

School of Social Sciences (ECSH)

Department of Social and Organizational Psychology

Social Dominance Orientation, Economic System Justification and the Belief in a Just World  
as predictors of hostile attitudes towards poverty and the poor in Brazil

Larissa de Oliveira Vanzellotti Monteiro

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of  
Psychology of Intercultural Relations

Supervisor:

Doutor Hélder António Vinagreiro Gomes Alves

Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)

Centro de Investigação e Intervenção Social (CIS-IUL)

September, 2018

School of Social Sciences (ECSH)

Department of Social and Organizational Psychology

Social Dominance Orientation, Economic System Justification and the Belief in a Just World  
as predictors of hostile attitudes towards poverty and the poor in Brazil

Larissa de Oliveira Vanzellotti Monteiro

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of  
Psychology of Intercultural Relations

Supervisor:

Doutor Hélder António Vinagreiro Gomes Alves

Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)

Centro de Investigação e Intervenção Social (CIS-IUL)

September, 2018

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to thank immensely my partner in life, Alisson, who supported me during all moments of this two long years. Thank you for being amazing.

I would also like to thank my supervisor, Hélder, for being so present in this whole process. I could never imagine to have a supervisor so dedicated, openminded and kind by my side. Thank you a lot for this supervision and for being this beautiful human being.

## Resumo

Em um contexto de grande desigualdade e de divisão de classes sociais, a sociedade brasileira é o objeto deste estudo, mais especificamente, sua classe média e sua atitude de hostilidade no que diz respeito a assuntos de classe e de pobreza. Nesse sentido, procurou-se estudar algumas variáveis que poderiam prever a hostilidade da classe média brasileira em relação aos pobres e a pobreza. Além das variáveis de controle (idade, sexo/gênero, classe social subjectiva, crença no mundo justo pessoal (BJW-P), orientação política e desabilidade social), medimos a Orientação para Dominância Social (SDO), que é a tendência que as pessoas têm de apoiar estruturas hierárquicas, a Justificação Sistema Econômico (ESJ), que é a tendência que as pessoas têm em justificar o sistema econômico, e a Crença no Mundo Justo Geral (BJW-G), que é a tendência que as pessoas têm a se comportar como se o mundo fosse um lugar justo. Os participantes (N=290) responderam a um questionário no Qualtrics onde tais variáveis foram testadas. Conforme esperava-se, a adição da SDO, da ESJ e da BJW-G contribuiu para uma maior predição da hostilidade nessa amostra. Percebeu-se também que a Orientação Política apresentou uma forte correlação com a manifestação de atitudes hostis. Ao final do trabalho, algumas limitações são levantadas, como a não utilização da classe social objetiva, e também algumas sugestões para futuros estudos, como entrevistar também as classes populares.

**Palavras-Chave:** Brasil; Hostilidade; Pobreza; Crença no Mundo Justo; Orientação para Dominância Social; Justificação do Sistema Econômico

## **Abstract**

In a context of huge inequality and of social class division, the Brazilian society is the object of this study, more specifically, its middle class and its attitude of hostility concerning class subjects and poverty. In this sense, we studied which variables could predict hostility in the Brazilian middle class towards the poor and poverty. Besides the control variables (age, sex/gender, subjective social class, BJW-P, political orientation and social desirability), we measured the Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), which is the tendency people have to endorse hierarchical structures, the Economic System Justification (ESJ), which is the tendency people have to justify the economic system, and the General Belief in a Just World (BJW-G), which is the tendency people have in behave like the world were a fair place. The participants (N=290) answered a questionnaire on Qualtrics, where those variables were tested. According to what was expected, the addition of the SDO, the ESJ and the BJW-G contributed to the prediction of hostility in this sample. It was also noticed that the Political Orientation showed a strong correlation with the manifestation of hostile attitudes. In the end of this work, some limitations are discussed, as the fact that we did not use a objective social class measure, and also some suggestions for future studies, like also interviewing the poorer classes.

**Key-words:** Brazil; Hostility; Poverty; Belief in a Just World; Social Dominance Orientation; Economic System Justification

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	01
CHAPTER I-THEORETICAL APPROACH.....	03
Brazil and its Inequality: History of a rough reality.....	03
Social Class and Social Psychology.....	06
Objective and subjective social class.....	08
Intergroup Relations and System-Justifying Ideologies.....	09
Social dominance theory and social dominance orientation.....	11
System justification theory and economic system justification.....	14
Just world theory and the belief in a just world .....	16
CHAPTER II- PRESENT STUDY.....	20
Pre-study.....	21
Main Study.....	22
Method.....	22
<i>Participants</i> .....	22
<i>Procedures</i> .....	23
<i>Measures</i> .....	24
CHAPTER III- RESULTS.....	26
CHAPTER IV- DISCUSSION.....	30
Limitations and Future Research.....	31
Conclusion.....	33
REFERENCES.....	34
Appendix 1.....	41
Appendix 2.....	44

## **List of Tables**

Table 1 - Correlations and descriptive statistics (N= 290)

Table 2 - Regression of hostility towards the poor, BJW-P, political orientation, subjective social class, social desirability, age and sex/gender (block 1), SDO, ESJ and BJW-G (block 2)

## **List of Acronyms**

**BJW-** Belief in a Just World

**BJW-G-** Belief in a Just World (General)

**BJW-P-** Belief in a Just World (Personal)

**ESJ-** Economic System Justification

**GNI-** Gross National Income

**HA-** Hierarchy-Attenuating

**HDI-** Human Development Index

**HE-** Hierarchy-Enhancing

**IHDI-** Inequality Human Development Index

**IPEA-** Instituto de Pesquisa Económica Aplicada

**SDO-** Social Dominance Orientation

**SES-** Social Economical Status

**SIT-** Social Identity Theory

**UNDP-** United Nations Development Program



## Introduction

Brazil has endured huge social and economic inequality, which is strongly based on its history of slavery and economic exploitation since colonial times (J. Souza, 2017). In this society, economic status plays a central role in personal identity and even survival. As a consequence, to a larger extent than in less unequal societies, in Brazil, the different socio-economic groups are highly distinct, with each having their own characteristics and social symbols. For instance, the differences among classes are such an ingrained feature of Brazilian social life that its members are able to categorize people they meet into their social class by simply looking at them. It is therefore relatively easy to segregate those individuals who do not belong to one's socio-economic group. The segregation is not formally established or imposed by the government or by any other institution. Instead, it is largely put into practice by most groups which leads to a very sectioned society.

The concept of "inequality" runs through this research. Inequality can be responsible for a huge separation in society which leads individuals not to feel connected to those who do not belong to their own social class, to discriminate against, display hostility and even to hate them. Indeed, according to various authors (e.g., Buttrick & Oishi, 2017; Rodriguez-Bailon et al., 2017), inequality has a negative impact on the development of a society (e.g., more criminality, lower well-being, health problems, drug abuse, racism). Also, the deeper the inequality, the bigger the mistrust in the society (Buttrick & Oishi, 2017).

This research intends to contribute to understand attitudes of individuals from the Brazilian middle-class towards poor classes in Brazil, mainly by using popular concepts in Social Psychology which, to our knowledge, have been used together only partially: 'Belief in a just world' (Lerner, 1980), 'Social Dominance Orientation' (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), and 'Economical System Justification' (Jost & Thompson, 2000). Those three dimensions are commonly used in cases of social perception and attitudes and (in the case of the last two dimensions: SDO and ESJ) in cases of social hierarchy legitimization in societies. Therefore, the three constructs will be used to verify if they can predict Brazilian middle-class members' hostility towards the poor. As it will be seen further in the literature review, the BJW is the tendency people have to behave as the world around them was just (Lerner, 1980). SDO, in turn, is the tendency to endorse hierarchy in society (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999); and ESJ is the tendency to legitimize economic inequality (Jost & Thompson, 2000).

Also, at this level, this research is relevant because social class has received relatively little research in social psychology when compared to other social sciences, such as sociology (Goudeau et al., 2017; Kraus & Stephens, 2012). This study is also important because it addresses a clear economic and social divide in Brazilian society, related not only to purchasing power, but also to status and various different symbols of belonging. This divide is responsible for many conflicts and much animosity in the Brazilian society. Since this is such a huge problem in the Brazilian society, this work also intends to contribute, even if minimally, to the reduction of inequality and to the improvement of social awareness in Brazil.

In the next sections, we will address the literature concerning the Brazilian reality and the main constructs chosen in this paper. First, we will make a brief description of the Brazilian social situation and its historical inequality. Then, we will discuss the social class concept and its role in social psychology studies. To finish the literature review, we will present the intergroup conflict theme as well as the system justification ideologies in a third section, separated in three different sub-sections: 'Social dominance theory and social dominance orientation'; 'System Justification Theory and Economic System Justification'; and 'Just World Theory and the Belief in a Just World'.

## Chapter I- Theoretical Approach

### Brazil And Its Inequality: History Of A Rough Reality

Even though Brazil is among the ten biggest economies in the world, with a GDP larger than Russia's or Australia's (World Bank, 2017), it is an extremely unfair and unequal country with many social classes<sup>1</sup> and huge social problems. As presented by the United Nations (2016), Brazil HDI (Human Development Index) is 0.754, in a scale which varies from 0 to 1, with 1 being the best possible score. Brazil is at the 79th position among all countries and this confers the country a status of High Human Development. It is important to analyze this information more carefully, however.

The HDI is measured based on three different indexes: Life expectancy at birth (years), gross national income (GNI) per capita, and expected years of schooling. It is true that Brazil's social conditions have improved in some ways. For example, in the 1960s, Life Expectancy was only 55 years, and it is 77 now. However, the HDI, which is supposed to measure human development, actually does not take into account many subtle factors that contribute to the quality of life of a population. If we look specifically at inequality, we will verify that, in the Inequality-Adjusted Index<sup>2</sup>, Brazil only scores 0.561, which means it has a medium classification of development (UNDP, 2016). Besides inequality and violence (almost 60,000 people were killed in 2015, according to IPEA, 2017), Brazil has recently been in political turmoil, as we present next.

The data for this research were collected in 2018, a pretty complicated year for the internal politics of Brazil as a consequence of a series of events that have been taking place for the past few years. For instance, in 2013, many demonstrations took place and, on August 31st 2016, president Dilma Roussef was impeached and replaced by her vice-president Michel Temer. Since this episode, many important and serious events have happened bringing along

---

<sup>1</sup> The definition and delimitation of what is considered a Social Class will be done in a further section.

<sup>2</sup> 'The IHDI combines a country's average achievements in health, education and income with how those achievements are distributed among country's population by "discounting" each dimension's average value according to its level of inequality. Thus, the IHDI is distribution-sensitive average level of HD. Two countries with different distributions of achievements can have the same average HDI value. Under perfect equality the IHDI is equal to the HDI, but falls below the HDI when inequality rises' (UNDP, 2016).

even more instability to Brazil (e.g., the constitution was amended to freeze public spending; accusation against the now President Temer of receiving bribes from Odebrecht; strikes against the pension reforms; military intervention in Rio de Janeiro). At the time of writing this text (march-july 2018) there are many open cases of corruption against many important politicians (almost none of them have been tried yet whilst some have already been closed), and the ex-president Luis Inácio Lula da Silva has been sentenced to prison. His conviction led to a lot of debate and protests in the country, whilst some people tried to stop his imprisonment. This whole situation is, in itself, very complicated and threatening to a population who feel it can no longer trust their politicians or the politics in Brazil.

Nevertheless, those last years of political uncertainty have brought up many discussions about Brazilian society, public policies and the achievements of the past governments. The mandates of the ex-president Lula were a turning point to one of the biggest (if not the biggest) problems of Brazil: its huge economic and social inequality.

Brazilian inequality has its roots in a very distant past, in a history of colonization and slavery. The logic of a society divided in very well established classes based on race was the hegemonic structure for many decades in Brazil. After the end of formal and legal slavery, the criterion for superiority and segregation based on skin color was replaced by cultural racism in which cultural and social heritage have played that role (J. Souza, 2017). Based on this new concept, it has thus become possible to keep on separating those who are supposedly superior from those who are supposedly inferior, or "less developed". The new method could be applied to people (like social classes in Brazil), but also to countries in different stages of this so called development. The idea of superiority brings along the concept of deservingness and also the internalization of a sort of slavery ideology (e.g., feeling superior as a class or group) from those who are not on the top of the world's hierarchy. This logic emerges as a new form of legitimization of the system, of its inequalities and of reproduction of privileges (Chalhoub, 2017; J. Souza, 2017).

