attitudes among children has received increased attention, much less research has been performed on further developmental aspects that pertain to the age period of adolescence (Fishbein, 1996; Hoover & Fishbein, 1999). Aboud (1988) résumés that there is a systematic decline in prejudice beyond the age of 7. Fishbein (1996) as well as Hoover and Fishbein (1999) also argue that during late childhood and adolescence, there should be a decline in prejudice due to massive improvement in social, cognitive, and moral abilities. However, this argumentation is empirically challenged, with some studies showing a remaining level of prejudice and others even an increase in prejudice beyond the age of 7 (Nesdale, 1999b, 2004). Nesdale (2008) argues that there are a variety of circumstances that determine the emergence of prejudice in the following years. The author provides a developmental approach to intergroup attitudes and prejudice that takes into account both childhood and adolescence: Social identity development theory (SIDT, Nesdale, 1999b, 2000, 2001, 2004, 2008). This approach is based on the previously developed social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, & Reicher, 1987). In SIDT, Nesdale (1999b, 2004) proposes that children pass through four different stages of social identity consolidation that may result in prejudice. Children younger than 2–3 years are still in the *undifferentiated* stage, with social categories and corresponding bias not yet being evident. In stage two at around 3 years of age, children develop *ethnic awareness*, meaning they learn from significant others that the people around them belong to social categories. In this stage, the maturing child also learns that he or she is also a member of some type of social category (ethnic self-identification). The increasing awareness of social groups then leads the child to proceed to stage three, *ethnic preference*. In the consideration of this stage, SIDT differs from Aboud's (1988) sociocognitive theory and from social categorization theory, stating that ethnic awareness does not directly initiate negativity toward outgroups but rather an increasing focus and preference for the ingroup. Children learn from their social environment that the ingroup is positively distinct from relevant outgroups. Then, under certain circumstances, this ingroup-focus can turn into an outgroup focus, and ethnic preference can turn into stage four, *ethnic prejudice*. Outgroups are not merely liked less than the ingroup anymore, they are disliked or even hated. One of these circumstances deals with the fact that, according to SIDT, the potential emergence of prejudice is associated with social identity processes (Nesdale, 2004, 2008). The maturing individual increasingly identifies with the own social group. In the course of this identification process, outgroup negativity is developed through adopting the negative attitudes that are prevalent in the individual's social ingroup (Nesdale, 1999b, 2004, 2008; see also Nesdale, Maass, Durkin, & Griffiths, 2005). Similarly, Verkuyten (2003) assumes that ingroup-bias depends on the norms of a social entity that an individual finds themselves in. In contrast to the assumptions of sociocognitive theory (Aboud, 1988), SIDT presumes that the fourth stage may emerge beyond the age of 7. Nesdale (2004) argues ''that it is precisely in this period [beyond the age of seven] that prejudice actually crystallizes and emerges in those children who come to hold such attitudes'' (Nesdale, 2004: p. 229).

The assumption that the development of prejudice is related to social identification processes leads us to the life phase of adolescence. The consolidation of an individual's identity is one important developmental step that has been shown to proceed drastically especially during this age period (e.g., Adams & Marshall, 1996; Erikson, 1959; Marcia, 1966; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001; Schwartz, Montgomery, & Briones, 2006; for an overview see Steinberg, 2008). In early adolescence, the individual begins to explore the own self-concerning who he or she is and what he or she considers to be important to him or herself (e.g., Erikson, 1959; Luyckx, Goossens, & Soenens, 2006; Marcia, 1966; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Over time, the individual then makes a number of commitments to certain aspects of the personality, to beliefs, norms and ways of life, and increasingly perceives them as integral components of the own self (Erikson, 1959; Marcia, 1966; Schwartz et al., 2006). At this it is important that an individual's identity has been proposed to be also influenced by its membership in social groups (Bennett & Sani, 2004; Phinney, 1990; Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). From the work of Phinney (1989) it is even known that in adolescence the development of ethnic identity undergoes similar stages like the development of individual identity, as postulated by Marcia (1966). The individual includes group membership in the own identity and to some extent takes over the group's norms and values (Bennett & Sani, 2004, 2008; Phinney, 1989, 1990; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Identifying with a group means—at least partly—accepting the group norms and values as one's own norms and values (Nesdale, 2004). This refers also to a possible adoption of values, ideals, and beliefs from the *cultural* group the individual lives in (Jensen, 2003; Schwartz et al., 2006).

Thus, we postulate that adolescence is an important age period for the internalization of group norms and values. The central theoretical assumption of this present paper is that in adolescence, outgroup negativity is influenced by norms and

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

values—i.e., the value climate—of a cultural group an individual lives in. We expect that (a) the more an individual accepts cultural values that promote negative perceptions of outgroup, and (b) the more the individual's cultural group shares such values more will the individual show outgroup negativity. The strength of these relationships are expected to increase in the course of adolescence, since with a more mature identity, individuals increasingly commit to the group's norms and values and accept them as guiding standards for their lives.

In the next section, we will outline how we approach this cultural value climate that a maturing adolescent is exposed to.

Outgroup Negativity among Adolescents: The role of Cultural Values

Schwartz et al. (2006) postulate that ''the wider cultural context sets parameters on what individuals can count on during the process of identity development'' (p. 5). In the present paper, we suggest a societal variable that can explain negative attitudes toward outgroups in adolescence, namely *cultural values* (Schwartz, 1999, 2008).

Values can be seen as a fundamental part of an individual's identity (Hitlin & Piliavin, 2004; Verplanken & Holland, 2002). They are incorporated into the self-concept of a person and serve as a guiding standard for attitudes and behavior (Schwartz, 1994). Values can be held by individuals (*cf*. the work of 1994) but also by cultural groups. According to Schwartz (1999, 2008) ''cultural values represent the implicitly and explicitly shared abstract ideas about what is good, right, and desirable in a society'' (Schwartz, 1999: p. 25). Individuals are exposed to these cultural values through a variety of societal institutions (such as economic institutions, legal systems, child-rearing institutions or schools, Schwartz, 2008). Schwartz' theory has some overlaps with other concepts of culture-level dimensions such as Hofstede's approach which describes—among others—the dimension of individualism–collectivism (Hofstede, 1980, 2001). However, it differs in a number of theoretical and empirical aspects and can be seen as a further extension of previous research on culture specific characteristics (for details see Schwartz, 2008).

Schwartz (2008) proposes three central dimensions of cultural values, each suggesting two opposing answers to a particular basic issue that a society is confronted with when regulating human activity. The first dimension deals with the issue of establishing a stable social fabric within a society. This dimension is constituted by *egalitarianism* at the one pole and *hierarchy* at the opposite pole. Egalitarianism promotes the equality of human beings: Social justice and mutual responsibility are the central intentions. The latter promotes the legitimization of status differences within a society. It states that an unequal distribution of power within a society is a natural and desirable condition. Roles are hierarchically structured with a certain number of people being superior while others are comparatively subordinate. The second dimension, *embeddedness* versus *autonomy* deals with the issue of defining the nature of the relations and boundaries between the person and the group. In autonomous cultures, individuals are encouraged to think, feel, and act as unique individuals. This value can be differentiated into intellectual autonomy (follow own ideas and thinking, e.g., being creative and curious) and affective autonomy (follow own attempts for positive affective conditions, e.g., having pleasure and excitement). The embeddedness value emphasizes the integration in a social entity with shared goals and ways of living. The interests of the ingroup are considered to precede the ones of the individual. The third dimension deals with the issue of people's treatment of human and natural resources and distinguishes *harmony* from *mastery*. Harmony values stand for unity with the social and natural environment. One should strive for a world at peace and the protection of the environment. In contrast, mastery values focus on an active self-assertion in order to master, change, and direct the social and natural world. One should be ambitious, seek success, and competence in order to attain group or personal goals.

