Published in final edited form as:

Eur J Soc Psychol. 2010 April ; 40(3): . doi:10.1002/ejsp.637.

Using the Stereotype Content Model to examine group depictions in Fascism: An Archival Approach

Federica Durante,

Dipartimento di Psicologia, Università di Milano—Bicocca, Piazza dell'Ateneo Nuovo 1, 20126 Milano, Italy

Chiara Volpato, and

University of Milan—Bicocca, Italy

Susan T. Fiske

Princeton University, NJ, USA

Federica Durante: federica.durante@unimib.it

Abstract

The Stereotype Content Model (SCM) suggests potentially universal intergroup depictions. If universal, they should apply across history in archival data. Bridging this gap, we examined social groups descriptions during Italy's Fascist era. In Study 1, articles published in a Fascist magazine — *La Difesa della Razza* — were content analyzed, and results submitted to correspondence analysis. Admiration prejudice depicted ingroups; envious and contemptuous prejudices depicted specific outgroups, generally in line with SCM predictions. No paternalistic prejudice appeared; historical reasons might explain this finding. Results also fit the recently developed BIAS Map of behavioral consequences. In Study 2, ninety-six undergraduates rated the content-analysis traits on warmth and competence, without knowing their origin. They corroborated SCM's interpretations of the archival data.

Recently, researchers have gone beyond stereotyping processes to look at stereotype content and functions. Examples include Enemy Images Theory (Alexander, Brewer, & Herrmann, 1999) and System Justification Theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994). The Stereotype Content Model (SCM; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; see also Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008; Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007), in particular, emphasizes how many societal stereotypes include mixed (ambivalent) ascriptions of competence and warmth, which combine both hostile and favorable beliefs about a group.

SCM proposes that prejudice is a consequence of the structural relationships between groups with reference to two critical dimensions: Perceived socio-economic *status* (high–low) and perceived *interdependence* (cooperative–competitive). The combinations of these structural relationships generate stereotype content which in turn revolves around two fundamental dimensions: Perceived *competence* and *warmth*. Status predicts competence, and interdependence predicts warmth. The combination brings about a taxonomy that includes four kinds of prejudice: Two ambivalent and two non-ambivalent types.

The first kind of non-ambivalent prejudice is the prejudice of admiration. Groups that are on the receiving end of this kind of prejudice are perceived as competent and warm at the same time. The prejudice of admiration may be directed to ingroups and cooperative groups of equal status, i.e., groups perceived as allies. By the same token, low-status, competitive

---

groups are targets of a contemptuous prejudice, which is purely hostile. The contemptuous prejudice stereotypes members of the outgroup as neither warm nor competent. Moreover, it links to negative emotions, such as contempt, disgust, resentment, hostility, and lack of respect, and to behaviors characterized by avoidance, exclusion, attack, and fighting.

The two remaining cells of the SCM represent the types of prejudice distinguished by ambivalence. The paternalistic prejudice targets non-competitive groups, with low socio-economic status. The target group is perceived as warm, but incompetent. This type of prejudice reflects liking but disrespect: Expressions of affection and emotional/physical closeness are coupled with lack of respect due to the incompetence attributed to the lower status group. Finally, the envious prejudice is directed toward high-status, competitive groups, regarded as competent but not warm. Groups of elevated status can become the target of extremely negative emotions. Viewed reluctantly as worthy of respect, such groups are not well liked, and they elicit envy, jealousy, resentment, and the attribution of anti-social traits (coldness, arrogance, lack of sincerity). As in the case of the paternalistic prejudice, the favorable aspects of the envious stereotype might legitimize discriminatory behavior, in that the characteristics regarding their competence may make the envied group look like a dangerous competitor against whom discrimination is considered a legitimate self-defense.

SCM has been substantiated by numerous studies (see Cuddy et al., 2008, for a review) across varied, representative, and cultural comparisons. SCM studies have demonstrated how groups are distributed in the four quadrants. For example, in today's US society some groups (rich people, feminists, business people, Asians, Jews) are considered to be more competent than warm, whereas others (mentally challenged people, disabled people, blind people, older people) are regarded as warm, but not competent. Although most early SCM studies were correlational, lately, some experimental research has been conducted. In the latter studies, the socio-structural factors status and competition were manipulated at an intergroup level, with results showing subsequent changes occurring in competence and warmth stereotypes (Caprariello, Cuddy, & Fiske, 2009; Oldmeadow & Fiske, 2007). Furthermore, interpersonal manipulations of status predicted perceived dispositional competence and manipulations of competition predicted perceived dispositional lack of warmth (Russell & Fiske, 2008). The breadth of results across cultures and laboratories suggests the principles are widely applicable, even universal. If so, the SCM should appear across history and political systems.