The concepts of "culture" and "superiority" allowed that the classes in Brazil were separated into those who have a soul and can think and those who are in charge of the physical work, close to the role that animals usually have. The ones in the low levels of this new division are, often, compared to animals and defined with animalistic characteristics (infra-humanization). But also, the power of these ideas affects the way the Brazilian population sees itself

compared to other nations. It has adopted this discourse and believed in its own inferiority compared to foreigner countries. Because of that, it is possible to see people, especially in the middle classes, defending that it would be better to give the national companies to the foreigners instead of letting them be controlled by the Brazilian government. In this case, the Brazilian State is seen as the great villain responsible for all the corruption and as the main opposition of free market (J. Souza, 2017). More than that, the Brazilians reproduce what is called “viralatismo”, which is the feeling that everything that comes from Brazil is inferior to the rest. It is the feeling of inferiority in life when compared to other countries and peoples (M. Souza, 2013).

The middle-class in Brazil has its origins in 19<sup>th</sup> century bourgeoisie and played an important role in the development of this new Brazilian society. Its own rise was a form of social distinction, which has become the distinction from those in the base of the society. There are two facets in this distinction. The first one is symbolic and represents the desire to possess “superiority” in itself (to be seen as superior) and to have the power to command. The second one is more material and pragmatic, with the goal to have material gains by creating a lower class that can be easily exploited. The middle-class transferred the hostility and contempt that once was devoted to the slaves to this new “inferior” class. This may explain to a large extent why the Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT; Workers' Party) and the former president Lula also became a target of hate (Souza, 2017).

During 'Lula's Age', the gap between classes was finally reduced and many affirmative actions were strongly implemented. The more well-known ones are the policy of quotas for public universities and the *Bolsa Família*. The former is based on the type of school that one attended (public or private), and on one's income. As it is largely known, the quality of schools in Brazil varies a lot (Horonato da Silva & Sampaio, 2010). Studying at a public school is not only a sign of social and economic inferiority, but is also meaning of having access to a poorer education. The second program, *Bolsa Família*, was created in 2003 under President Lula's mandate. It helps around 13 millions families (thus covering a quarter of Brazilian population) with a small amount of money defined according to the number of family members. The leading rule for being accepted in the program is to have a very low income and to keep those families' children at school. This program was responsible for the

reduction of extreme poverty in Brazil and also for the emancipation of many women who depended on their husbands' income to survive (IPEA, 2014).

Those two programs, among other actions, created by the so called left-wing governments, were responsible for a major social and economic change in Brazil. They helped millions of Brazilians to leave extreme poverty, to have more quality of life and to have access to education. Nevertheless, those programs have been firmly criticized by many in the middle class who consider unfair the maintenance of public policies and affirmative actions related to economic aid.

### **Social Class And Social Psychology**

Historically, social classes have been studied in sociology in works like those of Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx and Max Weber (See Durkheim, 1802; Marx & Engels, 1973/1848; Weber, 1958). The impact of social classes on the levels of education have been largely studied by sociologists like Pierre de Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1978b). Although discrimination, prejudice and stereotyping are three topics largely studied in Social Psychology, this discipline has surprisingly neglected these phenomena when they involve social class membership (Goudeau, Autin & Croizet, 2017; Kraus & Stephens, 2012; Manstead, 2018).

In this field, many types of prejudice and discrimination have been studied. For example, those motivated by age (e.g., Castro, 2016; Marques, 2011; Nelson, 2002), "race"/ethnicity (e.g., Monteiro, França, & Rodrigues, 2009; Vala, Pereira, Lima, & Leyens, 2012), sex/gender (e.g., Santos & Amâncio, 2016) or nationality (e.g., Sindic, 2011). However, in mainstream social psychology at least, the belonging (or the feeling of belonging) to a social class has received relatively little importance in the study of groups and in the establishment of conflicts and discrimination among them (for exceptions, see Goudeau et al., 2017; Kraus & Stephens, 2012; Manstead, 2018). This means that social classes are not largely used as a structural element of social division in the studies. Moreover, when we specifically look for information on segregation and discrimination in Brazil, most books and articles found have the racial situation as the main object of study (e.g., Hasenbalg, Silva, & Lima, 1999; Henriques, 2001; Martinez & Camino, 2000).

Most research in Social Psychology addressing social classes derives from social psychology of health (Gallo, Monteros, & Shivpuri, 2009; Lee, Lemyre, Turner, Orpana, & Krewski,

2008; O'Brien, 2012; Ostrove, Feldman, & Adler, 1999; Pudrovska, 2014), which mainly studies the effects of socio-economic status (SES) for the development of diseases and health problems in different populations (See Herffenan, Jae, Wilund, & Fernhall, 2008; Williams et al., 2007; Williams, Yu, Jackson, & Anderson, 1997). The study of social classes in Social Psychology shows to be essential since there are many differences in attitudes and social behavior between members of lower classes and middle classes.

For instance, members of lower classes usually tend to display more interdependence and have less perception of individual control of their own lives, which makes them to be more inclined to explain events by situational conditions. On the contrary, people from upper classes have the tendency to see things in a more independent way, which means they usually attribute events and results to personal characteristics or individual attitudes. Those who belong to upper-classes have more access to material goods and have, as consequence, a bigger sensation of control over their own lives and their choices. These differences become very clear with socialization and can be a doorway for discriminatory attitudes (Goudeau et al., 2017; Kraus & Stephens, 2012; Manstead, 2018; Stephens, Markus, & Phillips, 2014).

Another important difference between members of those two social positions is the level of empathy. Individuals from lower classes usually score higher in empathy, have more egalitarian values and are more capable of identifying people's emotions. This can be explained by the factors mentioned above: they are more interdependent and tend to see events from a situational point of view. On the contrary, individuals from higher classes tend to attribute results to dispositional factors. Besides that, they show less tendency to help and trust strangers. As could be expected, the differences among social groups usually become more evident in very unequal societies, where social class division and membership are more salient (Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2011; Manstead, 2018).

Finally, Croizet and Claire (1998) expanded to social class the social psychology concept of stereotype threat (Steele & Anderson, 1995), which can be defined as the fear one might have of confirming a negative stereotype. They found that when the test was claimed to be a measure of intellectual ability, students from lower social status groups performed worse. When the test was presented as a mere laboratory exercise, the performance was equal between lower and higher status participants. This kind of study, puts into evidence the importance of social classes belonging to people's perceptions and behaviors.

### **Objective and subjective social class.**

Nowadays, since professions have developed in different directions (they are no longer divided into those who control the main ways of production and those who work to produce), there are two main ways that can be used to delimit social classes: the objective and the subjective. The first one can be measured through three main aspects: the income, which is responsible for the access someone has to the material goods, such as neighborhood, housing, clothing (Kraus & Stephens, 2012). The second objective measure is the level of education the a person and their parents have achieved, which is part of the "Cultural Capital"<sup>3</sup> (Bourdieu, 1978). The third measure comprises the kind of occupation one has. Those occupations have a direct relation with social prestige (Goudeau et al., 2017; Kraus & Stephens, 2012), for instance, being a doctor, an engineer, a professor, etc. The occupation usually is responsible for the way people are seen in society.

Depending on social classes, one acquires non-verbal behaviors that are typical of one's economic-hierarchy. It is possible to compare this behavior along with wealth, education, tastes and occupation. There are norms that are not the same depending on the environment one grows up (Kraus et al., 2011; Manstead, 2018). In the case of Brazil, it is quite easy to identify to which class one belongs. This allows a great differentiation among social groups and also a huge opportunity for discrimination and segregation. Indeed, whereas members of the upper middle-class earn good salaries, have the opportunity to study more, speak foreigner languages, travel abroad, among other privileges, members of the lower classes usually have fewer prestiged jobs, earn poor salaries, barely speak or write properly in Portuguese and, many times, are the ones who work for the upper middle-class. Historically, the upper middle-class uses the lower classes in order to save time. So the first do not need to do the domestic duties and, many times, do not even have to take care of their own children (Souza, 2017).

The second way of measuring social class is subjective, which means it is based on individuals' self perceptions. According to Kraus et al. (2011), subjective social class shapes the way people think society, their emotions and also their behavior. The way people classify themselves, either as middle-class or as working class, has a relation with their socio-political

---

<sup>3</sup> Cultural Capital is the transmission of cultural values and habits through generations that influence social behavior. This can contribute to social reproduction of classes, for example (Bourdieu, 1978).



attitudes (Manstead, 2018). For instance, according to Brown-Iannuzzi, Lundberg, Kay and Payne (2015), subjective class is related to the support one gives to public policies of redistribution. People who, comparatively to others, perceive themselves as having a higher status tend to be less supportive to redistributive policies. Usually, in order to measure subjective social class, it is used a scale similar to a ladder, the MacArthur Scale (Adler et al., 2000; Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2009). The one problem with this measure is that it can be understood differently by each person. Nonetheless, it is a good form of social comparison among individuals and of understanding about one's social perception. This said, in order to measure people's perception about themselves, individuals need to answer in which position they would put themselves on a ladder that has many levels. In this case, the lowest number is also the perceived lowest division in a given society and the highest number is the perceived highest position (Kraus, Piff, Mendoza-Denton, Rheinschmidt, & Keltner, 2012).

Since in Social Psychology the way people perceive the world is very important for their positioning in the environment they live in, the subjective measure of social class will be used in this work so they could situate themselves in the social hierarchical order. Two objective measures of social class (years of formal education and professional occupation) were also asked in order to characterize the sample, but the focus was given on the subjective perception of each participant. In this paper, the idea was to use the subjective social classifications above in order to identify the relation that might exist between one's perception of belonging to a social class and the development of hostility towards "inferior" social groups in the Brazilian society. Since the subjective social class variable is very important in the study of social classes in Social Psychology, in this work, it will be used as a control variable.

### **Intergroup Relations And System-Justifying Ideologies**

An important theory about intergroup conflict is the Realistic Group Conflict Theory (Campbell, 1965). According to this theory, the competition between groups for limited resources or the existence of incompatible interests leads to the establishment of conflict, stereotype and hostility. The threat can be to people's physical safety, to their economic and political power, or to the existence of the group. This animosity can be exacerbated when one group's success blocks (or seems to block) the other group's achievement. Moreover, this hostility enhances the ingroup solidarity. One possible way of reverting or, at least, attenuating this phenomenon is through the creation of superordinate categories, for example.

Another important theory for the understanding of group conflict is the Social Identity Theory (SIT) (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) aimed at explaining the interplay between personal and social identities, and how those identities could influence people's perceptions and their behavior in society. The focus to do that was on the stereotypes and on intergroup conflicts. SIT identified (but went beyond it) conditions under which individuals identify to and defend the *ingroup* identity, discriminating the *outgroup*. Results showed that people would display ingroup preferences for the in-group even in random situations. The fact of categorizing people in groups was enough to get people to see themselves as part of a collective identity. These studies had the aim to understand intergroup conflicts, but also to understand people's social perceptions in different situations. It was an attempt to understand how individuals place themselves in society.

When people belong to high-status group, they try to maintain and protect a positive social identity. In the case of lower-status groups, that is not always the way things work. When the system is seen as unstable and social mobility is possible, lower-status individuals might engage in social competition in order to achieve a better position in society. However, when the system is stable and social mobility is not very likely, they might engage in cognitive resources as identity-management or social creativity strategies (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). System justification is a way of managing one's own identity. To endorse the system's functioning allows people to believe the systems hierarchy is fair and helps to accept their social position as just. This endorsement of the system is a cognitive strategy to expect a better future in a system that is not fair (Owuamalam, Rubin, Spears, & Weerabangsa, 2017). According to Pierre Van den Berghe (van den Berghe, 1978, as cited in Sidanius & Pratto, 2012), there is a Trimorphic Structure of Group-Based Social Hierarchy, which is (1) gender system; (2) age system and (3) a arbitrary-set system that is created by societies and that includes, among others, categories based on social class. In the latter case, one group has the political and material dominance. Those systems are arbitrary and define the distinctions found in a given society (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Even though the racial and gender issues are a present reality in the Brazilian society and also a arbitrary kind of system, Brazil's problems cannot be reduced to those two aspects.