To the best of our knowledge, examining the relationship between cultural values and outgroup negativity, especially taking a developmental perspective, has been rarely accomplished in previous research. One study that was based on data of a large European social survey (Eurobarometer 2000, *cf*. Thalhammer, Zucha, Enzenhoher, Salfinger, & Ogris, 2001) could show that Schwartz' cultural values relate to attitudes toward immigrants (Leong & Ward, 2006). However, the Eurobarometer survey includes mainly adults, which does not allow the examination of the developmental aspects proposed in the present article.

The cultural value types proposed by Schwartz (1999, 2008) are prone to relate to the rejection of outgroups, though to different degrees (see also Leong & Ward, 2006). The strongest predictions can be made for the *hierarchy–egalitarianism dimension*. Egalitarianism emphasizes the equality of all people in the world. In cultures higher on egalitarianism,

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

members of outgroups might less likely be devaluated. In contrast, in a society where hierarchical relationships between individuals and groups are valued as legitimate, individuals might be more prone to differentiate in- and outgroups, which is one motor of outgroup negativity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Thus, cultures that are located on the hierarchy end of this culture-level value dimension should show the most negative outgroup perception. Furthermore, intellectual and affective *autonomy*, as opposed to *embeddedness*, is a value that emphasizes the individual rather than the group, which in turn should decrease the likelihood of rejecting others based on their group membership. Thus, cultures that are closer to the embeddedness end pole of this culture-level value dimension should also state more outgroup negativity. Last, the aspiration for *harmony* with the social environment should be associated with a weaker tendency to feel negative toward outgroups, since this value is assumed to encourage living in accordance and avoiding conflict with the whole social world (Schwartz, 2008, 2010). Somewhat less clear hypotheses can be generated with regard to the mastery value. Directing and changing the environment to reach individual and group goals can be positively *or* negatively related to the rejection of outgroups, which can, among others, depend on the cooperative versus competitive nature of the relationship to a particular outgroup (Sherif & Sherif, 1953). Hence, we expect less strong effects on outgroup-negativity for the *harmony–mastery* dimension.

Hypotheses

To summarize, our Hypothesis 1 assumes that an adolescent's level of outgroup negativity is a function of cultural values. We expect that this relationship can be found on both the individual and the group level: First, an individual's level of negativity toward outgroups is a function of this individual's acceptance of a particular cultural value type. We assume stronger outgroup negativity among individuals who are closer to the hierarchy, the embeddedness or the mastery pole of the corresponding culture-level value dimension. Over and above this relationship on the individual level, we expect that a person's outgroup negativity is a function of the shared cultural values of the group the person lives in. Members of groups that are closer to the hierarchy, embeddedness, or mastery pole will show more negativity toward outgroups.

Our hypothesis 2 predicts—on both levels—stronger effects for older compared to younger adolescents, since identity development proceeds through the course of identity development in adolescence and cultural values increasingly serve as guiding standards for an individual's life.

The Cultural Groups Under Scrutiny

We examine the above-introduced hypotheses using data of six Native as well as immigrant and minority youth groups in two countries, *Germany* and *Israel*. In both countries, data from the majority groups, *Native Germa*ns and *Native Israelis* were collected. In addition, in both countries adolescents with a *migration background from the Former Soviet Union* (FSU) were sampled. These immigrants are culturally embedded in the Eastern European culture. However, although coming from similar regions of upbringing (FSU countries), these immigrant groups tend to have different cultural backgrounds in the two receiving countries (e.g., Rosenthal, 2005; Silbereisen, Lantermann, & Schmitt-Rodermund, 1999). FSU immigrants in Israel are mostly of Jewish heritage, whereas those that migrated to Germany were of German descent (German *Aussiedler*). Additionally, in each country we studied a second important minority group. In Germany, we collected data from *Turkish immigrants*, a large minority group that in sizable parts immigrated as guest workers in the 1960s (Böttiger, 2005). In Israel, we sampled *Arab* citizens, who form an important minority, albeit without the classical immigration background (e.g., Bar-Tal, 1996).

All these groups were expected to differ in their cultural values, based on the findings presented by Schwartz (2008). For example, Native German adolescents represent the values of Western European countries, with high preference for egalitarianism and autonomy. The Israeli society is similar to Anglo Saxon countries such as the USA (Schwartz, 2008) which are high in autonomy and mastery. The Arab minority of Israel represents the Muslim Middle Eastern cultures that favor embeddedness and hierarchy values. The Turkish immigrants in Germany are still strongly attached to their Turkish heritage (e.g., Piontkowski, Florack, Hoelker, & Obdrzálek, 2000), and can therefore be considered to be more similar to Muslim Middle Eastern cultures than to Western European cultures. The two FSU groups represent cultures such as Russia or Ukraine that are prone to favor mastery, hierarchy, and embeddedness values (*cf.* Schwartz, 2008). Nevertheless, as

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

described above, the cultural socialization of both groups may not be completely the same, due to their religious affiliation (FSU immigrants in Israel) respectively their descent (FSU immigrants to Germany).

Assessing Outgroup Negativity Among Majority and Minority Adolescents

Previous studies that assessed outgroup-related attitudes have usually been focusing on host culture members' views of certain immigrant groups or ''the other'' in more general terms (e.g., Decker & Brähler, 2006; Heitmeyer, 2007). Items like ''Foreigners take away our jobs'' are widely used to assess outgroup hostility, but they cannot be used in the current study as the samples include immigrants themselves. Hence, we were looking for a way to assess outgroup attitudes among members of the majority and of minority groups in a comparable manner. In the present study, we use the term *outgroup negativity* to describe a general tendency to show negative attitudes toward outgroups. We argue that such an underlying outgroup negativity can be derived from assessing attitudes toward different significant outgroups. We refer our assumption to the approach of Zick, Wolf, Kuepper, Davidov, Schmidt, & Heitmeyer (2008). Based on large sample survey data in different European countries, the authors could show that prejudices toward a variety of different groups are substantially interrelated. The authors identified a general underlying syndrome which they call group focused enmity (GFE). From their findings they reasoned that attitudes toward different outgroups ''mirror a general devaluation of outgroups, that is, GFE'' (Zick et al., 2008: p. 364). Interrelations of attitudes toward different (ethnic) groups have also been shown by previous researchers, such as Guimond, Dambrun, Michinov and Duarte (2003), Bratt (2005) as well as Stangor, Sullivan and Ford (1991). Empirical evidence for the existence of a general outgroup negativity factor is also provided by Hoover and Fishbein (1999). Based on these findings, we suppose that our approach is convenient when examining outgroup negativity among majority and minority individuals.

METHOD

Participants

Participants of the research reported here were 3223 students from public schools in Israel and Germany. To compare younger with older adolescents, individuals were divided into two groups. The younger age group consisted of 1585 children (767 male and 809 female, 9 did not report their gender) aged 9–12 ($M = 11$ years and 2 month, $SD = 0.72$). The older age group comprised 1638 adolescents (771 male and 855 female, 12 did not report their gender) aged 15–18 (16 years and 1 month, $SD = 0.74$).

As described in the previous section, we collected data of six cultural groups: Native Jewish Israelis, Israeli Arabs, FSU immigrants to Israel, Native Germans, Turkish immigrants to Germany, and FSU immigrants to Germany. A child or adolescent was seen as having a migration background if she/he or at least one of the parents was born in the FSU or in Turkey, respectively. Individuals were assigned to the Arab sample based on the school she/he was interviewed at. This was a technically reliable assignment, because in Israel a separate school system for Arab students exists. Hence, children whose parents were both born in Israel but who learned in an Arabic school were considered Arab.

Table 1 shows how the participants from the six samples were distributed in the two age groups.

