

Caring for the Future:
Potential Exit from Outgroup Discrimination

Davide Morselli

University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Paper presented at the 34th Annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of
Political Psychology (ISPP), Istanbul, 9-12 July 2011.

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Davide Morselli at
the Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lausanne, CH-1015, Lausanne,
Switzerland. E-mail: davide.morselli@unil.ch

Running Head: FUTURE ORIENTATION AND INTOLERANCE

Caring About the Future: Individual Future Orientation as an Exit from Intergroup
Intolerance

Abstract

In what way does our idea of the future influence everyday behaviours and attitudes? Erikson's (1969) concept of *generativity* suggests that the concern for the continuity of life in the future is connected to a sense of responsibility for future generations and to social activism towards the community. In this article, we have investigated the relationship between future orientation, social dominance orientation and derogative intergroup attitudes. Results from a study on 217 Italian respondents show that future time perception – measured with the Consideration of Future Consequence (CFC) scale – is positively linked to concerns about the future of the community, and negatively linked to social dominance orientation (SDO) and derogative outgroup attitudes. Mediation analyses also showed that CFC partially mediated the link between SDO and intergroup intolerance, reducing the strength of the relationship. This article discusses how the perception of future time plays an important role in the study of prejudice and intergroup relations, showing potential for applicative research on group conflict reduction.

Keywords: future time perception; generativity; social dominance orientation; prejudice.

Caring About the Future: Individual Future Orientation as an Exit from Intergroup Intolerance

In the famous so-called “good Samaritan” experiment on helping behaviour (Darley & Batson, 1973), participants were asked to move from one building to another during the study. On the way to the next building, they encountered a man lying slumped in an alleyway. The goal of the experiment was to study reactions of participants *vis-à-vis* a help request from strangers. Darley and Batson manipulated several variables to understand under which conditions people were most likely to help others. In particular, they varied the amount of urgency by telling in one condition that the subject was late for the next task. Results showed that the perception of time was one of the most important factors in predicting helping behaviour: the majority of participants that perceived they were not in a hurry prompted help, while those believing they were late did not prompt any helping behaviour.

To what extent does the perception of time influence our present? In what way does our idea of the future affect everyday behaviours and attitudes? The present research will address these questions and it concerns the interaction between the perspective on future and intergroup relations. The first part of the article, discusses some of the different approaches to the study of future orientation developed in psychology. The second part presents data supporting the hypothesis that future orientation can regulate intergroup relations and reduce intolerance towards social minorities.

Spotting the Future to Know the Present

Discussing the crisis of the principle of authority on the basis of clinical experience and with particular reference to adolescence, Benasayag and Schmitt (2005) argued that contemporary Western societies are affected by a lack of confidence in the future, which leads to an over-focus on the present and a loss of sense of long-term social ties. According to the two psychologists, when the future becomes something to avoid rather than to be aspired to, then individuals focus on the immediate satisfaction without considering the consequences of today's actions on the tomorrow's society. Furthermore, Benasayag and Schmitt suggest that societies – without the guarantee of the individual sense of social responsibility for the future – turn into stricter and more rigid structures, based on the use of power and coercion. Thus, the lack of responsibility for the future – with all the implied obligations and duties – instead of developing into greater individual freedom turns into more rigid and unequal social ties, because in a present-oriented society the only way to guarantee individuals' accountability is through the introduction of rigid rules that limit freedom.

Notwithstanding the centrality of this topic in social psychology, relatively few research studies have explored the links between future orientation and social behaviour and attitudes. Kurt Lewin (1948) was probably the very first author, or at least the most important, who systematically considered the influence of time on social behaviour. By translating the relativity theory (Einstein, 1931) and the philosophical arguments of Kant (1782/2007), Husserl (1964) and Heidegger (1992) into psychology, Lewin defined the time perspective as “the totality of the individual's views of his psychological future and psychological past existing at a given time” (Lewin, 1951, p. 75). According to Strathman, Gleicher, Boninger and Edwards (1994), the evaluation of future consequences of individual actions

supposedly represents a stable inter-individual difference and is anchored to different types of social behaviour and attitudes. The extent to which individuals project themselves into the future, the clarity with which individuals perceive future needs, and the degree to which present is connected to the past and the future, describes the time context (Husman & Shell, 2008) that individuals consider when making judgements about what is the adequate behaviour in their present. Moreover, Zimbardo and Boyd (1999) argued that time orientation is related to some personality traits. In particular, they found that a future time orientation was positively correlated with three of the Big Five dimensions of personality: conscientiousness $r(310) = .57$, $p < .001$; extroversion $r(310) = .30$, $p < .001$; openness $r(310) = .11$, $p < .05$.

