

# Group-Focused Enmity – Conceptual, Longitudinal, and Cross-National Perspectives Based on Pre-registered Studies

**Maria-Therese Friehs**

FernUniversität in Hagen, Germany  
maria-therese.friehs@fernuni-hagen.de

**Patrick Ferdinand Kotzur**

Durham University, United Kingdom  
patrick.f.kotzur@durham.ac.uk

**Alice Ramos**

University of Lisbon, Portugal  
alice.ramos@ics.ulisboa.pt

**Ulrich Wagner**

Philipps-University Marburg, Germany  
wagner1@uni-marburg.de

## Vol. 16/2022

### The IJCV

provides a forum for scientific exchange and public dissemination of up-to-date scientific knowledge on conflict and violence. The IJCV is independent, peer reviewed, open access, and included in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) as well as other relevant databases (e.g., SCOPUS, EBSCO, ProQuest, DNB).

The topics on which we concentrate—conflict and violence—have always been central to various disciplines. Consequently, the journal encompasses contributions from a wide range of disciplines, including criminology, economics, education, ethnology, history, political science, psychology, social anthropology, sociology, the study of religions, and urban studies.

All articles are gathered in yearly volumes, identified by a DOI with article-wise pagination.

For more information please visit [www.ijcv.org](http://www.ijcv.org)

### Suggested Citation:

APA: Friehs, M.-T., Kotzur, P. F., Ramos, A., & Wagner, U. (2022). Group-focused enmity – conceptual, longitudinal, and cross-national perspectives based on pre-registered studies. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 16, 1-4. doi: 10.11576/ijcv-5361

Harvard: Friehs, Maria-Therese, Kotzur, Patrick Ferdinand, Ramos, Alice, Wagner, Ulrich. 2022. Group-focused enmity – conceptual, longitudinal, and cross-national perspectives based on pre-registered studies. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 16: 1-4. doi: 10.11576/ijcv-5361



# Group-Focused Enmity – Conceptual, Longitudinal, and Cross-National Perspectives Based on Pre-registered Studies

Maria-Therese Friehs

FernUniversität in Hagen, Germany

Patrick Ferdinand Kotzur

Durham University, United Kingdom

Alice Ramos

University of Lisbon, Portugal

Ulrich Wagner

Philipps-University Marburg, Germany

Group-Focused Enmity describes the idea that different outgroup-specific prejudices can be aggregated to a larger syndrome of inequality-based derogation of others. This focus section brings together three studies on Group-Focused Enmity that had been registered and peer-reviewed before they were conducted. All of the reports advance the Group-Focused Enmity literature in important ways and demonstrate the fruitfulness of the concept. They also show that using sophisticated methods can help us to address novel and exciting questions, and demonstrate the opportunities that preregistration offers for studies analysing secondary data.

Prejudice, devaluation, and violence against different social groups are interconnected: A person's rejection of one outgroup is often positively related to his or her rejection of other outgroups (Adorno et al. 1950, Allport 1954, Zick et al. 2008). In 2002, Wilhelm Heitmeyer at the University of Bielefeld, Germany, started a research project on Group-Focused Enmity (GFE), the idea that prejudice against different outgroups often originates from the same causes, takes similar forms and leads to comparable consequences (see Heitmeyer 2002). Others call this phenomenon generalized prejudice (see, e.g., Crawford and Brandt 2019; Meeusen et al. 2017). Over a period of ten years, the GFE project ran a representative annual survey and a panel. It produced numerous scientific papers and a series of ten books aimed at policymakers, the media and the general public (Heitmeyer 2002–2012).

Now, ten years after the end of the GFE project, we bring researchers together to showcase recent developments and advances in GFE research in this focus section of the *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*. In the call for papers, we invited researchers to submit empirical papers that would

- contribute to the phenomenology of the syndrome of GFE, for example by disentangling the different components of GFE in different cultural contexts (based on cross-sectional data and inter-cultural comparisons) and/or the empirical differentiation of the GFE syndrome from related concepts like ethnocentrism and social dominance orientation;
- focus on intrapersonal and social stability and change in mean values and structure over time, incorporating panel and/or repeated cross-sectional data;
- investigate the causal predictors and consequences of GFE on the basis of longitudinal data analyses and/or experimental data (Friehs et al. 2020).

We also decided to adopt innovative methodological approaches. This focus section includes only pre-registered studies whose proposals were reviewed before the research was conducted (Reich, 2021; Soderberg et al. 2021). Eligible papers could be based on new or existing data, but they had to undergo a pre-registration procedure (see e.g., Nosek et al., 2018).

Contributors were required to submit a proposal explaining their research plan before they conducted their studies and data analyses. In other words, the proposal and not the final version was the basis for the decision to accept a paper into this focus section. The proposals for pre-registering were expected to contain:

- the research hypotheses and their theoretical justification including the relevant references;
- a description of the data set(s) to be used, variables to be selected as indicators of the theoretical concepts, and planned statistical analyses. For experimental studies, a detailed description of the experimental design and procedure and operationalizations of independent and dependent variables were expected;
- the prediction of the expected outcome based on the hypotheses (Friehs et al 2020).