Procedure

Children and adolescents participated in the study voluntarily without being rewarded. In Israel, parent's consent was obtained for all participants, whereas in Germany this was only required for youngsters below the age of 16. Questionnaires were distributed to the students in their schools and were filled during class time in the presence of a member of the research team. Students were assured that their answers were being kept anonymous and were asked to answer spontaneously. Trained research assistants explained the instructions and assisted the adolescents in case of any question.

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

Table 1. Division of participants across ethnic and age groups

	Participants younger age group				Participants older age group			
	Total	Age range (*M*)	Male	Female	Total	Age range (*M*)	Male	Female
Native Germans	770	9–12 (10.98)	378	392	439	15–18 (15.99)	227	212
Turkish immigrants to Germany	315	10–12 (11.09)	153	162	161	15–18 (15.95)	76	85
FSU immigrants to Germany	181	9–12 (11.24)	98	83	171	15–18 (16.02)	75	96
Native Israelis	171	11–12 (11.78)	79	92	343	15–18 (16.30)	164	179
FSU immigrants to Israel	62	11–12 (11.80)	30	32	332	15–18 (16.13)	179	153
Arab Israelis	86[a]	11–12 (11.67)	33	53	192	15–18 (16.52)	57	135
Total[b]	1585	9–12 (11.19)	767[b]	809[b]	1638	15–18 (16.14)	771[b]	855[b]

[a]The original sample size of young Arabs was higher. Analyses of data quality revealed a number of younger Arabs who answered items measuring negativity toward the ingroup systematically high, and those measuring outgroup negativity systematically low. We suppose that these individuals had comprehension difficulties, because such an answer pattern is highly unlikely, given the fact that additional measures not reported here (*cf.* Schiefer, 2009) show very high scores of ingroup identification among these individuals. In order to correct possible data distortion, we excluded 128 participants based on the following criterion: All Arab Israeli individuals younger than 14, who had a score higher than 2.5 (indicating agreement to the item) on both of the ingroup negativity items. Among the other five samples this issue was not a problem. [b]The sum of males and females in this table is lower than the total numbers, due to the fact that a few individuals did not report their gender.

Measures

Outgroup Negativity

Two items were selected from a larger set of items, which were meant to measure derogatory intergroup attitudes among all groups in a comparable way, resembling an indicator of a general outgroup negativity. Participants answered the statement ''When I shake hands with a member of [a particular group], I feel uncomfortable.'' (adapted from Lederer, 1995) as well as the statement ''It is not good to have too much to do with [a particular group] because they are unpleasant to interact with.'' (adapted from Liebhart & Liebhart, 1971). In each of the six samples, respondents had to answer these items with regard to three groups that were considered relevant outgroups. Each participant of a sample had to evaluate the respective two other groups that were part of our study in Germany respectively Israel (e.g., a German child evaluated Turkish and FSU immigrants). Additionally, participants had to rate the two items for ''Blacks''; in Israeli this was narrowed to Ethiopian immigrants. This additional outgroup was chosen because it represents a social category that is not solely based on national or cultural heritage but to a much greater extend (even greater than the category ''Arab'' or ''Turk'') on skin color as a visible characteristic, thus representing what the literature sometimes calls visible minorities (*cf.* Lavergne, Dufour, Trocmé, & Larrivée, 2008; Tafarodi, Kang, & Milne, 2002). This was done to broaden the variety of relevant outgroups. Finally, participants also had to evaluate the items with regard to the own cultural ingroup. This was implemented to test whether the items are validly measuring attitudes toward outgroups, and not, e.g., a general aversion against shaking hands (as formulated in item 1) or interaction with other people (item 2).

Since we wanted to have an indicator of a general outgroup negativity, we checked whether all items in all subgroups would form a uni-factorial structure. Results of an exploratory principal component factor analysis showed that all six variables (two derogation items × three outgroups) load on a single factor explaining 60.29% of the variance of the items with an eigenvalue of $\lambda = 3.61$. This presence of an overlapping factor of outgroup negativity fits to previous work (e.g., Bratt, 2005).

In addition, we created the three attitudes scales (one for each particular outgroup) using the mean of the two items and correlated them with each other. Table 2 documents the intercorrelations of the attitude scales, for all cultural groups and age groups. As can be seen, nearly all correlations show substantially high scores (range of $r = .87$ to $r = .42$). A comparison of the scores with data presented by Zick et al. (2008) shows that the intercorrelations of attitudes toward different outgroups replicates such previous research.

Only in five cases, the correlations are rather low (between .09 and .38). Four of these five lower correlations can be found in the Native Israeli group and the group of FSU immigrants to Israel. In all cases, they represent correlations of

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

Table 2. Intercorrelations of outgroup negativity measures, for both age groups

Ethnic group	Age group	Att1 × Att2[a]	Att1 × Att3[b]	Att2 × Att3[c]
Native Germans	9–12	.75**	.64**	.68**
	15–18	.82**	.75**	.72**
Turkish immigrants to Germany	9–12	.52**	.61**	.65**
	15–18	.71**	.69**	.64**
FSU immigrants to Germany	9–12	.27**	.44**	.53**
	15–18	.42**	.64**	.59**
Native Israelis	9–12	.54**	.57**	.54**
	15–18	.29**	.76**	.38**
FSU immigrants to Israel	9–12	.09	.47**	.51**
	15–18	.18**	.43**	.66**
Arab Israelis	9–12	.75**	.84**	.78**
	15–18	.66**	.61**	.87**

[a]Correlation of attitude toward outgroup 1 and outgroup 2. [b]Correlation of attitude toward outgroup 1 and outgroup 3. [c]Correlation of attitude toward outgroup 2 and outgroup 3. **$p < .01$.

attitudes toward other Jewish groups with the attitude toward Arab Israelis. Obviously, among these samples attitudes toward Arab Israelis have a somewhat different meaning than attitudes toward other Jewish groups, which is not surprising given the ongoing conflict in the Middle East.

The above presented results allowed us to use the overall mean of the six outgroup attitude items to form an indicator of the individual's general outgroup negativity. Study participants rated their agreement on a six-point Likert scale (6 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree). Consistencies for the outgroup negativity measure ranged between $\alpha = .74$ and .91 in the younger age group, respectively $\alpha = .81$ and .91 in the older age group (Table 3).

Cultural Values

We calculated scales of culture-level values on the basis of ratings given by study participants in the Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ, Schwartz & Bardi, 2001; Schwartz & Rubel, 2005). The questionnaire has been primarily used as an individual-level measure, based on Schwartz' (1992) original theory of—ten—individual-level value types (1994; for a comparison of individual and cultural values see Schwartz, 2010). The PVQ has been shown to be suitable for use with children and adolescents (Bubeck & Bilsky, 2004; Knafo & Schwartz, 2003;Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). It has also been

Table 3. Reliabilities of all key variables, documented for all cultural and age groups

Variables	Cronbach's α by age group (9–12/15–18)					
	Germany			Israel		
	Native Germans	Turkish Immigrants	FSU Immigrants	Native Israelis	FSU Immigrants	Israeli Arabs
Affective autonomy	.69/.73	.62/.67	.58/.71	.41/.77	.64/.73	.35/.53
Intellectual autonomy	.57/.47	.49/.48	.40/.41	.38/.52	.50/.57	.43/.35
Embeddedness	.72/.67	.71/.63	.65/.68	.67.69	.71/.69	.69/.63
Egalitarianism	.65/.56	.62/.35	.58/.61	.56/.47	.78/.52	.31/.38
Hierarchy	.41/.30	.43/.32	.45/.42	.13/.35	.16/.32	.44/.39
Harmony[a]	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mastery	.78/.72	.72/.65	.74/.70	.64.65	.63/.69	.56/.61
Outgroup derogation	.86/.91	.85/.87	.77/.83	.84/.81	.74/.82	.91/.91

FSU = Former Soviet Union. [a]No reliability can be computed for the harmony value, because it consists only of one item.