In more recent years, interesting results on the link between future time orientation and present behaviour were found in the domain of environmental psychology, according to which the capability of evaluating future scenarios would be a good predictor of how people respond to climate change (Swim et al, 2010). For instance, Strathman and colleagues (Strathman et al. 1994; Lindsay & Strathman, 1997) showed that individuals that score high on the importance attached to future consequences of their actions are more persuaded by long-term benefits of environmental interventions and are more likely to engage in changing consuming behaviours, such as recycling and resource conservation. These results are in line with Joireman and colleagues (2001) who found that recognizing the long-term consequences of behaviour was moderately correlated to higher pro-environmental attitudes and behaviours among US university student participants. Similarly, in a study on Brazilian university students, Milfont and Gouveia (2006) found that future orientations mediated the relationship between social values and pro-environmental attitudes. Likewise, a research on a random sample of US citizens (Dietz, Dan &

Shwon, 2007) showed that future orientation was a large predictor of support for climate change policies. Therefore, all this research suggests that future focus should be connected to a sense of responsibility for the community and its future.

Generativity and Responsibility for the Community

Erik Erikson is mostly known in social psychology for his theories on identity formation across childhood and adolescence (Erikson, 1968), although his view covered the whole life span and he theorized that different periods of life corresponded to different needs and goals. In particular, in his book on Gandhi's life and events, Erikson (1969) suggested that adulthood expresses itself through *generativity*, i.e. the adult's concern for the continuity of life. According to Erikson, generativity is commonly and biologically expressed by parenting, but can also turn into a more general sense of responsibility for the community and the future generations, leading adults to find satisfaction in social activities such as teaching, mentoring, leadership and other actions that may leave behind a positive legacy for the future. Long forgotten, the concept of generativity has found new applications in empirical research in life-course and in studies of personality psychology and sociology (de St. Aubin, McAdams & Kim, 2004; Kotre, 1999; McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992; Snarey, 1993). For instance, research on the Midlife Development in the United States survey has shown that generativity was the most consistent predictor of many dimensions of social responsibility, such as volunteerism and contributing with time and money to community concerns, even after controlling for age and other socio-demographic factors. Similarly, Cole and Stewart (1996) found that generativity was linked to feelings of attachment to the community and civic agency.

It is worth noting that some research has shown that generativity describes an inclusive attitude towards society, rather than being exclusive or ascribed to one's

own family and beloved children (Marcia, 2010). Some research by Bradley (1997) and Bradley and Marcia (1998) has shown that generativity also differs from fostering others for instrumental purposes – i.e. caring only for people considered to be similar (as members of ingroup) or mainly for achieving personal goals. In its most developed way, generativity is indeed independent of immediate advantages or effects. Rather, it is focused on generations that have yet to come and children yet to be born (Erikson, 1969; Marcia, 2010).

These considerations suggest that generativity and future orientation and future consequences may be closely linked to a definition of community as an inclusive playground for different categories of people and social groups. This process of inclusion of outgroups within the concept of one's own community involves the extension of social justice to groups that had formerly been excluded, such as groups oppressed by and marginalized from society (Opatow, 1990; Passini, 2010). Inclusion is indeed linked to considering outgroups as eligible of fairness entitled to resources, and is therefore linked to willingness of to make sacrifices to foster a common sake (Opatow, 2008). The exclusion of the other from shared norms, justice and moral values is instead connected to a focus on the ingroup and a conception of the world as hierarchically stratified.

Surprisingly, little research has been carried out in this direction. In the last ten years, Insko and colleagues (Cohen & Insko, 2008; Insko, Shopler, Gaertner, Wildschut, Kozar, Pinter, Finkel, Brazil, Cecil & Montoya, 2001; Wolf, Cohen, Kirchner, Rea, Montoya & Insko, 2009) have stressed that future orientation is pivotal to reducing intergroup conflict. Their interesting experimental results showed that the manipulation of the way individuals think of the future may be a sufficient condition to generate some cooperative behavior towards outgroups. Indeed, qualitative research

on the Tulsa community in Oklahoma – where in 1921 the city administration was responsible for inciting a white mob that burned down the houses of America's most affluent Black community and murdered an estimated 300 Black residents (Madigan, 2001) – highlighted that people who focus on the long-term survival of their community are more willing to accept norms of distributive justice and intergroup equality (Greenwood, 2008). Similarly, in a group of 123 U.S. undergraduate students, Thornhill and Fincher (2007) found that consideration of future consequence was negatively correlated [$r(121) = -.25, p < .01$] with social dominance orientation (SDO) (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle, 1994). That is, people with a propensity to classify social groups on a superiority-inferiority dimension laid less emphasis on the future.