It was clear to the authors that it was their research ideas and procedures as outlined in their proposals that would be evaluated in the peer-review process. Thus, the final acceptance and publishing of a paper would be independent of empirical support for the hypotheses.

Six proposals were submitted. All were read by the editors (Friehs and Kotzur were naturally not involved in the handling of the submission by Friehs et al. 2022). If a paper satisfied the quality standards described above, it was forwarded to multiple independent external reviewers. Some proposals were desk-rejected, some underwent a regular peer-review process. Eventually, we accepted three proposals. The manuscripts submitted after completion of the research were checked by the editors for congruence with the proposal and accepted with suggestions for minor edits. We are grateful to the anonymous reviewers whose comments and suggestions contributed significantly to the quality of this focus section.

The impact of the pre-registration process is impressive: Firstly, the procedure offers benefits to the authors, who learned whether their proposal would be accepted *before* they invested major resources (in particular, conducting the analysis, writing a full research article). Secondly, the research presented in this focus section truly conforms to Popper's (1935) ideal of critical hypothesis testing and falsification. The empirical

research is based on hypotheses clearly formulated in advance, on appropriate and specified operationalization of the theoretical constructs, on the decision about the participants to be recruited, as well as pre-defined, appropriate statistical procedures. This approach permits publication independent of the degree to which the results support the original hypotheses. In other words, knowledge-distorting practices such as fishing for significance and publication biases can be avoided. As editors of this focus section, we strongly support further initiatives to replicate and improve the procedure of pre-registration and registered reports demonstrated here, and find it encouraging that many journals such as *Nature*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *British Journal of Social Psychology*, and *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science* also have started to adopt similar procedures.

Nevertheless, these advantages also need to be weighed against potential costs, such as the potential discouragement of surprising or high-risk research that is more likely to change scientific belief systems (Gross and Bergstrom 2021). Additionally, it should be noted that, at least from the editors' perspective, realizing a pre-registration procedure for the first time was more labour-intensive and time-consuming than handling a paper in a conventional editing process: We had to develop new administrative procedures and critically reflect on the criteria we used to evaluate the scientific merit of the submissions. We also had to share these new guidelines with the external reviewers, and both their and our feedback focused more on optimizing the content, methodology and statistical approaches than would be the case in a conventional *ex post* review process. We received similar feedback from our external reviewers, who described the procedure as ambitious and challenging, but also enlightening. All in all, we firmly believe that what is gained in quality, rigour, and transparency totally justifies the extra work that this procedure involves.

Even though we had offered the opportunity to submit proposals based on primary data, two of the three papers published here used secondary data. Up to now, pre-registration has mainly been of relevance for publications based on primary (often experimental) data (but see, for example, van den Akker et al. 2021

for a template for pre-registering secondary data analyses). The papers published in this focus section demonstrate that pre-registration is also possible and valuable in the field of re-analysis of existing data.

The focus section comprises three papers presenting new perspectives on the GFE phenomenon. Maria-Therese Friehs, Judith Masselmann, Maike Trautner, Patrick Ferdinand Kotzur, and Peter Schmidt demonstrate, on the basis of the 2011 German GFE survey data, that the GFE phenomenon is not a homogeneous one (Friehs et al. 2022). Using factor mixture modelling they found two (but not more, contrary to their hypotheses) latent classes of equivalent factor-analytical composition with consistently high versus low expressions of target-specific prejudice. Membership in the high prejudice latent class was associated with higher age, right-wing political orientation, high right-wing authoritarianism and high social dominance orientation. Their findings point to the importance of exploring unobserved heterogeneity in attitudes research and outline how person-centred research can complement variable-centred research in order to better understand social-psychological phenomena.

Hayeon Lee, Hoon-Seok Choi and Giovanni A. Travaglino extend the notion of GFE by identifying its structure in a non-European context, namely, South Korea (Lee, Choi, and Travaglino 2022). They also tested new hypotheses suggesting that independence in self-concept and a collectivistic value orientation interact to predict the overall level of GFE. Using data from two nationwide surveys, they use exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses to show how prejudiced beliefs against different social groups are inter-related with one another to form GFE as a second-order construct that explains first-order factors involving prejudice against different social groups. Further analyses reveal that independence in self-concept and a collectivistic value orientation interact to reduce GFE and that this interaction remains significant independently of national identification and political orientation, two variables that had predicted GFE in previous research.