In the case of Brazil, a country that has faced a major political instability and high levels of violence (IPEA, 2017), it is quite easy for people to perceive the environment as dangerous,

politically unstable and threatening. In this case, one could expect people to rebel and to fight for their rights and for better conditions. Nevertheless, that has not been case along the Brazilian history. Brazilians are well-known by their political passivity and acceptance of social injustices<sup>4</sup> (Mendonca & Freitas, 2007). That said, one plausible explanation for this acceptance could be different ideologies that can be used by people to justify or to better accept the system around them. According to this perspective, people try to justify and rationalize the structure they live in so they can perceive things as fair and legitimate (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost & Hunyady, 2005). There are many different ideological justifications that help people cope with their reality to feel more comfortable in it. Some examples are: 'Protestant work ethic, Meritocracy, Fair market, Economic System Justification, Belief in a Just World, Power distance, Social Dominance Orientation, Opposition to Equality, Right-wing Authoritarianism and Political Conservatism' (Jost & Hunyady, 2005, p. 260).

In our research, we chose Social Domination Orientation (SDO), Economic System Justification (ESJ) and General Belief in a Just world (BJW) as ideological justifications and as predictors of hostility towards the poor. In the next sections, we will review these three constructs.

### **Social dominance theory and social dominance orientation.**

According to Social Domination Theory (SDT)<sup>5</sup>, there is an unequal distribution of positive social value, wealth, power and status in all societies (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Because of that, the SDT intends to identify the mechanisms that produce, maintain and recreate this group-based social hierarchy. According to this theory, subordinates are not only victims of the system, but also participants of its functioning. It is like a game of cooperation to keep the system working. Indeed, certain beliefs people hold are central in legitimizing the status-quo and supporting the system; others are central in minimizing the existing inequalities. Those

---

<sup>4</sup> It is important to highlight that some demonstrations took place in Brazil in the past few years in order to protest against the scandals of corruption in the country. However, this is a very recent phenomenon and has not really changed Brazil's reality.

<sup>5</sup> Social Dominance Theory (SDT) was inspired by several models: the Authoritarian Personality Theory; the Rokeach's Two-dimensional model of Political Behavior; Blumer's Group Position Theory; the Marxist and Neoclassical Elite Theory; and the Social Identity Theory (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999, p.31).

'beliefs' are called "legitimizing myths", which can be defined as 'attitudes, values, beliefs, stereotypes, and ideologies that provide moral and intellectual justification for the social practices that distribute social value within the social system' (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999, p. 45).

There are two types of legitimizing myths: hierarchy-enhancing (HE) and hierarchy-attenuating (HA) (Sidanius, Levin, Federico, & Pratto, 2001; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). When someone holds HE legitimizing myths (e.g., individual responsibility, internal attribution, political conservatism), they are more inclined to support policies that contribute to increase inequality and to be against policies like affirmative actions. On the contrary, people who believe in HA legitimizing myths (e.g., 'socialism, communism, feminism and universal human rights'; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999, p. 46) tend to support policies that reduce inequalities and to be against policies that can enhance them. The extent to which an individual endorses the legitimizing myths (HE or HA) determines how much Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) a person has (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). SDO can be defined as the expression and the degree of people's valorization and desire of relationships that are unequal and based on hierarchy (Sidanius et al., 2001; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), it's the 'general support for the domination' (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999, p. 61).

In the case of Brazil, it is pretty common to see in the newspapers and on the internet (e.g., Lewgoy, 2018; O Globo, 2012) the discourse from the middle class against policies like the quotas for public university, and the governmental program called "Bolsa Família" (the already mentioned two main Brazilian public policies) that intend to reduce social inequalities. These attitudes against affirmative actions could be the reflect of a stronger Social Dominance Orientation, for instance.

According to Sidanius and Pratto (1999), it is important to understand the distribution of SDO to also understand the hierarchical dynamics of a given society. Specifically in the case of societies where Social class is the main structure of distinction, people tend to engage strongly in SDO. The more lower and upper classes agree on the same legitimizing myths (in this case the HE), the easier it is to maintain the social hierarchy. On the contrary, when there is low agreement on the best public policies, the dominant groups might use oppressive means to maintain the social and political hegemonic order, like the enforcement of the law and order, or even, in extreme situations, the use of physical violence. The *Bolsa Família* seems to be a good a example of what Sidanius, Levin, Federico and Pratto (2001) would call an

Anisotropic Asymmetry<sup>6</sup>, which means, in this case, that this Brazilian public policy is seen as a positive for lower classes and as negative for upper classes.

According to Sidanius and Pratto (1999), responses to SDO scales are influenced by four main factors. First, the respondent membership, for example, belonging to a higher or a lower status group. In this case, it is expected that people from high-status groups (e.g., higher social classes, White) show more SDO. Second, the socialization experiences an individual has. Have experienced good or bad situations or to have a specific level of education can change ideological attitude. Third, the individual's personality, for instance, being a person who is hard on others or is more compassionate. The fourth factor that can influence one's SDO endorsement is their sex membership/gender. In this case, males are expected to show more SDO than females (Duckitt, 2003; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). In this sense, personality and social situation/positioning/experiences can influence one's worldview, which can influence the SDO which, by its turn, can influence the attitude towards the ingroup and the outgroup.

In order to measure the SDO, some scales have been created, among which SDO<sub>5</sub>, SDO<sub>6</sub> and SDO<sub>7</sub>, which is the most recent. Most of SDO measures use 7-point scales. The two most used among them in the literature are the SDO<sub>5</sub> and SDO<sub>6</sub>. The former has 14 items that measure people's tendency to look for equality. The SDO<sub>6</sub>, by its turn, shares some items with the previous scale but is more focused on the intergroup relations and on the group domination (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999, p. 67). In this paper, we chose to use the SDO<sub>7</sub> Scale (Ho et al., 2015), since it is the most recent one.

Since it was intended to better understand people's animosity towards a low-status group (the poor), we chose to use the scale SDO<sub>7</sub> in order to measure Brazilian's inclination to support unequal arrangements of groups and to verify how this scale can be related to certain negative attitudes like internal attribution for poverty. It is expected that those who hold more SDO have less empathy, communality and tolerance and also those who come from higher groups to show higher levels of SDO. Because of that, it is expected that those who have HE ideologies will be less favorable to HA policies like *Bolsa família*, the system of quotes at

---

<sup>6</sup> Anisotropic Asymmetry exists 'when the correlation between a legitimizing ideology and some other group relevant variable is of opposite valence in dominant and subordinate groups' (Sidanius et al., 2001, p. 320)

public universities, etc. According to one of Sidanius and Pratto's studies (1999), there is a positive correlation between SDO and internal attributions for poverty. There is a negative correlation between SDO and affect and identification with poor people. These aspects can be very relevant for this research.

### **System justification theory and economic system justification.**

According to Jost (2001), the System Justification Theory was created as an attempt to complement the existing theories, by trying to explain why and how systems can keep functioning even when they are very unequal and unfair. In other words, this theory intends to understand why people can support systems even when they are not beneficial to them (Jost, 2001). According to Social Justification Theory (SJT; Jost & Banaji, 1994; 2004; Jost & Hunyady, 2002; 2005), there are three main factors that contribute for people to engage in the rationalization and justification of the system around them (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Gaucher, & Stern, 2015; Jost et al., 2017): 1) *Epistemic motivation*, which is 'the desire for certainty, structure and control' (p.101). People who have more need for order and closure, less openness to new experiences and need to control uncertainty and threats have higher probability to endorse ideologies that justify the system. This can be explained by the fact that justifications for the system help to maintain it in the way it is and diminish the changes, keeping things familiar; 2) *Existential motivation*, which is 'the desire for safety and security' (p.101). Those who have a perception of a dangerous world, death anxiety, and/or live in a (perceived) unstable and threatening system tend to engage in ideologies of justification; and 3) *Relational motivation*, which is 'the desire to affiliate with similar other'(p.101). The need to establish relation with similar people can shape the way people think, and, in this way, influence their ideologies of justifying, more or less, the system they live in. Basically, these motivations can reduce people's willingness to protest, and can be an obstacle to them to try to change the system's order. (Jost & Hunyady, 2002; 2005).

Individuals might engage in three different kinds of justification. First, the *ego-justification*, which is basically the tendency to use stereotypes<sup>7</sup> in order to maintain one's positive self-image (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost & Hunyady, 2002). This tendency has been addressed in such theories as the theory of self-affirmation (Steele, 1988) and of self-discrepancy (Higgins, 1987). Second, individuals engage in what is called *group-justification*, which is when the stereotypes are used to preserve the group's positive identity (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). Third, individuals engage in *system-justification*, when they try to explain and, of course, to justify the functioning of the system they live in, even if this functioning is not necessarily beneficial to them. According to Jost (2001), this last level of justification complements the previous two, because they cannot explain all the relations between individuals and groups and why many individuals and groups do not follow the tendency of self-protection.

In the case of advantaged groups, the *ego-justification*, the *group-justification* and *system-justification* are usually consonant with their interests. On the contrary, when it comes to disadvantaged groups, the *ego-justification* and the *group-justification* might not be on the same direction as the *system-justification*. In other words, the explanations they (disadvantaged groups) use to justify the system, many times are not in favor of their own group or their own identity. If the system works against themselves, they might have to hold a negative stereotype of themselves. This is especially the case in societies where inequality is pretty huge and, as a consequence, the system functioning (and its defense) plays against the interests of the underprivileged. This dynamic leads to an important concept of the SJT: the *False consciousness*, which can be defined as 'the holding of beliefs that are contrary to one's personal or group interest and which thereby contribute to the maintenance of the disadvantaged position of the self or of the group' (Jost & Banaji, 1994, p.3). In situation where the system is strongly justified, stereotypes can be activated and used in order to legitimize discriminatory actions. The adoption of those ideologies can be very useful at the individual level. In the case of the advantaged, in order to diminish the guilty they might have

---

<sup>7</sup> In order to justify the world around them, individuals tend to use stereotypes, which are ideas and beliefs they hold about a group or a person that belongs to a group before having the opportunity to know them. This happens because people have the tendency (and the need) to categorize the world around them in order to understand it. Stereotypes can, in this case, serve as ideological tools to guarantee the maintenance of the system.

and, in the case of the disadvantaged, to accept better their hierarchical position and to diminish their frustration (Wakslak, Jost, Tyler, & Chen, 2005). People from disadvantaged groups might show an internalization of the inequality and a depressed entitlement when they start to believe they are actually less than people from hierarchically superior groups (Jost, Banaji & Nosak, 2004; Jost & Thompson, 2000)

We chose to use Economic System Justification Scale (Jost & Thompson, 2000) in order to measure the ideological tendency people have to justify economic inequality. Since the object of this study are the opinions and attitudes of the middle class towards lower classes in Brazil and, among other factors, the economic is very important to the establishment and maintenance of social classes, we thought it would be very important to measure this tendency within the middle-class. This could help us better explain the social dynamics of the Brazilian society and the attitudes the middle-class might have towards lower classes.

According to studies conducted by Jost and Thompson (2000), people who score high in ESJ tend to be ethnocentric, more politically conservative and against affirmative actions. In the case of low-status individuals, it is expected ESJ to have a relation with their psychological well-being. When people believe in hard-work as a way of achieving success, they report more satisfaction in life, no matter if they are rich or poor. Besides that, stereotypes of rich and poor help to accept and to justify the system one lives in (Blasi & Jost, 2006). For instance, when poor people are seen as lazy or irresponsible, it is easier to blame them for they own fortune instead of seeing their situation as a product of the system (Jost & Hunyady, 2002).

### **Just world theory and the belief in a just world.**

According to Lerner (1980), individuals are motivated to perceive the world as a place where people get what they deserve and deserve what they get. In such world, bad people and behaviors are punished and good people and behaviors are rewarded. For this author, this is a “fundamental delusion”. They need to behave according to this illusion in order to stand reality. Otherwise, people would not stand the constant disappointments of living in a world where things are not always (almost never) fair. The BJW has different functions in people’s lives, for instance, to make them able to trust more other people and to believe that they will be treated fairly; to give meaning to events in their lives; to allow people to make long-term



commitments, by predicting that their efforts will be rewarded. In sum, it helps people to cope with hard events and difficulties in their lives (Dalbert, 2001).

It is very common for people who grew up in western societies (but not only) to develop the BJW. Since their childhood, through fairytales and parents' lessons, individuals are taught that the world is a fair place, where good behavior is rewarded and the bad behavior is punished (Correia, 2000; Rubin & Peplau, 1975). When they establish what is called a 'personal contract', people have to 'believe' that things will work in a fair way, because they compromise their immediate pleasure in order to have a better future. In this sense, the rewards will be seen as the result of their present effort (Lerner, 1977). With age, after having different experiences of how unfair life can be, many people reduce their conscious belief that the world is a fair place (Correia, 2000; Rubin & Peplau, 1975). However, it is possible to say that all people unconsciously and metaphorically "believe" in a just world even if in a small degree (Lerner, 1980). For instance, adults still show what is called immanent reasoning, which is the notion that bad behaviors and character lead to negative consequences, and that good behaviors and good character lead to positive consequences (Callan, Ellard, & Nicol, 2006).

