

Stereotypes, emotions, and behaviours in intergroup context in Portugal

Teresa Nascimento* / Mauro Bianchi**

* ISCTE – Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, CIS-IUL, Lisboa, Portugal; ** HEI-Lab, Universidade Lusófona, Lisboa, Portugal / ISCTE – Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, CIS-IUL, Lisboa, Portugal

Stereotype content has been much studied since the classic study by Katz and Braly (1933). The results obtained in these studies have been fundamental to building more complex experiments in order to explore the formation, purpose and maintenance of stereotypes. In Portugal, to our knowledge, the existing studies are quite scarce, and in some cases non-existent, particularly related to some social groups of interest. Furthermore, continuous social changes may bring variation in the meaning and importance of each attribute. The goal of this study is to explore and pre-test the stereotype content of 12 social groups in Portugal. Ninety-eight participants recruited online via social media responded to 35 stereotypic traits and their valence, 21 emotions and 12 behavioural tendencies related to these social groups. The results allow not only the selection of, for each group, the stereotypic traits, emotions, and behavioural tendencies that are significantly different from the midpoint of the scale, but also the identification of traits, emotions and behavioural tendencies that best seem to differentiate the different groups.

Key words: Stereotypes, Emotions, Behaviours.

Stereotypes

Stereotypes are shared beliefs (Karasawa et al., 2007; McGarty et al., 2009) about the characteristics, attributes and behaviours of members of certain social groups. They are cognitively processed and often occur without conscious awareness (Devine, 1989). Stereotypes are not necessarily negative although they may have more negative connotations regarding the outgroup in relation to the ingroup (Hilton & Hoppel, 1996). They contain information about the social roles of each group (e.g., Eagly & Steffen, 1984; Koenig & Eagly, 2014), their social status (Jost & Banaji, 1994), and the power relations between different groups (Pratto et al., 2006). They influence emotional reactions to members of different groups and, consequently, their behaviour (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2002).

Extensive evidence has shown that stereotypes serve many purposes, both cognitive and social. Cognitively, they help to make sense of the huge set of information that comes to the individual, simplifying their needs (Bodenhausen, 1990), making information processing easier. Information is categorized more easily, identified and remembered (Bodenhausen, 1990), reducing the effort and energy required for other tasks. They are, therefore, cognitive shortcuts that allow the individual to give meaning to their social context (Tajfel, 1974).

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Teresa Nascimento, ISCTE – Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, CIS-IUL, Av. das Forças Armadas, 1649-026 Lisboa, Portugal. E-mail: Teresa_Nascimento@iscte-iul.pt

Due to collective sharing beliefs, inherent to their nature, stereotypes are not only products of intra-individual processes (e.g., information processing), they are phenomena that also occur at the intergroup level and serve to differentiate different groups (Tajfel, 1974), classifying, for example, the ingroup more positively than the outgroup. They also serve to explain certain social events (McGarty et al., 2009) and serve to justify the behaviour of members of different groups (Tajfel, 1974), for example discriminatory behaviours. In fact, stereotypes can not only promote discrimination by influencing perception but also reinforce and justify disparities between groups.

The Stereotype Content Model (SCM; Fiske et al., 2002) proposes two fundamental dimensions of stereotypes: warmth (associated with cooperative groups and denied to competitive groups) and competence (associated to high-status groups and denied to low-status groups). This model argued that we rarely stereotype a group only through negative or positive stereotypes. The content of stereotypes is, in most cases, ambivalent, that is, considering a group favourably in one dimension and unfavourably in the other. This ambivalence stems from the power relations between the ingroup and the outgroup. In a study, Cuddy and colleagues (2009) asked European participants to characterize their and other European countries. High-status northern groups were characterized as competent but lack in warmth, cold and distant in opposition to lower-status southern groups, viewed as warmth and friendly but incompetent peoples as the Portuguese, Italians, or Greeks. In an international study, Durante and colleagues (2013), investigated stereotype ambivalence and income. Portugal, the most unequal country in Europe (according to the GINI's coefficient) reported ambivalence in terms of group's competition-warmth correlation, but not warmth-competence, and status-competence correlations.

Since the classic study by Katz and Braly (1933), much has been investigated about the content of the stereotypes of different social groups. In Portugal, several studies pre-tested material to be used in subsequent research. For example, a study from Cabecinhas and Amâncio (2004) characterizes the stereotype content of Angolans and Portuguese living in Portugal and they found that the greatest differentiation between the two groups was: positive sociability, expressiveness, exoticism, and negative instrumentality for Angolans; negative sociability, conservatism, dominance, and positive instrumentality for the Portuguese, confirming previous research about socially asymmetric groups. A research from Brazão and Garcia-Marques (2004), shows stereotypical and non-stereotypical negative attributes regarding Skinheads. Additionally, a study of Garrido et al. (2009), identifies the stereotypical traits that best differentiate Homosexuals from Heterosexuals, and Arabs from Americans. Marques, Lima, and Novo's study (2006), allows to distinguish the stereotypical traits associated to Young and Old people in Portugal. A different study from Moreira et al. (2008) assesses the cultural stereotypical attributes of 32 professional groups in Portugal.

Regarding behavioural descriptions of different personality traits, Garrido et al. (2004) tested 201 behavioural descriptions related to four traits: adventurous, religious, ecological, and artistic. In the same line of research, Jerónimo et al. (2004) analysed corresponding and non-corresponding personality traits generated for 96 behaviours, with 24 behaviours illustrative of four traits each: Kind, Unkind, Intelligent, and Stupid. Another study from Garrido (2013) tested 201 behavioural descriptions illustrative of two personality traits: Kindness and Intelligence. Differently, some researchers are interested in ambiguous behaviour that could be characteristic of one or more personality traits. For example, Ramos and Garcia-Marques (2006), created 163 behaviour descriptions that elicit simultaneously two personality traits.