These findings are particularly interesting if considered together with research on the close link between SDO and derogative attitudes towards outgroups – e.g. racism, intolerance, prejudice, social distance. SDO indeed has been proven to be a powerful predictor of racism and prejudice, accounting for over the 50% of the variance in various measures (e.g., Ekehammar, Akrami, Gylje & Zakrisson, 2004; Roets, Van Hiel & Cornelis, 2006; Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2002). Thus, if ideologies that justify social hierarchy – i.e. social dominance orientation – are predictive of social intolerance and future orientation is negatively linked to such ideologies, we can hypothesize that future orientation would, on the one hand, be negatively linked to derogative outgroup attitudes, as postulated by Marcia (2010), and, on the other, it could mediate the link between SDO and social intolerance, leading to a substantial reduction in prejudice.

The aim of this research is to investigate the relationship between future orientation, social dominance orientation and derogative intergroup attitudes in order

to find new ways of overcoming social conflict and improve community building. In particular, we expect that (1) individual future orientation will be positively linked to concerns about community future; (2) negatively linked to SDO, and (3) negatively linked to derogative outgroup attitudes. We also expect that (4) future orientation should reduce the strength of the link between SDO and intergroup intolerance.

Results

Participants

Participants were contacted via the Internet. A total of 217 people (53 % men, 40 % women, 7% did not declare), possessing Italian citizenship, responded by accessing the website of the survey and completing the questionnaire.

Participants' ages ranged from 21 to 80 years old ($M = 42.01$, $SD = 12.31$). Job-wise, 3% declared they were factory workers; 17% office worker, 27% freelance, 5% retired, 6% teachers, 6% housewives,/househusbands 3% unemployed, 6% students and, finally, 22% chose "other", 5% did not answer the question.

In order to check and prevent a person reentering the survey site, we controlled the IP address of the subject and the e-mail declared. Fifteen people did not complete the questionnaire.

Measures

Participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire containing the following measures.

Social intolerance. Two indicators were used to measure intolerance towards outgroups: the first tapped prejudice attitudes, while the second concerned perception of inclusion and proximity of outgroups (to be considered as a reversed measure). Prejudice was measured by the *subtle-blattant* prejudice scale (on a 7-point scale from 1 = 'strongly disagree' to 7 = 'strongly agree') by Pettigrew and

Meertens (1995), translated into Italian by Arcuri and Boca (1996). The scale taps two different although correlated dimensions of prejudice – i.e. subtle and blatant prejudice. Cronbach's alpha were .76 for subtle subscale and .84 for blatant subscale. In this article the scale was used with reference to generic immigrants. Some sample items of the scale are: "It is just a matter of some people not trying hard enough. If foreigners would only try harder they could be as well off as the Italians" (subtle), "Foreigners have jobs that the Italian should have." (blatant). To measure the counterpart of prejudice – i.e. tolerance – the *inclusion of the other in the self* (IOS) scale was adapted to intergroup relations. In the original version of Aron, Aron and Smollan's scale (1992), people were asked to indicate which from among five pictures better described their relationship with the others. In the pictures two circle were drawn, the first one contained the word "Me" and the second the word "Other." Different pictures represented different Me-Other distances: from completely separated to completely overlapping. The IOS is a reliable measure of social proximity. It positively correlates with other measure of closeness and have no correlation with social desirability scales (Aron et al., 1992). In our version, we substituted "Other" with different regional groups of people – i.e. European, Asian, African and South American. Participants had to indicate their perception of overlap for each, choosing between four pictures (from completely separated to completely overlapping). The Cronbach's α of the intergroup version was .83.

