



Interamerican Journal of Psychology

ISSN: 0034-9690

rip@ufrgs.br

Sociedad Interamericana de Psicología

Organismo Internacional

Gouveia, Valdiney V.; Milfont, Taciano L.; Martínez, María del Carmen; Paterna, Consuelo

Individualism-collectivism as predictors of prejudice toward Gypsies in Spain

Interamerican Journal of Psychology, vol. 45, núm. 2, mayo-agosto, 2011, pp. 223-233

Sociedad Interamericana de Psicología

Austin, Organismo Internacional

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=28422741013>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's homepage in redalyc.org

redalyc.org

Scientific Information System

Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America, the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal

Non-profit academic project, developed under the open access initiative

Individualism-collectivism as predictors of prejudice toward Gypsies in Spain

Valdiney V. Gouveia¹

Federal University of Paraíba, Brazil

Taciano L. Milfont

Victoria University of Wellington & Centre for Applied Cross-Cultural Psychology, New Zealand

María del Carmen Martínez

Consuelo Paterna

Universidad de Murcia, Spain

Resumen

Las asociaciones entre el individualismo-colectivismo y el prejuicio han producido resultados mixtos. Triandis (1995) sostiene que el prejuicio y la discriminación son más probables entre los colectivistas que individualistas, y que el atributo vertical (poniendo énfasis en la jerarquía) tanto del individualismo como del colectivismo está más relacionado con actitudes negativas hacia los exogrupos. El presente estudio analiza el poder predictivo del individualismo y colectivismo para explicar medidas de prejuicio hacia una minoría grupal (gitanos) en la población general de una cultura colectivista (España). Los resultados indican que los individualistas son más probables expresar prejuicio hacia los gitanos, mientras que los colectivistas favorecen más pensamientos, sentimientos y comportamientos positivos hacia este grupo. Los resultados también indican que el atributo horizontal (poniendo énfasis en la igualdad) fue más importante al evaluar las relaciones del individualismo-colectivismo con el prejuicio en España. En esta cultura colectivista, el individualismo es más probable instigar el perjuicio, mientras que el colectivismo es más probable inhibirlo. Estos hallazgos apoyan otras investigaciones que muestran que los individualistas son más probables presentar prejuicio y discriminar, pero contradice las expectativas de Triandis de que los colectivistas verticales son más propensos a expresar actitudes negativas hacia exogrupos (seguido por los individualistas verticales, colectivistas horizontales e individualistas horizontales). Se discuten las explicaciones teóricas para estos hallazgos.

Palabras clave: Individualismo, colectivismo; prejuicio, exogrupos, gitanos

Individualismo-colectivismo como predictores de prejuicio hacia gitanos en España

Abstract

The associations between individualism-collectivism and prejudice have yielded mixed findings. Triandis (1995) argues that prejudice and discrimination are more likely among collectivists than individualists, and that the vertical attribute (emphasizing hierarchy) of both individualism and collectivism is more related to negative attitudes toward out-groups. The present study examines the predictive power of individualism and collectivism to explain measures of prejudice toward a minority out-group (Gypsies) among the general population of a collectivist culture (Spain). Results indicate that individualists are more likely to express prejudice toward Gypsies, whereas collectivists favor more positive thoughts, feelings, and behaviors toward this out-group. The findings also indicate that the horizontal attribute (emphasizing equality) is more important when assessing individualism-collectivism relations with prejudice in Spain. In such a collectivistic culture, individualism is more likely to instigate prejudice, while collectivism is more likely to inhibit it. These findings support other research showing that individualists are more likely to show prejudice and discriminate, but contradict Triandis' expectation that vertical collectivists are more likely to express negative attitudes toward out-groups (followed by vertical individualists, horizontal collectivists and horizontal individualists). Theoretical explanations for the findings are discussed.

Keywords: Individualism; collectivism; prejudice; out-group; Gypsies.

¹ This study was partially supported by the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq, Brazil) by grant to the first author. Address all correspondence to Valdiney V. Gouveia, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, CCHLA – Departamento de Psicologia – 58051-900 João Pessoa, PB, Brazil. E-mail: vvgouveia@pesquisador.cnpq.br, or to María del Carmen Martínez, Universidad de Murcia, Campus Espinardo, Facultad de Psicología, Ed. Luis Vives – 30100 Murcia, Spain. E-mail: carmemar@um.es.

Can individualism and collectivism predict prejudice attitudes toward minority out-groups? There is no simple answer to this question. According to Triandis (1995), "the relationship between individualism-collectivism and prejudice and discrimination is extremely complex" (p. 125). He suggests that individualists and collectivists can express different reasons to behave in a prejudiced and discriminative way, depending on the horizontal and vertical attributes of individualism and collectivism. Although a complex relationship might appear, it can be assumed by Triandis' comments that both individualism and collectivism are related to prejudice. However, only few empirical studies have attempted to test this hypothesis (e.g., Brown et al., 1992; Lee & Ward, 1998; Verkuyten & Kwa, 1996). The aim of the present study is therefore to evaluate the predictive power of individualism and collectivism to explain measures of prejudice toward Gypsies in Spain.