So far, SCM studies have not been published on archival data and not on any data from an authoritarian régime. This comparison matters because authoritarian ideology often appears as simple, categorical, us–them thinking (e.g., Altemeyer, 1988). In this case, one might expect that the SCM space, which describes two ambivalent outgroups, might not apply under an authoritarian ideology because a simpler categorical structure might prevail. However, data from current authoritarian régime s would be difficult to collect. What's more, the Fascist ideology, as a particular authoritarian form, focused on eugenics and biological essentialism, and essentialism promotes extreme prejudices (e.g., Yzerbyt, Corneille, & Estrada, 2001), which might avert the formation of ambivalent, mixed stereotypes. Thus for both theoretical and practical reasons, this investigation fills an important lacuna in the existing evidence.

The present work aims at bridging this gap, so as to demonstrate the model's validity across historical and cultural contexts. The integration of psychosocial results with results of historical research has been strongly advocated (Gergen, 1973; Gergen & Gergen, 1984; Graumann & Gergen, 1996; McGuire, 1976, 1994). As Simonton (1990) argued, "history is an immense repository of individual thoughts and actions" (p. 2). The data included in this

repository are crucial to social psychology both for generating new research questions, and for corroborating already-existing hypotheses and theories, exploring their validity across time. As emphasized by McGuire (1976, 1997), the historical perspective provides new research domains, further examining links previously neglected.

The combination of historical and socio-psychological approaches proved important in studies concerning anti-Semitism and the Jews' genocide in Europe. On the one hand, the historical investigations used socio-psychological analyses of the common person's behavior (Browning, 1992; Goldhagen, 1996; Friedländer, 1997). On the other hand, the socio-psychological research on extreme situations drew largely on historical studies to generate hypotheses and theoretical interpretations (Bar-Tal, 1990; Staub, 1989; Volpato & Contarello, 1999). Furthermore, recently, historical–social research has encouraged interesting new insights in social psychology. For example, Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, and Manstead (1998) operationalized the construct of collective guilt as the guilt experienced by individuals for the colonial behaviors perpetrated by their nation or ethnic group in the past. This sense of guilt influences intergroup relations and collective identity construction and preservation (see also Brown & Čehajic, 2008; Brown, González, Zagefka, Manzi, & Čehajic, 2008). Seemingly, Sani and collaborators (Sani et al., 2007) talked about perceived collective continuity as a construct that leads individuals to perceive their ingroups as entities that move through time. Finally, Liu and collaborators (Liu, Wilson, McClure, & Higgins, 1999; Liu et al., 2005; Sibley, Liu, Duckitt, & Khan, 2008) investigated the social representation of history, suggesting that history provides foundational myths for nationhood, which have enduring implications for intergroup relations. All these studies attempt to grasp the historical dimension of social behavior by using the methods of social psychology. Likewise, emerging methodological proposals are aiming to pin-point historiometric techniques that allow cross-cultural generalizations, as well as identifying trans-historical variants (Simonton, 1998, 2003).

Given the feasibility of these methods and the importance of testing across history and politics, Study 1 applied the SCM to descriptions of social groups during the Fascist era in Italy, by content analyzing articles published in a Fascist magazine. The intent was to test the strength of the SCM in the case of archival data and, thus, to reveal possible trans-historical and trans-cultural aspects of the prejudice phenomena as hypothesized by the model. The SCM needs testing across history because its emphasis on ambivalent, mixed combinations might result from the modern world's globalization but not apply in more mono-cultural settings. Moreover, the SCM needs testing, as mentioned, in authoritarian settings that simplify society into us-against-them thinking.

More precisely, Study 1 aimed to identify the most relevant ingroup and outgroup representations and to specify the stereotype content that constitute these images. We expect to find the four types of stereotype content predicted by the SCM. More specifically, the ingroup description would correspond to the main characteristics of admiration prejudice, and the descriptions of specific outgroups would be based on patterns of envious, paternalistic, and contemptuous prejudices.

Content analysis allows researchers to extract useful information from a wide body of verbal material, systematically identifying each domain's specific features (Smith, 2000). Through content analysis, qualitative information can be reduced to smaller and more manageable forms of data, namely, frequencies, which can be summarized. Hence, content analysis is a qualitative–quantitative method which, starting from a text, undergoes reliable computational procedures—aiming to organize and summarize the verbal material—and returns to “narratives” when the researcher presents the interpretation.