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

shown that the instrument can validly be used in a variety of populations and cultures (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). The questionnaire consists of 25 short descriptions of a particular person's goals, aspirations, or wishes (e.g., ''She/he[1] thinks it is important that every person in the world should be treated equally. She/he believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.''). Each of the portraits represents certain value types. For each item, participants are asked to indicate how similar the portrayed person is to them. The response scale ranged from 6 (very much like me) to 1 (not like me at all).

Although the scale has been primarily used to measure individual-level value preferences, it can also be used to assess the seven culture-level value preferences, based on the theory of Schwartz (2008, 2010). Using the data presented by Schwartz (2008, 2010), one can match the PVQ-items to the appertaining culture-level values. For example, the above mentioned exemplar item stands for the cultural value of egalitarianism. We averaged all items that jointly represent one cultural value type, based on the concept presented in Schwartz (2008), in order to obtain indicators of culture-level values.

Table 3 shows the reliabilities of the cultural values for each cultural group. As can be seen, a number of Cronbach's α coefficients fall in the range below .60. This can be ascribed to the small number of items that were available for these scales (most scales consist of three to for items). Following the logic of the Spearman-Brown formula (e.g., Spearman, 1910) one can estimate based on these coefficients that a higher number of items with the same quality would have lead to a sufficient reliability (*cf.* Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). However, the succeeding analyses need to be interpreted having these reliabilities in mind. In addition, further analyses showed that the combined items of intellectual and affective autonomy lead to a higher reliability ($\alpha = .52$ to .74 in the younger cohort and $\alpha = .62$ to .72 in the older cohort). Therefore, a joint scale of autonomy was used for the subsequent analyses.

Since conceptually two cultural values each form the end poles of a culture-level value dimension, they are assumed to be negatively related. This is the case in our data; correlations of cultural values that form the end poles of a value dimension range between $r = -.34$ and $r^{\circ} = -.50$. To account for that mutual relation, we examine the cultural value *dimensions* instead of the actual values. We generated variables that indicate the individual's location on a given culture level value dimension by subtracting one culture-level value score from the other. The dimension hierarchy–egalitarianism was calculated by subtracting the score for egalitarianism from the score for hierarchy. Higher scores on this new variable indicate a tendency toward hierarchy. The dimension embeddedness–autonomy was calculated similarly by subtracting the score for autonomy from the score for embeddedness. Higher scores on this new variable indicate a tendency toward embeddedness. The same was done for the dimension mastery–harmony, with higher scores indicating a higher tendency toward mastery.

Questionnaire Translation

In Germany, the questionnaires were given to all children in German. In Israel, Arab Israeli participants received questionnaires in Arabic, whereas all other participants received questionnaires in Hebrew. Individuals, who actively requested this, were given a Russian version of the questionnaire. Since the original items chosen for the questionnaire were either in English or in German, items were translated into all of the different languages using strict back-translation procedures, with bilingual translators.

RESULTS

Descriptives

Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations of the key measures for the six groups in Germany and in Israel. Israeli Arabs show the highest tendency toward hierarchy, the Native Germans the lowest. Turkish Immigrants in Germany show the strongest tendency toward embeddedness, Native Germans show the lowest. Native Israelis show the highest tendency toward mastery, whereas Native Germans show the lowest. The highest outgroup negativity was found among the Israeli Arabs, the lowest scores among the FSU immigrants to Germany. To estimate, whether the scores of outgroup negativity

[1]The PVQ exists in two versions, one each for females and males, using the corresponding pronouns when describing the persons.

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

Table 4. Means and standard deviations of all key variables

Variables	*M* (*SD*)					
	Germany			Israel		
	Native Germans	Turkish Immigrants	FSU Immigrants	Native Israelis	FSU Immigrants	Israeli Arabs
Hierarchy–egalitarianism[a]	−1.61 (1.19)	−1.43 (1.29)	−1.32 (1.27)	−1.29 (1.11)	−1.36 (1.13)	−1.02 (1.07)
Embeddedness–autonomy[a]	−0.51 (0.86)	0.04 (0.80)	−0.33 (0.88)	−0.13 (0.91)	−0.49 (0.96)	−0.09 (0.82)
Mastery–harmony[a]	−0.61 (1.67)	−0.29 (1.57)	−0.04 (1.59)	0.81 (1.65)	0.54 (1.42)	−0.39 (1.30)
Outgroup negativity	2.38 (1.37)	2.78 (1.56)	2.37 (1.23)	2.96 (1.36)	2.75 (1.34)	3.37 (1.60)
Derogation ''ingroup''[b]	1.75	2.19	1.83	2.02	1.69	2.77

Note. FSU = Former Soviet Union. [a]Scores represent the difference of one value from the other (e.g., hierarchy–egalitarianism; see Methods section). [b]Ingroup attitudes are documented for comparison. All ingroup attitude scores are significantly lower than outgroup attitude scores.

do not simply reflect an aversion against shaking hands (item 1) or interaction with people (item 2), attitudes toward the own group are documented. As can be seen, attitudes toward the ingroup are all less negative than attitudes toward the outgroups.

Testing the Hypotheses

To test the hypotheses, we performed multilevel analyses using HLM (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). On Level 1 we examined the relationship between the individual's acceptance of a particular cultural value dimension and the individual's outgroup negativity. Secondly we examined the degree to which the actual location of the person's cultural group on a cultural value dimension (Level 2) and his or her outgroup negativity is related. It was postulated that there are significant effects on both levels, and that these effects would be stronger among older compared to younger adolescents.

As a first step, we tested whether a sufficient proportion of the overall variance of outgroup negativity can be attributed to group specific differences. This can be done by calculating the intra class coefficient (ICC) in an *empty model* that has no predictors included. Using the group level variance (τ_{00}) and the individual level variance (σ^2) one can calculate the share of the group level variance (τ_{00}) of the overall variance ($\tau_{00} + \sigma^2$): $p = T_{00}/(\tau_{00} + \sigma^2)$. In our case, 1.01% ($p < .01$) of the overall variance can be explained by group specific differences in the younger age group, whereas 15.48% ($p < .01$) can be explained in the older age group. The stronger proportion of explained variance in the older age group shows that multilevel analyses in the different age groups are worthwhile, and suggests that group level variables may indeed play a larger role in determining the attitudes of older adolescents.

As a second step, we added a particular cultural value dimension on both the individual level (individual preferences, Level 1) and the aggregated group level (group mean, Level 2) and analyzed effects on the individual's degree of outgroup negativity (for information about the mathematical principle behind HLM see Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). The analyses were performed separately for both age groups, in order to examine possible age-related differences in the predicted relations between cultural values and outgroup negativity. Furthermore, the analyses were also performed separately for each cultural value dimensions, a procedure that is suggested by Schwartz (2003) to technically avoid problems associated with multicolinearity and substantively provide for the circumplex structure of value interdependence that would be lost when including all value dimensions simultaneously. Table 5 documents the relevant coefficients for all three cultural value dimensions, separately for both age groups.

As can be seen in Table 5, on both levels there is a significant effect of the cultural value dimension hierarchy–egalitarianism. All coefficients are positive, which means that the closer the individual location on this cultural value dimension is to the hierarchy pole (Level 1), and the higher the group mean is closer to the hierarchy pole (Level 2), the higher is the tendency to show negative attitudes toward outgroups. Importantly, on both levels this effect is stronger for the older compared to the younger age group.