Amelie Nickel draws on Institutional Anomie Theory and the theoretical framework of GFE to investigate the effects of economization – in the sense of the ex-

ension of market principles to non-economic (social, political, cultural and educational) institutions – on attitudes towards groups that are stereotyped as economically “unprofitable” (Nickel 2022). Using data from twenty-eight countries that participated in the 2018 European Social Survey, Nickel carried out a cross-national multi-level analysis to investigate the relationship between market-based values and anti-immigrant attitudes. She concludes that hostility towards immigrants is more prevalent among individuals who strongly embrace market-based values and in countries where the institutional structure is highly dominated by the economy and non-economic institutions are enfeebled. Moreover, macro-level influences, as indicated by the aggregated level of market-based values, are important mediators of these processes. This study contributes to a better understanding of group prejudice under conditions of economization.

Overall, the studies in this focus section provide multiple new perspectives on GFE. They demonstrate that ten years after the end of the seminal GFE project, research questions related to Group-Focused Enmity are far from being exhausted. We are very curious to see what the next ten years will bring for the study of GFE.

## References

- Adorno, Theodor W., Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. Oxford: Harper.
- Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Oxford: Addison-Wesley.
- Crawford, Jarret T., and Mark J. Brandt. 2019. Who Is Prejudiced, and toward Whom? The Big Five Traits and Generalized Prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 45 (10): 1455–67. doi:10.1177/0146167219832335
- Friehs, Maria-Therese, Patrick Ferdinand Kotzur, Alice Ramos, and Ulrich Wagner, 2020. Call for Proposals: Group Focused Enmity – Conceptual, Longitudinal, and Cross-National Perspectives based on Pre-Registered Studies. Retrieved January 20, 2022. [https://ekvv.unibielefeld.de/blog/ikgblog/resource/IJCV/CfP\\_GFE\\_final.pdf](https://ekvv.unibielefeld.de/blog/ikgblog/resource/IJCV/CfP_GFE_final.pdf)
- Friehs, Maria-Therese, Judith Masselmann, Maike Trautner, Patrick Ferdinand Kotzur, and Peter Schmidt. 2022. Unobserved Heterogeneity between Individuals in Group-Focused Enmity. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 16: 1-17 doi: 10.11576/ijcv-5266
- Gross, Kevin, and Carl T. Bergstrom. 2021. Why Ex Post Peer Review Encourages High-Risk Research while Ex Ante

- Review Discourages It. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 118 (51): e2111615118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2111615118>
- Heitmeyer, Wilhelm. 2002. Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit: Die theoretische Konzeption und erste empirische Ergebnisse. In *Deutsche Zustände*, ed. Wilhelm Heitmeyer, 15–34. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Heitmeyer, Wilhelm, ed. 2002–2012. *Deutsche Zustände*. Frankfurt am Main and Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Lee, Hayeon, Hoon-Seok Choi, and Giovanni A. Travaglino. 2022. The Combined Role of Independence in Self-Concept and a Collectivistic Value Orientation in Group-Focused Enmity in Korea. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 16: 1–16. doi: 10.11576/ijcv-5085
- Meeusen, Cecil, Fiona Kate Barlow, and Chris G. Sibley. 2017. Generalized and Specific Components of Prejudice: The Decomposition of Intergroup Context Effects. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 47 (4): 443–56. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2252
- Nickel, Amelie. 2022. Institutional Anomie, Market-Based Values and Anti-Immigrant Attitudes: A Multilevel Analysis in 28 European Countries. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 16: 1–15. doi: 10.11576/ijcv-5126
- Nosek, Brian A., Charles R. Ebersole, Alexander C. DeHaven, and David T. Mellor. 2018. The Preregistration Revolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 115 (11): 2600–2606. doi:10.1073/pnas.1708274114
- Popper, Karl. 1935. *Logik der Forschung*. Vienna: Springer.
- Reich, Justin. 2021. Preregistration and Registered Reports. *Educational Psychologist* 56 (2): 101–9. doi:10.1080/00461520.2021.1900851
- Soderberg, Courtney K., Timothy M. Errington, Sarah R. Schiavone, Julia Bottesini, Felix S. Thorn, Simine Vazire, Kevin M. Esterling, and Brian A. Nosek. 2021. Initial Evidence of Research Quality of Registered Reports Compared to the Standard Publishing Model. Last modified June 24, 2021. <https://osf.io/preprints/metaarxiv/7x9vy/>
- van den Akker, Olmo, Sara J. Weston, Lorne Campbell, Bill Chopik, Rodica Damian, Pamela Davis-Kean, Andrew Hall et al. 2021. Preregistration of Secondary Data Analysis: A Template and Tutorial. *Meta-Psychology* 5, 2625. <https://doi.org/10.15626/MP.2020.2625>
- Zick, Andreas, Carina Wolf, Beate Küpper, Eldad Davidov, Peter Schmidt, and Wilhelm Heitmeyer. 2008. The Syndrome of Group-Focused Enmity: The Interrelation of Prejudices Tested with Multiple Cross-Sectional and Panel Data. *Journal of Social Issues* 64 (2): 363–83. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00566.x