The aforementioned technique entails the systematic application of explicitly stated coding rules in order to obtain unbiased results, replicable by other investigators. Here, to test the reliability of the interpretation of Study 1, a second study was carried out. Because the SCM proposes that the content of stereotype revolves around competence and warmth, Study 2 aimed to explore whether the categories of analysis emerging from the previous content analysis expressed competence and warmth as judged in the present by independent judges. If so, this would corroborate our interpretation of the archival data in terms of the SCM.

STUDY 1

The Archive

Archival data are defined as already existing data, collected, classified, and preserved by people or institutions that differ from those who conduct the investigation (Wrightsmann & Deaux, 1981). The archival data chosen for Study 1 are articles that appeared in *La Difesa della Razza*¹ (The Defense of the Race). This bimonthly magazine, published in Italy between 1938 and 1943, was one of the most well-known means of spreading Fascist propaganda in Italy. *La Difesa della Razza* defined itself as a magazine of “science, documentation, and debate,” and was characterized by aggressive graphics, sensationalist headlines, as well as photographs, cartoons, and photomontages that were often highlighted by offensive and vulgar captions, aimed at presumably hostile and inferior groups. The main arguments concerned anti-Semitism and racism, the stereotyping of races considered inferior, eugenics, racial politics, cross-breeding, and the glorification of national identity. *La Difesa della Razza* published 118 issues, the first on 5 August 1938 and the last on 20 June 1943, on the eve of the fall of the Fascist régime. The majority of the articles, authored by anthropologists, scientists, historians, philosophers, and writers, backed the “biological racism” perspective, which resembled the case made by the Nazis (Capozza & Volpato, 2009). The first issues’ circulation was high by the standards of the time (150 000 copies for each issue). From November 1940, the number of copies decreased, due to wartime restrictions on the use of paper. Nevertheless, the magazine continued to be highly regarded by the régime and was distributed in all types of schools. The magazine’s high circulation, its popular yet at the same time allegedly scientific nature, and the reputation of its editors all make it an ideal object for psychosocial research. In fact, the magazine meets the criteria of popularity and availability that are recommended when choosing texts for content analysis (Holsti, 1969; Krippendorff, 1980; Smith, 2000). In previous studies, *La Difesa della Razza* proved to be reliable as archival data for detailing stereotypes of individual groups (Volpato & Cantone, 2005; Volpato & Durante, 2003; Volpato, Durante, & Cantone, 2007). This analysis examines the overall system of group stereotypes.

Method

The archive, composed of the issues of *La Difesa della Razza* published during 6 years, contained 1321 articles. The theoretical framework of the previous studies conducted on the magazine was Bar-Tal’s (1989) theory of delegitimization. In classifying the magazine articles, many texts contained a delegitimization belief called “group comparison” (Volpato & Cantone, 2005; Volpato & Durante, 2003). This category included all the texts in which comparisons between groups constituted the main theme of the articles, thus emphasizing intergroup differences. For Study 1, therefore, we selected the texts previously classified in the “group comparison” category ($N = 159$), which can be considered to be the richest in terms of intergroup comparisons, and hence, in terms of the group descriptions.

¹Valentina Pisanty published the e-book “Educare all’odio: *La Difesa della Razza* (1938–1943),” on-line Motta edition, www.Mottaeditore.it, introduced by Umberto Eco. It consists of a collection of articles and illustrations taken from *La Difesa della Razza*, containing the most significant pages of the magazine.

Overall, the selected material described 22 social groups, outlining their positive and negative characteristics. The groups were: Americans, Arabs, Aryans, Australians, Jews, Etruscans, Europeans, the French, Japanese, the Greek, Indians, American Indians, the English, Italians, Mediterraneans, Half-Castes, Mongols, Blacks,² Nordics, Orientals, Russians, and Slavs.

Nouns, adjectives, and descriptions of behavior associated with each group were coded. The rules established in previous work (Volpato & Contarello, 1999) were also adopted in this study to create the categories for analysis: Synonymous or semantically similar terms were grouped together in the same category, and descriptions, even extensive ones, were summarized in a single category of analysis. For example, the adjectives “good-looking,” “cheerful,” “energetic,” “dynamic,” and “vivacious” were all grouped under the label *cheerful*; the label *moral/intellectual poisoners* included “pathogenic microbes,” “waste,” and “toxic;” *positive social characteristics* summarized “demographic superiority,” “social welfare,” “equal opportunities;” while *negative physical characteristics* included “ugly,” “frizzy hair,” “aquiline nose.” Furthermore, we considered only groups characterized by more than 100 quotations, namely, Aryans, Jews, the French, the English, Italians, Half-Castes, and Blacks. The remaining groups were characterized by a remarkably small number of quotations, implying the scarce relevance in the articles examined.³ Therefore, the final coding resulted in 128 categories of analysis associated with seven groups. The association frequencies between categories and groups were computed in a 128×7 contingency matrix.