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

Table 5. Individual-level and group-level effects of cultural values on outgroup negativity

	Younger age group			Older age group		
	Coefficient	*T*	df	Coefficient	*T*	df
Hierarchy/Egalitarianism						
Intercept	2.875676**	30.052	4	2.577829**	19.690	4
Individual level effect	0.213775**	6.904	1405	0.222473**	7.550	1473
Group level effect	0.616610	1.206	4	2.339434*	3.409	4
R^2 Level 1[a]	3.21%			3.67%		
R^2 Level 2[b]	—			69.77%		
Embeddedness/Autonomy						
Intercept	2.824028**	64.802	4	2.574636**	10.771	4
Individual level effect	0.047850	0.990	1405	0.066787 ($p < .08$)	1.768	1473
Group level effect	0.894363**	4.805	4	1.010787	0.841	4
R^2 Level 1[a]	—			0.14%		
R^2 Level 2[b]	97.82%			—		
Mastery/Harmony						
Intercept	2.868547**	30.104	4	2.573429**	10.282	4
Individual level effect	0.119794**	4.824	1405	0.075955**	3.318	1473
Group level effect	0.221537	1.143	4	0.278526	0.549	4
R^2 Level 1[a]	1.54%			0.68%		
R^2 Level 2[b]	—			—		

[a]Reduced error variance level 1 (r) compared to empty model, for significant effects. [b]Reduced error variance level 2 (u_0) compared to empty model, for significant effects. $^{*}p < .05$; $^{**}p < .01$.

With regard to the embeddedness–autonomy dimension, results are different for the two levels of analyses. On the individual level, the coefficient is stronger (and marginally significant) for the older age group compared to the younger age group, indicating for the older adolescents that individuals that are closer to the embeddedness pole of the dimension show more outgroup negativity. On the group level it is the other way around: The coefficient for the younger age group is stronger (and significant) compared to the older age group, indicating for the younger adolescents that a group's location that is closer to the embeddedness pole of the dimension is associated with more outgroup negativity among its members.

Regarding the dimension mastery versus harmony, significant effects can be found only on the individual level, indicating that individuals closer to the mastery pole of this dimension show more outgroup negativity. The coefficients are stronger among the younger age group.

Altogether, it can be stated that the predictions can be confirmed with regard to the cultural value dimension hierarchy–egalitarianism. A higher individual tendency to accept the culture's preference for hierarchy together with a lower tendency to accept the culture's preference for egalitarianism is associated with higher outgroup negativity (Level 1). In addition, a more hierarchical and less egalitarian cultural value climate of the cultural group a person lives in is associated with more outgroup negativity of the person (Level 2). The individual acceptance (Level 1) of the culture's embeddedness–autonomy values seems to be more important for outgroup negativity in the older age group, whereas the group's value climate regarding embeddedness and autonomy is more important for outgroup negativity in the younger age group. Furthermore, the group's level of the mastery–harmony dimension is not predictive for the degree of outgroup negativity of its members, whereas the individual acceptance of this cultural value dimension is.[2]

A major hypothesis of this paper concerns age-related differences in the effect of cultural values prevalent in a cultural group (Level 2) and the level of outgroup negativity among the individuals of that group. In order to get additional estimation of the significance of these age differences, we performed a number of univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) using contrast analyses for a significance test. We first tested whether the six cultural samples as well as the two age groups differed with regard to their scores on outgroup negativity. Cultural group membership was used as a factor

[2]A concern one might have when interpreting the presented results is that the impact of cultural values on outgroup negativity is (on both levels) confounded with the fact that in the different samples different outgroups were evaluated. We tested that assumption using negativity toward Blacks (who were evaluated by all individuals of this study) as a dependent measure. All HLM results remained the same.

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

Table 6. Linear Trends of outgroup negativity as a function of cultural values (contrasts obtained from the ANOVAs)

Value	Age groups	Linear Contrast	p	95% Confidence interval	
				Lower bound	Upper bound
Hierarchy–egalitarianism	9–12	.27	*	.01	.52
	15–18	1.02	**	.85	1.18
Embeddedness–autonomy	9–12	.40	**	.17	.63
	15–18	.52	**	.35	.69
Mastery–harmony	9–12	.16	.21	−.09	.42
	15–18	.24	**	.08	.39

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$.

with six levels, each representing one sample. The second factor was age, a two-level factor (9- to 12-year-olds and 15- to 18-year-olds). The main effect of cultural group was significant, $F(5, 2920) = 26.34$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$. Also, a main effect of age could be confirmed, $F(1, 2920) = 20.74$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .007$, younger adolescents expressed more outgroup negativity than older adolescents. To test how cultural values prevalent in the cultural groups predict outgroup negativity among its members, we rank ordered the cultural groups according to their group's location on the three dimensions of cultural values. To give an example, the group's locations on the hierarchy–egalitarianism dimension[3] were −1.02 for Arab Israelis, −1.29 for Native Israelis, −1.32 for FSU immigrants in Germany, −1.36 for FSU immigrants to Israel, −1.43 for Turkish immigrants in Germany, and −1.61 for Native Germans. Base on these scores, Arab Israelis are then treated in the analysis as the group with the strongest tendency toward hierarchy, Native Israelis are treated as having the second strongest tendency, and so on. This way, different rank orderings were obviously obtained for the cultural value dimensions that Schwartz proposes[4]. If, so our rationale, we now find a linear trend in outgroup negativity according to the value-guided rank ordering of cultural groups, we can infer that cultural value dimension of the kind at stake in a given analysis is a relevant determinant of levels of outgroup negativity. For the three rank orders we repeated one-way ANOVAS with the two age groups. Contrast estimates were used to examine a possible linear trend and to compare the two age groups with each other, in order to find out whether the linear trends are stronger among the older compared to the younger cohort. Differences in the linear trends were seen as statistically significant when the contrast estimate of one age group did not fall into the 95% confidence interval of the contrast estimate of the other age group. Higher order trends were left uninterpreted.

Table 6 documents the contrast parameters relevant for our hypotheses. A contrast score below zero indicates less outgroup negativity among groups higher on a cultural value dimension, a score above zero indicates more derogation among groups higher on a cultural value dimension. As can be seen in Table 6, cultural groups that are closer to the hierarchy pole, the embeddedness pole and the mastery pole of the particular value dimension show a linear trend to more negative outgroup attitudes.

Table 6 also documents that the contrast parameters are different in both age groups. It can be seen that the criterion for a significant age difference is only fulfilled for the dimension hierarchy–egalitarianism. Regarding the other two dimensions there is an overlap of the 95% confidence intervals in both age groups. This confirms the results of the HLM analyses. Significant age differences can be assumed for the cultural value dimension of hierarchy versus egalitarianism.

[3]Note that the location on the dimension is indicated by the difference between the two end poles of the dimension. The less negative respectively more positive the score is, the closer is the group to the hierarchy (respectively embeddedness or mastery) pole.

[4]In the ANOVA, only the ordinal information was used, which means that the distances between the factor levels were treated as equal. Obviously this does not numerically reflect the measured differences between the groups (e.g., the difference between Arab and Native Israelis regarding the scores on the hierarchy—egalitarianism dimension is weaker than the difference between FSU immigrants to Germany and Israel). However, we decided to not analytically account for these numerically unequal distances because—with norm samples providing representative information on the ''true'' cultural value levels of the corresponding groups not being available—group-level scores were estimated from our samples. In this situation, weighted contrast analyses would in our opinion have implied an over-interpretation of the sample's estimated location on the cultural value dimensions.

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

DISCUSSION

The present study examined the relationship between the culture-level value dimensions postulated by Schwartz (1999, 2008, 2010) and negative perceptions of outgroups. We established a cross-cultural design, using data of adolescents coming from two different countries, Germany and Israel. Furthermore, in each country participants from the majority society as well as individuals with ethnic minority background took part in the study. The research was implemented to gain further insights regarding developmentally induced variations in the relationship between cultural values and outgroup negativity among adolescents. Hypothesis 1 postulated that (a) the individual acceptance of particular cultural values would be systematically related to their degree of negativity toward outgroups, and (b) that over and above this individual acceptance differences between cultural groups regarding their location on a particular culture-level value dimension would be related to the degree of outgroup negativity among the group's members. These assumptions were based on the consideration that the content of a number of cultural values regards to the importance of social group membership as well as the evaluation of others, including outgroups. In addition, hypothesis 2 predicted that the relationship between cultural values and outgroup negativity enhances during the course of adolescence. This assumption was based on theoretical considerations regarding identity development during adolescence. Identity development involves the exploration of the own person and the finding of an answer to the question ''Who am I?'' (Erikson, 1959). As has been described, this also includes the incorporation of cultural values into the own self (Hitlin & Piliavin, 2004; Nesdale, 2004; Phinney, 1989, 1990; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Verplanken & Holland, 2002). These values increasingly serve as guiding principles for attitudes and behavior—including attitudes toward outgroups.