Intergroup emotions

Stereotypes can affect the appraisal of specific emotions (Bijlstra et al., 2014; Inzlicht et al., 2008). Indeed, much more than an individual phenomenon, emotions are also intergroup phenomena in that they refer to specific emotions that individuals feel towards a social group or its members (Smith & Mackie, 2015). Fundamentally, intergroup emotions arise from the distinction that individuals tend

to make between their group and the group of others (Tajfel, 1974). That is, to feel a particular emotion towards one group, one has to see oneself as an integral part of the group and see others as integral parts of other groups. Emotions are then shaped by how groups view the world, and over time and repetition become part of the group itself (Mackie et al., 2008). They are also shaped by subjective assessments of the relationship between the two groups, for example, if an individual believes that a group of migrants competes with their group for employment, they may be angry or jealous of members of that group (Mackie et al., 2000, 2008; Smith & MacKie, 2008). The SCM, postulates that people can experience four emotions directed to different groups depending the group's stereotypical warmth and competence. For example, warm and competent groups, such middle-class Americans, elicit emotions of pride. Groups seen as competent but not warm, such as Jews, elicit envy. Warm and incompetent groups, such the elderly, elicit pity. Cold and incompetent groups, such the welfare recipients, elicit contempt. Another model from Cottrell and Neuberg (2005) take a sociofunctional approach that emphasizes the variety of potential intergroup threats that may elicit distinct emotional reactions. For example, an outgroup may threaten an ingroup with diseases or group values evoking disgust. Importantly, intergroup emotions play an important role in the interaction between individuals belonging to different groups, that is, different emotions can trigger different behaviours (Mackie et al., 2000, 2008). For example, feeling angry about members of a particular group can be an incentive for the individual to behave aggressively toward members of a group, while feeling admiration for members of a particular group can stimulate mutually beneficial behaviours (Cuddy et al., 2007).

Study

Aim

Despite the different studies referred above, there is a lack of scientific evidence and a scarce number of validated studies in Portugal considering simultaneously: stereotypic traits, intergroup emotions and behavioural tendencies of social groups. Moreover, to our knowledge, there are no studies in Portugal that take into account most of the 12 groups that we considered. The aim of this study is to fill this gap.

Participants and procedure

Ninety-eight participants recruited online via social media, separated into three samples, completed our questionnaire. The questionnaire is the same for all samples but varies according to the social groups evaluated. We decided to split the questionnaire into three versions in order to prevent participant fatigue (e.g., one questionnaire would be very long and exhausting to fill in), and to avoid random answers. All participants were reassured of the anonymity of their identity and their answers. Each participant provided his/her written informed consent before the study began. An email address was made available for possible future questions.

In the first sample, 36 participants (13 men, 23 women, $M_{\text{age}}=47.97$) answered the questionnaire related to four social groups: Men, Women, Gay Men (“Homossexuais Masculinos” in Portuguese) and Lesbians. All participants were White, one participant was Bisexual, and one male participant indicated that was gay.

In the second sample, 32 participants (10 men, 22 women, $M_{\text{age}}=49.91$) answered the questionnaire related to four social groups: Elderly, Young, People with Physical Disability and Overweight people (“Obesos” in Portuguese). Thirty-one participants were White, and two participants were physically disabled.

In the third sample, 36 participants (14 men, 26 women, $M_{\text{age}}=48.70$) answered the questionnaire related to four social groups: Black, White, Chinese and Romanian. All participants were White, 28 participants were Portuguese, one participant was Italian, and one participant was Moldovan.

Sensitivity analysis, with $\alpha=.08$, $1-\beta=.91/93$, $N=32/36$, and Cohen's $f=.115$ suggested that a sample size of 32/36 participants had enough power to detect a small effect size (Cohen, 1988).

Scale

The scale was developed based on previous investigations of SCM (Fiske et al., 2002) and on stereotypes, emotions and behavioural tendencies in Portugal (Brazão & Garcia-Marques, 2004; Garrido, 2013; Garrido et al., 2004, 2009; Jerónimo et al., 2004; Ramos & Garcia-Marques, 2006) and on the classic study by Katz and Braly (1933). Using a five-point Likert scale (from 1=not at all to 5=extremely), participants evaluated 12 Portuguese social groups related to 35 stereotypic traits, 21 emotions, 12 behavioural tendencies, and rated the valence from the 35 stereotypic traits (from -2=very negative to +2=very positive), selected according to previous investigations. At the end, we asked participants to answer sociodemographic questions, a question about sexual orientation, and a question about physical disability (see Table 1). All participants were instructed to answer according to the way these groups are seen in the Portuguese society.

All scales have good internal consistency with Cronbach $\alpha \geq .90$.

Table 1

Examples from questionnaire

Construct	Item (Example)
Stereotypic trait	As viewed by Portuguese society, how competent are members of this group?
Emotion	To what extent do most Portuguese feel contempt for the members of this group?
Behavioural tendencies	To what extent do most Portuguese cooperate with members of this group?
Valence	Finally, we ask you to evaluate the adjectives/characteristics that you attribute to the various groups, from very negative to very positive .

Results

In order to assess the degree of stereotypicality of each trait, mean, standard deviation and respective 95% confidence interval for each trait were calculated. A statistical t-test was also performed to test if the mean response to the traits was equal to 3 – null hypothesis – or different from 3 (see Appendix 1, 2 and 3). The same procedure was performed to test emotions (see Appendix 4, 5 and 6) and behavioural tendencies (see Appendix 7, 8 and 9) toward 12 social groups. The results of the test show typical traits, typical emotions and typical behavior tendencies with values above score 3 of the Likert scale, and with statistical significance. Traits with values below the mean and with statistical significance are atypical. Concerning emotions also with values below the mean and with statistical significance our reasoning is that participants did not consider that Portuguese feel those emotions for that particular groups. We applied the same reasoning for behavioural tendencies, that is, we considered that values below the mean and with statistical significance suggest that people do not behave that way toward these groups. Mean values with statistical significance ($p \leq 0.05$) are highlighted in bold in all tables.