The texts were coded by one of the authors. The reliability of the classification was checked by measuring its consistency (intra-observer agreement; Krippendorff, 1980). To this end, a group of articles (10% of the total) was re-coded by the same coder 3 months after the first coding. The percentage agreement index was used ($(N_d a / N_d a + N_d d) \times 100$, where $N_d a$ is the number of agreements between the two codings and $N_d d$ the number of disagreements). The result was 85.71%. In addition, we decided to check the inter-rater reliability (inter-observer agreement), using Cohen’s Kappa index (1960), which corrects for agreements due to chance (Bakeman & Gottman, 1986). To this end, a random sample of the research material (a group of articles, equivalent to the 10% of the total) was examined by a new judge. The η coefficient for the classification was 0.81, which is satisfactory (Fleiss, 1981; Smith, 2000).

The 128×7 (categories x groups) frequency matrix was submitted to Correspondence Analysis, a method particularly applicable to large contingency tables. This technique “is a tool to analyze the association between two or more categorical variables by representing the categories of the variables as points in a low-dimensional space: Categories with similar distributions will be represented as points that are close in space; categories that have a very dissimilar distribution will be positioned far apart” (Clausen, 1998, p. 1–2). Correspondence analysis is based on the χ^2 -statistic: The null hypothesis is that the table rows and columns (categories and groups) are independent. The analysis identifies the dimensions underlying the data structure, and then summarizes the interdependences between the contingency table’s variables (i.e., rows and columns). In other words, correspondence analysis finds the deviations from independence by dividing the table into several simpler ones. It reclassifies the rows and columns and ranks them in order to provide the best association (Benzécri,

²The label used in the original texts was “Negroes.” See Faloppa (2004) on the use of the terms that represent everything that is considered “alien” in the Italian language. See also the contributions of Kennedy (2002) and Philogène (1999) in relation to the term “Negro” and the more recent switch from “Black” to “African American”.

³The groups kept in the analysis had the following number of quotations: Aryans (159), the English (280), Italians (1284), Jews (952), Blacks (257), Half-Castes (239), the French (165). The groups excluded from the analysis had the following number of quotations: Americans (99), Arabs (21), Australians (4), Etruscans (4), Europeans (33), Japanese (9), the Greek (6), Indians (5), American Indians (14), Mediterraneans (15), Mongols (2), Nordics (11), Orientals (28), Russians (47), and Slavs (11). Despite their relative high number of quotations, Americans were excluded because they were mentioned only in the articles published in the last two years of the magazine’s publication.

1980; Clausen, 1998; Greenacre & Blasius, 1994). To interpret the dimensions emerging from correspondence analysis, the absolute contribution, cosine square ($\cos^2$), and coordinates are used. The *absolute contribution* is the proportion of inertia—in correspondence analysis the term inertia is used as a synonym of variance (Clausen, 1998)—of a particular dimension explained by a variable. It expresses the extent to which the variable has contributed to determining the direction of the dimension concerned. Relatively large contributions are most important to the dimension, and the sum of these contributions for each dimension equals 1.00. Also, the $\cos^2$ expresses how well each variable is described by each dimension, i.e., how much of a variable's variance is explained by a dimension. The sum of the $\cos^2$'s values for each variable over all dimensions is equal to 1.00. Finally, the *coordinates* provide information on the position of variables in relation to dimensions, which are the basis for the graphical display. Results are interpreted on the basis of the relative positions of the variables and their distributions along dimensions. A criterion that has to be satisfied in using correspondence analysis is that the variables in the contingency table “must be homogeneous, so that it is meaningful to calculate distances between the categories” (Clausen, 1998, p. 50). In the present work, this criterion was met by grouping synonymous or semantically similar terms in one category, by excluding the groups with fewer than 100 quotations, and by considering only the groups whose quotations were distributed along the 6 years of the magazine's publication (see footnote 3).

Results

Results showed six dimensions. In correspondence analysis, dimensions are extracted in a decreasing order of importance. In fact, as reported in Appendix A, the percentage of the total inertia explained by each dimension decreased from the first to the last one: First 36.7%, second 21.8%, third 15.4%, fourth 10.5%, fifth 10.4%, and sixth 5.2%. For this reason, in correspondence analysis, the Cartesian plane formed by the first two dimensions is the space that best represents the underlying data structure, and is therefore the most relevant for the results' interpretation (Benzécri, 1980).