Our findings support our argumentations, yet the data show that the three culture-level value dimensions are differently predictive for outgroup negativity. In our samples we found that the more an individual has a preference for hierarchy values as opposed to egalitarian values, the more negativity this person states toward outgroups. Over and above this individual-level relationship, individuals of a sample that in our data was located closer to the hierarchy pole of the hierarchy–egalitarianism dimension tended to state more outgroup negativity. All these relationships were found to be stronger for older compared to younger adolescents. Thus, our hypotheses could be confirmed for the hierarchy–egalitarianism dimension.

Regarding the other two dimensions, results showed a different pattern. The individual acceptance of embeddedness (as opposed to autonomy) was found to be (marginally) related to outgroup negativity only among the older adolescents. In turn, the group's locations on the embeddedness–autonomy dimension related to outgroup negativity among the group's members only with respect to the younger adolescents. Regarding the mastery–harmony dimension it was found that only the individual acceptance of mastery versus harmony values (and not the group's location on that dimension) proved to be predictive for outgroup negativity.

Results indicate that especially the cultural-level value dimension hierarchy versus egalitarianism is predictive for outgroup negativity. This finding is comprehensible. The content of the values hierarchy and egalitarianism as described by Schwartz (1999, 2008) allows the most confident predictions, given the fact that a hierarchal thought pattern and a general belief in the equality of individuals and groups has been incorporated by numerous widely acknowledged approaches that attempt to explain origins of outgroup negativity, such as the concept of the authoritarian personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950), right wing authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1998) and social dominance orientation (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). With the present study we could show that this value dichotomy of hierarchy versus egalitarianism is related to the negative perception of outgroups on both the level of individual acceptance and the level of the group's acceptance of such values. To the best of our knowledge, such multilevel finding has rarely been documented. Moreover, our data support our proposition of a developmentally induced change in adolescence due to a further consolidated individual and social identity. Our data suggest that beyond the developmental processes that take place in childhood, such as the ability to distinguish between social categories and an increasing preference for the own ingroup (Aboud, 1988, 2003), identity processes become increasingly important in the following years, and the group an individual lives in can set standards for the individual's thinking and behavior (Phinney, Ong, & Madden, 2000; Schwartz, 2008, 2010).

However, it is an interesting question, why in our data the group's locations on the value dimension embeddedness versus autonomy predict outgroup negativity only among younger adolescents. The embeddedness value emphasizes the importance of being integrated in social groups. The way of life and the goals of the group should provide a meaning of life for individuals. In cultures that prefer embeddedness values, autonomy is preferred less. Own feelings, ideas, ambitions,

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

and attempts for individual independence are suppressed to some extend. Interestingly, being involved in a group versus being an autonomous individual is a theme that becomes important in adolescence as well. It is known that during the course of adolescence, the individual increasingly separates from close family surroundings and develops a more and more autonomous way of life (Fend, 2003; Grotevant, 1998; Larson, Richards, Moneta, Holmbeck, & Duckett, 1996; Steinberg, 2008). One could argue that a group's expectations toward an individual to favor embeddedness are less influential to older adolescents because during the course of adolescence the individual *per se* increasingly strives for individual autonomy for itself. The fact that the embeddedness–autonomy dimension predicts outgroup negativity on the *individual* level (indicating that an individual's tendency toward autonomy reduces outgroup negativity) and that this prediction is somewhat stronger for older adolescents may support this reasoning. However, it is difficult to infer that such an individuation process can account for the less predictive power of a group's embeddedness values for the outgroup attitudes of older adolescents, because such an individuation process refers mainly to the separation from the family environment, not necessarily from the cultural group (*cf*. Phinney, 1989, 1990). Further studies are needed to explore the validity of such a finding. One would need to show that in the course of an individuation process older adolescents accept the embeddedness values of the cultural ingroup less strongly and prefer a more autonomous way of life compared to younger adolescents, and therefore are not influenced in their attitudes by such a value climate as strong as younger adolescents might be.

The culture-level value dimension mastery versus harmony is only predictive for outgroup negativity on the individual level, not on the group level. A group's location on this culture-level value dimension is not significantly related to the outgroup negativity of its members. This finding is not surpising, given the ambiguous predictions one can formulate regarding the relations between a group's preference for mastery and its outgroup perception. The quality of the relationship with a specific outgroup might indeed play a role. Directing and changing the surrounding world, as it is emphasized by the mastery value may be seen as threatened when an outgroup is judged as competitive (Sherif & Sherif, 1953), thus, a group's stronger emphasis of mastery values would predict a stronger rejection of competitive outgroups. The perceptions of groups that are seen as cooperative (Sherif & Sherif, 1953) should not be impacted by the group's higher preference for mastery. This could be a task for further examination. As described earlier in this paper, we assessed attitudes toward different outgroups, but the inclusion of this hypothesis would have exceeded the frame of this paper.

Another interpretation of our finding that the mastery–harmony dimension is only predictive at the individual level is that this variable—as we measured it—might more reflect an individual-level variable. Boehnke, Hadjar and colleagues (Boehnke, Hadjar, & Baier, 2007; Hadjar, 2004, 2005), for example, introduced an individual-level construct named hierarchic self-interest. This latent construct includes individualism, strong ambitions for success, also on the cost of others, as well as the acceptance of status differences between groups. Hierarchic self-interest has been demonstrated to be a strong predictor for outgroup negativity (Boehnke et al., 2007; Hadjar, 2004). In our case, a location close to the mastery pole of the mastery–harmony dimension might rather express such a tendency.

Altogether, we argue that the research on origins of outgroup negativity in adolescence needs to take into account the cultural context an adolescent individual lives in. Adolescence is a crucial age period where an individual's identity is further developed. In the course of identity consolidation cultural values increasingly become guiding standards for a person's thinking and behavior. We suggest to conduct further research on this issue, incorporating measures in the analyses that directly tap identity development. Especially whether individuals with various levels of both commitment and exploration (based on the postulations by Marcia, 1966) or various stages of ethnic identity (*cf*. the stage model of ethnic identity development, Phinney, 1989) differ regarding the link between cultural values and outgroup negativity is an important task for future research.

Over and above the developmental-psychological arguments of this paper, a general statement can be made that when looking at variables which might explain outgroup negativity, the present results indicate that culture might have a moderating function. Most of the research on outgroup negativity has focused its attention on variables on the individual level, e.g., work on right wing authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1998), social dominance orientation (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), or other personality variables such as tolerance of ambiguity and need for closure (e.g., Shah, Kruglanski, & Thompson, 1998). However, research on group-level variables and their influence on outgroup negativity is an issue that has been almost totally neglected so far. In line with Schwartz (2008, 2010) we argue that the above mentioned individual-difference variables and their relation to outgroup negativity are influenced by group-level variables such as the values preferred in a culture. For example, in a meta-analysis, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) found that in 5% of the studies contact was related to more outgroup negativity, which is contrary to theoretical considerations (e.g., Allport, 1954). Pettigrew

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

(2008) emphasizes the need to further study conditions under which contact might lead to more rejection. ''Factors that curb contact's ability to reduce prejudice are now the most problematic theoretically, yet the least understood'' (Pettigrew, 2008: p. 190). Cultural values may explain some of that variance. An individual must be ready and open for positive contact experiences. The values one receives from a culture can hinder or promote the positive effects of contact. For example, in egalitarian cultures, contact has a higher chance to positively impact outgroup attitudes. In a culture that promotes hierarchy values, contact to a group lower in status might differentially impact the attitudes toward this group compared to cultures that ascribe less importance to this value.