Just World Theory has contributed to explain reactions towards victims, namely innocent ones. When individuals feel that they can do something for the person in suffer, they might adopt a rational strategy of actually doing something to reduce the injustice (Alves, 2012; Correia, 2000). However, when people feel impotent facing a tough situation of suffering, the BJW serves as a protection. In this last case, observers tend to blame the victims for their situation, which is a case of secondary victimization (Correia, 2000). Normally, individuals use four (irrational) strategies to deal with the threat against the BJW when they feel that not can be done to diminish the witnessed suffering. The first strategy is avoidance; the second, the denial of the suffering; the third, the derogation of the victim and the fourth, the blaming of the victim (Correia, 2000; Rubin & Peplau, 1975). There are basically two ways of blaming the victim, one is by their behavior, in the sense that the victims would put themselves in that situation, and, because of that, they deserve their destiny. Or, when it is not possible to identify the behavior that caused the problem, frequently, the blame is attributed to the victim's personal characteristics, like being lazy, for example (Lerner & Simmons, 1966).

Rubin and Peplau (1973; 1975) created a scale of BJW, in order to measure participants' BJW endorsement. They found that people who score high in BJW are more inclined to be authoritarian, religious and have the impression to be more in control over their own decisions (Rubin & Peplau, 1975). Later, it was found that the BJW could be divided into two different spheres: BJW for self (Lipkus, Dalbert, & Siegler, 1996) or Personal BJW (BJW-P) (Dalbert, 1999) and the BJW for others (Lipkus et al., 1996) or General BJW (BJW-G) (Dalbert, Montana, & Schmitt, 1987). The two spheres of BJW are positively correlated but predict different phenomena in society. BJW-P predicts aspects related to the personal well-being (in the intra-personal level). It is the belief that one's life is fair. People who score more in BJW-P usually have a more positive perspective of their own lives and see their life problems in a lighter way (Alves, 2012; Bègue & Bastounis, 2003; Sutton & Douglas, 2005). The BJW-P has shown to be very important in many aspects of people's well-being, like their sleep, their capacity to plan the future, their level of stress, etc. (Sutton & Douglas, 2005).

The BJW-G, in turn, predicts more people's perceptions and reactions to victims and the status quo. It is the belief that society is fair (Bègue & Bastounis, 2003; Sutton & Douglas, 2005; Thomas & Napolitano, 2016). People with high BJW-G tend to see powerful people as good and powerless people as bad. Which means that they will admire strong leaders and will like more personalities that are socially considered as successful (Rubin & Peplau, 1975). They also might derogate or even show hostility towards groups that are seen as weak or underprivileged. Stronger BJW-G is also related to more support for political and social institutions like the congress and is related to political conservatism (Correia, 2000; Rubin & Peplau, 1975; Sutton, et al., 2008).

A study was conducted in Brazil (Thomas & Napolitano, 2016) in order to verify the differences between the BJW-P and BJW-G among adolescents from the three types of school in Brazil: public, private and military. As we have mentioned, there is a huge difference in the educational quality level among those three kinds of school, which means that the type of school one attends is a good indicative of social class in the Brazilian context. In this research, Thomas and Napolitano (2016) found out that in the privileged contexts (military and private school), there was a bigger difference between BJW-G and BJW-P than in under-privileged context (public school). This means that students from high-status contexts tended to see their own lives as more just than life in general. On the contrary, students from poorer contexts

tended to perceive their lives as closer, in terms of justice, to the justice seen in society. Based on that results, it is possible to think that people from privileged social contexts in Brazil show a relevant difference between their BJW-P and BJW-G.

In Western societies at least, BJW-P is stronger than BJW-G. Because of that, it is expected that people show more BJW-P than BJW-G. In other words, that they believe that their lives are fairer than life in general. For instance, females tend to evaluate themselves as less victims than their own group (Crosby, 1984). This means that they recognize that women, in general, are discriminated, but they do not believe that they, as individuals, suffer as much discrimination as other women. Usually, those women who show more BJW also tend to endorse more this idea, which means, they deny more their personal deprivation (Hafer & Olson, 1993). In a study of Sutton et al. (2008), the results show that the BJW-P can be extended to someone's own ingroup. Which means that the point of comparison one has (their own life or the sense of belonging to a group) can affect the manifestations of BJW-P. In sum, the BJW-G has an important role in explaining society in its ideological level, since it helps to understand how the *status quo* can be maintained. One exception to this pattern is the case of wife abuse (Correia, Alves, Morais, & Ramos, 2015), when the BJW-P was more positively related to the legitimization of abuse against abused wives.

Specifically related to social class, it is possible to see that, since people tend to derogate victims in order to reduce their own suffering, they also have the tendency to devalue those who are poor and are victims of the economic system (Appelbaum, Lennon, & Aber, 2003; Bègue & Bastounis, 2003; Sutton & Douglas, 2005). It is also expected that the middle class display less acknowledgment of poor people's suffering or victim condition since they belong to a underprivileged group. To reduce the importance of the difficult situation poor people live in is a way of reducing the perception of injustice when it comes to the economic system.

In this work, both the BJW-P and the BJW-G will be measured. The main goal will be to verify if, as other studies have shown (Appelbaum et al., 2003; Bègue & Bastounis, 2003; Sutton & Douglas, 2005), the BJW-G is related with the manifestation of negative attitudes towards low-status groups, in this particular case, the poorer classes in Brazil. The BJW-P was also measured in order to analyze both dimensions of the BJW in people and to control its manifestation, first, without the inclusion of the BJW-G and then with the inclusion of the BJW-G.

## Chapter II - Present Study

In this study, the Brazilian middle-class opinion about poverty, the poor and social hierarchy were tested. In order to do that, three System Justifying motives were used as main predictors: Social Dominance Orientation (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999); Economic System Justification (Jost & Thompson, 2000) and BJW (Lerner, 1980). The combination of these three variables in a same study was chosen since it could not be found in the existing literature. Only two could be found together. The criterion variable used was hostility (whose creation will be described later - see section “pre-study”).

As reviewed, people who show higher SDO have the tendency to support less Hierarchy Attenuating (HA) public policies like, for example, *Bolsa Familia*, and to show more internal attribution for poverty. Those two elements (Brazilian public policies of redistribution and attribution for poverty) were part of the hostility measure as we will see in the next sections. As concerns the ESJ (Jost & Thompson, 2000), people who score high in ESJ have the tendency to be more conservative, to be against affirmative actions (e.g., the quotas) and to legitimize economic inequality. The third predictor variable chosen was BJW (Lerner, 1980). More specifically, the BJW-G (Dalbert, et al., 1987). The BJW-G was used because of the purpose of this study. According to the literature, it is expected that the BJW-G indicates in which degree people believe that people get what they deserve, and, predicts the attitudes towards others, in this case, the poor. Based on that, our main hypothesis was that higher degrees of SDO, ESJ and BJW-G would predict higher levels of hostility towards the poor (less support for social policies like affirmative actions; more internal attribution for poverty; derogation; less acknowledgment of people’s suffering; etc).

We also tested whether SDO, ESJ and BJW-G variables predicted hostility towards the poor over and above the effects of several socio-demographic. The socio-demographic variables included were *age and sex/gender*. According to the literature, older people tend to show higher levels of prejudice (Henry & Sears, 2009), and males tend to hold more prejudice towards other groups and to support more inequality in general (Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006; Sidanius & Veniegas, 2000).

The psycho-social variables included were: (1) the *BJW-P* (Dalbert, 1999) because it, usually, has a positive correlation with BJW-G; (2) the *subjective social class* (Adler et al., 2000;

Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2009) because the way people perceive themselves might shape their thoughts, emotions and behaviors and also because people from higher-status tend to be less supportive to redistributive policies (Brown-Iannuzzi et al., 2015; Kraus et al., 2011). (3) *Social Desirability* (Stöber, 2001) which is a propensity of psychological research participants to answer in a biased way to the questions presented (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Since the subject of poverty is quite a sensitive issue, there was a huge probability for people to respond what was more politically correct. In this way, we could have a clearer idea about people's tendency to say what they actually think. The last psycho-social variable to be controlled will be (4) the *Political Orientation*. The main idea was to control if people's political orientation would predict in any measure the hostility and related to measures of endorsement of social hierarchy. According to the literature, political orientation influences peoples' attitudes, which means, for instance, that Right-wings tend to be more conservatives and to accept more social and economic inequalities (Jost et al., 2003a; 2003b). Since the literature in Social Psychology is limited when it comes to social classes and its measures (Harrington, 2004), in order to establish a measure of social hostility, a pretest was run<sup>8</sup>.

### **Pre-Study**

Some inspiration was taken from other kinds of group conflict studies and attitudes measures. Statements based on characteristics of inter-group hostility were taken into account so we could form an set of 31 sentences. Those sentences were inspired by different constructs. The idea was to compile some dimensions in order to have one final measure of hostility towards poverty. Four of those dimensions were inspired by Brickman et al. (1982) secondary victimization: *avoidance* versus *proximity*, suffering *minimization* versus *acknowledgment*, *derogation* versus *valuation*, *internal attributions/blame* versus *external attribution*. We added *hatred* versus *appreciation*.

The creation of 31 sentences was, then, based on these dimensions and adapted to the Brazilian context and to the question of poverty. Items of *avoidance* versus *proximity* were also inspired by the Social Distance measure (Bogardus, 1926), with six sentences like "Não aguento estar próximo a pessoas de classes mais baixas" e "Difícilmente me envolveria

---

<sup>8</sup> Although we could have used one already published prejudice measure (e.g., racism) and replace the target group in that measure with "poor people", we did not find any that would encompass the various dimensions we wanted to include and one that would be adapted to Brazilian reality.

romanticamente com alguém de baixa renda”. In the case of *minimization* versus *acknowledgment*, six sentences like “As classes mais baixas não sofrem tanto quanto fazem parecer” and “De fato, pessoas de classe baixa passam por muita dificuldade no Brasil”. Also *derogation* versus *valuation*, with six sentences like: “As pessoas de classe mais baixa só servem para desempenhar trabalhos baratos” and “As classes baixas têm grande valor para o crescimento do Brasil”. *Internal attribution* versus *External attribution*, with sentences like, “As pessoas seguem na pobreza porque não gostam de trabalhar” and “Mesmo que as pessoas de baixa renda tentem melhorar de vida, há muitas dificuldades que são impostas pela sociedade brasileira”. The last two categories were Hatred versus Appreciation, with sentences like, “Odeio que pessoas de pouca ou nenhuma educação ocupem cargos políticos” and “Me orgulha colaborar para que meu país tenha programas inclusivos como as cotas sociais”.

A Qualtrics survey was created with the 31 sentences (See Appendixes 1 and 2) and 32 Brazilians responded to this pretest. The participants could classify each of the statements in one or more of the ten categories mentioned above. The results of this pretest showed that several sentences were interpreted by the participants as belonging to several categories. Because of that, instead of having some items from each of the 10 categories, we decided to only keep the sentences that were classified (in more than 95% of the cases) negatively or (in more than 95% of the cases) positively, independently of their original dimension. As a result, the measure of social hostility finished with nine negative items and eight positive items. These sentences are presented in the Appendixes 1 and 2, they are the first ones that are in bold.

## **Main Study**

### **Method.**

#### ***Participants.***

Our sample consists of 290 Brazilian individuals (115 males; 39.7% and 175 females; 60.3%) with ages ranging between 18 and 76 years ( $M = 40.37$ ,  $SD = 12.83$ )<sup>9</sup>. They were all workers, from different fields, like health, law, public service, etc. They could be currently working or

---

<sup>9</sup> 499 people accessed the survey and, of those who started the questionnaire, 290 answered it completely.

not and some of them were living out of Brazil. Their level of education<sup>10</sup> varied in seven levels from incomplete first degree and PhD, specifically two participants (0.2%) had basic school level (“1º grau completo”) 37 (13.3%) had secondary school education, 87 (31.3%) had a university degree, 97 (34.9%) had a postgraduation, 44 (15.8%) had a Master degree, nine (2.2%) had a PhD and two participants were post-doctorate. As regards (subjective) social class one participant (0.3%) said to be Miserable, nine (3.1%) indicated to be Poor, 71 (24.5%) to be Lower-middle class, 155 (53.4%) said to belong to the Middle-class, 47 (16.2%) participants said to belong to the Upper-middle class, six (2.1%) said to be Rich and only one (0.3%) alleged to be Millionaire.

### ***Procedure.***

People were invited to participate on Facebook and by e-mail, and the link of the study created in Qualtrics was sent to them (Appendix B). Also, they were invited to share the link with their friends, family, coworkers, etc. Because of that, the sample was a mixture of convenience and snowball. In the first page of the study, there was a text where people received information about the study. It was said that it would take about 15 minutes to complete it and that they could quit at any time. It was recommended to fulfill the questionnaire in a calm and quiet place where they could have some privacy. After this first part, people had the option to accept or not to participate in the survey.

Once they accepted to participate, they would find, in the next page, a brief explanation of how to respond the questions. Right after, they could find the questions in a random order. For each question, there were seven different options of answer. The participants had the option to agree or to disagree with the statements with a 7-point scale that varied from 1 (Totally disagree) to 7 (Totally agree). In the end of the questionnaire, people could find the sociodemographic questions. In the last page, people had access to the debriefing of the study and also to the contacts of the researchers.

---

<sup>10</sup> The level of education of the parents was asked as well as the type of school was attended by the children of those who had them (public, military or private). This information was asked in order to perceive with more details the kind of population that was answering the survey. However, this information will only be used in future studies.

### *Measures.*

*Hostility* ( $\alpha = .84$ ). The results of the pretest showed that 17 items (nine negatives and eight positives) were consistent enough to be used. Some examples of the sentences used are: "Não aguento estar próximo a pessoas de classes mais baixas"; "De fato, pessoas de classe baixa passam por muita dificuldade no Brasil" (Reverse); "As pessoas seguem na pobreza porque não gostam de trabalhar".

*Social Domination Orientation* (Ho et al., 2015;  $\alpha = .86$ ). This variable was measured using the full version of SDO7 with 16 items, translated into Brazilian Portuguese. Some items were: "Alguns grupos devem ser mantidos em seu lugar"; "Nenhum grupo deveria dominar na sociedade" (Reverse); "É injusto tentar tornar os grupos iguais"; "Igualdade de grupo deveria ser nosso ideal" (Reverse).

*Economic Social Justification* (Jost & Thompson, 2000;  $\alpha = .78$ ). This variable had 17 items, which we adapted to the Brazilian context and translated into Brazilian Portuguese. Some items were: "É totalmente impossível eliminar a pobreza"; "A distribuição dos recursos de forma igualitária é uma possibilidade na sociedade brasileira" (Reverse); "Distribuição igualitária dos recursos é contra a natureza"; "Não existem diferenças inerentes entre ricos e pobres, é tudo uma questão das circunstâncias em que você nasce" (Reverse).

*General Belief in a Just World* (Dalbert et al., 1987;  $\alpha = .67$ ). This scale was translated into Brazilian Portuguese and adapted to the Brazilian context by Gouveia et al. (2018). The measure comprises six items of BJW-G, like, for example: "Tenho certeza que a justiça sempre prevalece sobre a injustiça"; "Acredito que, em geral, as pessoas adquirem o que elas realmente merecem"; "Penso que o mundo é basicamente um justo lugar".

*Personal Belief in a Just World* (Dalbert, 1999;  $\alpha = .64$ ). This scale was translated into Brazilian Portuguese and adapted to the Brazilian context by Gouveia et al. (2018). Originally, the measure comprises seven items, but, in order to reduce the numbers of statements in the questionnaire, three items from the BJW-P were removed randomly. In total, four items of BJW-P were used, like, for example, "De modo geral, os acontecimentos da minha vida são justos"; "Eu acredito que importantes decisões tomadas ao meu respeito geralmente são justas".



*Political Orientation.* The Political Orientation was measured by asking participants to indicate, in a 7-point scale from (1)*Left-wing* to (7)*Right-wing*, in which position they found themselves. In this measure, 13.4% said to be in the *position 1* (Left), 21.7% in the *position 2*, 14.8% in the *position 3*, 31.7% in the *position 4* (Center), 8.3% in the *position 5*, 5.5% in the *position 6* and 4.5% said to be in the *position 7* (Right).

*Subjective social class.* Participants' subjective social class was measured with the MacArthur Scale (Adler et al., 2000; Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2009). Participants had to choose one step out of the seven position where they thought they were in the Brazilian society. The scale had 7 items and varied from Miserable to Millionaire.

*Social Desirability* (Stöber, 2001;  $\alpha = .69$ ). The original version presented by Stöber (2001) has 16 items, but, in this study, only half of these items were randomly chosen to be used. Once again, the aim was to reduce the number of questions in the questionnaire to minimize participant fatigue<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> Five statements of Scope of justice (Lima-Nunes, Pereira, & Correia, 2013) were also measured in the questionnaire (e.g., “Quando se fala de justiça, ricos e pobres não partilham os mesmos princípios”). The original idea was to test a mediational analysis in which the Scope of Justice was the mediator between our predictors and hostility. However, because of their low alpha, we decided not to use them in the analysis ( $\alpha = .44$ ).

### Chapter III- Results

As it can be seen in Table 1, Hostility correlated positively and significantly with the SDO, ESJ, BJW-G, BJW-P (but less than with BJW-G), Political Orientation and sex/gender. Which means that people, in general, who have higher levels of SDO, ESJ, BJW-G, BJW-P, also display higher levels of hostility. The SDO, in turn, correlated positively with ESJ<sup>12</sup>, BJW-G, BJW-P, political orientation and subjective social class. ESJ had a positive correlation with both BJW General and Personal and with Political Orientation, Subjective Social Class and Sex/gender. The latter correlation indicates that male participants endorse more ESJ, than female participants. BJW-G correlated positively with BJW-P, Political Orientation and Social Desirability. The BJW-P correlated positively with Political Orientation and negatively with Subjective Social Class. Political Orientation correlated positively with sex/gender, indicating that male participants are more Right-wing. Social desirability correlated positively with age, indicating that older people show more tendency to give answers that are normatively desirable.

---

<sup>12</sup> The high correlation between these two variables could indicate multicollinearity in the regression. According to Field (2005), however, the highest VIF value (a collinearity diagnostic) is 2.76, which is well below 10, the cutoff value usually used to identify multicollinearity (Field, 2005)

Table 1

*Correlations and descriptive statistics (N= 290)*

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1- Hostility	2.11	0.76										
2- SDO	2.54	0.99	.72***									
3- ESJ	3.13	0.85	.75***	.75***								
4- BJWG	2.78	0.99	.55***	.54***	.58***							
5- BJWP	4.09	1.11	.25***	.20**	.28***	.39***						
6- Political Orientation	3.34	1.58	.60***	.58***	.61***	.43***	.28***					
7- Subj. Social Class	4.10	0.82	.11	.15**	.16**	.11	-.19**	.01				
8- Social Desirability	4.73	1.01	-.06	-.11	.00	.14*	.04	.01	-.04			
9- Age	40.37	12.83	.07	-.02	.03	.11	.01	-.04	-.04	.31***		
10- Sex/Gender			.18**	.26***	.19**	-.00	-.00	.22***	-.01	-.11	-.14*	

Note: All scales range from 1 to 7, with higher values indicating stronger endorsement of the construct. For gender, 0 indicates "female" and 1 "male".

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01

\*\*\*p < .001

We then tested whether SDO, ESJ and BJW-G would predict hostility towards the poor (criterion variable) displayed by the participants, while controlling the effects of sex/gender, age, Subjective Social Class, Political orientation, BJW-P and Social Desirability. We thus conducted a regression analysis with two blocks. In the first block we entered the socio-demographic (sex/gender, age) and the psycho-social variables: Subjective Social Class<sup>13</sup>, political orientation, BJW-P and Social Desirability. In a second block, we entered SDO, ESJ and BJW-G.

The results are shown in Table 2. Forty percent of the variance in hostility was explained by the main effects of age, sex/gender, BJW-P, Political orientation, Subjective Social Class and Social Desirability. Political orientation predicted (positively) the stronger hostility towards the poor. Age, Subjective Social Class and BJW-P also predicted positively and significantly the hostility. Social Desirability, by its turn, predicted hostility significantly but negatively way. In the second model, the previous socio-demographic and psycho-social variables together with the variables SDO, ESJ and BJW-G explained sixty-five percent of the variance in hostility. Whereas political orientation and age continued to significantly predict positively hostility (even if less intensely than in the first model), SDO, ESJ and BJW-G had a positive significant effect in predicting hostility in the second model (block 2).

---

<sup>13</sup> The results do not change even when we deleted the four participants who indicated being miserable or millionaire.

Table 2

*Regression of hostility towards the poor on, BJW-P, political orientation, subjective social class, social desirability, age and sex/gender (block 1), SDO, ESJ and BJW-G (block 2).*

	Model 1			Model 2		
	b	SEb	Beta	b	SEb	Beta
<b>Block 1</b>						
Sex/Gender	.08	.08	.05	-.01	.06	-.00
Age	.01	.00	.14**	.01	.00	.09*
Subjective Social Class	.12	.05	.13**	.01	.04	.01
Political Orientation	.27	.02	.56***	.08	.02	.17***
BJW-P	.09	.03	.13*	.00	.03	.00
Social Desirability	-.08	.04	-.10*	-.06	.03	-.07
<b>Block 2</b>						
SDO				.23	.05	.30***
ESJ				.32	.05	.35***
BJW-G				.08	.04	.11*
Constant	0.36	0.31	–	0.05	0.25	–
R2		.40			.65	
R2 change		.40			.25	
F		30.88***			56.59***	
F change		30.88***			25.71***	
df		6, 273			9, 270	

Note: b = Unstandardized coefficients; Beta = Standardized coefficients

For all measures, scores were computed by averaging across items, with higher scores indicating stronger endorsement of the construct. For gender, 0 indicates “female” and 1 “male”.

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

\*\*\*  $p < .001$

## Chapter IV- Discussion

The main goal of this study was to predict hostility towards the poor in the Brazilian middle-class based on participants' Social Dominance Orientation, the Economic System Justification and also the General Belief in a Just World. As far as we could find in the literature, those three variables had never been used together in the same study, and had never been used together to predict hostility. Moreover, the study of social classes conflict and hostility in the case of Brazil seems to be a new topic in the literature. Therefore, in this study, we extended the research on group hostility based on socio-class division by measuring the predictive power of SDO, ESJ and BJW-G on the attitudes of Brazilian middle-class participants towards poor people and poverty.

Based on the literature we hypothesized that participants who had high levels of BJW-G would display more hostility towards poor people (Rubin & Peplau, 1975). Moreover, in line with previous studies (Jost & Thompson, 2000; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), we expected that people who showed higher SDO and ESJ would also display more hostility towards poor people and poverty.

As hypothesized, SDO, ESJ and BJW-G predicted hostility towards the poor positively. This results can be a great indicative of the importance of reuniting those three variables in order to explain hostility and intergroup relations in different contexts. In the specific case of the present study about social classes, it was important to have the BJW-G as the more general element of people's attitudes, SDO as the aspect more related to group relations and dominance in society, and the ESJ as the element that directly concerns the beliefs related to economy and its consequences for people's lives.

The main results of this study are related to the prediction of hostility by the three variables (SDO, ESJ and BJW-G). However, we did those analysis, meanwhile controlling the socio-demographic variables (age and sex/gender) and the psycho-social variables (BJW-P, Political orientation, Subjective Social Class and Social Desirability). The results showed that individually, sex/gender correlated positively with hostility, but, that it is not significant when included in the model. As indicated by table 2, it was possible to verify that all variables in Block 1 (excluding *sex/gender*) predicted in a bigger or smaller level the manifestation of hostility. In the case of SDO, ESJ and BJW-G, as reviewed in the literature (Jost &

Thompson, 2000; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; Sutton et al., 2008), people who endorsed more those measures also showed to be more Right-wing inclined. The subjective social class had a significant, even if not very strong, correlation with ESJ and BJW-G, showing that participants from higher social classes endorsed more ESJ and BJW-G. As regards age, individually, it seemed to not have a relevant correlation with hostility, but, when analyzed in the model, age showed to have a significant and positive relations with the attitudes of the participants. The same happened with the Subjective Social Class. We also would like to highlight that the results of our study confirmed the expectation that BJW-G usually is more related to attitudes towards others than the BJW-P (Begue & Bastounis, 2003; Sutton & Douglas, 2005).

The study presented here highlights the importance of considering the social economic status of a group, as well as, their social and political positioning in order to better understand their opinions and attitudes towards other groups, in this case, other social-classes. However, it is important to mention that, individually, the Political Orientation of the participants showed to be more positively related to hostility than the BJW-G and the Subjective Social Class. Moreover, when included in the model, even if both BJW-G and Subjective Social Class showed to be significant to predict hostile attitude, the Political Orientation was more significantly related to hostile attitudes. This might lead us to further studies where the Political Orientation could be, along with SDO and ESJ, used to predict hostile attitudes. It could also mean that social class in itself could not be necessarily determinant for one's social attitudes.

### **Limitations and Future Research**

We are aware that this study is only a small step in the way to understanding group conflicts, specially those coming from social class divisions. Moreover, we believe that for future researches, it would be important to add new elements to the equation and go deeper in the correlational models presented. Clearly, this study has its limitations. Therefore, in future studies it would be important to include the variable of Objective Social Class (income, years of study, professional occupation). Two of them (years of study and professional occupation) were asked in the questionnaire, but we did not include income, which is one of the most used measure when it comes to objective social class (Kraus & Stephens, 2012). Because of that, the only measure of social class used was the subjective one, the MacArthur Scale (Adler et

al., 2000; Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2009). We are aware that the use of a subjective measure can rise doubts about its reliability to prove that the sample really belonged to Brazilian middle class. Nevertheless, we believe that people's perception of their own status in society often differs from their "real" (objective) social class (Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2009) and that the subjective class seems to predict more measures of health (e.g.: Adler et al., 2000) and social explanations (Kraus et al., 2009). This does not mean that both subjective and objective social class' measures could not be simultaneously used. On the contrary, it would be important to use both in the same analysis in order to have a wider analysis of the sample.

It could be also interesting (and even important) to produce a study where not only the middle class is consulted in its opinion, but also the lower classes. Originally, the idea of this study was to compare the opinions and attitudes of poor classes and middle class. The intention was to verify if there was animosity and hostility in both ways: poor people towards richer people, and richer people towards poor people. This way we had the intention to perceive if there is more hostility in one of the directions and also to verify if the hostility was more determined by the aversion of poverty or by the belonging to a social class independently of being poor or rich. However, this study showed to be too complex and too hard to achieve in the time of a master thesis.

Besides that, the fact that a large number of Brazilians does not have access to a computer at home and, many times, does not even know how to use it, was, for sure, a huge challenge the data collection. Nevertheless, we believe that having "the other side's opinion" could be very enriching to build a broader frame of Brazilian reality and of its intergroup conflicts based on social classes. Having both "sides" would bring more perspective to this research and could give opportunity to deeper discoveries and information. Like, for instance, giving voice to social classes that usually are not heard in Brazil and, maybe, deconstructing the idea hate only from rich or middle class people towards poorer people, and also perceiving this intergroup relations more as a dynamic than a unilateral phenomenon. Moreover, other measures of the Scope of Justice could be applied in the analysis in order to verify if there are huge differences in the size of the Scope of Justice of each of these groups (Lower class and Higher classes).



## **Conclusion**

Even if the scope of this work is limited, we believe that it could contribute to the reduction of inequalities, or, at least, to bring more awareness to the population (not only in Brazil) of the attitudes and prejudices that might exist in a given society. And that those attitudes may be the source of the continuity of inequalities and of its structural justification. Moreover, the present study could be useful to identify the profile of people who display hostility and to remind people of the strong power of the structural inequalities. The awareness of this phenomenon is very important to achieve social and political changes through the change of mentality.

## References

- Adler, N. E., Epel, E. S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J. R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy, White women. *Health Psychology, 19*, 586–592.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Alves, H. (2012). Sobre a descoberta da normatividade injuntiva da expressão da crença no mundo justo – uma aventura em Psicologia Social. In C. R. Pereira & R. Costa-Lopes (orgs.). *Normas, atitudes e comportamento social*, (pp. 73-107). Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.
- Appelbaum, L. D., Lennon J. M. C., & Aber, L. (2003). How Belief in a Just World Influences Views of Public Policy. *Public Attitudes Toward Low- Income Families and Children. Research Report No. 2*. National Center for Children in Poverty. Columbia University.
- Bègue, L., & Bastounis, M. (2003). Two spheres of belief in a just world: Extensive support for the dimensional model of belief in a just world. *Journal of Personality, 71*, 435-463.
- Blasi, G. & Jost, J. T. (2006). System Justification Theory and Research: Implications for Law, Legal Advocacy, and Social Justice. *California Law Review, 94*, 1119-1168.
- Brickman, P., Rabinowitz, V. C., Karuza, J., Coates, D., Cohen, E., & Kidder, L. (1982). Models of helping and coping. *American Psychologist, 37*, 368-384.
- Brown-Iannuzzi, J. L., Lundberg, K. B., Kay, A. C., & Payne, B. K. (2015). Subjective status shapes political preferences. *Psychological Science, 26*, 15–26.
- Bobo, L. (1999). Prejudice as group position: Microfoundations of a sociological approach to racism and race relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 445–472.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1926). Social Distance in the City. *Proceedings and Publications of the American Sociological Society, 20*, 40–46.
- Buttrick, N. R. & Oishi, S. (2017). The psychological consequences of income inequality. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 11*, 1–12.
- Carvacho, H., Zick, A., Haye, A., Gonzalez, R., Manzi, J., Kocik, C., & Bertl, M. (2013). On the relation between social class and prejudice: The roles of education, income, and ideological attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*, 272–285.
- Castro, G. S. (2016). O idadismo como viés cultural: Refletindo sobre a produção de sentidos para a velhice em nossos dias. *Galáxia (São Paulo)* [online], *31*, 79-91.
- Chalhoub, S. (2017, June 17). A meritocracia é um mito que alimenta as desigualdades. *Jornal da Unicamp*. Retrieved from: <https://www.unicamp.br/unicamp/ju/noticias/2017/06/07/meritocracia-e-um-mito-que-alimenta-desigualdades-diz-sidney-chalhoub>
- Correia, I. F. (2000). A teoria da crença no mundo justo e a vitimização secundária: Estudos empíricos e desenvolvimentos teóricos. *Psicologia, 14*, 253-283.
- Correia, I. & Alves, H. & Morais, R., & Ramos, M. (2015). The legitimation of wife abuse among women: The impact of belief in a just world and gender identification. *Personality and Individual Differences, 76*.
- Croizet, J., & Claire, T. (1998). Extending the concept of stereotype threat to social class: The intellectual underperformance of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*, 588-594.

- Crosby, F. (1984). The denial of personal discrimination. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 27, 371-386.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
- Dalbert, C. (1999). The world is more just for me than generally: About the personal belief in a just world scale's validity. *Social Justice research*, 12, 79-98.
- Dalbert, C. (2001). *The just motive as a personal resource: Dealing with challenges and critical life events*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Dalbert, C., Montada, L., & Schmitt, M. (1987). Glaube an die gerechte welt als motiv: Validierung zweier skalen [The belief in a just world as a motive: Validation of two scales]. *Psychologische Beitrage*, 29, 596-615.
- Duckitt, J. (2003). Prejudice and intergroup hostility. In D. Sears, L. Huddy, & R. Jervis (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (pp. 559-600). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics with SPSS* (2nd edition). Sage: London.
- Gallo, L. C., Monteros, K. E., & Shivpuri, S. (2009). Socioeconomic status and health: What is the role of reserve capacity? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18, 269-274.
- Goudeau, S., et al. (2017). Etudier, mesurer et manipuler la classe sociale en psychologie sociale: Approches économiques, symboliques et culturelles. *International Review of Social Psychology*, 30, 1-19.
- Gouveia, V. V., Nascimento, A. M., Gouveia, R. S. V., Medeiros, E. D., Fonsêca, P. N., & Santos, L. C. O. (2018). Medindo crença no mundo justo pessoal e geral: Adaptação de uma escala ao contexto brasileiro. *Avances en Psicología Latinoamericana*, 36, 167-181.
- Hafer, C. L., & Olson, J. M. (1993). Beliefs in a just world, discontent, and assertive actions by working women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 30-38.
- Harrington, E. R. (2004). The social psychology of hatred. *Journal of Hate Studies* 3: 49-82
- Hasenbalg, C. A.; Silva, N. V. & Lima, M. (Orgs.) (1999). *Cor e estratificação social*. Rio de Janeiro, Contracapa.
- Heffernan, K. S., Jae S. Y., Wilund K. R., Woods J. A., & Fernhall B. (2008). Racial differences in central blood pressure and vascular function in young men. *American Journal of Physiology Heart and Circulatory Physiology*, 295, H2380-H2387.
- Henriques, R. (2001). *Desigualdade racial no Brasil: A evolução das condições de vida da década de 90*. Rio de Janeiro, Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada.
- Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2009). The crystallization of contemporary racial prejudice across the lifespan. *Political Psychology*, 30, 569-590.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94, 319-340.
- Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Kteily, N., Sheehy-Skeffington, J., Pratto, F., Henkel, K. E., Foels, R., & Stewart, A. L. (2015). The nature of social dominance orientation: Theorizing and measuring preferences for intergroup inequality using the new SDO<sub>7</sub> scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109, 1003-1028.

- Honorato da Silva, L., & Sampaio, Y. (2010). Notas sobre pobreza e educação no Brasil (Notes about poverty and education in Brazil). *Revista Problemas del Desarrollo*, 163, 75–97.
- IPEA (2014). *Programa Bolsa Família: uma década de inclusão e cidadania*- Sumário Executivo. Instituto de Pesquisa Estatística Aplicada- IPEA. Brasília.
- IPEA (2017). *Atlas da Violência*. Instituto de Pesquisa Estatística Aplicada-IPEA. Retrieved from: [http://www.ipea.gov.br/portal/images/170609\\_atlas\\_da\\_violencia\\_2017.pdf](http://www.ipea.gov.br/portal/images/170609_atlas_da_violencia_2017.pdf)
- Jost, J. T. (2001). System justification theory as compliment, complement, and corrective to theories of social identification and social dominance. In D. Dunning (Ed.), *Social motivation*, 223–263. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- 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.
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25, 881–919.
- Jost, J. T., Gaucher, D., & Stern, C. (2015). “The world isn’t fair”: A system justification perspective on social stratification and inequality. In J. F. Dovidio & J. A. Simpson (Eds.), *APA handbook of personality and social psychology*, (pp. 317–340). Washington, DC: APA.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., and Sulloway, F. J. (2003a). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339–375.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., and Sulloway, F. J. (2003b). Exceptions that prove the rule—Using a theory of motivated social cognition to account for ideological incongruities and political anomalies: Reply to Greenberg and Jonas. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 383–93.
- 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.
- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 260–265.
- Jost, J. T., Becker, J., Osborne, D., & Badaan, V. (2017). Missing in (collective) action: Ideology, system justification, and the motivational antecedents of protest behavior. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26, 99–108.
- 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.
- Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., & Keltner, D. (2009). Social class, sense of control, and social explanation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 992–1004.
- Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., & Keltner, D. (2011). Social class as culture: The convergence of resources and rank in the social realm. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 246–250.

- Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., Mendoza-Denton, R., Rheinschmidt, M. L., & Keltner, D. (2012). Social class, solipsism, and contextualism: How the rich are different from the poor. *Psychological Review*, *119*, 546–572.
- Kraus, M. W., & Stephens, N. M. (2012). A road map for an emerging psychology of social class. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *6*, 642–656.
- Lee, J. E. C., Lemyre, L., Turner, M. C., Orpana, H. M., & Krewski, D. (2008). Health risk perceptions as mediators of socioeconomic differentials in health behaviour. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *13*, 1082–1091.
- Lerner, M. J. (1980). *The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lerner, M., & Simmons, C. H. (1966). The observer's reaction to the "innocent victim": Compassion or rejection? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *4*, 203-210.
- Lewgoy, B. (2018, 7 May). Dez motivos para ser contra as cotas raciais. *Revista Exame*. Retrieved from: <https://exame.abril.com.br/blog/instituto-millennium/dez-motivos-para-ser-contra-as-cotas-raciais/>
- Lima-Nunes, A., Pereira, C. R., & Correia, I. (2013). Restricting the scope of justice to justify discrimination: The role played by justice perceptions in discrimination against immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *43*, 627-636.
- Lipkus, I. M., Dalbert, C., & Siegler, I. C. (1996). The importance of distinguishing the belief in a just world for self versus for others: Implications for psychological well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*, 666-677.
- Manstead, A. (2018). The psychology of social class: how socioeconomic status impacts thought, feelings, and behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *57*, 267-291.
- Marques, S. (2011). *Discriminação da Terceira Idade*. Portugal: Fundação Francisco Manuel dos Santos & Relógio d'Água Editores.
- Martinez, I., & Camino, L. (2000). Brasil es Racista, Brasil no es Racista: El discurso social como determinante de las diferencias percibidas entre blancos, negros y morenos. In *VII Congresso de Psicologia Social da Espanha*. Oviedo, Spain. 26-29 of September 2000.
- Mendonça, M., & Freitas, R. (2007, 19 October). Por que o brasileiro não reclama? *Revista Época*. Retrieved from: [https://www2.senado.leg.br/bdsf/bitstream/handle/id/182941/ Porque\\_o\\_brasileiro\\_Epoca.pdf?sequence=7](https://www2.senado.leg.br/bdsf/bitstream/handle/id/182941/ Porque_o_brasileiro_Epoca.pdf?sequence=7)
- Monteiro, M. B., França, D. X., & Rodrigues, R. (2009). The development of intergroup bias in childhood: How social norms can shape children's racial behaviours. *International Journal of Psychology*, *44*, 29-39.
- Nelson, T.D. (Ed). (2002). *Ageism: Stereotyping and prejudice against older persons*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- O'Brien, K. M. (2012). Healthy, wealthy, wise? Psychosocial factors influencing the socioeconomic status-health gradient. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *17*, 1142-1151.
- O Globo (2012, 4 October). Criadora do 'Diário de Classe' critica sistema de cotas. *O Globo*. Retrieved from: <https://oglobo.globo.com/sociedade/educacao/criadora-do-diario-de-classe-critica-sistema-de-cotas-6280849>

- Ostrove, J. M., Feldman, P., & Adler, N. E. (1999). Relations among socioeconomic status indicators and health for African Americans and Whites. *Journal of Health Psychology, 4*, 451–463.
- Owuamalam, C. K., Rubin, M., Spears, R., & Weerabangsa, M. M. (2017). Why do people from lower class backgrounds support systems that disadvantage them? A test of two mainstream explanations in Malaysia and Australia. *Journal of Social Issues, 73*, 80–98. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12205>
- 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*, 271–320.
- Pudrovska, T. (2014). Early-Life socioeconomic status and mortality at three life course stages: An increasing within-cohort inequality. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 55*, 181-195.
- Rodriguez-Bailon, R., Bratanova, B., Willis G. B., Lopez-Rodriguez, L., Sturrock, A., & Loughan, S. (2017). Social class and ideology of inequality: How they uphold unequal societies. *Journal of Social Issues, 73*, 99-116.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. A. (1973). Belief in a just world and reactions to another's lot: A study of participants in the National Draft Lottery. *Journal of Social Issues, 29*, 73-93.
- Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. A. (1975). Who believes in a just world. *Journal of Social Issues, 31*, 65-89.
- Santos, M., & Amâncio, L. (2016). Gender inequalities in highly qualified professions: A social psychological analysis. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 4*, 427-443.
- Sears, D. O., Huddy, L., & Jervis, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Oxford handbook of political psychology*. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Sidanius, J., Levin, S., Federico, C. M., & Pratto, F. (2001). Legitimizing ideologies: The social dominance approach. In J. T. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations* (pp. 307-331). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidanius J., & Pratto F. (2012). Social dominance theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.). *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*. Vol. 2. 1st ed. Sage, pp. 418-439.
- Sidanius, J., & Veniegas, R. C. (2000). Gender and race discrimination: The interactive nature of disadvantage. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination. The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology*, (pp. 47–69). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Sindic, D. (2011). Psychological citizenship and national identity. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 202–214.
- Souza, J. (2017). *A Elite do Atraso: Da escravidão à Lava Jato*. Rio de Janeiro: Leya.
- Souza, M. H. M. (2013, December). O complexo de vira-lata e o vira-lata complexo. *TRANZ: Revista de Estudos Transitivos do Contemporâneo, 8*, 1-11

- Steele, C. M. (1988). The Psychology of Self-Affirmation: Sustaining the Integrity of the Self. In Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 21, pp. 261–302. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 797–811.
- Stephens, N. M., Markus, H. M., & Phillips, L. T. (2014). Social class culture cycles: How three gateway contexts shape selves and fuel inequality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 611–634.
- Stöber, J. (2001). The Social Desirability Scale-17 (SDS-17): Convergent validity, discriminant validity, and relationship with age. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 17, 222-232.
- Sutton, R. M., & Douglas, K. M. (2005). Justice for all, or just for me? More evidence of the importance of the self-other distinction in just-world beliefs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 637-645.
- Sutton, R. M., Douglas, K. M., Wilkin, K., Elder, T. J., Cole, J. M., & Stathi, S. (2008). Justice for whom, exactly? Beliefs in justice for the self and various others. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 528-541.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-37). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- The World Bank (2017). GDP Ranking. Retrieved from: <https://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/GDP-ranking-table>
- Thomas, & Napolitano, (2012). Educational privilege: The role of school context in the development just world beliefs among Brazilian adolescents. *International Journal of Psychology*, 52, 106-113.
- United Nations Development Program (2016). Country Profile. Retrieved from: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/BRA>
- Vala, J., Pereira, C., Lima, M., & Leyens, J-P. (2012). Intergroup time bias and racialized social relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 38, 491-504.
- Van den Berghe, P.L. (1978) Man in Society: A Biosocial View. New York: Elsevier North Holland. In Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2012). Social Dominance Theory. In *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*. Vol. 2. 1st ed. Sage. (pp. 418-439).
- Vargas-Salfate, S., Paez, D., Liu, J. H., Pratto, F., & Zúñiga, H. G. (2018). A comparison of social dominance theory and system justification: The role of social status in 19 nations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44, 1060-1076.
- Wakslak, C. J., Jost, J. T., Tyler, T. R., & Chen, E. S. (2007). System justification and the alleviation of emotional distress. *Psychological Science*, 18, 267-274.
- Williams, D.R., Gonzalez, H.M., Neighbors, H., Nesse, R., Abelson, J. M., Sweetman, J., & Jackson, J. S. (2007). Prevalence and distribution of major depressive disorder in African Americans, Caribbean Blacks, and Non-Hispanic Whites: Results from the national survey of American life. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 64, 305–315.

Willians, D. R., Yu Y., Jackson J., & Anderson N. (1997). Racial Differences in Physical and Mental Health: Socio-economic Status, Stress and Discrimination. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 2, 335–351.



## **Appendix 1- Pre-test**

### Negatively Worded Items (in percentage)

Negative Constructs		
Original Category	Sentence	%
Social Distance	<i>Não aguento estar próximo a pessoas de classes mais baixas.</i>	100
Social Distance	<i>Difícilmente me envolveria romanticamente com alguém de baixa renda.</i>	100
Social Distance	<i>Incomoda-me a presença de pessoas de classe baixa em lugares que frequento.</i>	100
Derogation	<i>Pessoas de classe baixa não merecem receber grande coisa pelos serviços que prestam.</i>	100
Internal Attribution	<i>As pessoas de baixa renda não vencem na vida porque não buscam melhorar.</i>	100
Internal Attribution	<i>As pessoas seguem na pobreza porque não gostam de trabalhar.</i>	100
Internal Attribution	<i>As pessoas de classe baixa não sabem aproveitar as oportunidades que têm.</i>	98,3
Derogation	<i>As pessoas de classe mais baixa só servem para desempenhar trabalhos baratos.</i>	98,3
Minimization	<i>As classes mais baixas não sofrem tanto quanto fazem parecer.</i>	98,1
Derogation	<i>Pessoas de classes baixas não têm a capacidade de desenvolver tarefas complexas.</i>	94,5
Hatred	<i>Odeio que pessoas de pouca ou nenhuma educação ocupem cargos políticos.</i>	93,7
Hatred	<i>Me dá raiva que pessoas possam usar as cotas sociais para entrar na universidade pública.</i>	93,5
Hatred	<i>Me dá raiva ter que sustentar as classes mais baixas através do bolsa família.</i>	91
Minimization	<i>As classes mais baixas são felizes em ter a vida que têm.</i>	77,5
Hatred	<i>Não suporto a forma como as pessoas de classes mais baixas vivem.</i>	72,4
Minimization	<i>As pessoas classes mais baixas estão habituadas às dificuldades da vida.</i>	63,2

**Positively Worded Items (in percentage)**

<b>Positive Constructs</b>		
<b>Original Category</b>	<b>Sentence</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Appreciation</b>	<i>Me orgulha colaborar para que meu país tenha programas inclusivos como as cotas sociais.</i>	<b>100</b>
<b>Valorization</b>	<i>Pessoas que desempenham trabalhos braçais deveriam ganhar mais do que costumam ganhar.</i>	<b>98,3</b>
<b>Acknowledgment</b>	<i>As classes mais baixas não recebem as mesmas oportunidades de emprego que as classes mais altas. (Escala de atitude pró-negro, Lima, 2002)</i>	<b>97,9</b>
<b>Acknowledgment</b>	<i>Efetivamente, não é nada fácil nascer nas classes mais baixas no Brasil.</i>	<b>97,9</b>
<b>Acknowledgment</b>	<i>De fato, pessoas de classe baixa passam por muita dificuldade no Brasil.</i>	<b>97,7</b>
<b>External Attribution</b>	<i>Mesmo que as pessoas de baixa renda tentem melhorar de vida, há muitas dificuldades que são impostas pela sociedade brasileira.</i>	<b>96,2</b>
<b>Valorization</b>	<i>As classes baixas têm grande valor para o crescimento do Brasil.</i>	<b>95,7</b>
<b>Appreciation</b>	<i>Gosto da ideia de haver o Bolsa Família no Brasil.</i>	<b>95,7</b>
<b>Valorization</b>	<i>No fundo, são as classes baixas que mantêm o Brasil funcionando.</i>	<b>94,2</b>
<b>Social Proximity</b>	<i>Gosto muito de estar perto de pessoas de classes mais baixas.</i>	<b>92,3</b>
<b>Appreciation</b>	<i>Admiro o modo de vida das classes mais baixas.</i>	<b>90,1</b>
<b>Social Proximity</b>	<i>Não me importaria de ter famílias de baixa renda morando no meu prédio.</i>	<b>90</b>
<b>External Attribution</b>	<i>Na sociedade brasileira, é muito difícil ascender socialmente quando se nasce pobre.</i>	<b>90</b>
<b>External Attribution</b>	<i>É a sociedade brasileira que dificulta a ascensão social dos mais pobres.</i>	<b>88,7</b>
<b>Social Proximity</b>	<i>Sairia, sem problemas, com pessoas de classe baixa.</i>	<b>86,3</b>

## **Appendix 2- Questionnaire**

Bem vindo(a) a este estudo!

Ele foi planejado no âmbito do Mestrado em Psicologia da Relações Interculturais do ISCTE-IUL (Lisboa) por Larissa Monteiro (lovmo@iscte-iul.pt) e seu orientador Hélder Vinagreiro Alves (havga@yahoo.com).

Nele, irá ler uma série de frases, sobre as quais deverá se posicionar. Não há respostas certas ou erradas. Assim, lhe pedimos que seja sincero(a) e que responda a todas as questões.

Não existem quaisquer riscos, físicos ou psicológicos, associados ao estudo em questão. A sua participação é voluntária, tendo a possibilidade de negar a participação ou de se retirar do estudo, a qualquer momento, sem qualquer prejuízo ou sem que tenha que dar justificações. As suas respostas são anônimas e apenas alvo de tratamento estatístico juntamente com as demais respostas. Não será possível associá-lo(a) às respostas que der.

É importante responder às questões em um local sossegado e sem distrações. Se isso não for possível, por favor, adie a sua participação para mais tarde. O tempo estimado é de cerca de 15 minutos.

Clicando no botão "Concordo" abaixo, você concorda que sua participação nesse estudo é voluntária, que você tem mais de 18 anos, que tem nacionalidade brasileira e que é trabalhador(a) assalariado(a) no Brasil, em atividade ou não. Após concordar, clique no botão >>.

Se não concordar em participar, poderá sair clicando na tecla "Discordo" e, depois, no botão >>.

ATENÇÃO: POR RAZÕES TÉCNICAS, PEDIMOS QUE RESPONDA EM UM COMPUTADOR.

- Concordo
- Discordo

Muito obrigada por ter concordado em participar deste estudo.

A seguir, lerá algumas afirmações e perguntas. Por favor, nos dê sua posição sincera sobre cada uma. Para isso, basta clicar em um dos sete pontos que surgem por baixo de cada frase.

Por favor, tente responder a todas as questões com cuidado e sinceramente, mas não pense demasiado tempo sobre cada uma.