Future orientation was measured by the 10-item version of the *Consideration of Future Consequences* (CFC) (Strathman et al., 1994). The CFC captures the intrapersonal struggle between the immediate vs. delayed consequences of respondent's actions (Joireman et al., 2001). Participants were

asked to rate on a scale from 1 (extremely uncharacteristic) to 7 (extremely characteristic) the extent to which each statement of the CFC described them. Strathman et al. (1994) have shown that the scale is one-dimensional and possesses high internal and test–retest reliability and good convergent and discriminant validity. The scale showed it could tap stable individual differences and was very consistent over time even in longitudinal research (Toepoel, 2010). In the current study, the reliability of the scale was $\alpha = .81$. Examples of item are “I consider how things might be in the future, and try to influence those things with my day to day behavior” and “I only act to satisfy immediate concerns, figuring the future will take care of itself” (reversed). In addition to CFC scale, respondents were asked to indicate on a scale from 0 (never) to 5 (often) how often they thought to their personal future and to the future of their own country.

Social dominance orientation (SDO). Social dominance orientation was measured by a 4-item reduced version of the SDO6 scale (Pratto et al., 1994). From a previous research (Passini, 2008), the two positive and the two negative items with highest factor loading were selected. Items were “Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups,” “Inferior groups should stay in their place,” and the reversed items “all groups should be given an equal chance in life,” “we should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.” People responded to each item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Reliability of the scale was $\alpha = .70$, which is higher than other 4-item versions of the SDO used in the past (Sidanius, Pratto & Bobo, 1994).

Covariates. Participants indicated their age, gender, political affiliation (on a 10-point scale, from 1 = extreme left to 10 = extreme right), whether they were

active members of political or social organizations, and their level of confidence in the newspapers and in television news.

Results

According to research on generativity, time orientation changes in relation to the age and the psycho-physiological development of people. Table 1 presents means and standard deviations for all measures across three categories of age: respondents aged from 20 to 35, from 35-50 and respondents older than 50. Considering age distribution, the 20-35 group had the higher proportion of female (20-35 = 59% women; 35-50 = 36%; > 50 = 35%).

In line with the generativity theory, younger people declared they thought more often to their own personal future than older people; the mean difference between the two groups was significant ($p < .01$) at Scheffe's post-hoc test. The post-hoc test also revealed that the two adult groups were significantly more oriented to thinking about the future of the country and had higher CFC scores than the 20-35 year old group.

Concerning differences on the other variables, young people in our sample had lower scores on the IOS – significant at $p < .05$ – and slightly higher on blatant prejudice and social dominance than the over 50s (Scheffe's test: $p = .08$) but not the 36-50 age group. Comparisons between the two adult groups showed no significant differences.

Table 2 includes Pearson correlation coefficients for the overall sample. In line with previous research, the correlation between SDO and prejudice, especially blatant prejudice, was high, and IOS negatively correlated with SDO and prejudice. The positive correlation between CFC and concerns for the future of the country [$r(209) = .46, p < .001$] supported our first hypothesis according to which future orientation –

i.e. CFC – is linked to social rather than personal concerns. Correlation between CFC and concerns for personal future was null.

In line with the second and third hypotheses, respondents scoring high on CFC scored low on SDO¹ and on both dimensions of intergroup prejudice, and scored high on social proximity (IOS). A similar correlation pattern was found for concerns about the future of the country, with the difference being that the correlation with personal future was positive, and with SDO and prejudice much lower – although still significant at $p < .05$.

Confidence in television news and newspapers had opposite correlations with measures stressing intergroup differences and outgroup exclusion, but the correlations with future orientations were null. It is also interesting that political affiliation and political activism correlated $r(179) = .30, p < .001$, that is, in our sample the activists were mainly right-wingers and men [$r(190) = -.27, p < .001$].

Structural Equation Model

A Structural Equation Model (SEM) was computed to test whether individual future orientation might play a role in reducing prejudice. In particular, in our model we assumed that blatant and subtle prejudice and the social distance may be explained by the same psychological dimension. Thus, we considered derogative outgroup attitudes (DOA) to be a latent factor underlying prejudice and, in a reversed way, social proximity. Compared to the use of a single index computed as the mean of the three indicators, considering DOA as a latent dimension allows us to preserve information about the variance of single indicators that would otherwise have been lost and confused. As suggested by Hu and Bentler (1999), model fit was assessed using the χ^2 test, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Root Mean Square Error of

¹ The negative link between SDO and CFC persisted even after controlling for the effects of age and activism on CFC.

Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMSR). A two to one or less ratio of χ^2 value to degrees of freedom in the model suggests a good fit (Carmines & McIver, 1981). For the CFI, values close to or greater than .95 indicate good model fit, while for RMSEA and SRMS values below .06 indicate good model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

A CFA with maximum likelihood estimator was performed with Mplus 6.1 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2010) to determine the indicators loaded on DOA. The model fitted the data well: $\chi^2(1, N = 213) = .57, p = .45$; CFI = 1.00, RMSEA < .01, SRMR = .01; keeping blatant prejudice as reference (i.e. constrained to 1), the unstandardized factor loading of subtle prejudice was .89 ($SE = .04$), $p < .001$, and that of IOS was -.16 ($SE = .03$), $p < .001$.

Social dominance orientation (SDO), consideration of future consequences (CFC), age, sex, political activism and confidence in the media were then tested as predictors of DOA and excluded from the model if not significant. The coefficient estimates of the final model are reported in Figure 1 (standard errors are reported in brackets); CFC, SDO and confidence in television news were, among the variables of the research, the only significant predictors of DOA. To test whether future orientation may reduce the strength of the link between SDO and intergroup intolerance (Hypothesis 4), we controlled the model for indirect effects of CFC on the path between SDO and DOA. The final model fitted the data in a satisfactory way: $\chi^2(6, N = 166) = 12.34, p = .06$.; CFI = .98; RMSEA = .08²; SRMR = .04. The overall variance explained of the latent factor DOA was $R^2 = .76$ and that for single indicators was: blatant prejudice, $R^2 = .58$; subtle prejudice, $R^2 = .38$; IOS, $R^2 = .19$. The model's unstandardized estimates are reported in Figure 1.

² Although the conventional cutoff for RMSEA is fixed to .06, RMSEA tend to overreject models at small sample size and it is less reliable when sample size is $N < .250$, thus it has to be considered in conjunction with other fit indexes (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

In line with previous studies, SDO resulted to be a really powerful predictor of prejudice. In addition, as hypothesized, SDO was negatively linked to CFC, which in turn had a negative effect on DOA [$B = -.33$ ($SE = .12$), $p < .001$]. The mediation analysis between CFC, SDO and DOA was computed with Mplus (Delta Method, Taylor, MacKinnon & Tein, 2008). In line with our hypothesis, results show that the indirect effect of SDO on DOA through CFC was significant [$B = .09$ (.04), $p < .05$]: i.e. the magnitude of the SDO coefficient decreased by .09 when the model controlled for individual responses to the CFC scale. Even if the size of the indirect effect was not high, it was systematic across the observations as indicated by the low p -value (Ziliak & McCloskey, 2008): i.e. individuals with high SDO had a likelihood higher than 95% of scoring lower on DOA when they had high scores of CFC. Thus, in line with expectations, CFC partially mediated the path between SDO and the latent variable.

Discussion

The results of the present research are intriguing and we think they can pave the road to a new approach in the study of prejudice and intergroup relations. Indeed, although the CFC scale does not include any specific question about intergroup relations but focuses on the individual perception of the future, the results show that such a perception is highly linked to the concern for the future of the community and – as hypothesized – has a moderate effect on derogative outgroup attitudes. We think this result has two main consequences for social psychology.

On the one hand, it highlights that time and its perception are important dimensions for social psychology, although they have been neglected at length (Spini, Elcheroth & Figini, 2008). Indeed, our results suggest that – as argued by Erikson (1963) – the concern about future overflows the edges of personal future and spreads

over the concern for the future of the community. In line with Erikson's theory of generativity and following postulates (de st. Aubin, Mc Adams, Kim, 2004; Marcia, 2010), the concern for the continuity of life should overcome the issue of one's own procreation to turn into a sense of care and protection towards the future of the society in all its manifestations. In this sense, generativity is not linked to the perception of the immediate future, but is directed towards the long term future. The philosopher Hans Jonas (1984) indeed distinguishes between an horizontal responsibility, addressed to fellow mates and which we could also be consider as an ingroup responsibility, and a vertical responsibility that goes beyond our immediate progeny and that is referred to unknown future generations. Generativity and vertical responsibility are closely interrelated notions and both are relevant concepts for social psychology in understanding those individual "forces" oriented to preserving the perpetuation of the community for the next generations. These forces suggest the individual as an actor in social change rather than as a mere bystander. In this sense, both concepts of generativity and vertical responsibility lead to an active commitment towards the community and society. The correlation between future orientation and IOS also suggests that such a commitment goes in the direction of the inclusion of other social groups.