Critical Reflection

Some limitations are to be noted regarding the present findings. The first is the cross-sectional nature of the study that precludes talking about causal relations. Hence, in our study we can (and so we do) only claim relations instead of causes.

We furthermore chose the mean scores of the samples on the culture-level value dimensions as an indicator of the cultural values prevalent in that cultural group. Whether the sample means represent the values prevalent in the particular culture can be discussed. However, Schwartz (2008, 2010) postulate that such a procedure is an appropriate way of assessing cultural values. The author states that the average importance of a certain value reflects the impact of exposure to the same culture and hence, the averaged individual responses can point to the latent cultural value orientations in a society. Nevertheless, we remind the reader that the rank order of our cultural samples regarding their locations on the value dimensions is derived from the sample's mean. A replication of this study using different cultural samples would support our findings.

Another critical point is that reliabilities are in some case rather low, indicating that the findings have to be interpreted with some caution. Furthermore, the reader could argue that stronger effects in the older age group may be due to comprehension problems among the younger participants that might have lead to less reliable data. However, our analyses of psychometric properties did not show any serious age differences regarding the reliability of the data. Hence, we argue that age-related differences in comprehension cannot account for the findings.

Furthermore, outgroup negativity is a complex issue and regards to different dimensions, such as intergroup attitudes, intergroup emotions, social distance, and intergroup behavior (e.g., Fishbein, 1996; Kleinert, 2004). Developmentally induced changes may be differently evident in various dimensions of outgroup negativity. In the present study a narrow aspect of derogation was focused on. In the widest sense, our measure taps social distance or readiness for contact. Furthermore, we used items that contain mainly emotional aspects such as intergroup anxiety. The inclusion of items that additionally capture the cognitive, evaluative aspects of outgroup perception might lead to more differentiated insights.

At last, our measure of outgroup negativity was operationalized as a general negativity extracted from derogatory attitudes toward three particular outgroups. However, although previous research strongly supported an underlying factor of outgroup negativity (*cf*. Zick et al., 2008), the way cultural values relate to outgroup negativity might also depend on the particular outgroup that is evaluated. For example, whether or not cultural values influence the attitude of a Native Israeli adolescent toward a certain outgroup depends on whether the outgroup is that of Jewish Immigrants from the FSU or that of Arab Israelis. The relationship between Native Israelis and these two outgroups is highly different. FSU immigrants may be perceived as belonging to a common ingroup (*cf*. Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) based on the shared religious background (and corresponding values). In contrast, the Arab group is much more perceived as an outgroup by Jewish Israelis. Hence, the specific role of cultural values for negative attitudes toward particular outgroups could earn more attention in future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank both reviewers and editors for the interest in our work and the very constructive comments on earlier versions of this paper. Furthermore, we thank the German Ministry of Education and Science (Bundesministerium fue Bildung und Forschung, BMBF) for funding the Germany-Israeli research project 'Identity Development and Value

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

Transmission among Veteran and Migrant Adolescents and their Families in Germany and Israel: Life Transitions and Contexts' which this article is based on.

REFERENCES

Aboud, F. E. (1988). *Children and prejudice*. New York: Blackwell.

Aboud, F. E. (2003). The formation of in-group favoritism and out-group prejudice in young children: Are they distinct attitudes? *Developmental Psychology*, *39*, 48–60.

Aboud, F. E. & Amato, M. (2001). Developmental and socialization influences on intergroup bias. In R. Brown & S. L. Gaertner, (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology* (pp. 65–85). Oxford: Blackwell.

Abrams, D. & Rutland, A. (2008). The development of subjective group dynamics. In S. R. Levy & M. Killen, (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 47–65). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Adams, G. R. & Marshall, S. K. (1996). A developmental social psychology of identity: Understanding the person-in-context. *Journal of Adolescence*, *19*, 429–442.

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E. Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality.* New York: Harper and Row.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Oxford, England: Addison-Wesley.

Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other ''a uthoritarian personality'' In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 47–92). San Diego: Academic Press.

Augoustinos, M. & Reynolds, K. J. (2001). *Understanding prejudice, racism and social conflict*. London: Sage.

Bar-Tal, D. (1996). Development of social categories and stereotypes in early childhood: The case of ''The Arab'' concept formation, stereotype and attitudes by Jewish children in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *20*, 341–370.

Bennett, M. & Sani, F. (2004). *The development of the social self*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Bennett, M. & Sani, F. (2008). Children's subjective identification with social groups. In S. R. Levy & M. Killen, (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adolescence* (pp. 19–31). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bigler, R. S. & Liben, L. S. (2007). Developmental intergroup theory: Explaining and reducing children's social stereotyping and prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*, 162–166.

Boehnke, K. Hadjar, A., & Baier, D. (2007). Parent-child value similarity: The role of zeitgeist. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *69*, 778–792.

Böttiger, H. (2005). *Migration in deutschland - analysen und perspektiven [Migration in Germany - analyses and perspectives]*. Göttingen: Sierke Verlag.

Bratt, C. (2005). The structure of attitudes toward non-western immigrant groups: Second-order factor analysis of attitudes among Norwegian adolescents. *Group Processes and Intergroup relations*, *8*, 447–469.

Brown, R. (1995). *Prejudice: its social psychology.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Bubeck, M. & Bilsky, W. (2004). Value structure at an early age. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, *63*, 31–41.

Decker, O. & Brähler, E. (2006). *Vom Rand zur Mitte. Rechtsextreme Einstellungen und ihre Einflussfaktoren in Deutschland [From the brink to the middle. Right-wing attitudes and their antecedents in Germany]*. Berlin: Wagemann Medien GmbH.

Erikson, E. H. (1959). Identity and the life cycle: Selected papers. *Psychological Issues*, *1*, 1–171.

Fend, H. (2003). *Entwicklungspsychologie des Jugendalters. Ein Lehrbuch für pädagogische und psychologische Berufe. [Developmental psychology of adolescents. A textbook for pedagogic and psychological professions]*. Opladen: Vs Verlag.

Fishbein, H. D. (1996). *Peer prejudice and discrimination: Evolutionary, cultural, and developmental dynamics*. Westview Press.

Gaertner, S. L. & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Grotevant, H. D. (1998). Adolescent development in family contexts. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg, (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology, 5th ed. Vol 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 1097–1149). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Guimond, S., Dambrun, M. Michinov, N., & Duarte, S. (2003). Does social dominance generate prejudice? Integrating individual and contextual determinants of intergroup cognitions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*, 697–721.

Hadjar, A. (2004). *Ellenbogenmentalität und Fremdenfeindlichkeit bei Jugendlichen. Die Rolle des Hierarchischen Selbstinteresses [Elbow mentality and xenophobia among adolescents: The role of Hierarchic Self-Interest]*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Hadjar, A. (2005). Hierarchisches Selbstinteresse und Fremdenfeindlichkeit bei Jugendlichen [Hierarchic Self Interest and outgroup derogation among adolescents]. *Gruppendynamik und Organisationsberatung*, *36*, 103–126.

Heitmeyer, W. (2007). *Deutsche Zustände. Folge 6 [German States. Series 6]*. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

Hitlin, S. & Piliavin, J. A. (2004). Values: Reviving a dormant concept. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *30*, 359–393.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values*. London: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills CA. Sage.