Understanding the influence of individualism and collectivism on prejudice has important implications. Although assuming different forms (e.g., subtle, traditional), prejudice is still a pervasive and destructive social problem in contemporary society (Pedersen & Walker, 1997; Williams et al., 1999). Moreover, prejudice is a contingent variable, and it is not inevitable (Duckitt, 1992). Thus, understanding the antecedents of prejudice is an important step to design preventive programs aiming at its reduction (Brewer, 2000). Moreover, the Gypsies (members of a community or group originally from the Indian subcontinent with common cultural traits and a nomadic lifestyle) were chosen as the minority out-group because of their well-known condition as the most important ethnic minority in Spain (Rodríguez-Bailón & Moya, 2003; Vera & Martínez, 1994). For example, recent research has indicated that prejudice is stronger toward Gypsies among Spaniards than toward other traditional minority out-groups (e.g., Mogrebian, South-American, see Rodríguez-Bailón & Moya, 2003). For this reason, the relationship between payos (non-Gypsies) and Gypsies has interested sociologists, anthropologists, and social psychologists in Spain, preoccupied with guaranteeing a peaceful and harmonious society.

Prejudice toward minority ethnic out-groups

Prejudice has traditionally been treated as a negative attitude of a majority group toward minority or out-groups (Duckitt, 1992; Martínez, 1996). However, nowadays it seems impracticable to conceive prejudice exclusively in this traditional view for two main reasons. First, the old-fashion or dominative racism, which is openly expressed toward victims, has decreased in recent years (Biernat, Vescio, Theno, & Crandal, 1996;

Williams et al., 1999). In several countries, including Spain, discrimination against people because of race, gender or religion is severely punished according to formal laws. Second, the decrease in racism does not mean that prejudice has ceased to exist. Rather, prejudice simply has assumed a new form, defined as symbolic, modern, and aversive prejudice (Martínez, 1996; Williams et al., 1999). One example of this modern type of prejudice is the strategy practiced by majority groups to regulate prejudice during social interaction by avoiding talking about race, or even acknowledging racial difference (Apfelbaurn, Sommers, & Norton, 2008).

These two forms of prejudice (traditional and modern) are positively correlated to each other (Pedersen & Walker, 1997; Rodríguez-Bailón & Moya, 2003), but they are not exactly the same. For instance, Williams et al. (1999) comment that the focus of the traditional form of prejudice is stronger on biological or innate inferiority of the minority out-group (e.g., Gypsies) in respect to the dominant group (e.g., payos), while the modern form of prejudice focuses on negative feelings, pathological culture, maladaptive responses, and deficient attitudinal orientations of the minority out-group. This indicates that the traditional form of prejudice seems to be based on an essentialist lay theory of race, in which race reflects deep-seated, inalterable essence and is indicative of traits and ability; the modern form, in contrast, is based on a social constructionist lay theory of race, in which race is socially constructed, malleable, and arbitrary (No et al., 2008). Regardless of the form of racial or ethnic prejudice, it has long been recognized that prejudice is a complex, multidimensional phenomenon, which is expressed in different forms, and includes multiple indicators (e.g., avoidance of social contact, rejection of the out-group, negative attitudes; see Allport, 1954; Brewer, 1999).

Elements of individualism and collectivism

Although individualism and collectivism mainly represent opposite poles of a cultural dimension (Hofstede, 1984), they are also seen as two different factors at the individual level (Gouveia, 1998; Hofstede, 1994). People and cultures can at the same time assume both an individualist and collectivist perspective (Schwartz, 1990), depending on the specific milieu (Triandis, 1995). These dimensions can be defined as follow (Gouveia & Clemente, 2000; Kim, Triandis, Kagitçibasi, Choi, & Yoon, 1994):

Individualism. It describes someone that is considered discrete, autonomous, and self-sufficient, respecting the rights of others. Such people are defined as abstract and universal entities. Their status or social roles are not predetermined or ascribed, but defined by their

achievements (e.g., educational, occupational). Their interaction with others is based on rational principles, such as equality and equity (justice). Law, rules and regulations are institutionalized, aiming at protecting their individual rights. In-groups are perceived as more heterogeneous than out-groups. Debate and confrontation are acceptable. Conflict with out-groups is accepted but not desired.

Collectivism. It emphasizes well-being and social harmony over individual interests. All individuals are connected in a net of interrelationship, and situated in particular roles or status. Their relationship emphasises common luck or destiny. Individuals are encouraged to prioritize interests of the in-group over their own. Duties and obligations are prescribed by roles, and the individual loses prestige if he/she fails to accomplish them. Institutions are perceived as an extension of the family, and the paternalism and legal moralism (i.e., the moral values institutionalized in moral codes) are imperatives. In-groups are perceived as more homogeneous than out-groups. In-group harmony is required, and conflict with out-groups is expected.

Individualism and collectivism are thus two general dimensions of social orientation. In general, the means for survival is the individual for individualists and the group for collectivists. However, Hofstede (1994) states that the group, to a collectivist, does not include all humankind. He comments that collectivism is not altruism, but in-group egoism. Despite a great acceptance of this typology (see Kim et al., 1994; Smith & Bond, 1999), it has been recognized that more specific attributes can be related to individualism and collectivism (Gouveia, 1998). Crossing these constructs with power distance (Hofstede, 1984) or social hierarchy (Schwartz, 1994), Triandis and his colleagues (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995; Triandis, 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) have proposed two types of attributes for each of the dimensions. Both individualism and collectivism can thus be divided into two more specific orientations, defined by their focus on horizontal or vertical attributes. This fourfold typology has received empirical support in different cultural milieu (e.g., Chen, Meindl, & Hunt, 1997; Gouveia, Clemente, & Espinosa, 2003; Singelis et al., 1995), and can be described as follows:

Horizontal individualism. For those assuming this orientation, it is desirable to be unique, and different from others. Their privacy is highly valued, and the principles of social justice (high equality) and self-direction (high freedom) guide their lives. Interpersonal relationships are established in an egalitarian context, where all people are equals and have the same rights and obligations.

Vertical individualism. To adopt this orientation implies assigning maximum importance to personal achievements. Such people pursue a triumph ideal. It combines an emphasis on value principles such as power (low equality) and self-direction (high freedom). Interpersonal relationships are established in a contractual context, in which relationships are valued by the status occupied by each person.

Horizontal collectivism. When asked to describe themselves, those assuming this orientation define themselves as cooperative. The harmony within their in-group is appreciated. It puts emphasis on the value principles of belonging and social support (high equality), and minimizes the importance assigned to privacy and self-direction (low freedom). Interpersonal relationships are established in a communal context, emphasizing cooperation, friendship, and affections.

Vertical collectivism. The principal characteristic that describes those guided by this orientation is dutiful. There is a strong sense of obedience and conformity (low equality), paralleled to a restriction of personal choices and self-determined behaviors (low freedom). Interpersonal relationships are based on hierarchical principles. The vertical collectivist stresses respect to others, principally older and higher status persons.

Individualism and collectivism as predictors of prejudice

Different and sometimes contradictory points of view have been expressed with respect to the associations between individualism-collectivism and prejudice (e.g., Gudykunst, 1988; Triandis, Brislim, & Hui, 1988). However, Triandis (1995) argues that collectivists are more likely to identify with their cultural group, which leads them to be more ethnocentric. Thus, it is more likely to observe prejudice and discrimination among collectivists than individualists. In line with this, Triandis et al. (1988) indicate that social distance from out-groups tends to be stronger in collectivist cultures, while it is attenuated in individualist societies. Other authors have also supported the notion that in-group favoritism can be expressed in a context of eminently collectivist cultures (see Han & Park, 1995; Smith & Bond, 1999; Verkuyten & Kwa, 1996). Many authors thus suggest that individualism inhibits prejudiced thought and behavior toward out-groups, while collectivism promotes them.

However, other scholars have indicated an inverse pattern. For example, Morales, Lopez and Vega (1992) found that individualists (compared to collectivists) discriminate more in favor of their in-group and less in favor of out-groups. In another study, Vera and Martínez (1994) studied the prejudice toward three

minority out-groups in Spain (South-American and Mogrebian immigrants, and Gypsies). Grouping the participants into low-prejudice and high-prejudice groups, they performed a discriminant analysis considering Schwartz's (1994) value types. Results indicated that high-prejudice participants scored higher in values of achievement, power and anti-universalism (all indicative of individualism), and that high prejudice was expressed toward all three minority out-groups. Biernat et al. (1996) observed a similar result in the United States. They found that participants' pro-black attitudes (i.e., positive trait evaluation) were positively correlated with the importance assigned to the values of egalitarianism/humanism (which are indicative of collectivism); in contrast, participants' anti-black attitudes (i.e., social distance and the probability of firing the employee) were positively correlated with the importance assigned to values of the Protestant Work Ethic (which are indicative of individualism). These findings therefore support the notion that in-group favoritism is more likely to be expressed by individualists.

To make matters more difficult, other researchers have found mixed findings. For example, Al-Zahrani and Kaplowitz (1993) observed that Saudis (members of a collectivist culture) showed more out-group derogating bias than Americans (members of an individualist culture). However, this pattern was not consistent to inter-group attitudes. In favorability terms, Americans' ratings of themselves did not differ from their ratings of the Saudis. Saudis, on the other hand, had a more favorable perception of Americans than of themselves. Moreover, the study did not confirm a predictive power of collectivism regarding different indicators of group bias (e.g., family serving). Similarly, Lee and Ward (1998) observed that Malay and Chinese participants (members of collectivist cultures) expressed ethnocentric bias (in-group serving). Nevertheless, they also registered more favorable attitudes toward ethnic-based community development groups among collectivists than among individualists.

Overall, these studies provide confirmatory findings for the influence of individualism-collectivism on prejudice. However, it is still not clear whether in-group favoritism and prejudice are highly expressed in a context of individualism or collectivism. These contradictory findings seem to be a result of researchers considering only individualism-collectivism, and not taking a multi-dimensional approach with the more specific vertical and horizontal orientations. Indeed, Triandis (1995) argues that there are two tendencies that increase prejudice, depending on the vertical or horizontal character of individualism-collectivism. He suggests that collectivists are more likely to express ethnocentrism than individualists. However, vertical

collectivists (compared to horizontal collectivists) feel more comfortable seeing themselves as different from other groups. On the other hand, he argues that vertical individualists (compared to horizontal individualists) are more likely to express prejudice and to discriminate because they tend to put down groups that are different from their own, as a result of their effort to be distinguished and to win. Based on Triandis' (1995) account it seems more likely to see prejudice and discrimination among collectivists than individualists, but that a different pattern also emerges from the vertical or horizontal orientation. He argues that "it seems likely that prejudice and discrimination will be high among vertical collectivists, followed by vertical individualists, followed by horizontal collectivists, and will be low among horizontal individualists" (p. 127). Prejudice is thus more likely among those on the vertical domain of collectivism and individualism.

In sum, despite publications linking individualism-collectivism to prejudice, there is no consistent set of findings. The main aim of this study was to contribute to this debate by providing more empirical evidence of the relationship between individualism-collectivism and prejudice. The present study goes beyond previous studies by using a multi-dimensional approach to individualism and collectivism, and by using different measures of prejudice (e.g., intention of social contact, negative attitudes).

Method

Participants

A total of 209 Spaniards (136 female; 73 male) from the general population participated in this study. All participants identified themselves as a member of the majority in-group: payos (non-Gypsies). Their ages ranged from 15 to 76 years old ($M = 30.3$, $SD = 13.08$).

Instruments

Participants filled out a survey questionnaire containing socio-demographic questions (age, gender, ethnic group, degree of contact with Gypsies, and number of children), and the measures described below.

Measure of Individualism-Collectivism. The Horizontal-Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale was used (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). This is a 16-item measure assessing the four sub-dimensions of individualism and collectivism: *horizontal individualism* (e.g., I'd rather depend on myself than others; I often do 'my own thing'), *vertical individualism* (e.g., Winning is everything; Competition is the law of nature), *horizontal collectivism* (e.g., The well-being of my co-workers is important to me; I feel good when I cooperate with others), and *vertical collectivism* (e.g.,

Parents and children must stay together as much as possible; It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my group). Responses are made on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). To our knowledge, no previous study has assessed the psychometric properties of this measure in Spain.

Measures of Social Contact. Two scales were used to assess participants' contact with members of the minority out-group.

Quality of Contact. Participants were asked to indicate in a 5-point scale (anchored by 1 = *Never* and 5 = *Always*) the quality of their contact with Gypsies. Seven attributes of contact were presented to participants, four positive (voluntary, agreeable, equal, and cooperative contact) and three negative (superficial, discriminatory, and challenging contact). Negative attributes were reversed scored such that a higher score indicates a more positive contact. The Cronbach's alpha was .65.

Intention of Contact. Eighteen items were used to measure participants' intention to have contact with members of the out-group (Martínez & Vera, 1994). Five domains of contact were assessed: health (e.g., I am annoyed in sharing a room in a hospital with a Gypsy), educational (e.g., I would have a Gypsy as my teacher), workplace (e.g., I would not like if my supervisor was a Gypsy), politics (e.g., I would vote for a Gypsy to be the mayor of my city), and personal (e.g., I would have Gypsy friends). Participants rated each item using a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*), with higher scores indicating greater intention of contact. The Cronbach's alpha for this measure was .91.

Measures of Prejudice. Two scales were considered for measuring prejudice.

Attitudes toward Out-group Scale (Stephan, Ybarra, Martínez, Schwarzwald, & Tur-Kaspa, 1998). This measure comprises ten items equally distributed into positively (admiration, acceptance, affect, sympathy, and cordiality) and negatively (hostility, displeasure, indifference, hate, and rejection) worded items. Participants rated these items on a 5-point scale (anchored by 1 = *Never* and 5 = *Always*) to indicate their positive and negative attitudes toward Gypsies. The Cronbach's alphas were .88 and .72 for the positive and negative scales, respectively.

In-group Superiority Scale. Participants were asked to indicate their perceived judgment as inferiors or superiors to Gypsies regarding culture, religion, education and economic status. Participants rated these four items on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (*Inferior*) to 5 (*Superior*), with higher scores indicating perceived in-group superiority. The Cronbach's alpha was .62.

Procedure

The questionnaire was administered individually at the participants' home. Three trained research assistants were responsible for contacting the participants and giving the necessary instructions. The participants were informed about the confidentiality of the survey. The participants were also given the contact details of the principal investigator, from whom they could get additional information about the study. They completed the questionnaire in 20 minutes on average.

Results

Structure of the Measure of Individualism and Collectivism

To test the structure of the Horizontal-Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale in Spain, a principal component analysis was first performed with the extraction of four components and *oblimin* rotation [$KMO = .74$; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, $\chi^2 (120) = 873.55$, $p < .001$]. As can be seen in Table 1, by and large the items loaded onto the expected theoretical component. Confirmatory factor analyses were then performed, using LISREL and maximum-likelihood estimation procedures, and taking the observed covariance matrix as the input. The degree to which the data fit the confirmatory model was assessed using the ratio of the chi-square statistic to the degrees of freedom (χ^2/df), the comparative fit index (CFI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). Models with a χ^2/df ratio in the 2–3 range, and RMSEA and SRMR with values respectively close to .06 and .08 or lower indicate good fit (Carmines & McIver, 1981; Hu & Bentler, 1999).

The fit indices indicated acceptable overall fit for the model: $\chi^2 = 256.74$; $df = 98$; $\chi^2/df = 2.62$; RMSEA = .088; SRMR = .081. All parameters from the observed indicators to the four latent constructs were significant ($t > 1.96$, $p < .05$), and all loadings were high; the weakest standardised path was .24 from one horizontal individualism item (i.e., "My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me"). This supports the four-factor model structure of the scale. Another model was also tested in which horizontal and vertical individualism were specified to load on a higher-order individualism factor, and horizontal and vertical collectivism were specified to load on a higher-order collectivism factor. This two-second-order-factors model also had acceptable fit: $\chi^2 = 261.19$; $df = 99$; $\chi^2/df = 2.64$; RMSEA = .089; SRMR = .084.

The items of each of the four sub-scales were then averaged to form *horizontal individualism* (Cronbach's

Table 1
Structure Matrix of the 16-items Individualism-Collectivism Scale

Items	COMPONENTS			
	I	II	III	IV
02. I feel good when I cooperate with others (HC)	83	-01	-25	01
01. The well-being of my coworkers is important to me (HC)	75	-01	-19	-17
06. If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud (HC)	62	-20	-20	-20
07. To me, pleasure is spending time with others (HC)	60	-00	-00	-01
11. It is important that I do my job better than others (VI)	01	74	01	-30
10. When another persona does better than I do, I get tense and aroused (VI)	-01	72	19	-01
04. Winning is everything (VI)	-19	68	-14	-14
15. Competition is the law of nature (VI)	-01	66	-25	-13
05. Family members should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required (VC)	27	11	-85	-01
12. It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want (VC)	20	01	-84	-02
03. Parents and children must stay together as much as possible (VC)	<u>46</u>	01	-72	-11
01. It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my group (VC)	<u>66</u>	-01	-32	20
13. I'd rather depend on myself than others (HI)	-00	13	-01	-79
16. I often do 'my own things' (HI)	00	23	-24	-73
14. My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me (HI)	01	19	29	-48
08. I rely on myself most of the time; I rarely rely on others (HI)	00	<u>55</u>	-23	-40
Eigenvalue	3.41	2.69	1.54	1.29
Cronbach's Alpha	.71	.68	.77	.53
% Variance	21.3	16.8	9.6	8.1

Note. N = 209. Loadings based on Principal Components and Oblimin Rotation. Identification of the factors: I = Horizontal Collectivism (HC), II = Vertical Individualism (VI), III = Vertical Collectivism (VC), and IV = Horizontal Individualism (HI). Loadings were multiple by 100. Loadings in bold face denote a theoretically coherent item; only these items were used to compute the reliability coefficients. Underlined loadings indicate the interpretable loading in another compatible factor.

alpha, .53), *vertical individualism* (Cronbach's alpha, .68), *horizontal collectivism* (Cronbach's alpha, .71), and *vertical collectivism* (Cronbach's alpha, .77) scores. The items were also averaged to form total scores of *individualism* (Cronbach's alpha, .70) and *collectivism* (Cronbach's alpha, .79).

Spaniards' Scores on Individualism and Collectivism

Participants scored significantly higher [$t(207) = 12.66, p < .001$] on collectivism ($M = 44.1, SD = 7.65$) than on individualism ($M = 34.6, SD = 7.83$), confirming the collectivist orientation of Spaniards. This was also corroborated when the collectivism score was compared to the theoretical midpoint (32) of the total score [$t(207) = 22.86, p < .001$]. To identify the predominant specific type of individualism and collectivism held

INDIVIDUALISM-COLLECTIVISM AS PREDICTORS OF PREJUDICE TOWARD GYPSIES IN SPAIN

by participants, repeated measures MANOVA was performed. The four specific dimensions were considered as within-subject factors, indicating a significant difference [Wilks' Lambda = .32, $F(3,205) = 142.98$, $p < .001$]. Bonferroni's *post hoc* test indicated that among the participants there were more *horizontal collectivists* ($M = 22.7$, $SD = 3.75$), followed by *vertical collectivist* ($M = 21.4$, $SD = 5.26$), *horizontal individualist* ($M = 20.7$, $SD = 4.10$), and, finally, *vertical individualist* ($M = 13.9$, $SD = 5.27$). The only non-statistically significant difference ($p > .05$) was between horizontal individualism and vertical collectivism.

Individualism and Collectivism as Predictors of Prejudice

Table 2 shows the correlations between the dimensions of individualism-collectivism and the different measures of prejudice. As can be seen, a clear pattern

of associations was found for individualism and its vertical-horizontal components. Individualism was negatively related to all positive orientations toward Gypsies (quality and intention of contact, and positive attitudes), while being positively related to negative attitudes toward Gypsies. The associations for collectivism were smaller and not as clear, especially for its vertical component. Overall, however, both collectivism and its horizontal component were positively related to positive orientations toward Gypsies, while negatively related to the measure assessing negative attitudes. These findings indicate a somewhat coherent pattern of correlations between individualism-collectivism and their dimensions and the indicators of prejudice toward Gypsies in Spain. In general, individualists are more likely to express prejudice toward Gypsies, whereas collectivists favor more positive thoughts, feelings, and behaviors toward this out-group.

Table 2

Correlations between Horizontal-Vertical Individualism and Collectivism and Indicators of Prejudice toward Gypsies

	Individualism			Collectivism		
	T	H	V	T	H	V
Measures of Contact						
Quality	-.22**	-.16*	-.19**	.18*	.22**	.10
Intention	-.37***	-.27***	-.34***	-.02	.21**	-.18**
Measures of Prejudice						
Positive Attitudes	-.30***	-.26***	-.25***	.18**	.25***	.09
Negative Attitudes	.33***	.26***	.28***	-.17*	-.22**	-.10
In-group Superiority	-.13	-.14*	-.08	.04	.03	.04

Note. T = Total, H = Horizontal, and V = Vertical. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. (2-tailed test).

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were then performed to specifically assess the extent to which the horizontal and vertical attributes can predict prejudice. As in-group superiority had the smaller associations with the individualism-collectivism dimensions (Table 2), this construct was excluded from the analyses. The other indicators of prejudice were entered as dependent variables, and the horizontal-vertical individualism and collectivism as independent variables. Results are showed in Table 3. As can be seen, horizontal-vertical individualism and collectivism predicted the various indicators of prejudice toward Gypsies. The total variance explained ranged from 8% (quality of social contact) to 25% (intention of social contact). The main predictors were the horizontal attribute of both individualism and collectivism, which predicted significant unique variance for all prejudice indicators. Horizontal collectivism positively predicted quality and intention

of contact and positive attitudes toward gypsies, while negatively predicting negative attitudes. In contrast, horizontal individualism positively predicted negative attitudes toward Gypsies, while negatively predicting quality and intention of contact and positive attitudes. The third main predictor was vertical individualism, which positively predicted negative attitudes toward Gypsies and negatively predicted intention of contact. The weaker predictor was vertical collectivism, only negatively predicting intention of contact. These results further indicate that individualists are more likely to express prejudice toward Gypsies, when compared to collectivists. More importantly, the findings indicate that horizontal attributes (emphasizing equality) are more important when assessing individualism-collectivism relations with prejudice.

Table 3
Stepwise Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting the Indicators of Prejudice

Dependent Variable	Independent Variables	Standardized		
		R	R ²	Betas at Final Step
Measures of Contact Quality	Horizontal Collectivism	.28	.08	.23**
	Horizontal Individualism			-.18**
Intention	Horizontal Collectivism	.50	.25	.32***
	Vertical Collectivism			-.30***
	Vertical Individualism			-.22**
	Horizontal Individualism			-.18**
Measures of Prejudice Positive Attitudes	Horizontal Collectivism	.36	.13	.26***
	Horizontal Individualism			-.26***
Negative Attitudes	Horizontal Collectivism	.38	.15	-.21**
	Horizontal Individualism			.20**
	Vertical Individualism			.17*

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Discussion

Individualism and collectivism are two main dimensions of cultural as well as individual variation that guide and inform social scientists. The current study tested the predictive power of these dimensions in explaining multiple indicators of prejudice toward a minority out-group (Gypsies) in a general population sample in Spain. The present study is also the first to test the factor structure of the 16-item Horizontal-Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale in Spain, which allowed the assessment of the main orientation of our participants. The results and their implications are discussed below.

The role of individualism and collectivism in explaining prejudice

In general, our findings reinforce the adequacy of individualism and collectivism dimensions to explain inter-group relationships (Han & Park, 1995; Triandis, 1995).

The results indicate that individualists are more likely to express prejudice toward Gypsies, when compared to collectivists, and that the horizontal attribute (emphasizing equality, egalitarianism between in-group members) is more important when assessing individualism-collectivism relations with prejudice. Our findings contradict Triandis' (1995) predictions that collectivists are more ethnocentric and that the

vertical attribute (emphasizing hierarchy) of both individualism and collectivism would be more related to prejudice and discrimination.

Although contradicting the Triandis predictions, our findings that individualism promotes prejudiced attitudes and beliefs are in line with results showing that individualists tend to express more in-group favoritism and out-group prejudice in comparison to collectivists (Biernat et al., 1996; Morales, Lopez & Vega, 1992; Vera & Martínez, 1994). Our results are also coherent with contemporary theoretical formulations of prejudice and racism, especially if one considers individualism-collectivism constructs from a values approach. This perspective indicates that the conflict between individualism and egalitarianism underlies the manifestation of the majority groups' prejudice toward the minority group (Biernat et al., 1996; Stephan & Stephan, 1996; Vera & Martínez, 1994). For example, promotion (power and achievement; Oishi, Schimmack, Diener, & Suh, 1998) is a key value to vertical individualism (Gouveia, Milfont, Fischer, & Santos, 2008). Thus, if individualists assess out-group members from this value perspective, they would assign low importance to social contact with such members because out-group members would be perceived as not being able to provide any benefit to them. In terms of symbolic racism, individualists might believe that racism is something from the past, but at the same time maintain resentments toward minorities by believing

that minority groups receive more than they deserve. In contrast, interactive and suprapersonal are two key values for horizontal collectivism (Gouveia et al., 2008; benevolence and universalism, respectively, according to Oishi et al., 1998). Collectivists assessing out-group members from the perspective of these values would assign high importance to social contact in general, emphasizing egalitarian dimensions in the relationships with out-group members. Collectivists would not have motives to discriminate minorities, and would think about them from a universalist perspective, as members of a bigger collective (Spaniards).

There is also an alternative explanation for prejudice and discrimination toward Gypsies in terms of structural factors. Gypsies form an out-group that can compete with the majority group (*payos*), being perceived by vertical individualists as potentially changing or threatening the status quo, which are key factors for the manifestation of prejudice and discrimination (Bobo, 1999; Duckitt, 2001; Stephan et al., 1998). Nevertheless, collectivists, especially those with a horizontal orientation, might not perceive symbolic and real threats from Gypsies. As a result, they could extend the idea of cooperation and social support to this out-group. However, we have also observed a negative correlation between vertical collectivism and the intention of social contact, which is in line with Triandis' (1995) predictions. He suggested that vertical collectivists feel more comfortable to be different from out-groups, so they are more likely to show prejudice toward these groups. An alternative explanation can be obtained from normative values that underlie vertical collectivism (tradition and conformity, according to Oishi et al., 1998; Gouveia et al., 2008). Normative values establish the obedience to social norms, which in Spain seem to inhibit the contact with Gypsies (Rodríguez-Bailón & Moya, 2003; Vera & Martínez, 1994).

According to Triandis (1995, p. 125), horizontal individualists are least likely to be prejudiced. Perhaps this prediction would hold in an individualist culture. However, our data from a collectivist culture does not support this view. Horizontal individualism was negatively associated with quality and intention of contact and positive attitudes toward Gypsies, while positively associated with negative attitudes toward this out-group. Probably, the principal element of horizontal individualism, as defined by Triandis and his colleagues (Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), is the sense of privacy. Horizontal individualists desire to maintain their own space, living independently from others, and expressing positive affect only to people close to them. Hence, the importance that such individuals assign to the value of equality is less evident. For instance, Oishi et al. (1998) observed that horizontal individualism

does not correlate with Schwartz's (1992) universalism value type, which includes values such as social justice, equality, broad-mind, and a world at peace.

In brief, individualism and collectivism are good predictors of prejudice toward a minority out-group in Spain. In such a collectivistic culture, individualism is more likely to instigate prejudice, while collectivism is more likely to inhibit it. Although Hofstede (1994) argues that collectivists are not good Samaritans, in the current research they seemed to be. Overall, collectivists showed more positive attitudes and intention of social contact with Gypsies compared to individualists. Nevertheless, one must still consider the personality trait of social desirability that characterizes collectivists as an alternative explanation for our findings (Schwartz, Verkasalo, Antonovsky, & Sagiv, 1997).

The Individualism-Collectivism Measure and Spaniards' Collectivistic Orientation

Although it was not the principal aim of this study, testing the factor structure of the Horizontal-Vertical Individualism and Collectivism Scale was necessary due to the scarcity of information about its psychometric properties in Spain. The advantages of this measure in comparison to well-known individualism-collectivism measures in Spain (e.g., Gouveia & Clemente, 1998; Morales et al., 1992) seem evident: it is a short 16-items scale and presents a multidimensional structure that permits the consideration of the advances and refinements of these constructs (Singelis et al., 1995; Triandis, 1995). Moreover, the reliabilities found in this study for its four factors is not different from that observed for the Spanish 32-items version of Singelis et al.'s scale (Gouveia et al., 2003). The factor structure results also allow researchers to consider the specific horizontal and vertical dimensions as well as the individualism and collectivism total scores.

Although it is common to assign a collectivist orientation to Spaniards (Gouveia & Clemente, 2000), this classification is sometimes not so clear. For instance, Spain appears as a median individualism-collectivism culture in Hofstede (1984), and this country is among those cultures that assume a high score in individualistic values (e.g., affective autonomy, intellectual autonomy) in Schwartz (1994). At an individual level of analyses, using different individualism and collectivism measures in several regions from Spain, Gouveia and his colleagues have observed that Spaniards assume an eminently collectivist orientation (Gouveia & Clemente, 2000; Gouveia et al., 2003). These findings were corroborated by the current study. Spaniards are horizontal collectivist, thus emphasizing interdependence and harmony within their in-group.

A limitation of this study was that it was carried out

in only one collectivist culture. So, it may not be simple to generalize its findings for other contexts. Further research is obviously needed considering other cultural groups. From a theoretical perspective, despite the assumed associations between individualism-collectivism and prejudice (Gudykunst, 1988; Reynolds, Turner, Haslam, & Ryan, 2001; Triandis, 1995), there is a lack of empirical studies assessing this link. So, replicating this study in another culture could be interesting. For instance, one could select cultures that represent the four different types of individualism-collectivism orientations and then assess the association between individualism-collectivism and prejudice toward a common minority out-group in each culture. Perhaps, collectivists would be more prejudiced in individualist milieus, corroborating Triandis' (1995) predictions.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Al-Zahrani, S. S. A., & Kaplowitz, S. A. (1993). Attributional biases in individualistic and collectivistic cultures: A comparison of American with Saudis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 56, 223-233.
- Apfelbaurn, E. P., Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2008). Seeing race and seeming racist? Evaluating strategic colorblindness in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 918-932.
- Biernat, M., Vescio, T. K., Theno, S. A., & Crandall, C. S. (1996). Values and prejudice: Toward understanding the impact of American values on outgroup attitudes. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario Symposium, Vol. 8* (pp. 153-189). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bobo, L. D. (1999). Prejudice as group position: Microfoundations of a sociological approach to racism and race relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 445-472.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 429-444.
- Brewer, M. B. (2000). Reducing prejudice through cross-categorization: Effects of multiple social identities. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 165-183). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brewer, M. B. (2001). Ingroup identification and intergroup conflict: When does ingroup love become outgroup hate? In R. Ashmore, L. Jussim, & D. Wilder (Eds.), *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict resolution* (pp. 17-41). Oxford University Press.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 745-778.
- Brown, R., Hinkle, S., Ely, P. G., Fox-Cardamone, L., Maras, P., & Taylor, L. A. (1992). Recognizing group diversity: Individualist-collectivist and autonomous-relational social orientations and their implications for intergroup processes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 327-342.
- Chen, C. C., Meindl, J. R., & Hunt, R. G. (1997). Testing the effects of vertical and horizontal collectivism: A study of reward allocation preferences in China. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28, 44-70.
- Duckitt, J. (1992). Psychology and prejudice: A historical analysis and integrative framework. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1182-1193.
- Duckitt, J. (2001). A dual-process cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 33, pp. 41-113). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Feather, N. T. (1994). Values, national identification and favouritism towards the in-group. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 467-476.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. P., & Johnson, G. (1982). Race victim, non-responsive bystanders, and helping behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 117, 69-77.
- Gouveia, V. V. (1998). *La naturaleza de los valores descriptores del individualismo y del colectivismo: Una comparación intra e intercultural* [The nature of individualist and collectivist values: A comparison within and between cultures]. Ph.D.'s Dissertation. Department of Psychology, Complutense University of Madrid, Spain.
- Gouveia, V. V., & Clemente, M. (1998). *La medida del individualismo y del colectivismo* [The measurement of the individualism and collectivism]. La Coruña, Spain: Editorial de la Universidad de La Coruña.
- Gouveia, V. V., & Clemente, M. (2000). O individualismo-coletivismo no Brasil e na Espanha: Correlatos sócio-demográficos [Individualism-collectivism in Brazil and Spain: Socio-demographic correlates]. *Estudos de Psicologia*, 5, 317-346.
- Gouveia, V. V., Clemente, M., & Espinosa, P. (2003). The horizontal and vertical attributes of individualism and collectivism in a Spanish population. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 143, 43-63.
- Gouveia, V. V., Milfont, T. L., Fischer, R., & Santos, W. S. (2008). Teoria funcionalista dos valores humanos [Functionalist theory of human values]. In M. L. M. Teixeira (Ed.), *Valores humanos e gestão: Novas perspectivas* [Human values and management: New perspectives] (pp. 47-80). São Paulo: Senac.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1988). Culture and intergroup process. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The cross-cultural challenge to social psychology* (pp. 165-181). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Han, G., & Park, B. (1995). Children's choice in conflict: Application of the theory of individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 298-313.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (1994). Foreword. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kagitçibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. ix-xiii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kagitçibasi, Ç., Choi, S.-C., & Yoon, G. (1994). Introduction. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kagitçibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and application* (pp. 1-16). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lee, L., & Ward, C. (1998). Ethnicity, idiocentrism-allocentrism, and intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 109-123.
- Martínez, M. C. (1996). Análisis psicosocial del prejuicio [Psychosocial analysis of the prejudice]. Madrid: Editorial Síntesis.
- Martínez, C., & Vera, J. (1994). La estructura del prejuicio: Realidad y simbolismo [The structure of prejudice: Reality and symbolism]. *Boletín de Psicología*, 42, 21-38.
- Morales, J. F., Lopez, M., & Vega, L. (1992). Individualismo, colectivismo e identidad social [Individualism, collectivism and social identity]. *Revista de Psicología Social, Monographic*, 49-72.

- No, S., Hong, Y. Y., Liao, H. Y., Lee, K., Wood, D., & Chao, M. M. (2008). Lay theory of race affects and moderates Asian Americans' responses toward American culture. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 991-1004.
- Oishi, S., Schimmack, U., Diener, R., & Suh, E. M. (1998). The measurement of values and individualism-collectivism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 1177-1189.
- Pedersen, A., & Walker, I. (1997). Prejudice against Australian aborigines: Old-fashion and modern forms. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 561-587.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 57-75.
- Reynolds, K. J., Turner, J. C., Haslam, S. A., & Ryan, M. K. (2001). The role of personality and group factors in explaining prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 427-434.
- Rodríguez-Bailón, R. & Moya, M. (2003). La diferencia percibida en valores como proceso vinculado a las relaciones intergrupales de payos y gitanos [Perceived values-differences as a process involved in the intergroup relationship between gypsies and non-gypsies]. *Psicothema*, 15, 176-182.
- Rustemli, A., Mertan, B., & Ciftci, O. (2000). In-group favoritism among native and immigrant Turkish Cypriots: Traits evaluations of in-group and out-group targets. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 26-34.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21, 139-157.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kagitçibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and application* (pp. 85-119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schwartz, S. H., Verkasalo, M., Antonovsky, A., & Sagiv, L. (1997). Value priorities and social desirability: Much substance, some style. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 3-18.
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. S., & Gelfand, M. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29, 240-275.
- Smith, P. R., & Bond, M. H. (1999). *Social psychology across cultures*. Needham Heights, Mass: Allyn & Bacon.
- Stephan, W., & Stephan, C. (1996). *Intergroup relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Stephan, W., Ybarra, O., Martínez, C., Schwarzwald, J., & Turkaspa, M. (1998). Prejudice toward immigrants to Spain and Israel: An integrated threat theory analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 559-576.
- Struch, N., & Schwartz, S. H. (1989). Intergroup aggression: Its predictors and distinctness from in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 364-373.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C., Brislin, R., & Hui, C. H. (1988). Cross-cultural training across the individualism-collectivism divide. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 12, 269-289.
- Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 118-128.
- Vera, J. J., & Martínez, M. C. (1994). Preferencias de valores en relación con los prejuicios hacia exogrupos [Value preferences in relation to prejudice toward outgroups]. *Anales de Psicología*, 10, 29-40.
- Verkuyten, M., & Kwa, G. A. (1996). Ethnic self-identification, ethnic involvement, and group differentiation among Chinese youth in the Netherlands. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 136, 35-48.
- Williams, D. R., Jackson, J. S., Brown, T. N., Torres, M., Forman, T. A., & Brown, K. (1999). Traditional and contemporary prejudice and urban whites' support for affirmative action and government help. *Social Problems*, 46, 503-527.

Received 10/04/2010

Accepted 12/01/2011

Valdiney V. Gouveia. Federal University of Paraíba, Brazil**Taciano L. Milfont.** Victoria University of Wellington & Centre for Applied Cross-Cultural Psychology, New Zealand**María del Carmen Martínez.** Universidad de Murcia, Spain**Consuelo Paterna.** Universidad de Murcia, Spain