Our results shows that Men are seen as competent, intelligent, workers, efficient, actives, adventurers, and conservative; Women are seen as competent, kind, worker, superstitious, generous, conservative, wise, dependent, grumpy, funny, active, educated, sensitive, effeminate, religious, vain,

and attentive; Gay Men are seen as stupid, aggressive, sensitive, effeminate, eccentric, creative, religious, vain, and liberal; Lesbians are seen as suspicious, active, sensitive, eccentric, creative, and liberal; Elderly are seen as competent, intelligent, kind, superstitious, suspicious, generous, conservative, wise, forgotten, dependent, slow, grumpy, sensitive, attentive, and religious; Young people are seen as lazy, intelligent, aggressive, problematic, funny, active, unthinking, fast, adventurers, eccentric, creative, artistic, vain, and liberal; People with Physical Disability are seen as kind, generous, dependent, slow, and sensitive; Overweight People are seen as lazy, kind, slow, funny, sensitive, and attentive; Black people are seen as lazy, aggressive, problematic, superstitious, unclean, funny, and religious; White people are seen as competent, intelligent, kind, worker, efficient, conservative, wise, active, educated, sensitive, creative, religious, vain, and attentive; Chinese people are seen as competent, intelligent, worker, superstitious, suspicious, efficient, conservative, wise, active, fast, adventurers, and shy; Romanian people are seen as lazy, aggressive, problematic, superstitious, suspicious, unclean, and adventurers (see Appendix 1, 2, and 3).

In regard to intergroup emotions, Portuguese people feels sympathy towards Men's group and Women's group; feels admiration, pity, pride, sympathy, sadness, love, and compassion towards Elderly's group; feels pride, sympathy, happiness, attraction, and love towards Young's group; feels pity, sympathy, sadness, and compassion People with Physical Disability's group; feels fear towards Black's group; feels admiration, pride, sympathy, happiness, attraction, love, and passion towards White's group; feels fear towards Romanian's group. For Gay Men, Lesbians, Overweight People and Chinese we could not find any statistically significant result related to intergroup emotions (see Appendix 4, 5, and 6) above the middle point of the scale. However, below the middle point of the scale, we could find disgust, guilt, pride, envy, jealousy, sympathy, happiness, and fear for Gay Men; admiration, guilt, pride, envy, jealousy, sympathy, happiness, and fear for Lesbians; disgust, admiration, guilt, pride, envy, jealousy, happiness, anger, fear, attraction, remorse, rancour, and passion for Overweight people; contempt, disgust, pity, guilt, shame, pride, envy, jealousy, sympathy, happiness, sadness, anger, fear, attraction, love, compassion, remorse, rancour, and passion for Chinese.

Concerning behaviour tendencies, we found that the Portuguese people tend to help, protect, cooperate, and associate with Men' group; Help, and cooperate with Women' group; attack, humiliate, exclude, insult, criticize, and avoid Gay Men' group; insult, and criticize Lesbian' group; help, and exclude Elderly' group; criticize Young' group; exclude People with Physical Disability' group; exclude, and criticize Overweight People' group; criticize Black' group; cooperate, and associate with White' group; exclude Chinese' group; and exclude, criticize, and avoid Romanian' group (see Appendix 7, 8, and 9).

Regarding valence, an ANOVA analysis of variance was performed to test whether valence is affected by the subsample factor. From the results, it was concluded that there is no influence from this factor with values ranging from Competent $F(2,97)=0.040, p=.960, \eta^2=.056$ to Sensitive $F(2,97)=2.189, p=.118, \eta^2=.437$). The "Eccentric" trait is the one exception where there is at least one significant difference in a pair of subsamples $F(2,97)=6.013, p=.003, \eta^2=.873$. We understand that this exception is due to the ambiguity that this feature seems to demonstrate. For this reason, and because no other characteristics are influenced by the "subsample" factor, we present the values of the three subsamples together. Results can be seen in Appendix 10.

Discussion

As mentioned earlier, we found some pre-tested material (e.g., stereotypical traits) relating to some social groups in Portugal, such as Elderly and Young people, Homosexuals and Heterosexuals males, Skinheads, and Young Angolans and Young Portuguese. But, as far as we

know, there is a lack of pre-tested material for the other social groups. It is also noteworthy that the continuous social changes may bring some variation in the meaning and importance of each of the traits (Garrido et al., 2009) attributed to each social group, and although they have been previously studied in Portugal, we chose to study them again, as well as the valence attributed to each trait. Therefore, our results corroborate previous findings, but diverge in some groups: elderly are seen as competent, intelligent and kind. These three positive traits do not appear in previous literature. We could hypothesize there was a bias due to the characteristics of the sample, but only three participants were above 65 years old. For Young people, we found different negative traits, like lazy, unthinking, vain, aggressive, and problematic. Related to Gay Men, we found three different negative traits like stupid, aggressive, and vain. So, we can put forward that here may have been a change in the perception of these groups. However, White people remains the group with the most positive attributes in line with previous findings (Fiske et al., 2002).

As well as stereotypes, intergroup emotions can be predictors for intergroup behaviour (Cuddy et al., 2007; Vala et al., 2015). White, Young, and Elderly people were the groups with more positive emotions attributed. In fact, and in line with previous studies, people feel both pity and admiration toward the elderly and, at the same time they express helping intentions towards them, they report that they could as well exclude people from this group. Admiration was the only emotion attributed to Men as a group, however this group was the one associated with more positive behaviour tendencies in general (i.e., help, protect, cooperate, and associate) and not the White's group as expected from previous studies. Indeed, White people are admired and loved but it seems that they no need protection or help, instead one wants to cooperate and associate with them. Black and Romanian people are feared and possibly that is why they are excluded, and Romanians are also criticized and avoided. Gay Men's group were the most discriminated group (i.e., associated with avoidance exclusion) although we found no specific emotions related to that group. On other hand, Lesbians are not so discriminated as Gay Men although the ratings related to emotions are quite similar and almost overlapping. Overweight people and People with Physical Disability are excluded but the former is also criticized, probably, because they are perceived as responsible for their excess weight. Finally, people feel sympathy for Women, and they tend to help them. Helping is not always a positive behaviour, could derive from pity and sympathy, like helping an old woman to cross the street. Nevertheless, people cooperate with them, which is a positive behaviour.

References

- Bijlstra, G., Holland, R. W., Dotsch, R., Hugenberg, K., & Wigboldus, D. H. J. (2014). Stereotype associations and emotion recognition. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40*(5), 567-577. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213520458>
- Bodenhausen, G. V. (1990). Stereotypes as judgmental heuristics: Evidence of circadian variations in discrimination. *Psychological Science, 1*(5), 319-322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1990.tb00226.x>
- Brazão, P., & Garcia-Marques, T. (2004). Valência de atributos pessoais e estereotipicalidade em relação aos *skinheads*. *Laboratório de Psicologia, 2*(1), 21-32. <https://doi.org/10.14417/lp.775>
- Cabecinhas, R., & Amâncio, L. (2004). Estereótipos sociais e assimetria simbólica: Três estudos com jovens angolanos e portugueses. *Actas do VIII Congresso Luso-Afro-Brasileiro de Ciências Sociais* (pp. 1-21). Centro de Estudos de Comunicação e Sociedade, Universidade do Minho.
- Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: A sociofunctional threat-based approach to "prejudice". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(5), 770-789. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.5.770>

- Cuddy, A., Fiske, S., Kwan, V., Glick, P., Demoulin, S., Leyens, J. P., Bond, M., Croizet, J., Ellemers, N., Sleebos, E., Htun, T., Kim, H., Maio, G., Perry, J., Petkova, K., Todorov, V., Rodríguez-Bairon, R., Morales, E., Moya, M., . . . Ziegler, R. (2009). Stereotype content model across cultures: Towards universal similarities and some differences. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *48*(1), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466608X314935>
- Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2007). The BIAS Map: Behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*, 631-648. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.4.631>
- Devine, P. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*(1), 5-18. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.1.5>
- Durante, F., Fiske, S., Kervyn, N., Cuddy, A., Akande, A., Adetoun, B., Adewuyi, M., Tserere, M., Ramiah, A., Mastor, K., Barlow, F., Bonn, G., Tafarodi, R., Bosak, J., Cairns, E., Doherty, C., Capozza, D., Chandran, A., Chrysochoou, X., . . . Storari, C. (2013). Nations' income inequality predicts ambivalence in stereotype content: How societies mind the gap. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *52*(4), 726-746. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12005>
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*(4), 735-754. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.46.4.735>
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*(6), 878-902. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878>
- Garrido, M. (2013). Afinal o que fazem os simpáticos e os inteligentes? Um pré-teste de descrições comportamentais. *Laboratório de Psicologia*, *1*(1), 45-55. <https://doi.org/10.14417/lp.771>
- Garrido, M., Garcia-Marques, L., & Jerónimo, R. (2004). Aventureiros, religiosos, ecológicos e artísticos: Pré-teste de descrições comportamentais. *Laboratório de Psicologia*, *2*(1), 95-101.
- Garrido, M., Palma, T., Carrega, A., Padeiro, C., Barrileiro, F., Castelo, F., Figueiredo, L., Raposo, M., Feliciano, R., Santos, S., Rodrigues, S., Silva, S., Casaleiro, S., & Lory, S. (2009). O que pensamos sobre estes grupos? Um pré-teste de características estereotípicas de homossexuais e heterossexuais masculinos e de Árabes e Americanos. *Laboratório de Psicologia*, *7*(1), 101-131.
- Hilton, J. L., & von Hippel, W. (1996). Stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *47*, 237-271. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.237>
- Inzlicht, M., Kaiser, C. R., & Major, B. (2008). The face of chauvinism: How prejudice expectations shape perceptions of facial affect. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*(3), 758-766. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2007.06.004>
- Jerónimo, R., Garcia-Marques, L., & Garrido, M. (2004). Comportamentos e traços de personalidade: Traços gerados para comportamentos de duas dimensões de personalidade. *Laboratório de Psicologia*, *47*(2), 33-47. <https://doi.org/10.14417/lp.776>
- 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), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x>
- Karasawa, M., Asai, N., & Tanabe, Y. (2007). Stereotypes as shared beliefs: Effects of group identity on dyadic conversations. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *10*(4), 515-532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430207081538>
- Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *28*(3), 280-290. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0074049>
- Koenig, A. M., & Eagly, A. H. (2014). Evidence for the social role theory of stereotype content: Observations of groups' roles shape stereotypes. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *107*(3), 371-392. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14777260710751735>

- Mackie, D., Devos, T., & Smith, E. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(4), 602-616. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10022-3514.79.4.602>
- Mackie, D., Smith, E., & Ray, D. (2008). Intergroup emotions and intergroup relations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 1866-1880.
- Marques, S., Lima, M. L., & Novo, R. (2006). Traços estereotípicos associados às pessoas jovens e idosas na cultura portuguesa. *Laboratório de Psicologia*, 4(1), 91-108. <https://doi.org/10.14417/lp.764>
- McGarty, C., Yzerbyt, V., & Spears, R. (2002). Social, cultural and cognitive factors in stereotype formation. In C. McGarty, V. Yzerbyt, & R. Spears (Eds.), *Stereotypes as explanations: The formation of meaningful beliefs about social groups* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511489877.002>
- Moreira, S., Garcia-Marques, L., & Santos, A. S. (2008). Traços estereotípicos associados a 32 grupos profissionais. *Laboratório de Psicologia*, 6(1), 3-13.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17(1), 271-320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280601055772>
- Ramos, T., & Garcia-Marques, L. (2006). Quando uma acção permite diferentes interpretações: Pré-teste de comportamentos ambíguos. *Laboratório de Psicologia*, 4(1), 45-63. <https://doi.org/10.14417/lp.762>
- Smith, E. R., & Mackie, D. M. (2015). Dynamics of group-based emotions: Insights from intergroup emotions theory. *Emotion Review*, 7(4), 349-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073915590614>
- Smith, E. R., & MacKie, D. M. (2008). Intergroup emotions. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (3rd ed., pp. 428-439). The Guildford Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*, 13, 65-93.
- Vala, J., Brito, R., & Lopes, D. (2015). *Expressão dos racismos em Portugal* (2nd ed.). ICS Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.

Appendix 1

Traits results obtained for: Men, Women, Gay Men and Lesbians (mean and standard deviation)

Traits	N	Men		Women		Gay Men		Lesbians	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Competent	36	3.56	.843	3.28	.676	2.75	.867	2.94	.860
Lazy	36	2.75	.906	2.33	1.079	2.42	.937	2.44	.773
Stupid	36	2.42	.937	2.42	.906	3.00	1.079	2.33	1.042
Intelligent	36	3.39	.838	3.25	.696	3.25	.956	3.14	.899
Kind	36	2.97	.609	3.53	.838	2.53	.841	3.00	.862
Aggressive	36	3.31	1.009	2.39	.735	3.22	.971	2.78	1.072
Worker	36	3.83	.811	3.56	1.150	3.42	.797	3.22	.797
Problematic	36	2.58	1.025	2.86	.894	2.94	1.079	3.28	1.059
Superstitious	36	2.72	.974	3.33	1.175	3.31	.984	2.92	.906
Suspicious	36	2.97	1.000	3.36	.920	2.92	1.009	3.44	.998
Efficient	36	3.47	.941	3.31	.967	2.61	.732	3.03	.810
Unclean	36	2.64	.931	2.25	.798	3.06	1.225	2.58	1.079
Generous	36	3.17	.737	3.64	.833	2.33	.754	3.22	.760
Conservative	36	3.69	.786	3.36	.828	2.78	1.219	2.31	1.238
Wise	36	3.25	.841	3.33	1.022	2.75	.832	2.89	.785
Forgotten	36	2.92	1.228	2.61	.841	3.06	1.025	2.72	1.059
Dependent	36	3.03	.941	3.42	.866	2.75	.826	2.94	.893
Slow	36	2.92	1.079	2.78	.950	3.19	.996	2.64	.899
Grumpy	36	3.25	1.025	3.11	.637	3.14	.951	3.08	1.052
Funny	36	3.22	.898	3.22	.909	3.28	.961	2.81	.749
Active	36	3.47	1.028	3.44	.941	3.06	.914	3.36	.899
Unthinking	36	2.97	1.000	3.03	.822	2.78	1.145	2.94	1.040

Appendix 1 (cont.)

Traits	N	Men		Women		Gay Men		Lesbians	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Fast	36	3.11	1.063	2.69	.786	3.17	.797	2.78	.760
Educated	36	3.25	.770	3.31	.994	3.03	.845	3.22	.866
Adventurers	36	3.44	1.157	2.61	.841	3.89	1.108	3.06	.984
Sensitive	36	2.64	.931	3.92	1.323	3.97	.708	3.36	.798
Effeminate	36	1.50	.697	3.72	1.052	3.75	1.253	2.39	1.271
Eccentric	36	2.11	.919	2.42	1.037	3.42	1.228	3.61	1.248
Creative	36	2.97	.878	3.31	.906	3.39	1.025	3.44	1.027
Artistic	36	2.58	.937	3.08	.793	2.61	1.050	3.31	1.009
Shy	36	2.44	.773	2.67	.926	2.36	.964	2.56	.998
Religious	36	3.03	.845	3.67	1.008	3.94	.961	2.36	.961
Vain	36	2.97	.810	3.89	.854	3.83	1.013	2.97	.941
Liberal	36	2.61	.994	2.89	.688	3.36	1.159	3.86	1.150
Attentive	36	2.67	.676	3.61	.676	2.75	.723	3.19	.856

Appendix 2

Traits results obtained for: Elderly, Young, People with Physical Disability and Overweight People (mean and standard deviation)

Traits	N	Elderly		Young		People with Physical Disability		Overweight People	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Competent	32	3.16	.847	3.22	.870	2.81	.738	2.81	.780
Lazy	32	2.38	.707	3.59	1.043	2.25	.718	3.44	.914
Stupid	32	2.28	1.023	2.47	.983	2.19	.821	2.31	.998
Intelligent	32	3.16	.767	3.47	.950	2.97	.933	2.97	.861
Kind	32	3.88	.871	2.63	.707	3.34	.827	3.56	.840
Aggressive	32	2.00	.718	3.78	.832	2.25	1.016	2.41	.756
Worker	32	2.97	1.231	2.56	1.045	2.91	.734	2.69	.859
Problematic	32	2.88	1.070	3.75	.803	3.13	1.100	2.91	1.058
Superstitious	32	3.66	1.234	2.09	.777	2.50	.984	2.59	.875
Suspicious	32	3.78	1.099	2.59	.875	3.13	1.070	3.06	1.014
Efficient	32	2.75	.803	2.97	.861	2.53	.803	2.63	.793
Unclean	32	2.63	1.040	2.78	.906	2.31	1.061	2.69	1.091
Generous	32	3.69	.859	2.44	.801	3.50	.762	3.19	.859
Conservative	32	4.34	.701	1.88	.793	2.44	.878	2.78	.870
Wise	32	4.09	.893	2.56	.948	2.84	.767	2.66	.787
Forgotten	32	4.38	.707	2.78	1.099	2.84	1.167	2.72	.991
Dependent	32	3.91	.641	3.22	1.157	4.28	.729	3.06	.948
Slow	32	3.81	.859	2.47	1.047	3.34	.827	3.78	1.008
Grumpy	32	3.81	.821	2.84	.987	2.59	.979	2.59	.979
Funny	32	2.94	1.045	3.66	.971	2.78	.870	3.56	.840
Active	32	2.47	.621	3.78	.975	2.66	.865	2.31	.998
Unthinking	32	1.91	.928	4.22	.751	2.13	.751	2.66	.937
Fast	32	1.69	.693	3.91	.995	2.03	.695	1.94	.759
Educated	32	3.03	.999	3.16	.884	2.88	.707	3.03	.695
Adventurers	32	1.88	.660	4.25	.718	2.25	.842	2.13	.793
Sensitive	32	4.13	.793	2.97	1.031	4.00	.842	3.47	1.016
Effeminate	32	1.56	.759	2.59	1.073	1.69	.896	1.91	.928
Eccentric	32	2.03	.897	3.69	.965	2.13	1.040	2.41	.837
Creative	32	2.50	.916	3.94	.914	3.06	.982	2.75	1.016
Artistic	32	2.72	1.054	3.56	.759	2.78	.941	2.69	.896
Shy	32	2.69	1.030	2.25	.950	3.31	.931	3.09	1.174
Religious	32	4.28	.729	1.84	.628	3.06	.948	2.72	.991
Vain	32	2.28	.851	4.06	.878	2.16	.628	2.09	.689
Liberal	32	1.84	.677	4.09	.777	2.63	.833	2.72	.924
Attentive	32	3.69	.931	2.34	.653	3.13	.833	3.34	.701

Appendix 3

Traits results obtained for: Black, White, Chinese and Romanian (mean and standard deviation)

Traits	N	Black		White		Chinese		Romanian	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Competent	30	2.53	.860	3.77	.728	3.70	.877	2.33	1.124
Lazy	30	3.67	1.061	2.80	.484	1.77	.774	3.43	1.135
Stupid	30	3.30	1.208	2.17	.747	2.20	.925	2.73	1.081
Intelligent	30	2.27	.740	3.80	.664	3.57	.817	2.63	.999
Kind	30	2.87	.776	3.37	.809	2.47	.937	2.20	.997
Aggressive	30	3.43	1.006	2.57	.817	2.10	.712	3.63	1.066
Worker	30	2.57	1.040	3.40	.770	4.47	.629	2.57	1.194
Problematic	30	3.80	1.126	2.60	.855	2.37	1.129	3.87	1.106
Superstitious	30	4.13	.860	2.93	.740	3.97	1.189	3.40	1.003
Suspicious	30	3.27	1.112	3.00	.947	4.03	.64	3.87	.937
Efficient	30	2.43	.774	3.47	.629	3.97	.850	2.27	.944
Unclean	30	3.37	.964	2.33	.711	2.90	1.125	3.67	1.061
Generous	30	2.93	1.015	3.30	.794	1.97	.809	2.07	.944
Conservative	30	2.97	1.033	3.50	.731	3.93	1.015	3.37	1.098
Wise	30	2.33	.802	3.70	.750	3.47	.937	2.60	.968
Forgotten	30	2.97	.809	2.57	.626	2.27	.980	2.87	.973
Dependent	30	3.33	1.061	2.90	.885	2.37	1.299	3.33	1.213
Slow	30	3.37	1.273	2.77	.728	2.00	.910	3.07	1.112
Grumpy	30	2.67	1.028	3.27	.907	2.50	.861	3.10	1.094
Funny	30	3.83	.834	3.13	.629	2.10	.759	2.43	1.073
Active	30	2.63	.809	3.60	.724	4.07	.868	2.47	1.008
Unthinking	30	3.20	1.031	3.20	.761	2.17	1.020	2.73	1.081
Fast	30	2.30	1.149	3.20	.925	3.77	1.073	2.53	1.074
Educated	30	2.27	.691	3.87	.681	3.17	.986	2.17	1.053
Adventurers	30	2.90	.759	3.17	.834	3.50	1.280	3.40	1.163
Sensitive	30	2.70	.952	3.57	.679	2.47	.860	2.30	.915
Effeminate	30	1.57	.774	2.37	.964	1.87	.860	1.57	.774
Eccentric	30	2.80	1.215	2.57	.774	2.40	1.221	2.33	1.028
Creative	30	2.77	1.006	3.67	.758	3.27	1.081	2.57	1.073
Artistic	30	3.03	.964	3.33	.922	2.80	1.375	2.20	1.064
Shy	30	2.40	.855	2.77	.504	3.37	1.245	2.53	1.008
Religious	30	3.40	1.192	3.50	1.042	2.43	1.278	2.87	1.432
Vain	30	3.20	1.297	3.93	.828	2.60	.855	2.43	.817
Liberal	30	2.90	1.094	3.33	.884	2.03	.718	2.10	.885
Attentive	30	2.83	.874	3.40	.770	2.83	1.053	2.20	.925

Appendix 4

Emotions results obtained for: Men, Women, Gay Men and Lesbians (mean and standard deviation)

Emotions	N	Men		Women		Gay Men		Lesbians	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Contempt	36	1.75	.841	1.94	.984	3.31	1.327	3.19	1.327
Disgust	36	1.75	.906	1.58	.770	3.11	1.389	2.97	1.383
Admiration	36	3.31	1.064	3.19	.951	2.17	1.000	2.14	.961
Pity	36	1.97	1.082	2.25	1.131	2.64	1.313	2.67	1.331
Guilt	36	1.86	1.046	2.03	1.082	2.11	1.166	2.14	1.175
Shame	36	1.81	1.037	1.75	1.025	3.22	1.333	3.22	1.267
Pride	36	3.17	1.183	3.03	1.108	2.03	.941	2.03	1.000
Envy	36	2.36	1.268	2.22	1.222	1.75	1.105	1.69	1.037
Jealousy	36	2.11	1.141	2.28	1.256	1.75	.874	1.81	.951
Sympathy	36	3.42	1.052	3.47	1.108	2.44	1.027	2.36	1.018
Happiness	36	2.97	1.108	3.00	1.095	2.08	.874	2.11	.854
Sadness	36	2.08	1.156	2.22	1.149	2.83	1.404	2.92	1.381
Anger	36	1.75	.732	1.75	.770	2.83	1.254	2.81	1.261
Fear	36	2.08	1.204	1.72	1.031	2.28	1.301	2.19	1.238
Surprise	36	2.11	1.008	2.11	1.008	2.81	1.348	2.75	1.296
Attraction	36	2.89	1.141	3.08	1.156	2.08	.874	2.11	.854
Love	36	3.31	1.037	3.31	1.037	2.08	.996	2.14	1.018
Compassion	36	2.56	1.081	2.92	1.105	2.58	1.025	2.61	1.022
Remorse	36	1.86	.961	1.92	.937	1.97	1.000	2.00	1.014
Rancour	36	1.75	.874	1.78	.832	2.72	1.210	2.64	1.150
Passion	36	2.94	1.094	3.19	1.117	2.08	.874	2.08	.874

Appendix 5

Emotions results obtained for: Elderly, Young, People with Physical Disability and Overweight People (mean and standard deviation)

Emotions	N	Elderly		Young		People with Physical Disability		Overweight People	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Contempt	32	2.28	.924	1.97	.822	2.28	1.114	2.66	1.004
Disgust	32	2.28	.958	1.69	.693	2.41	1.132	2.56	1.268
Admiration	32	3.81	.780	3.16	.954	3.28	1.114	2.19	.896
Pity	32	3.84	.847	2.09	.689	4.22	1.008	3.19	1.091
Guilt	32	2.59	1.188	2.44	.982	2.63	1.070	2.09	.928
Shame	32	2.38	1.040	2.06	.759	2.50	1.078	2.88	1.100
Pride	32	3.69	.896	3.53	1.016	3.16	1.019	2.38	.907
Envy	32	2.06	.914	3.31	1.176	1.44	.669	1.44	.504
Jealousy	32	1.69	.644	3.03	1.177	1.28	.457	1.44	.619
Sympathy	32	3.63	.942	3.56	.914	3.38	1.008	2.84	1.019
Happiness	32	3.25	.950	3.53	.983	2.59	1.043	2.38	1.008
Sadness	32	3.66	1.066	2.31	.859	3.97	.861	3.28	.991
Anger	32	1.88	.751	2.22	.975	1.81	.965	1.91	1.027
Fear	32	1.81	.859	2.84	1.167	2.25	1.244	2.03	.822
Surprise	32	2.72	1.023	3.13	1.040	3.16	1.081	2.78	1.039
Attraction	32	2.41	.946	3.78	.792	2.06	.878	1.78	.751
Love	32	3.63	.942	3.50	1.136	3.03	1.092	2.66	1.004
Compassion	32	3.78	1.039	2.31	.859	3.97	.999	2.75	.984
Remorse	32	2.88	1.212	2.13	.833	2.88	1.264	2.28	1.114
Rancour	32	2.28	.958	2.16	.808	1.88	.942	2.09	.893
Passion	32	2.59	.946	3.06	1.014	2.53	1.016	2.22	.870

Appendix 6

Emotions results obtained for: Black, White, Chinese and Romanian (mean and standard deviation)

Emotions	N	Black		White		Chinese		Romanian	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Contempt	30	3.03	1.066	2.00	1.083	2.47	.973	3.47	1.279
Disgust	30	2.70	.988	1.47	.507	2.03	.809	3.00	1.313
Admiration	30	2.17	.648	3.67	.884	2.83	1.020	1.90	.923
Pity	30	2.63	.765	2.10	1.213	1.90	.923	2.33	.994
Guilt	30	2.13	.900	1.77	.817	1.60	.675	1.63	.809
Shame	30	2.50	1.106	1.97	.809	1.93	.828	2.53	1.279
Pride	30	1.93	.740	3.60	1.037	1.93	.785	1.80	.847
Envy	30	1.63	.765	2.57	1.223	2.30	1.119	1.30	.535
Jealousy	30	1.77	.817	2.50	1.106	1.93	.980	1.50	.777
Sympathy	30	2.80	.805	3.93	.740	2.47	.819	2.07	1.015
Happiness	30	2.27	.785	3.53	.973	2.17	.747	1.97	.809
Sadness	30	2.40	.968	2.17	1.147	1.83	.592	2.37	1.098
Anger	30	2.70	1.088	1.77	.679	2.23	.898	3.00	1.339
Fear	30	3.53	.937	1.97	.718	2.00	.910	3.73	1.112
Surprise	30	2.60	1.037	2.53	1.008	2.83	1.117	2.63	1.159
Attraction	30	2.33	.758	3.73	.828	2.20	.887	2.00	1.083
Love	30	2.27	.828	3.70	.794	1.90	.803	1.77	.898
Compassion	30	2.33	.711	2.73	1.172	2.07	.740	2.17	.874
Remorse	30	2.13	.776	2.13	.973	1.63	.669	1.83	.913
Rancour	30	2.57	1.073	1.70	.651	2.00	.830	2.63	1.217
Passion	30	2.07	.980	3.40	.814	1.83	.874	1.70	.915

Appendix 7

Behavioural tendencies results obtained for: Men, Women, Gay Men and Lesbians (mean and standard deviation)

Behavioral tendencies	N	Men		Women		Gay Men		Lesbians	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Help	36	3.47	.941	3.44	1.027	2.42	.732	2.50	.737
Protect	36	3.39	1.103	3.31	1.009	2.36	.867	2.42	.874
Fight	36	2.31	1.037	2.28	1.031	2.69	1.064	2.56	.939
Attack	36	2.14	.762	2.44	.909	3.36	.961	3.31	.856
Cooperate	36	3.64	.798	3.44	.773	2.61	.964	2.67	.926
Associate	36	3.44	.969	3.25	.874	2.31	.920	2.31	.856
Humiliate	36	1.92	.770	2.56	1.054	3.47	1.158	3.25	1.105
Exclude	36	1.89	.820	2.33	.926	3.50	1.108	3.39	1.076
Refuse to help	36	2.03	.845	2.14	.931	2.94	1.241	2.81	1.167
Insult	36	2.14	.798	2.64	1.046	3.53	1.158	3.44	1.081
Criticize	36	2.44	.809	2.83	.775	3.86	.723	3.69	.749
Avoid	36	1.97	.845	2.00	.926	3.47	1.158	3.33	1.121