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

Hoover, R. & Fishbein, H. D. (1999). The development of prejudice and sex role stereotyping in White adolescents and White young adults. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *20*, 431–448.
Jensen, L. A. (2003). Coming of age in a multicultural world: Globalization and adolescent cultural identity formation. *Applied Developmental Science*, *7*, 189–196.
Katz, P. A. (1976). *Towards the elimination of racism*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
Kessler, T. & Mummendey, A., (2008). Prejudice and intergroup relations. In M. Hewstone, W. Stroebe, & K. Jonas, (Eds.), *Introduction to social psychology. A European perspective* (pp. 290–314). Oxford: Blackwell.
Kleinert, C. (2004). *Fremdenfeindlichkeit. Einstellungen junger Deutscher zu Migranten [Xenophobia. Attitudes of young Germans towards immingrants]*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
Knafo, A. & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Parenting and adolescents' accuracy in perceiving parental values. *Child Development*, *74*, 595–611.
Larson, R. W., Richards, M. H., Moneta, G. Holmbeck, G., & Duckett, E. (1996). Changes in adolescents' daily interactions with their families from ages 10 to 18: Disengagement and transformation. *Developmental Psychology*, *32*, 744–754.
Lavergne, C., Dufour, S. Trocmé, N., & Larrivée, M. C. (2008). Visible minority, aboriginal, and caucasian children investigated by Canadian protective services. *Child Welfare Journal*, *87*, 59–76.
Lederer, G. (1995). Der Fragebogen [The questionnaire]. In G. Lederer & P. Schmidt (Eds.), *Autoritarismus und Gesellschaft: Trendanalysen und Vergleichende Jugenduntersuchungen* 1945-1993 [Authoritarianism and society: Trend analyses and comparative youth studies 1945–1993] (pp. 389–401). Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
Leong, C. H. & Ward, C. (2006). Cultural values and attitudes toward immigrants and multiculturalism: The case of the Eurobarometer survey on racism and xenophobia. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *30* 799–810.
Levy, S. R. & Killen, M. (2008). *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood*. New York: University Press.
Liebhart, E. H. & Liebhart, G. (1971). Development of and attempts to validate a scale of German ethnocentricity. *Zeitschrift für Experimentelle und Angewandte Psychologie*, *18*, 447–471.
Luyckx, K. Goossens, L., & Soenens, B. (2006). A developmental contextual perspective on identity construction in emerging adulthood: Change dynamics in commitment formation and commitment evaluation. *Developmental Psychology*, *42*, 366–380.
Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *3*, 551–558.
Nesdale, D. (1999a). Developmental changes in children's ethnic preferences and social cognitions. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *20*, 501–519.
Nesdale, D. (1999b). Social identity and ethnic prejudice in children. In P. Martin & W. Noble (Eds.), *Psychology and society* (pp. 92–110). Brisbane: Australian Academic Press.
Nesdale, D. (2000). Developmental changes in children's ethnic preferences and social cognitions. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *20*, 501–519.
Nesdale, D. (2001). Development of prejudice in children. In M. Augoustinos & K. J. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding prejudice, racism and social conflict* (pp. 57–72). London: Sage.
Nesdale, D. (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 219–246). East Sussex: Psychology Press.
Nesdale, D. (2008). Peer group rejection and children's intergroup prejudice. In S. R. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 32–46). New York: Oxford University Press.
Nesdale, D., Maass, A. Durkin, K., & Griffiths, J. (2005). Group norms. *threat and children's ethnic prejudice*. *Child Development*, *76*, 652–663.
Nunnally, J. C. & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
Pettigrew, T. F. (2008). Future directions for intergroup contact theory and research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *32*, 187–199.
Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 751–783.
Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *9*, 34–49.
Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic-identity in adolescents and adults - review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*, 499–514.
Phinney, J. S., Ong, A., & Madden, T. (2000). Cultural values and intergenerational value discrepancies in immigrant and non-immigrant families. *Child Development*, 528–539.
Piontkowski, U., Florack, A. Hoelker, P., & Obdrzálek, P. (2000). Predicting acculturation attitudes of dominant and non-dominant groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *24*, 1–26.
Raudenbush, S. W. & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
Rosenthal, D. (2005). *The Israelis: Ordinary people in an extraordinary land*. New York: Free Press.
Schiefer, D. (2009). Prädiktoren von Fremdgruppeneinstellungen bei Kindern und Jugendlichen im interkulturellen Vergleich: Das Beispiel Deutschland und Israel [Antecedents of outgroup derogation in a cross-ethnic and cross-cultural comparison: the example of Germany and Israel]. *Paper presented at the 12th Conference of the German Association of Social Psychology (Fachgruppe Sozialpsychologie)*, Université du Luxembourg, September 2009.
Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). New York: Academic Press.
Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues*, *50*, 19–45.

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues*, *50*, 19–45.
Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied psychology: An international review: Special issue: Values and work*, *48*, 23–47.
Schwartz, S. H. (2003). *Instructions for Computing Scores for the 10 Human Values and Using them in Analyses. Documentation for ESS-1*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Jerusalem. (Retrieved 2 January 2010 from http://ess.nsd.uib.no/ess/round1/).
Schwartz, S. H. (2008). *Cultural value orientations: Nature and implications of national differences*. Moscow: State University Higher School of Economics Press.
Schwartz, S. H. (2010). Values: Cultural and individual. In S. M. Breugelmans, A. Chasiotis, & F. J. R. van de Vijver (Eds.), *Fundamental questions in cross-cultural psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schwartz, S. H. & Bardi, A. (2001). Value hierarchies across cultures: Taking a similarities perspective. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, *32*, 268–290.
Schwartz, S. H. & Rubel, T. (2005). Sex differences in value priorities: Cross-cultural and multi-method studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*, 1010–1028.
Schwartz, S. J. Montgomery, M. J., & Briones, E. (2006). The role of identity in acculturation among immigrant people: Theoretical propositions, empirical questions, and applied recommendations. *Human Development*, *49*, 1–30.
Shah, J. Y, Kruglanski, A. W., & Thompson, E. P. (1998). Membership has its(epistemic) rewards: Need for closure effects on in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *15*, 383–393.
Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. (1953). *Groups in harmony and tension; an integration of studies of intergroup relations*. Oxford, England: Harper & Brothers.
Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Silbereisen, R., Lantermann, E. D., & Schmitt-Rodermund, E. (1999). *[Aussiedler in Deutschland: Akkulturation von Persönlichkeit und Verhalten [Aussiedler in Germany: Acculturation of Personality and Behaviour]*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
Spearman, C. (1910). Correlation calculated from faulty data. *British Journal of Psychology*, *3*, 271–295.
Stangor, C., Sullivan, L. A., & Ford, T. E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. *Social Cognition*, *9*, 359–380.
Steinberg, L. D. (2008). *Adolescence*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
Tafarodi, R. W., Kang, S. J., & Milne, A. B. (2002). When different becomes similar: Compensatory conformity in bicultural visible minorities. *Personality and Social Psychololgy Bulletin*, *28*, 1131–1142.
Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
Thalhammer, E., Zucha, V., Enzenhoher, E., Salfinger, B., & Ogris, G. (2001). *Attitudes towards minority groups in the European union: A special analysis of the Eurobarometer 2000 opinion poll on behalf of the European monitoring centre on racism and xenophobia*. Vienna: SORA.
Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A. Oakes, P. J., & Reicher, S. D. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorisation theory.* Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
Verkuyten, M. (2003). Ethnic in-group bias among minority and majority early adolescents: The perception of negative peer behaviour. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *21*, 543–564.
Verplanken, B. & Holland, R. W. (2002). Motivated decision making: Effects of motivation and self-centrality of values on choices and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*, 434–447.
Zick, A., Wolf, C., Kuepper, B., Davidov, E. Schmidt, P., & Heitmeyer, W. (2008). The syndrome of group-focused enmity: The interrelation of prejudices tested with multiple cross-sectional and panel data. *Journal of Social Issues*, *64*, 363–383.

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp