

The Values and Attitudes Towards TEU in a Cross-Cultural Sample*

Melek Göregenli, Pelin Karakuş
Ege Üniversitesi, Izmir, Turkey

Hans Werner Bierhoff
Ruhr University, Bochum, Germany

The aim of this research is to determine the attitudes towards the TEU (Turkey's entry to the European Union) in terms of group-based values, system justification theory, SDO (social dominance orientation), human rights, gender roles, and socio-demographical variables in two different cultural groups. The sample consisted of 151 college students from Ege University in Izmir, Turkey (37 males and 61 females), and Ruhr University in Bochum, Germany (29 males and 24 females). The mean age of Turkish participants was 22.7 years old (range = 19-38, $SD=3.47$) and of German participants was 23.7 years old (range = 18-59, $SD=6.14$). Participants filled out a questionnaire including Schwartz value scale (1992; 43 items) modified to measure the value priorities of Europeans at group level rather than their own values, system justification survey (Jost & Banaji, 1994), SDO (Sidanius, Levin, & Pratto, 1999), gender attitude inventory (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Bilder, 1995), and several socio-demographic questions. Multiple regression analysis including only the values revealed that hedonism ($\beta = -0.22$; $p < 0.05$) and achievement ($\beta = 0.20$; $p < 0.05$) are the significant predictors of TEU in whole sample. The latter regression analysis revealed that ethnicity factor ($\beta = 0.42$; $p < 0.05$) is the significant predictor in Turkish sample whereas political view ($\beta = -0.37$; $p < 0.05$) is the significant predictor in German sample. Significant differences emerged on social dominance, system justification, and enforcement of family roles and civil engagement of human rights depending on cultural group, political orientation, and religious affiliation. The contextual dimensions and cultural implications of the results are discussed on the basis of social-psychological theories.

Keywords: TEU (Turkey's entry to the European Union) membership, values, SDO (social dominance orientation), system justification, human rights, gender roles

Introduction

Turkish community is in a new period on the process of entry to the EU (European Union) in its westernization process since the administrative reforms until today. Turkey's accession process to the EU is not only one of the important political phenomena in aspect of the democratization of the country, but also an academic limelight in recent years because of its dynamic and changing structure (Göregenli, 2010). Turkish intuition about the EU is nothing less than the culmination of a very intense interaction deepened by geography and a history spanning hundreds of years. Therefore, it makes sense to place the Turkish-EU relationship within

***Acknowledgment:** The authors are grateful to Shalom H. Schwartz for his comments on earlier version of this paper.
Melek Göregenli, professor, Ege Üniversitesi.
Pelin Karakuş, Ph.D. candidate, Ege Üniversitesi.
Hans Werner Bierhoff, professor, Faculty of Psychology, Ruhr University.

this long historical context (Aybar, Mergen, Perotti, & Reid, 2007). In this historical respect, cultural, regional and religious differences and occasionally conflict have characterized Turkish-European relations. Thus, the main dimensions of differentiation between Turkey and Europe are differences with respect to EU criteria concerning economy and human rights and cultural/religious differences reflected by the history of conflict (Hortaçsu & Cem-Ersoy, 2005; Kuşdil & Şimşek, 2007). The last two decades were characterised by political and social reforms in Turkey since accession negotiations started in October, 2005. Some of the reforms that had a bearing on the Kurdish issue in Turkey, among others, included the reduction of the influence of the military in Turkish politics and public policy, the abolishment of the death penalty and state security courts, enabling broadcasting and education in minority languages, liberalising freedom of expression and association, and the adoption of a modernised penal and civil code (Kirişçi, 2011; Kirişçi & Çapan, 2004). Turkish governmental volition continues to make efforts on the way to EU with a changing support of public opinion as shown in several opinion surveys (Çarkoğlu, 2003; Esmer, 1997; Göregenli, 2010; Göregenli & Teközel, 2006; Hortaçsu & Cem-Ersoy, 2005; TESEV, 2002; TUSES, 1999). There is evidence from Turkish opinion survey data that the majority of Turkish citizens are, at best, ambivalent about the EU and European integration (Göregenli, 2010; Göregenli & Teközel, 2006; Hortaçsu & Cem-Ersoy, 2005), and at worst, openly negative and sceptical about the enterprise (Göregenli, 2010; Sandal-Önal, 2007).

This ongoing accession process sometimes causes a rigid political polarization in several social and political groups in Turkey. Turkey's efforts towards democratization related to the undertaking of attaining admission to the EU have brought into the focus of interest in the citizens' attitudes, values, beliefs, and ideologies related to democracy and the democratic lifestyle.

Thus, the present study aimed to provide a social-psychological analysis to one of the most controversial topics in Turkey's current agenda. The analysis was based on individual values and several social-psychological variables that predict rationalization ideology of political conservatism. Two core dimensions of conservative ideology are resistance to change and acceptance of inequality (Altemeyer, 1998; Jost & Thompson, 2000). Although there is numerous empirical evidence of a link between system justification, SDO (social dominance orientation), right-wing authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1998; Cohrs, Moschner, Maes, & Kielmann, 2005; Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002; McFarland & Adelson, 1996; Rohan & Zanna, 1996), social norms and attitudes (Collani & Grumm, 2009; Stankov, 2007), normativism, dogmatism, different forms of prejudice (Wilson, 1973), and conservative ideology on the one hand (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003), as well as conservatism and values on the other hand (Feather, 1979, 1984; Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009), it may be surprising that researchers showed few efforts (Heaven & Oxman, 1999) to examine the interactions between these variables.

The theoretical framework of the current study is outlined in the following paragraphs:

(1) Schwartz Value Taxonomy. Values were defined as desirable, transsituational goals, varying in importance, which serve as guiding principles in people's lives (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Ten values were distinguished based on the universal requirements of human existence. Brief definitions of the central goal underlying each value are summarized in Table 1. The Schwartz Value Taxonomy is based on two dimensions. One dimension opposes openness to change (self-direction and stimulation) into conservation (conformity, tradition, and security). The other contrasts self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence)

with self-enhancement (achievement and power). Hedonism shares elements of both openness and self-enhancement. This structure has been empirically confirmed by research in a number of domains, using various samples and different methods of measurement (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003; Devos, Spini, & Schwartz, 2002; Schwartz, 2005a, 2005b; Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004; Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, & Knafo, 2002; Schwartz, Struch, & Bilsky, 1990);

(2) SDO. Social dominance theory is used to conceptualise the intergroup relations. The theory includes the evolutionary assumption that all social systems will draw on a settled, stable, and group-based hierarchy. One of the mechanisms justifying or even feeding the unequal relations among groups is the justified myths “raising the hierarchy” rather than “adopting to hierarchy” (Pratto, 1999; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Some permanent beliefs in the direction of inequality of people, groups, cultures, nations and states, and existence of a natural hierarchy among them constitute the basic framework of the social dominance theory (Lipkus & Siegler, 1993; Sidanius, 1993). People justify the intergroup hierarchies by some stereotypic beliefs, such as: “It is probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups at the bottom”; “Some groups of people are just more worthy than others”; “Superior groups should dominate inferior groups”; and consequently inequalities and injustices generally become a natural process;

(3) System justification theory. The main focus of system justification theory is the use of stereotypes and other supportive ideological tools for protecting the existing social system (Jost et al., 2003; Jost & Hunyady, 2002). Researchers emphasize that people have an instinct for justifying the system to support or increase the justification and the stability of the given forms of social orders. The most impressive aspect of this view is not only the advantaged groups, but also the disadvantaged groups of people who engage themselves in the system justification and can explain what they live by using this justification as an adaptation mechanism. Women can directly embrace the stereotypes related with man dominant ideology that do violence to them. Women can think that, “They are less intelligent, they should not be left by their own, if a woman takes a beat there should be reason for it”. Or in an opposite way, disadvantaged groups have common beliefs that there is a positive aspect of their life. The system justification theory is firmly fixed on the efforts of combining and developing the important studies such as belief in a just world, cognitive discrepancy theory, Marxist-feminist theories of ideology, and social dominance theory. This theory should be seen as a complementary or in some ways as an improver for its theoretical premises (Jost, 2002);

(4) CEHR (Civil engagement for human rights) and military enforcement of human rights. Attitudes toward the enforcement of human rights focus on the mental structures of concern and CEHR and their relationship with general value orientations (Doise, Spini, Jesuino, Ng, & Emler, 1994; Spini & Doise, 1998; Staerklé, Clémence, & Doise, 1998), social responsibility and authoritarianism (Fetchenhauer & Bierhoff, 2004), and personality (McFarland, 2010). Fetchenhauer and Bierhoff (2004) developed a short and reliable scale to measure attitudes toward the military enforcement of human rights in order to examine how these attitudes related with CEHR, prosocial and antisocial personality dispositions, authoritarianism, and social responsibility. Social responsibility was not significantly related to the attitude toward the military enforcement of human rights although those scoring high on social responsibility indicated higher CEHR and scored higher on constructive sanctioning. In contrast, authoritarianism was positively related to the attitudes towards the military enforcement of human rights scale but negatively related to CEHR. Moreover constructive sanctioning

was positively related to the civil engagement of human rights scale and unrelated to the attitudes toward the military enforcement of human rights scale, and aggressive sanctioning was positively related to the attitudes toward the military enforcement of human rights scale, but did not correlate with the CEHR scale.

The notions on the social-psychological meanings of SDO, system justification, CEHR and attitudes towards military enforcement of human rights can be integrated into a comprehensive theoretical framework: the motivational theory of basic human values. Thus, the aim of this research is to predict the evaluations and attitudes towards TEU (Turkey's entry to the European Union) in young Turkish and German samples in terms of values, SDO, general and economical system justification, human rights, gender attitudes, and intergroup relations.

Method

Sample and Procedure

The sample of the present study consists of Turkish and German college students who are assumed to possess relatively advanced understanding of the cross-cultural differences. With pending accession of Turkey to the EU, of which Germany is the biggest member, Turkish-German relations seem to become one of the main axes of the relations between Turkey and EU. Turkey is a big Muslim country that is trying to access the EU, and at the same time, a large number of its nationals constitute immigrant communities within countries of the EU (Kirişçi, 2007). Relations between Turkey and Germany have deep roots and they are bound by close ties back over the centuries. This relation dates back to the times of the Ottoman Empire that led to the development of strong bonds with many facades that include economic, military, cultural, and social relations. Starting from the early 1960s and well into the 1970s, large numbers of Turkish nationals migrated to the Western European countries, particularly West Germany. The migration started as a result of an agreement signed by the Turkish and West Germany governments in 1961.

The sample consists of 151 college students. The participants were drawn from various sections of the state universities in Izmir, Turkey (37 males and 61 females) and Bochum, Germany (29 males and 24 females). The mean age of Turkish participants was 22.7 (range = 19-38, $SD = 3.47$) and of German participants was 23.9 (range = 18-59, $SD = 6.14$). The Turkish and German samples were not homogenous in terms of their ethnicity and religion. That is, the Turkish sample comprised 70.4% Turkish, 5.1% Kurdish, 3.1% Arabian, 2% Caucasian, 1% Georgian, 1% Circassian, and 1% Rhodian participants. Sixteen participants did not report ethnicity. The German sample comprised 88.5% German, 7.7% Russian, 1.9% Austrian participants. One participant did not report ethnicity. Forty point eight percent of the Turkish sample reported their religious background as Sunni, 14.3% Hanafi, 6.1% Alevi, and 10.2% Atheist. The German sample comprised 37% Catholic, 25.9% Protestant, 7.4% Orthodox, 1.9% Roman Catholic, 1.9% Muslim, 1.9% Jewish, and 14.8% Atheist. Twenty-eight participants in the Turkish sample and five participants in the German sample did not report religious background.

Questionnaire Translation

Respondents completed the questionnaire in their native language. Translation of questionnaires was from English to Turkish (except the scales which were validated in Turkish culture) and German was done by the authors. The survey was conducted anonymously in groups. Participants were briefed by the interviewer about

the content of the survey and the confidentiality of the data collection. The time required to complete the survey was about 15 to 25 minutes.

Instruments

A comprehensive questionnaire was prepared including socio-demographic variables, political orientation and religious affiliation and attitude scales related to social-psychological constructs. The subsections of the questionnaire with abbreviations are described as follows.

The sociodemographic variables. Questions about gender, age, education level, income, nationality, ethnic identity, and place of birth were included.

Political orientation. All participants were asked to place themselves on a single left-right continuum, from 1 (Extreme left) to 7 (Extreme right), with 4 (Centrist) as the midpoint.

Religious affiliation. Participants who were affiliated with a religion rated their affiliation to religion in response to the question: "How strong does your religious belief affect your daily life?" Responses were provided on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Very much).

The attitudes towards TEU. Attitudes towards TEU were measured with a single item, as well. All participants were asked to rate their view in response to the question: "What do you think about the joining process of Turkey to the European Union?" Responses ranged from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree).