In addition, the other important result of this research is represented by the partial mediation of SDO by CFC. That is, future orientation has the effect of partially reducing the well-known link between social dominance orientation and derogation of outgroups. The results highlighted that the respondents who think about the future and the consequences of their actions declared a lower negative attitude towards the outgroup, in spite of what they think about intergroup hierarchy. Even if the effect was marginal in magnitude, it was systematic in our sample. This opens the door to

the second important implication of this study. Indeed, if a simple measure of future orientation as the CFC showed an effect of mediation over SDO and intergroup prejudice, a more systematic emphasis on future orientation could be used to reduce intergroup conflicts and derogative attitudes towards outgroups. This result is in line with research on post-conflict communities which showed that concerns for social norms become relevant when the survival of the community is at stake (Spini, Elcheroth, Fasel, 2008; Elcheroth & Spini, 2009) That is, the more people are concerned about the future of the community, the more they are likely to overcome ideological and ethnical differences and foster tolerance. In this sense, concerns for the future of society are not socially neutral, but push towards balanced intergroup relations and a decline in social conflicts.

Thus, thinking about the future and about the consequences of our actions for the future not only have an effect on concerns for the society and for the future generations in terms of the continuity of our world – e.g. the effects on environmental interventions and pro-environmental attitudes and behaviours demonstrated by the literature – and therefore only indirectly related to other people. It directly influences the perception of the others and the interaction with the others. This is a point that may open many applicative interventions on the reduction of prejudice and the promotion of ethnic tolerance. Indeed, according to Lewin's (1948) analysis, future orientation is a relevant factor for coping with intergroup violence. Similarly, Seginer (2008) argues that the type of future orientation – such as threats or hopes – may speed up processes of coping and resilience in adolescents exposed to violent conflicts. The analysis of our data heads in the same direction and suggests that future orientation could be an important factor in reducing intergroup tension. Thus, further developments in the research on time orientation and perspective could have an

applicative approach, exploring whether different dimensions of future orientation – e.g. extension, density, valence, accessibility (Lasane & O'Donnell, 2005) – may have different effects or interactions in situations of real life intergroup hostility. For instance, it would be worthwhile exploring what relations may exist between the extension of the future time perspective – i.e. how far individuals or groups project themselves into the future – and the willingness to reduce group conflict in post-civil war communities.

Reference

- Arcuri L., & Boca, S. (1996). Pregiudizio e affiliazione politica: destra e sinistra di fronte all'immigrazione dal terzo mondo [Prejudice and political affiliation: Left and right confronting immigration from the Third World]. In P. Legrenzi & V. Girotto (Eds.), *Psicologia e politica* [Psychology and politics] (pp. 241-274). Milano: Raffaello Cortina.
- Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of other in the self scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 596-612.
- Benasayag, M., & Schmit, G. (2003). *Les passions tristes. Souffrance psychique et crise sociale* [Sad passions. Psychic sufferance and social crisis], Paris: La Découvert.
- Bradley, C. L. (1997). Generativity-stagnation: Development of a status model. *Developmental Review, 17* (3), 262-290.
- Bradley, C. L., & Marcia, J. E. (1998). Generativity-stagnation: A five-category model. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 39-64.
- Carmines, E. G., & McIver, J. P. (1981). Analyzing models with unobserved variables: Analysis of covariance structures. In G. W. Bohrnstedt & E. F. Borgatta (Eds). *Social Measurement: Current Issues* (pp. 65-115). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cohen, T., & Insko, C. (2008). War and peace: Possible approaches to reducing intergroup conflict. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3*, 87-93.

- Cole, E. R., & Stewart, A. J. (1996). Meanings of political participation among black and white women: Political identity and social responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 1, 130-40.
- Darley, J. M., & Batson, C. D. (1973). From Jerusalem to Jericho: A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27*, 29-40.
- de St. Aubin, E., McAdams, D. P., & Kim, T. (2004). *The generative society: Caring for future generations*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Dietz, T., Dan, A., & Shwom, R. (2007). Support for climate change policy: Social psychological and social structural influences. *Rural Sociology, 72*, 185-214.
- Einstein, A. (1931). *Relativity: The special and general theory*. New York: Crown.
- Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., Gylje, M., & Zakrisson, I. (2004). What Matters Most to Prejudice: Big Five Personality, Social Dominance Orientation, or Right-Wing Authoritarianism?. *European Journal of Personality, 18*, 463-482.
- Elcheroth, G., & Spini, D. (2009). Public support for the prosecution of human rights violations in the Former Yugoslavia. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 15*, 189-214.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1969). *Gandhi's truth: On the origins of militant nonviolence*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Greenwood, R.M. (2008). *Time, Place, & Identity: Reparations and the Tulsa Race Riot*. Paper presented at the 7th Biennial Convention of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Chicago, Illinois.
- Heidegger, M. (1992). *Being and time*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Hiel, A. V., & Mervielde, I. (2002). Explaining conservative beliefs and political preferences: A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 965-987.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1-55.
- Husman, J., & Shell, D. F. (2008). Beliefs and perceptions about the future: A measurement of future time perspective. *Learning and Individual Differences, 18*, 166-175.
- Husserl, E. (1964). *The phenomenology of internal time-consciousness*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Insko, C. A., Schopler, J., Gaertner, L., Wildschut, T., Kozar, R., Pinter, B., et al. (2001). Interindividual-intergroup discontinuity reduction through the anticipation of future interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 95-111.
- Joireman, J. A., Lasane, T. P., Bennett, J., Richards, D., & Solaimani, S. (2001). Integrating social value orientation and the consideration of future consequences within the extended norm activation model of proenvironmental behaviour. *The British Journal of Social Psychology, 40*, 133-55.
- Jonas, H. (1984). *The imperative of responsibility: In search of an ethics for the technological age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kant, I. (1782/2007). *Critique of pure reason*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kotre, J. N. (1984). *Outliving the self: Generativity and the interpretation of lives*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Lasane, T. P., & O'Donnell, D. A. (2005). Time orientation measurement: A conceptual approach. In E. Strathman & J. Joireman (Eds.), *Understanding behavior in the context of time: Theory, research, and application* (pp.11-30). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lewin, K. (1948). *Resolving social conflicts*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in the social sciences*. New York: Harper & Co.
- Lindsay, J. J., & Strathman, A. (1997). Predictors of recycling behavior: An application of a modified health belief model. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27*, 1799.
- Madigan, T. (2001). *The burning: Massacre, destruction, and the Tulsa race riot of 1921*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Marcia, J. E. (2010). Life transitions and stress in the context of psychosocial development. In T. W. Miller (Ed), *Handbook of stressful transitions across the lifespan* (pp. 19-34), New York: Springer.
- McAdams, D. P., & de St. Aubin, E. (1992). A theory of generativity and its assessment through self-report, behavioral acts, and narrative themes in autobiography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 1003-1015.
- Milfont, T. L., & Gouveia, V. V. (2006). Time perspective and values: An exploratory study of their relations to environmental attitudes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 26*, 72-82.
- Muthén, L. K. & Muthén, B. O. (1998-2010). *Mplus user's guide* (6th ed). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Opatow, S. (1990). Moral exclusion and injustice: an introduction. *Journal of Social Issues, 46*, 1-20.

- Opatow, S. (2008). "Not so much as place to lay our head...": Moral inclusion and exclusion in the American civil war reconstruction. *Social Justice Research, 21*, 26-49.
- Passini, S. (2008). Exploring the multidimensional facets of authoritarianism: authoritarian aggression and social dominance orientation. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 67*, 51-60.
- Passini, S. (2010). Moral reasoning in a multicultural society: Moral inclusion and moral exclusion. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 40*, 435-451.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 25*, 57-75.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social Dominance Orientation: A Personality Variable Predicting Social and Political Attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741-763.
- Roets, A., Van Hiel, A., & Cornelis, I. (2006). Does materialism predict racism? Materialism as a distinctive social attitude and a predictor of prejudice. *European Journal of Personality, 20*, 155-168.
- Seginer, R. (2008). Future orientation in times of threat and challenge: How resilient adolescents construct their future. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32*, 272-282.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Bobo, L. (1994). Social Dominance Orientation and the Political Psychology of Gender: A Case of Invariance?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 998-1011.
- Snarey, J. R. (1993). *How fathers care for the next generation: A four-decade study*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

- Spini, D., Elcheroth, G., & Fasel, R. (2008). The impact of group norms and generalization of risks across groups on judgments of war behavior. *Political Psychology, 29*, 919-941.
- Spini, D., Elcheroth, G., & Figini, D. (2008). Is there space for time in social psychology publications? A content analysis across five journals. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 19*, 165-181.
- Strathman, A., Gleicher, F., Boninger, D. S., & Edwards, C. S. (1994). The consideration of future consequences: Weighing immediate and distant outcomes of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*, 742.
- Swim, J., Clayton, S., Doherty, T., Gifford, R., Howard, G., Reser, J., et al. (2009). *Psychology and global climate change: Addressing a multi-faceted phenomenon and set of challenges*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Taylor, A., MacKinnon, D., & Tein, J.-Y. (2008). Tests of the three-path mediated effect. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 241-269.
- Thornhill, R., & Fincher, C. L. (July 01, 2007). What is the relevance of attachment and life history to political values?. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 28*, 215-222.
- Toepoel, V. (2010). Is consideration of future consequences a changeable construct?. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*, 951-956.
- Wolf, S. T., Cohen, T. R., Kirchner, J. L., Rea, A., Montoya, R. M., & Insko, C. A. (2009). Reducing intergroup conflict through the consideration of future consequences. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*, 831-841.

Ziliak, S. T., & Mc Closkey, D. N. (2008). *The cult of statistical significance: How the standard error costs us jobs, justice, and lives*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Zimbardo, P. G., & Boyd, J. N. (1999). Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable individual-differences metric. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 6, 1271-1288.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations and ANOVA by Group of Age

Variable	Age 20-35		Age 36-50		Age > 50		F
	<i>n</i> = 66		<i>n</i> = 76		<i>n</i> = 60		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Age	28.86	3.95	42.53	4.55	56.78	5.48	-
Female	.59	.50	.36	.48	.35	.48	5.33**
CFC	4.22	.82	4.86	.64	4.82	.67	16.79**
Future of country	3.25	1.35	3.92	1.11	3.82	1.25	6.08**
Personal future	4.20	.91	3.94	1.14	3.60	1.13	5.32**
SDO	1.79	1.03	1.42	.77	1.45	.81	3.01*
Blatant prejudice	2.89	1.73	2.31	1.51	2.33	1.37	3.05*
Subtle prejudice	3.13	1.84	2.72	1.62	2.85	1.34	1.18
IOS	2.29	.73	2.51	.82	2.70	.61	4.93*
Political affiliation	4.09	3.13	3.84	3.11	3.62	2.88	.37
Activist	.30	.46	.36	.48	.38	.49	.41
Trust in TV	2.45	1.47	2.50	1.25	2.58	1.39	.14
Trust in Newspapers	3.26	1.45	3.41	1.37	3.67	1.41	1.35

Note. ** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$. CFC = Consideration of Future Consequences. SDO =

Social Dominance Orientation. IOS = Inclusion of Other in the Self.

Table 2

Correlations for Variables of the Study

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
1. Age	-											
2. Female	-.21**	-										
3. CFC	.30**	-.02	-									
4. Future of country	.23**	.03	.46**	-								
5. Personal future	-.16*	.05	.04	.39**	-							
6. SDO	-.15 ^a	-.18*	-.31**	-.18*	.05	-						
7. Blatant prejudice	-.13 ^a	-.14*	-.27**	-.18*	-.02	.64**	-					
8. Subtle prejudice	-.03	-.18*	-.18**	-.15*	-.03	.52**	.76**	-				
9. IOS	.24**	.04	.25**	.29**	.06	-.35**	-.36**	-.28**	-			
10. Political affiliation	-.06	-.27**	-.16*	-.18*	-.13	.58**	.72**	.64**	-.31**	-		
11. Activist	.09	-.27**	.10	.14	-.07	.06	.22**	.17*	-.03	.30**	-	
12. Trust in TV	.01	.14*	-.04	-.05	-.01	.10	.20**	.15*	.00	.19**	-.03	-

13. Trust in Newspapers .14* .14* .09 .11 .13^a -.15* -.10 -.11 .18** -.16* .01 .51**

Note. ** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$. CFC = Consideration of Future Consequences; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation; IOS = Inclusion of Other in the Self.

Figure caption:

Figure 1. Structural Equation Model of Derogative Outgroup Attitudes. Reported coefficients are unstandardized. Standard errors are indicated parenthesis. The total effect of SDO on DOA is reported in square brackets. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