**As posições econômicas ocupadas pelas pessoas são reflexos legítimos de suas conquistas.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Nunca pensei duas vezes em ajudar alguém em necessidade.**

Desirability

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**É injusto ter um sistema econômico que produz extrema riqueza e extrema pobreza ao mesmo tempo.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Eu penso que as pessoas tentam ser justas quando tomam decisões importantes.**

BJWG

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**As pessoas de classe mais baixa só servem para desempenhar trabalhos baratos.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**A distribuição dos recursos de forma igualitária é uma possibilidade na sociedade brasileira.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**As classes mais baixas não sofrem tanto quanto fazem parecer.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Igualdade de grupo deveria ser nosso ideal.**

SDO

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Se as pessoas trabalham duro, elas quase sempre conseguem o que querem.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**As pessoas de classe baixa não sabem aproveitar as oportunidades que têm.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Em termos de justiça, pobres e ricos fazem parte de mundos diferentes.**

Scope of Justice

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Diferenças econômicas na sociedade brasileira refletem uma distribuição ilegítima de recursos.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Alguns grupos de pessoas são simplesmente inferiores a outros.**

SDO

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Não deveríamos forçar a igualdade de grupos.**

SDO

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Alguns grupos devem ser mantidos em seu lugar.**

SDO

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



**Às vezes, só ajudo porque espero algo em troca.**

Desirability	Discordo Completamente	Discordo muito	Discordo um pouco	Nem discordo nem concordo	Concordo um pouco	Concordo muito	Concordo completamente
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

---

**A ideia de alguns grupos dominarem outros é um princípio pobre.**

SDO	Discordo Completamente	Discordo muito	Discordo um pouco	Nem discordo nem concordo	Concordo um pouco	Concordo muito	Concordo completamente
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

---

**É totalmente impossível eliminar a pobreza.**

ESJ	Discordo Completamente	Discordo muito	Discordo um pouco	Nem discordo nem concordo	Concordo um pouco	Concordo muito	Concordo completamente
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

---

**Pessoas que desempenham trabalhos braçais deveriam ganhar mais do que costumam ganhar.**

Hostility	Discordo Completamente	Discordo muito	Discordo um pouco	Nem discordo nem concordo	Concordo um pouco	Concordo muito	Concordo completamente
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

---

**Nós deveríamos trabalhar para dar a todos os grupos uma chance igual de vencer na vida.**

SDO	Discordo Completamente	Discordo muito	Discordo um pouco	Nem discordo nem concordo	Concordo um pouco	Concordo muito	Concordo completamente
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Uma sociedade é justa se os cidadãos de maior status têm melhores condições de vida do que aqueles de baixo status.**

Perception of Societal Justice

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Diferenças de classe social refletem as diferenças na ordem natural das coisas.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Uma sociedade é justa se a renda e a riqueza são distribuídas igualmente entre todos os cidadãos.**

Perception of Societal Justice

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Não existem diferenças inerentes entre ricos e pobres, é tudo uma questão das circunstâncias em que você nasce.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Em minha vida, a injustiça acontece raramente.**

BJWP

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**As pessoas de baixa renda não vencem na vida porque não buscam melhorar.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Em geral, mereço o que me acontece.**

BJWP

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Aceito sempre as opiniões dos outros, mesmo quando discordam de mim.**

Desirability

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Já me aproveitei de alguém.**

Desirability

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**A maioria das pessoas que não vencem na sociedade brasileira não deveriam culpar o sistema, mas sim elas mesmas.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Sempre existirão pessoas pobres porque não haverá trabalho suficiente para todos.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Eu, seguramente, acredito que as injustiças em todas as áreas da vida (p.ex.: profissional, familiar, política) são exceções à regra.**

BJWG

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**No Brasil, todos têm chance de atingir o nível de educação que eles querem atingir.**

Perception of Societal Justice

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Não aguento estar próximo a pessoas de classes mais baixas.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Creio que a maior parte do que me acontece é justo.**

BJWP

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**De fato, pessoas de classe baixa passam por muita dificuldade no Brasil.**

Hostility	Discordo Completamente	Discordo muito	Discordo um pouco	Nem discordo nem concordo	Concordo um pouco	Concordo muito	Concordo completamente
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**Deveríamos fazer o que podemos para equalizar as condições para os diferentes grupos.**

SDO	Discordo Completamente	Discordo muito	Discordo um pouco	Nem discordo nem concordo	Concordo um pouco	Concordo muito	Concordo completamente
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**Distribuição igualitária dos recursos é contra a natureza.**

ESJ	Discordo Completamente	Discordo muito	Discordo um pouco	Nem discordo nem concordo	Concordo um pouco	Concordo muito	Concordo completamente
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**É injusto tentar tornar os grupos iguais.**

SDO	Discordo Completamente	Discordo muito	Discordo um pouco	Nem discordo nem concordo	Concordo um pouco	Concordo muito	Concordo completamente
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**Não importa quanto esforço demande, devemos lutar para garantir que todos os grupos tenham a mesma oportunidade na vida.**

SDO	Discordo Completamente	Discordo muito	Discordo um pouco	Nem discordo nem concordo	Concordo um pouco	Concordo muito	Concordo completamente
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Pessoas pobres não são essencialmente diferentes de pessoas ricas.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**O Brasil deveria proibir que pessoas com baixa escolaridade concorressem a cargos políticos.**

Discrimination

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**As classes baixas têm grande valor para o crescimento do Brasil.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Grupos da base são tão merecedores quanto os grupos do topo.**

SDO

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Gosto da ideia de haver o Bolsa Família no Brasil.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**As decisões que os demais tomam com respeito a mim são justas.**

BJWP

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Se as pessoas quisessem mudar o sistema econômico para tornar as coisas iguais, elas poderiam.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**O SUS não deveria ser universal e gratuito para todos, deveria cobrar daqueles que contribuem menos.**

Discrimination

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**As pessoas seguem na pobreza porque não gostam de trabalhar.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Pobres e ricos no Brasil são uma única comunidade moral, isto é, os princípios éticos e morais aplicam-se igualmente a ambos.**

Scope of Justice

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Uma sociedade ideal requer que alguns grupos estejam no topo e outros na base.**

SDO

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**As leis da natureza são as responsáveis pelas diferenças de riqueza na sociedade brasileira.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Incomoda-me a presença de pessoas de classe baixa em lugares que frequento.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Igualdade de grupo não deveria ser nosso objetivo-primário.**

SDO

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**As classes mais baixas não recebem as mesmas oportunidades de emprego que as classes mais altas.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



**Já aconteceu, pelo menos uma vez, de ficar com uma coisa que tinha pego emprestada.**

Desirability

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**Quando se fala de justiça, ricos e pobres não partilham os mesmos princípios.**

Scope of Justice

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**Os tribunais brasileiros devem ser mais severos em casos de crimes comuns do que no caso de crimes de colarinho branco.**

Discrimination

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**São as competências, as habilidades e os esforços de cada um os responsáveis pelo grau de educação de cada brasileiro.**

Perception of Societal Justice

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**Não faz sentido tentar tornar as rendas dos brasileiros mais iguais.**

ESJ

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Perception  
of Societal  
Justice

**Uma sociedade é justa se pessoas esforçadas ganham mais que os demais.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

SDO

**Grupos na base não deveriam ter que ficar em seu lugar.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Hostility

**Me orgulha colaborar para que meu país tenha programas inclusivos como as cotas sociais.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ESJ

**Há muitas razões para se pensar que o sistema econômico é injusto.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ESJ

**A existência de diferenças econômicas por todos os lados não significa que elas sejam inevitáveis.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Efetivamente, não é nada fácil nascer nas classes mais baixas no Brasil.**

Hostility	Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**Quando se trata de justiça, os ricos e os pobres devem ser considerados como uma única comunidade.**

Scope of Justice	Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**Uma sociedade é justa se ela cuida daqueles que são pobres e necessitados.**

Perception of Societal Justice	Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**Acredito que, em geral, as pessoas adquirem o que elas realmente merecem.**

BJWG	Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

**Sou sempre gentil e agradável, mesmo quando estou estressado(a).**

Desirability	Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

BJWG

**Penso que o mundo é, basicamente, um lugar justo.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

BJWG

**Estou convencido(a) de que, no longo prazo, as pessoas serão compensadas pelas injustiças.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Desirability

**Às vezes, falo mal dos outros nas suas costas.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Não deveríamos tentar garantir que todos os grupos tenham a mesma qualidade de vida.**

SDO

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Nenhum grupo deveria dominar na sociedade.**

SDO

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Pessoas de classe baixa não merecem receber grande coisa pelos serviços que prestam.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**É, provavelmente, uma boa coisa que certos grupos estejam no topo e outros na base.**

SDO

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Difícilmente, me envolveria romanticamente com alguém de baixa renda.**

Hostility

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Scope of Justice

**Na justiça, os mesmos princípios que são aplicados aos ricos devem ser aplicados aos pobres.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Hostility

**Mesmo que as pessoas de baixa renda tentem melhorar de vida, há muitas dificuldades que são impostas pela sociedade brasileira.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

BJWG

**Tenho certeza que a justiça sempre prevalece sobre a injustiça.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Perception of Societal Justice

**Todas as pessoas no meu país têm chances iguais de encontrar um emprego se elas procurarem com vontade.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Desirability

**Admito sempre quando erro e enfrento as consequências negativas do meu erro.**

Discordo Completamente 1	Discordo muito 2	Discordo um pouco 3	Nem discordo nem concordo 4	Concordo um pouco 5	Concordo muito 6	Concordo completamente 7
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Qual é seu sexo/gênero?

- Masculino
- Feminino
- Prefiro não responder

Qual é sua idade?

Qual é sua escolaridade?

- |                        |                       |                          |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Primeiro Grau Completo | Ensino Médio Completo | Ensino Superior Completo | Pós-Graduação         | Mestrado              | Doutorado             | Pós-Doutorado         |
| <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Que tipo de escola você frequentou?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Pública               | Privada               | Militar               | Pública e Privada     |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Se tem o Ensino Superior completo, você estudou em uma:

- Universidade Pública
- Universidade Privada paga por você
- Universidade Privada paga por seus pais
- Universidade Privada com Bolsa de estudos do governo

Qual é a escolaridade de sua mãe?

- |                                |                              |                             |                                |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Primeiro<br>Grau<br>Incompleto | Primeiro<br>Grau<br>Completo | Ensino<br>Médio<br>Completo | Ensino<br>Superior<br>Completo | Pós-<br>Graduação     | Mestrado              | Doutorado             | Pós-<br>Doutorado     |
| <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/>        | <input type="radio"/>       | <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Qual é a escolaridade de seu pai?

- |                                |                              |                             |                                |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Primeiro<br>Grau<br>Incompleto | Primeiro<br>Grau<br>Completo | Ensino<br>Médio<br>Completo | Ensino<br>Superior<br>Completo | Pós-<br>Graduação     | Mestrado              | Doutorado             | Pós-<br>Doutorado     |
| <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/>        | <input type="radio"/>       | <input type="radio"/>          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Qual é o principal transporte que utiliza?

- |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Bicicleta             | Carro próprio         | Moto                  | Transporte Público    | Uber/Táxi             |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Em que ramo/setor trabalha ou trabalhava?

Que tipo de posição ocupa/ocupava?

- Empregado
- Supervisor
- Gerente
- Coordenador
- Outro



Se tem filhos, em que tipo de escola estudam ou estudaram?

Pública

Privada

Militar

Não tenho filhos

Se você se auto-classificasse comparativamente a todos os brasileiros, você diria que é:

Milionário

Rico

Classe Média Alta

Classe Média

Classe Média Baixa

Pobre

Miserável

Em que ambiente respondeu a este questionário?

Cafeteria

Casa

Hospital

Hotel

Rua

Trabalho

Em política, costuma-se falar de esquerda e direita. Como é que se posiciona nessa escala?

Esquerda

<<

<

Centro

>

>>

Direita

Por favor, utilize o espaço abaixo para se manifestar sobre este estudo e para dizer o que acredita serem os objetivos do estudo.

Com os dados recolhidos neste questionário, pretendemos colaborar para o melhor entendimento das relações de sociais e de classe na sociedade brasileira. Para tanto, as questões aqui propostas tiveram o intuito de medir as atitudes de seus respondentes no que diz respeito a esse assunto.

Caso tenha interesse em obter mais informações acerca desse estudo ou mesmo seus resultados futuros, por favor, entre em contato com Larissa Monteiro através do e-mail "lovmo@iscte-iul.pt" ou com Hélder Alves (havga@yahoo.com).

Obrigada por sua colaboração!