Table 1

Definitions of the Motivational Types of Values in Terms of Their Core Goal

Value type (number of items)	Definition and item that represent each value type
Security (5)	Safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self (social order, national security, reciprocation of favours, family security, clean)
Conformity (4)	Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms (politeness, self-discipline, honouring of parents and elders, obedient)
Tradition (4)	Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self (respect for tradition, moderate, humble, accepting my portion in life)
Benevolence (5)	Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact (loyal, honest, helpful, responsible, forgiving)
Universalism (8)	Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature (equality, a world at peace, unity with nature, wisdom, a world of beauty, social justice, broadminded, protecting the environment)
Self-direction (5)	Independent thought and action-choosing, creating, exploring (freedom, independent, creativity, choosing own goals, curious)
Stimulation (3)	Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life (an exciting life, a varied life, daring)
Hedonism (2)	Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself (pleasure, enjoying life)
Achievement (4)	Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards (ambitious, influential, capable, successful)
Power (3)	Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources (social power, wealth, authority)

SVS (Schwartz value scale). All participants completed the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) which has been widely used in cross-cultural research on values. For the present study, the 43 value items used list that Schwartz recommended for cross-cultural research (Schwartz, 1992, 1994; S. H. Schwartz, personal communication, September 11, 2011). These items represent all 10 basic values, so they provide a more comprehensive test of value meaning than that of previous research. Each was followed in parentheses by an explanatory phrase intended to clarify meaning (e.g., social order (stability of society)). Turkish and German participants rated the importance of the 43 items in European society on a Likert-scale ranging from 1 (Opposed to European values)

to 7 (Of supreme importance for European people). Note that the authors focus on how Turkish and German participants differ in their perceptions of the value priorities of Europeans. In the current study, the participants rated the value priorities of an out-group rather than their own values, the more common procedure (Schwartz, 1992). The 10 value types represented by the items are shown in Table 1. To measure the priority given to each of the 10 values, single value was standardized in order to correct scale used in the value survey (Schwartz, 1992, 1994; S. H. Schwartz, personal communication, September 11, 2011; for a similar procedure, Sagiv & Schwartz, 1995).

SDO scale. This Likert-scale which has been developed by Sidanius, Pratto, and Mitchell (1994) includes 16 items. Jost and Thompson (2000) performed a factor analysis with the items of this scale and extracted two factors. These factors are “being against equality” and “group-based dominance”. According to the aim of this study, “group-based dominance” was used with regard to appropriateness to intergroup comparison. This factor consists of seven items and the responses range from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). The reliability and validity of the Turkish version of this scale were determined by Göregenli (2004; 2005) (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.78$ for the present study).

GSJ (General System Justification) scale (Kay & Jost, 2003). This scale includes eight items. The response scale ranges from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). This scale has sufficiently high reliability and good validity to justify its use as a measurement of attitudes in Turkish culture (Göregenli, 2004; 2005) (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.74$ for the present study).

ESJ (Economical System Justification) scale (Jost & Hunyady, 2002). This scale includes 17 items. The response scale ranges from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Göregenli (2005; 2010) demonstrated that the Turkish version of this scale was reliable and valid (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.82$ for the present study).

CEHR. The scale that has been developed by Fetchenhauer and Bierhoff (2004), as a measure of attitudes toward the enforcement of human rights, focused on concern and CEHR. This four-item scale includes the following items: (1) I am able to make an important contribution to the enforcement of human rights; (2) I take part in campaigns that aim at the enforcement of human rights; (3) The enforcement of human rights is not my responsibility but that of the government (to be reversed); and (4) I will join an organization like Amnesty International Organization which aims to enforce human rights (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.76$ for the present study).

ATMEHR (The attitude toward military enforcement of human rights). This 10-item scale has been also developed by Fetchenhauer and Bierhoff (2004), as a reliable and relatively short scale to measure the attitude toward military interventions in the context of the enforcement of human rights in nondemocratic countries. For the present study, four items were used with a five-point response scale. The items are: (1) Generally speaking, I object to war as a means of politics. However, in the case of the enforcement of human rights it is a different matter; (2) It is better to go to war for several months than to accept violations of human rights for an indefinite period of time; (3) One has always tried to enforce human rights via negotiations. However, sometimes there are cases where the only alternative is military force; and (4) It is a sign of a humanitarian attitude to use military means to stop violations of human rights (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.78$ for the present study).

Gender attitude inventory (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Bilder, 1995). The questionnaire includes two sub-scales: ATS (acceptance of traditional stereotypes) and EFR (endorsement of family roles) which include

10 and 11 items respectively. A sample item of the first sub-scale is: "Compared to men, women are more able to devote themselves completely to others". A sample item of the EFR subscale is: "Women should be concerned with their duties of child rearing and house handling rather than with desires for professional and business careers". The response scale ranges from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree) (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.85$ for the present study).

Results

In the first part of this section, it will provide the results of principal component analysis of 10 types of European values. In the second part, the central issue of the study, the measurements concerning values and key variables (SDO, GSJ, ESJ, ATS, EFR, CEHR, and ATMEHR) will be examined and in the third part the group differences will be presented. Finally, in the last part the findings of multiple regression analyses will be reported.

Factor Analysis: Value Priorities



Figure 1. Schwartz's theoretical structure of values.

A principal component analysis yielded two factors that explained 47.9 % of the variance with a similar internal structure of values as hypothesized by Schwartz (1992; 1994) and reproduced by Spini and Doise (1998) (see Figure 1). The first exception to a precise matching between theory and results was the location of benevolence and hedonism, though theory would predict that benevolence should have been closer to self-transcendence and hedonism to openness to change and self-transcendence value types. However, benevolence was linked to conservatism value types and closer to security and tradition, and hedonism was linked to self-enhancement value types and closer to power and achievement. Otherwise, the location of the value types confirmed the predicted internal structure of values. The first factor (24.4 % of the variance) opposed to higher order self-transcendence values (universalism -0.83) to self-enhancement values (power 0.67 and achievement 0.61). Hedonism was located in self-enhancement values with (0.66) factor loading. The second factor (23.5 % of the variance) opposed to higher order openness to change values (self-direction 0.76

and stimulation 0.73) to conservation values (security -0.51, tradition -0.47, and conformity -0.42). Benevolence was located in conservation values with (-0.64) factor loading. The internal reliabilities of the value factors were as follows: Factor 1: 0.78, and Factor 2: 0.87.

Intercorrelations Among the Key Variables

The intercorrelations among the key variables are reported in Table 2. CEHR is negatively correlated with EFR ($r = -0.19, p < 0.05$, respectively), SDO, GSJ, and ESJ ($r = -0.26, -0.29, -0.42, p < 0.01$, respectively). Contrary to CEHR, ATMEHR is positively correlated with EFR, ESJ ($r = 0.17, 0.22, p < 0.05$, respectively), SDO, and GSJ ($r = 0.28, 0.25, p < 0.01$, respectively), and as expected negatively correlated with CEHR ($r = -0.20, p < 0.05$). Several other relationships are also worth noting. ATS is positively associated with EFR, ESJ, and ATMEHR ($r = 0.29, 0.18, 0.19, p < 0.05$, respectively). EFR is correlated positively with SDO, GSJ, ESJ ($r = 0.48, 0.25, 0.35, p < 0.01$, respectively), and ATMEHR ($r = 0.17, p < 0.05$), and negatively with CEHR ($r = -0.19, p < 0.05$, respectively).

Table 2

Correlations Among the Key Variables (N=151)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. ATS	-						
2. EFR	0.29*	-					
3. SDO	0.11	0.48**	-				
4. GSJ	0.10	0.25**	0.39*	-			
5. ESJ	0.18*	0.035**	0.46**	0.61**	-		
6. CEHR	0.03	-0.19*	-0.26**	-0.29**	-0.42**	-	
7. ATMEHR	0.19*	0.17*	0.28**	0.25**	0.22*	-0.20*	-

Notes. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$.

Intercorrelations Between European Values and the Key Variables

According to the correlations between 10 types of European values and key variables, benevolence is negatively correlated with GSJ, and ESJ ($r = -0.23, p < 0.05$; $r = -0.29, p < 0.01$, respectively), and positively correlated with CEHR ($r = 0.25, p < 0.05$). Finally security is positively correlated with ATS ($r = 0.24, p < 0.05$). The intercorrelations between the key variables and values are reported in Table 3.

Table 3

Correlations Between the 10 Types of European Values and the Key Variables (N=151)

Variable	Value									
	HE	ST	CO	PO	UN	TR	SD	BE	AC	SE
1. ATS	0.12	-0.10	-0.13	0.02	-0.04	0.04	-0.07	0.03	-0.12	0.24*
2. EFR	-0.01	-0.07	-0.09	0.03	-0.10	0.08	0.06	-0.02	0.10	0.12
3. SDO	-0.06	-0.15	0.11	-0.01	0.13	0.07	-0.01	-0.15	-0.002	0.04
4. GSJ	0.11	-0.16	0.17	0.12	-0.05	0.06	-0.11	-0.23*	0.12	0.15
5. ESJ	0.13	-0.09	0.15	0.14	-0.10	-0.10	0.15	-0.29**	0.17	0.11
6. CEHR	-0.11	0.11	-0.18	0.01	0.06	-0.03	-0.11	0.25*	-0.18	-0.02
7. ATMEHR	0.05	-0.05	0.02	0.05	-0.01	0.08	0.06	-0.10	0.03	-0.06

Notes. HE = hedonism; ST = stimulation; CO = conformity; PO = power; UN = universalism; TR = tradition; SD = self-direction; BE = benevolence; AC = achievement; SE = security. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$.

Group Differences in TEU, Values, and Key Variables

Gender. The authors examined the relationship among the key variables: 10 types of European values, value priorities (two factors derived from PCA), and gender. The authors performed an analysis of variance on the key variables and 10 types of values scores. The analysis of variance with the 10 types of values was performed with adjusted mean scores. Male and female participants differed significantly on TEU ($F_{(1, 146)} = 4.760, p < 0.05$) and EFR ($F_{(1, 140)} = 8.421, p < 0.001$). Male participants ($M = 4.00, 25.74$, respectively) reported higher TEU and EFR scores than female participants did ($M = 3.35, 21.54$, respectively).

According to results with 10 types of European values, male and female participants differed significantly on stimulation ($F_{(1, 115)} = 4.319, p < 0.05$) and self-direction ($F_{(1, 115)} = 5.251, p < 0.05$). Male participants ($M = 2.95, -2.60$, respectively) reported higher stimulation and self-direction scores than female participants did ($M = 2.75, -3.66$, respectively).

Political orientation. The authors categorized participants based on their response to the single item with seven-point Likert type. A majority of participants identified with left-wing (39.4 %), a less percentage with politically moderate (27.7%), and (32.8 %) with right-wing. The analysis of variance with the 10 types of values was performed with adjusted mean scores. Analyses of associations among the key variables, 10 types of European values, values priorities (two factors), and participants political orientation revealed that there were significant differences on EFR ($F_{(2, 129)} = 15.213, p < 0.001$), SDO ($F_{(2, 131)} = 8.407, p < 0.001$), GSJ ($F_{(2, 121)} = 22.638, p < 0.001$), ESJ ($F_{(2, 121)} = 24.766, p < 0.001$), and CEHR ($F_{(2, 114)} = 9.351, p < 0.001$).

Table 4

Means and SD (Standard Deviation) for Key Variables and European Values as a Function of Political Orientation

Key variable	Political orientation			F	
	Left <i>M (SD)</i>	Moderate <i>M (SD)</i>	Right <i>M (SD)</i>		
1. Attitudes towards TEU membership	3.86 (1.92)	3.81 (1.60)	3.55 (1.81)	0.381	
2. ATS	32.19 (6.01)	28.18 (8.20)	33.50 (4.20)	0.399	
3. EFR	22.02 (7.69)	30.63 (9.90)	40.25 (2.87)	15.213***	
4. SDO	12.30 (4.59)	14.18 (4.90)	16.39 (4.93)	8.407***	
5. GSJ	15.95 (4.34)	19.88 (5.15)	22.46 (4.31)	22.638***	
6. ESJ	37.02 (9.01)	42.52 (8.12)	49.35 (6.77)	24.766***	
7. CEHR	14.86 (2.98)	13.06 (3.47)	11.94 (3.01)	9.351***	
8. ATMEHR	9.41 (3.70)	10.66 (3.45)	10.20 (3.11)	1.490	
9. European values	Hedonism	-1.77 (1.47)	-1.30 (1.55)	-1.34 (1.51)	1.081
	Stimulation	-0.78 (3.41)	-0.72 (2.64)	-0.66 (2.76)	0.015
	Self-direction	-3.01 (2.81)	-3.20 (2.28)	-3.27 (2.66)	0.875
	Universalism	0.88 (4.52)	-0.85 (4.01)	-0.69 (3.11)	3.208*
	Benevolence	3.59 (3.03)	2.29 (3.44)	2.72 (3.87)	2.144
	Tradition	4.57 (2.75)	3.64 (2.93)	3.79 (2.46)	0.307
	Conformity	1.23 (2.53)	1.78 (3.18)	2.09 (2.89)	0.103
	Security	-0.29 (3.11)	0.43 (2.71)	-0.03 (2.58)	1.233
	Power	-2.02 (2.49)	-0.65 (2.54)	-1.06 (1.80)	2.727
Achievement	-2.39 (3.11)	0.43 (2.71)	-0.03 (2.58)	0.554	
10. Value priorities	Factor 1: Self-transcendence and self-enhancement	92.04 (13.84)	90.96 (10.30)	90.20 (10.90)	0.368
	Factor 2: Openness to change-conservation	124.97 (13.84)	127.15 (15.50)	125.87 (18.22)	0.174

Notes. * $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

ANOVAs which were followed by comparisons between each cell using the Turkey adjustment procedure revealed that right-wing supporters ($M = 16.39$) reported higher SDO scores than left-wing supporters did ($M = 12.30$). Moreover, right-wing supporters reported higher ESJ and EFR scores ($M = 49.35, 40.25$, respectively) than left-wing supporters ($M = 37.02, 22.02$, respectively) and the participants ($M = 42.52, 30.63$, respectively) who placed themselves as politically moderate. On the other hand, left-wing supporters ($M = 14.86$) expressed higher CEHR scores than right-wing supporters did ($M = 11.94$) and the participants who placed themselves as politically moderate ($M = 13.06$) (see Table 4).

Comparisons of European value mean scores between each cell using the same procedure revealed that left-wing supporters ($M = 0.88$) attributed more importance to Universalism than right-wing supporters ($M = -0.69$) and participants who placed themselves as politically moderate ($M = -0.85$).

Religious affiliation. Categorization of participants based on their responses to the single item concerning the religious affiliation showed that 29.8 % of participants reported that the religion does not affect their daily life. Forty six point one percent of participants expressed that it moderately affects their daily life and 24.1% expressed that religious affiliation considerably affects their daily life. The authors now report the analyses of associations among the three key variables: European values, values priorities, and participants' religious affiliation. The three groups differed in terms of ATS ($F_{(2, 131)} = 3.819, p < 0.05$), EFR ($F_{(2, 132)} = 8.981, p < 0.001$), SDO ($F_{(2, 135)} = 8.522, p < 0.001$), GSJ ($F_{(2, 124)} = 6.166, p < 0.01$), and ESJ ($F_{(2, 125)} = 4.881, p < 0.01$).

Table 5

Means and SD for Key Variables and European Values as a Function of Religious Affiliation

Key variable	Religious affiliation			F	
	Low	Middle	High		
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)		
1. Attitudes towards TEU membership	3.67 (2.12)	3.81 (1.63)	3.48 (1.67)	0.363	
2. ATS	28.17 (7.79)	29.76 (5.89)	32.33 (5.44)	3.819*	
3. EFR	19.00 (6.21)	23.80 (9.25)	27.24 (9.03)	8.981***	
4. SDO	11.50 (3.86)	14.93 (5.15)	15.67 (5.12)	8.522***	
5. GSJ	17.58 (5.45)	19.20 (4.92)	22.07 (5.00)	6.166**	
6. ESJ	39.10 (10.31)	43.63 (8.36)	45.48 (8.01)	4.881**	
7. CEHR	13.88 (3.83)	13.26 (3.11)	13.07 (3.13)	0.523	
8. ATMEHR	9.36 (4.12)	10.14 (3.52)	9.93 (2.92)	0.590	
9. European values	Hedonism	-1.72 (1.64)	-1.30 (1.69)	-1.75 (1.04)	1.024
	Stimulation	0.41 (3.48)	-1.35 (2.30)	-1.00 (3.03)	3.970*
	Self-direction	-2.68 (2.78)	-3.08 (2.78)	-3.83 (2.71)	1.414
	Universalism	1.07 (4.96)	-0.64 (3.66)	0.00 (3.31)	1.840
	Benevolence	1.81 (2.56)	3.50 (3.70)	2.83 (3.46)	2.537
	Tradition	3.74 (2.39)	4.03 (2.64)	4.29 (2.78)	0.309
	Conformity	1.86 (2.68)	1.58 (2.85)	1.54 (2.95)	0.125
	Security	-0.74 (2.79)	0.04 (2.27)	0.79 (3.63)	2.141
	Power	-1.30 (2.26)	-1.48 (2.34)	-0.95 (2.55)	0.406
Achievement	-2.47 (1.98)	3.50 (3.70)	2.83 (3.46)	3.906*	
10. Value priorities	Factor 1: Self-transcendence and self-enhancement	91.74 (8.90)	90.87 (8.48)	88.14 (13.30)	1.085
	Factor 2: Openness to change-conservation	126.56 (15.27)	126.22 (15.24)	123.89 (19.04)	0.261

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Comparisons among cells revealed that participants who expressed high ($M = 27.24, 15.67, 45.48$, respectively) and medium ($M = 23.80, 14.93, 43.63$, respectively) levels of religious affiliation reported higher EFR, SDO and ESJ scores than the low level religious affiliation group did ($M = 19.00, 11.50, 39.10$, respectively). Moreover participants who expressed a high level of religious affiliation exhibited higher ATS and SDO scores ($M = 32.33, 15.67$, respectively) than a low level participants did ($M = 28.17, 11.50$, respectively) (see Table 5).

Comparisons of European values mean scores among each cell using the same procedure revealed that participants who had a low level of religious affiliation ($M = 0.41$) attributed more importance to stimulation than participants who had a medium level of religious affiliation ($M = -1.35$). Finally, participants who had a medium level of religious affiliation ($M = 2.83$) reported higher achievement scores than low level participants did ($M = -2.47$).

Cultural group. Next, the authors examined the relationship among key variables, values, and participants cultural group with an analysis of variance. Compared to German sample, Turkish sample scored significantly lower in GSJ ($F_{(1, 133)} = 17.881, p < 0.001$) and ESJ ($F_{(1, 132)} = 8.419, p < 0.01$), higher in CEHR ($F_{(1, 119)} = 27.727, p < 0.001$). There were no differences for other key variables (see Table 6).

Table 6

Means and SD for Key Variables and European Values as a Function of Cultural Group

Key variable	Cultural group				F	
	Turkish		German			
	M	SD	M	SD		
1. Attitudes towards TEU membership	3.66	1.91	3.61	1.58	0.024	
2. ATS	30.73	6.67	28.59	6.08	3.565	
3. EFR	24.28	8.80	21.80	8.50	2.657	
4. SDO	13.65	5.57	14.75	3.60	1.615	
5. GSJ	17.96	4.73	21.70	5.33	17.881***	
6. ESJ	40.79	9.32	45.49	8.66	8.419**	
7. CEHR	14.79	2.97	11.27	3.06	27.727***	
8. ATMEHR	9.84	3.60	10.21	3.54	0.346	
9. European values	Hedonism	-1.42	1.50	-1.73	1.60	1.131
	Stimulation	-1.11	3.13	-0.42	2.50	1.600
	Self-direction	-3.26	2.71	-2.95	2.22	0.421
	Universalism	-0.74	3.95	1.11	3.83	6.414*
	Benevolence	4.07	3.49	1.29	2.48	22.339***
	Tradition	3.94	2.97	4.27	2.01	0.460
	Conformity	0.91	2.50	2.77	2.74	14.392***
	Security	0.75	2.85	-1.18	2.24	15.320***
	Power	-1.46	2.53	-1.11	2.09	0.636
	Achievement	-1.66	2.10	-2.05	1.68	1.163
10. Value priorities	Factor 1: Self-transcendence and self-enhancement	90.61	10.74	90.86	9.16	0.018
	Factor 2: Openness to change-conservation	123.07	16.95	129.21	15.27	4.388*

Notes. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

For 10 types of European values, it was found that Turkish participants attributed more importance to benevolence ($F_{(1, 115)} = 22.339, p < 0.001$) and security ($F_{(1, 115)} = 15.320, p < 0.001$) than German participants, whereas German participants attributed more importance to universalism ($F_{(1, 115)} = 6.414, p < 0.05$), and conformity ($F_{(1, 115)} = 14.392, p < 0.001$). Finally, this study examined the relationship between value priorities and cultural group with an analysis of variance. Two cultural groups differed significantly on the second factor ($F_{(1, 129)} = 4.388, p < 0.05$). Compared to Turkish participants ($M = 123.07$), German participants ($M = 129.21$) attributed more importance to “openness to change-conservation” factor (see Table 6).

Regression Analyses

Multiple regression analyses with adjusted mean scores were conducted to investigate the predictive power of 10 European value types towards Turkey’s EU membership in the whole sample. Result of the regression analyses revealed that hedonism and achievement are the significant predictors. These values explained 27% of the total variance, $F_{(1, 113)} = 4.028 (p < 0.05)$, $R^2 = 0.07$. Two predictors had a significant beta weight in this analysis: hedonism: $\beta = -0.22 (p < 0.05)$; achievement $\beta = 0.20 (p < 0.05)$. In other words, the more participants had higher scores on hedonism value, the more they were less in favour of TEU. As for achievement value, it can say that participants who had higher scores on achievement were more in favour of TEU.

Next, this study performed multiple regression analyses to examine the predictive power of several key variables (excluding the values) on the attitudes towards Turkey’s EU membership in Turkish and German samples. Result of the regression analysis revealed that the ethnicity factor is the significant predictor in Turkish sample and the political view is the significant predictor in German sample. Ethnicity factor explained 43% of the total variance, $F_{(1, 47)} = 10.268 (p < 0.01)$, $R^2 = 0.18$, with a significant beta weight: $\beta = 0.42 (p < 0.05)$. Specifically, Kurdish participants indicated more positive attitudes towards TEU. On the other hand, the political view factor explained 38% of the total variance, $F_{(1, 31)} = 4.994 (p < 0.5)$, $R^2 = 0.14$, with a significant beta weight: $\beta = -0.37 (p < 0.05)$, which indicated that left-wing supporters had more positive attitudes towards TEU.

Discussion and Conclusions

The present study aimed to compare the priorities of the two different cultural groups (Turkish and German university students) given to European values. In this cross-cultural comparison, European culture can be assessed as an out-superordinate group for Turkish participants and an institutional and geographical union for German participants in which they are included. Therefore, the present study is questioning what Turkish and German college students think about the value priorities that Europeans have. Specifically, this study aimed to show that these given priorities had associations with SDO, system justification, gender roles, and human rights. Furthermore, this study aimed to examine the possible group differences in these variables. Finally, it was predicted that these variables would be related with the attitudes towards Turkey’s membership to the EU. The authors briefly summarized the main findings.

Concerning the 10 European value types, Turkish participants rated benevolence and security higher than German participants did. On the other hand, German participants gave more priority to universalism and conformity as European value types than Turkish participants.

There are few results on values correlated with SDO that have been reported in literature, and these studies revealed that SDO related to power (Altemeyer, 1998; Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002; Cohrs, Moschner, Maes, & Kielmann, 2005; Cohrs, Maes, Moschner, & Kielmann, 2007), security values (Cohrs, Moschner, Maes, & Kielmann, 2005; Cohrs, Maes, Moschner, & Kielmann, 2007), and low importance to universalism values (Altemeyer, 1998; Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002; Cohrs, Moschner, Maes, & Kielmann, 2005; Cohrs, Maes, Moschner, & Kielmann, 2007; McFarland & Adelson, 1996; Rohan & Zanna, 1996; Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2005). SDO did not significantly correlated with any type of values in the present study. However, there were several indications that nationalism correlates with values in previous studies in Turkey (Hortaçsu & Cem-Ersoy, 2005; Kuşdil & Şimşek, 2007). As for the associations between Schwartz's values and other key variables, Gürşimşek and Göregenli (2005) reported that participants with higher scores on traditionalism power and conformity were seen to have higher scores on system justification. However, in the present study, benevolence value was correlated with CEHR and negatively correlated with GSJ and ESJ. Besides, security value was correlated with ATS.

Secondly, the present study analyzed associations among the other variables. SDO was highly correlated with GSJ, ESJ, ATMEHR, and EFR in line with the results from the previous studies (Altemeyer, 1998; Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Burgess, & Mosso, 2001; Pratto, 1999; Sidanius et al., 1996, Bar-Tal, 1993; Doob, 1964; Druckman, 1994; Göregenli, 2004, 2005, 2010; Göregenli & Teközel, 2006; Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003; Kelman, 1997; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Schatz, 1995) and negatively correlated with CEHR. Furthermore, CEHR was negatively correlated with ATMEHR, which also supports the previous findings from Fetchenhauer and Bierhoff (2004). Concerning the attitudes towards TEU, there is no group difference except the main effect of gender. In accordance with the previous studies in Turkey, men indicated more positive attitudes towards TEU and reported higher points of EFR than women. The effect of gender on these attitudes was also confirmed by previous studies in Turkey (Göregenli & Teközel, 2006; Göregenli, 2010). Moreover, male participants rated stimulation and self-direction values higher than females as also shown in previous studies in Turkey (Gürşimşek & Göregenli, 2005). Compared to German sample, Turkish sample scored significantly lower in GSJ and ESJ, higher in CEHR. It may suggest that compared to German system, the hierarchical capitalist system and also the social justice system are not stable in Turkey. This unsettled and less institutionalized atmosphere may lead to an increasing democratization discussion in the last decade and this is because Turkish participants became more sensitive to these issues.

Concerning political orientation, right-wing supporters scored higher on SDO, ESJ, and EFR than left-wing supporters. These findings replicated research conducted in Turkish and other contexts (Bar-Tal, 1993; Doob, 1964; Druckman, 1994; Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003; Kay, Gaucher, Peach, Laurin, Friesen, Zanna, & Spencer, 2009; Göregenli, 2005, 2010; Göregenli & Teközel, 2006; Kelman, 1997; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1994; Pratto, Stallworth, & Sidanius, 1997; Schatz, 1995) and confirmed that right-wing supporters were more likely to report higher scores on social order in comparison with left-wingers. Values can provide a general structure to political attitudes, which enables people to organize their political evaluations in a relatively consistent manner (Feldman, 2003). Schwartz (2007) provided additional evidence that basic values underlie politically relevant attitudes and actions in the ESS (European Social Survey) countries. There are several empirical results which indicate that left-wing supporters assign more importance to peace, harmony, and equality, whereas right-wing supporters value national security and social order higher (Barnea & Schwartz, 1998; Braitwaite,

1994; Cochrane, Billig, & Hogg, 1979; Fetchenhauer & Bierhoff, 2004; Rokeach, 1979; Schwartz, 1994; Sidanius, 1990). In line with these results politically left-orientated supporters held significantly more favorable attitudes toward the CEHR and attributed more importance to universalism in the present study. With respect to religious affiliation, participants who had expressed high religious affiliation scored higher on EFR, SDO, ESJ, and ATS than participants who had expressed a low level of religious affiliation. These findings are consistent with previous studies (Göregenli, 2010; Göregenli & Teközel, 2006; Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1994; Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002). Besides participants who had a low level of religious affiliation gave more priority to stimulation as a European value type than the other religious participants. This finding is also in line with conclusion drawn from research on religiosity and stimulation value (Devos, Spini, & Schwartz, 2002; Roccas & Schwartz, 1997; Schwartz & Huismans, 1995). Attitudes towards TEU were not significantly related with the key variables. However, the examinations of the predictive power of other key variables on these attitudes within the groups revealed that ethnicity factor is the significant predictor in Turkish sample. Kurdish participants indicated a more positive attitude towards TEU. This finding is consistent with the conclusion from Göregenli (2010), which indicated that Kurdish participants supported TEU more than Turkish participants and Kurdish participants who also had stronger belief about the social, economic benefits of EU than Turkish group. In German sample, the political view significantly correlated with TEU. Thus, left-wing supporters had more positive attitudes towards TEU. In addition to this finding, multiple regression analysis revealed that hedonism and achievement are the significant predictors of TEU in the whole sample. In this latter analysis, only the 10 types of European values were included to the model. Hedonism was negatively correlated with TEU whereas achievement was correlated positively with TEU. In other words, the more participants expressed higher scores on hedonism, the more they were less in favour of TEU. As for achievement, the authors conclude that participants who had higher scores on achievement were more in favour of TEU.

Limitation

Some limitations are to be noted regarding the present findings. The first is the small size of the sample. The examination of relations between values and other social-psychological variables should be examined on the basis of large samples to enhance the dependability of results. Although the size of the sample is quite small, the authors suggest that this study revealed significant hints between values and other key variables. The accession process of Turkey to EU and the ongoing discussion on this issue may be considered as a dynamic process. The people who are against TEU and who are in favour of differ substantially from each other. Being against TEU on the one hand and supporting TEU on the other hand can be understood in the context of other social-psychological variables in order to have deeper understanding.

References

- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality". *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 47-92. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60382-2
- Ashmore, R. D., Del Boca, F. K., & Bilder, S. M. (1995). Construction and validation of the gender attitude inventory: A structured inventory to assess multiple dimensions of gender attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 32, 753-785. doi: 10.1007/BF01560188
- Aybar, C. B., Mergen, A. E., Perotti, V., & Reid, D. M. (2007). Analysis of attitudes of Turkish citizens towards the effect of European Union membership on the economic, political, and cultural environment. *Turkish Studies*, 8, 329-348. doi: 10.1080/14683840701489084

- Aygün, Z. H., & İmamoğlu, E. O. (2002). Value domains of Turkish adults and university students. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 142*, 333-351. doi: 10.1080/00224540209603903
- Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Value and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 1207-1220. doi: 10.1177/0146167203254602
- Barnea, M. F., & Schwartz, S. H. (1998). Values and voting. *Political Psychology, 19*, 17-40. doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00090
- Bar-Tal, D. (1993). Patriotism as fundamental beliefs of group members. *Politics and Individual, 3*, 45-62.
- Braitwaite, V. (1994). Beyond Rokeach's equality-freedom model: Two dimensional values in a one-dimensional world. *Journal of Social Issues, 50*, 67-94. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1994.tb01198.x
- Çarkoğlu, A. (2003). Who wants full membership? Characteristics of Turkish public support for EU membership. *Turkish Studies, 4*, 171-194. doi: 10.1080/714005717
- Cochrane, R., Billig, M., & Hogg, M. (1979). Politics and values in Britain: A test of Rokeach's two-value model. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 18*, 159-167. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8260.1979.tb00320.x
- Cohrs, J. C., Maes, J., Moschner, B., & Kielmann, S. (2007). Determinants of human rights attitudes and behaviour: A comparison and integration of psychological perspectives. *Political Psychology, 28*, 441-469. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2007.00581.x
- Cohrs, J. C., Moschner, B., Maes, J., & Kielmann, S. (2005). The motivational bases of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation: Relations to values and attitudes in the aftermath of September 11, 2001. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1425-1434. doi: 10.1177/0146167205275614
- Collani, G. V., & Grumm, M. (2009). On the dimensional structure of personality, ideological beliefs, social attitudes, and personal values. *Journal of Individual Differences, 30*, 107-119. doi:10.1027/1614-0001.30.2.107
- Devos, T., Spini, D., & Schwartz, S. H. (2002). Conflicts among human values and trust in instructions. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 481-494. doi: 10.1348/014466602321149849
- Doise, W., Spini, D., Jesuino, J. C., Ng, S. H., & Emler, N. (1994). Values and perceived conflicts in the social representations of human rights: Feasibility of a cross-national study. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 53*, 240-251.
- Doob, L. (1964). *Patriotism and nationalism: Their psychological foundations*. New Haven, C. T.: Yale University Press.
- Druckman, D. (1994). Nationalism, patriotism, and group loyalty: A social psychological perspective. *Mershon International Studies Review, 38*, 43-68.
- Duriez, B., & Van Hiel, A. (2002). The march of modern fascism: A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Personality and Individual Difference, 32*, 1199-1213. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00086-1
- Esmer, Y. (1997). Turkish public opinion and Europe. In B. Gökay (Ed.), *Where is Turkey in European Union? Thoughts on the Customs Union Agreement* (pp. 124-135). Istanbul: Ayraç Publishing Company.
- Feather, N. T. (1979). Value correlates of conservatism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*(9), 1617-1630.
- Feather, N. T. (1984). Protestant ethic, conservatism and values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 1132-1141.
- Feldman, S. (2003). Values, ideology, and the structure of political attitudes. In O. D. Sears, L. Huddy, & R. Jervis (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of political psychology* (pp. 477-508). New York, N. Y.: Oxford University Press..
- Fetchenhauer, D., & Bierhoff, H. W. (2004). Attitudes toward a military enforcement of human rights. *Social Justice Research, 17*, 75-92. doi: 0885-7466/04/0300-0075/0
- Göregenli, M. (2004). *The evaluation of attitudes towards violence and torture*. Izmir Law Society—Justice for All Project—EU Project. Turkey, Izmir: Izmir Law Society Press.
- Göregenli, M. (2005). *The evaluation of attitudes towards violence and torture*. Diyarbakir Law Society—Justice for All Project—EU Project. Turkey, Diyarbakir: Diyarbakir Law Society Press.
- Göregenli, M. (2010). *Identity: The presentation of Turkish identity in the process of accession to the EU*. 4. Psikoloji Lisansüstü Öğrenci Kongresi, 15-19. Eylül, ODTÜ, Ankara.
- Göregenli, M., & Teközel, M. (2006). *The investigation of values and attitudes towards the process of accession to the EU in adult and college students samples*. Ege Üniversitesi Araştırma Projesi, İzmir, 2002/EDB/2003.
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 1029-1046. doi: 10.1037/a0015141

- Gürşimşek, I., & Göregenli, M. (2005). Humanistic attitudes, values, system justification, and control beliefs in a Turkish sample. *Social Behaviour and Personality, 34*, 747-758. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2006.34.7.747
- Heaven, P. C. L., & Oxman, L. N. (1999). Human values, conservatism and stereotypes of homosexuals. *Personality and Individual Differences, 27*, 109-118. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00216-5
- Hortaçsu, N., & Cem Ersoy, N. (2005). Values, identities, and social constructions of the European Union among Turkish university youth. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*, 107-121. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.235
- Jost, J., T. (2002). System justification theory as compliment, and corrective to theories of social identification and social dominance (Unpublished manuscript).
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 1-27. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x
- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2002). The psychology of system justification and the palliative function of ideology. *European Review of Social Psychology, 13*, 111-153. doi: 10.1080/10463280240000046
- Jost, J. T., & Thompson, E. P. (2000). Group-based dominance and opposition to equality as independent predictors of self-esteem, ethnocentrism, and social policy attitudes among African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 209-232. doi: 10.1006/jesp.1999.1403
- Jost, J. T., Burgess, D., & Mosso, C. O. (2001). Conflicts of legitimation among self, group, and system: The integrative potential of status justification theory. In J. T. Jost, & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations* (pp. 363-388). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. (2003). Political conservatism as a motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 339-375. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.3.339
- Kay, A. C., & Jost, J. T. (2003). Complementary justice: Effects of “poor but happy” and “poor but honest” stereotype exemplars on system justification and implicit activation of the justice motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 823-837. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.823
- Kay, A. C., Gaucher, D., Peach, J. M., Laurin, K., Friesen, J., Zanna, M. P., & Spencer, S. J. (2009). Inequality, discrimination, and the power of the status quo: Direct evidence for a motivation to see the way things are as the way they should be. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*, 421-434. doi: 10.1037/a0015997
- Kelman, H. C. (1997). Nationalism, patriotism, and national identity: Social-psychological dimensions. In D. Bar-Tal, & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the lives of individuals and nations* (pp. 165-189). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology, 10*, 257-274.
- Kirişçi, K. (2007). Turkey: A country of transition from emigration to immigration, *Mediterranean Politics, 12*, 91-97. doi: 10.1080/13629390601136871
- Kirişçi, K. (2011). The Kurdish issue in Turkey: Limits of European Union reform, *South European Society and Politics, 16*(2), 335-349. doi: 10.1080/13608746.2011.577954
- Kirişçi, K., & Çapan, Z. C. (2004). Turkey on the edges of the convention on the “future of Europe”. *South European Society and Politics, 9*, 173-191. doi: 10.1080/13608740410001681460
- Kuşdil, E., & Şimşek, S. (2007). The importance of values in predicting Turkish youth’s opinions about the European Union in light of the Copenhagen political criteria. *International Journal of Psychology, 43*, 988-996. doi: 10.1080/00207590701484827
- Lipkus, I. M., & Siegler, I. C. (1993). The belief in a just world and perceptions of discrimination. *Journal of Psychology, 127*(4), 465-474.
- McFarland, S. (2010). Authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and other roots of generalized prejudice. *Political Psychology, 31*, 453-477. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00765.x
- McFarland, S., & Adelson, S. (1996, June/July). An omnibus study of personality and prejudice. Paper presented at the 19th Annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology. Vancouver, Canada, June 30-July 3, 1996.
- Pratto, F. (1999). The puzzle of continuing group inequality: Piecing together psychological, social, and cultural forces in social dominance theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 191-263). San Diego: Academic Press.

- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741
- Pratto, F., Stallworth, L., & Sidanius, J. (1997). The gender gap: Differences in political attitudes and social dominance orientation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 49-68.
- Roccas, S., & Schwartz, S. H. (1997). Church-state relations and the association of religiosity with values: A study of Catholics in six countries: Cross-cultural research. *The Journal of Comparative Social Science*, 31, 356-375. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2003.10.005
- Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S. H., & Knafo, A. (2002). The big five personality factors and personal values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 789-801. doi: 10.1177/0146167202289008
- Rohan, M. J., & Zanna, M. P. (1996). Value transmissions in families. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The psychology of values* (pp. 253-276). Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rokeach, M. (1979). From individual to institutional values: With special reference to the values of science. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *Understanding human values: Individual and societal* (pp. 47-70). New York: Free Press.
- Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (1995). Value priorities and readiness for out-group social contact. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 437-448. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.69.3.437
- Sandal-Önal, E. (2007). *Social representations of European Union* (Doctor dissertation, Middle East Technical University).
- Schatz, R. T. (1995). On being a good American: Blind versus constructive patriotism (Unpublished Dissertation Abstracts International, University of Massachusetts).
- 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* (pp. 1-65). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the content and structure of values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50, 19-45. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1994.tb01196.x
- Schwartz, S. H. (2005a). Basic human values: Their content and structure across countries. In A. Tamayo, & J. B. Porto (Eds.), *Values and behaviour in organizations* (pp. 21-55). Petrópolis, Brazil: Vozes.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2005b). Robustness and fruitfulness of a theory of universals in individual human values. In A. Tamayo, & J. B. Porto (Eds.), *Values and behaviour in organizations* (pp. 56-95). Petrópolis, Brazil: Vozes.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bardi, A. (2001). Value hierarchies across cultures: Taking a similarities perspective. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 268-290. doi: 10.1177/0022022101032003002
- Schwartz, S. H., & Boehnke, K. (2004). Evaluating the structure of human values with confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38, 230-255. doi: 10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00069-2
- Schwartz, S. H., & Huismans, S. (1995). Value priorities and religiosity in four Western religions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58, 88-107.
- Schwartz, S. H., Struch, N., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Values and intergroup social motives: A study of Israeli and German students. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 53, 185-198.
- Sidanius, J. (1990). Basic values and sociopolitical ideology: A comparison of political experts and political novices. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 71, 447-450. doi: 10.2466/pms.1990.71.2.447
- Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamics of oppression: A social dominance perspective. In S. Iyengar, & W. McGuire (Eds.), *Explorations in political psychology* (pp. 183-219). Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press.
- Sidanius, J., Levin, S., & Pratto, F. (1996). Consensual social dominance orientation and its correlates within the hierarchical structure of American society. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 385-408.
- 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. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.998
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Mitchell, M. (1994). In-group identification, social dominance orientation, and differential intergroup social allocation. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 134, 151-167. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1994.9711378
- Spini, D., & Doise, W. (1998). Organizing principles of involvement in human rights and their social anchoring in value priorities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 603-622. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992

- Staerklé, C., Clémence, A., & Doise, W. (1998). Representation of human rights across different national contexts: The role of democratic and non-democratic populations and governments. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 207-226. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992
- Stankov, L. (2007). The structure among measures of personality, social attitudes, values, and social norms. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 28, 240-251. doi: 10.1027/1614-0001.28.4.240
- TESEV. (2002). *The perspectives of the Turkish public on membership to the European Union*. Retrieved from <http://www.tesev.org.tr/temmuz2002/t1.html>
- TUSES (Turkish Social Economic and Political Studies Foundation). (1999). *Political party voters and social order in Turkey*. Turkey, Istanbul: Boyut Press.
- Van Hiel, A., & Mervielde, I. (2002). Explaining conservative beliefs and political preferences: A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32, 965-976. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb00250.x
- Wilson, G. D. (Ed.). (1973). *The psychology of conservatism*. London: Academic Press.