Appendix 8

Behavioural tendencies results obtained for: Elderly, Young, People with Physical Disability and Overweight People (mean and standard deviation)

Behavioural tendencies	N	Elderly		Young		People with Physical Disability		Overweight People	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Help	32	3.34	.827	3.06	.914	3.25	.842	2.53	.718
Protect	32	3.25	.916	3.22	.941	3.34	1.066	2.31	.780
Fight	32	2.19	.859	2.66	1.035	1.91	.893	2.03	.822
Attack	32	2.69	.965	2.66	.902	2.03	.822	2.78	.975
Cooperate	32	3.06	1.014	3.31	.965	2.97	.861	2.69	.738
Associate	32	2.78	.832	3.25	.950	2.00	.622	2.22	.706
Humiliate	32	2.56	.914	2.19	.859	2.47	.983	3.25	.842
Exclude	32	3.50	1.136	2.13	.793	3.59	.979	3.44	1.014
Refuse to help	32	2.41	.946	2.16	.808	2.09	.893	2.41	.911
Insult	32	2.72	.991	2.59	.837	2.28	.888	3.38	1.070
Criticize	32	3.25	1.016	3.75	.718	2.31	.859	3.75	.950
Avoid	32	3.03	.999	2.00	.842	3.16	1.019	3.19	.896

Appendix 9

Behavioural tendencies results obtained for: Black, White, Chinese and Romanian (mean and standard deviation)

Behavioral tendencies	N	Black		White		Chinese		Romanian	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Help	30	2.63	.765	3.20	.961	2.10	.845	2.30	.915
Protect	30	2.47	.900	3.37	1.033	2.07	.785	2.07	.868
Fight	30	2.73	1.048	2.17	.791	1.77	.728	2.50	1.106
Attack	30	2.77	1.223	1.90	.845	2.00	.947	2.50	1.137
Cooperate	30	2.60	.621	3.73	.828	2.57	.858	2.03	.809
Associate	30	2.50	.974	3.93	1.015	2.23	.858	1.90	.923
Humiliate	30	2.90	1.094	2.13	.776	2.33	.711	2.83	1.147
Exclude	30	3.40	1.133	1.83	.986	3.00	1.114	3.63	1.326
Refuse to help	30	2.73	1.081	2.07	.944	2.63	.964	3.13	1.224
Insult	30	3.00	1.017	2.13	.776	2.43	.858	3.07	1.172
Criticize	30	3.53	1.137	2.40	.968	2.90	.995	3.63	1.189
Avoid	30	3.40	1.163	1.73	1.015	2.57	.858	3.50	1.196

Appendix 10

Stereotypic traits valence

Traits	N	Mean	SD	Sig. (bilat.)
Competent	98	4.24	.886	.000
Intelligent	98	4.22	.868	.000
Kind	98	4.24	.719	.000
Worker	98	4.18	.912	.000
Efficient	98	4.22	.819	.000
Generous	98	4.27	.819	.000
Wise	98	4.15	.978	.000
Funny	98	4.19	.755	.000
Active	98	4.08	.858	.000
Fast	98	3.77	.847	.000
Educated	98	4.12	.966	.000
Adventurers	98	3.72	.847	.000
Sensitive	98	3.95	.804	.000
Eccentric	98	3.11	.745	.139
Creative	98	4.22	.831	.000
Artistic	98	4.03	.855	.000
Liberal	98	3.48	.763	.000
Attentive	98	4.22	.819	.000
Lazy	98	2.05	.878	.000
Stupid	98	1.87	.959	.000
Aggressive	98	1.91	.996	.000
Problematic	98	2.14	1.075	.000
Superstitious	98	2.60	.756	.000
Suspicious	98	2.52	.911	.000
Unclean	98	1.65	.898	.000
Conservative	98	2.89	.884	.212
Forgotten	98	2.56	.909	.000
Dependent	98	2.58	.873	.000
Slow	98	2.50	.865	.000
Grumpy	98	2.34	.919	.000
Unthinking	98	2.46	.789	.000
Effeminate	98	2.72	.770	.001
Shy	98	2.95	.581	.387
Religious	98	3.14	.658	.034
Vain	98	2.86	.837	.094

Estereótipos, emoções e comportamentos em contexto intergrupar em Portugal

O conteúdo dos estereótipos tem sido muito estudado desde o clássico estudo de Katz e Braly (1933). Os resultados obtidos nestes estudos têm sido fundamentais na construção de estudos mais complexos no sentido de explorar a formação, propósito e manutenção dos estereótipos. Do nosso conhecimento, em Portugal, os estudos neste campo são poucos ou até inexistentes, particularmente relacionados com alguns grupos sociais. Além disso, as mudanças sociais contínuas podem trazer variação no significado e importância de cada atributo. O objetivo deste estudo é explorar e pré-testar o conteúdo dos estereótipos de 12 grupos sociais em Portugal. Noventa e oito participantes recrutados online, através das redes sociais, avaliaram 35 traços estereotípicos e a sua valência, 21 emoções e 12 tendências comportamentais relacionadas com estes grupos sociais. Os resultados permitem não apenas a seleção, para cada grupo, dos traços estereotípicos, das emoções e das tendências de comportamento que são significativamente diferentes do ponto médio da escala, mas também a identificação de traços, emoções e tendências de comportamento que melhor parecem diferenciar os diferentes grupos.

Palavras-chave: Estereótipo, Emoções, Comportamentos.