Figure 1 shows the plane formed by the first two dimensions, which explained 58.5% of the total inertia of the frequency table. The first dimension shows the fundamental opposition between, on the one hand, Italians and Aryans—the ingroup and the ideal of the ingroup—and on the other hand, their enemies—the Jews, English, Blacks, and Half-Castes. (The remaining outgroup, the French, is not included in Figure 1 because it is explained almost exclusively by a fourth dimension.) The second dimension distinguishes among the enemies of Italy: On the one hand, the Jews and the English are the powerful, competent, and dangerous enemies; on the other hand are the stupid, disrespected enemies (see Figure 1).

While the Italian group is entirely explained by the plane and, in particular, by the first dimension ($\cos^2 = .96$), the other groups are also explained by the subsequent dimensions (Aryans, $\cos^2 = .30$ first dimension, and $\cos^2 = .70$ sixth dimension; Jews, $\cos^2 = .58$ first dimension, and $\cos^2 = .37$ third dimension; the English, $\cos^2 = .21$, $\cos^2 = .38$, and $\cos^2 = .36$ first, second and third dimension, respectively; Blacks, $\cos^2 = .58$ second dimension, and $\cos^2 = .18$ fifth dimension; Half-Castes, $\cos^2 = .37$ and $\cos^2 = .54$ second and fifth dimension, respectively; the French, $\cos^2 = .72$ fourth dimension). These remaining correspondence analysis results are reported in Appendix A.

Categories of analysis concerning the ingroup and its ideal reference point (Figure 1) mainly refer to the Italians because the Aryan group is largely explained by the sixth dimension. The description of the Italians is characterized by positive attributes only. Numerous features exalt the racial aspect of the group, by emphasizing its purity, antiquity, and pride. In the articles, the Italian “race” is described in contradictory terms; as a matter of fact, some consider the “race” to be “Aryan,” others describe it as “European” or “Mediterranean,” and

many declare it to be a “multiform” race as it is composed of various elements not always attributable to the Aryan prototype (blonde, blue eyes, fair skin). Italians are good-looking and cheerful, they live in an exceptionally beautiful territory, and are independent, united, strong, proud, and hard-working; they are descendants of the ancient Romans, from whom they have retained greatness, which makes them carriers of civilization, pioneers, and warriors. This inheritance goes hand in hand with the Christian identity, which contributes to their differentiation from other peoples by a humanitarian tendency, which also pervades their colonial policy. Besides the characteristics reminiscent of the Italian people’s centuries-old history, others refer to current affairs: The alliance with the Germans and the supposition that they are being exploited by the Jews.

The enemies are, first and foremost, the Jews, who are situated on the other extreme of the axis 1. They are depicted in an exceedingly negative manner: They plot, corrupt, and are accused of every possible misdeed. They are described as opportunistic, dishonest, capitalists, greedy money makers, and loan sharks. They collaborate with democracies so as to lay claim to world dominance, which is also why they hate Rome and its régime. Furthermore, various descriptions refer to the ancient anti-Semitic religious tradition: The Jews are blasphemous Judases charged with the crucifixion of Christ.

Another enemy group, the English, is assimilated to the Jewish group: The groups have the majority of analyzed categories in common, even though the frequency is higher for the Jews. Peculiarly, in the analyzed texts, the English are referred to 23 times as “Judases.”

The remaining enemy groups illustrated in Figure 1 relate to the inhabitants of the African colonies. The descriptions of Blacks and Half-Castes are undoubtedly negative. The colonized peoples are characterized by negative physical characteristics and allegedly are stupid, meek, dark, miserable, as well as complaining.

As mentioned, Italians are the only group entirely explained by the first dimension. To account for the remaining inertia, not explained by the first two dimensions, and to complete group depictions, it is worthwhile to consider features emerging on other dimensions. For instance, if we consider the sixth dimension (see Appendix A), Aryans are depicted by characteristics that define them as being superior: They are the ideal and prototypical group (harmonious, physically and psychologically homogeneous, nationalistic, superior, Nordic, a sense of honor). As previously shown for the Italians, the Aryans are also defined by comparisons with the Jewish group (they differ from Jews; they fight the Jews). Seemingly, the Jewish group is also explained by the third dimension (see Appendix A). The attributes, in this case, are idiosyncratic to the Jews (unlike the categories of analysis mentioned above that conveyed a commonality between Jews and the English). Some characteristics point out how the Jews contradict positive values. Supposedly, they are materialists, bourgeois, close to the English, enemies of Fascism, and instilling hatred toward Aryans. Being of Levantine origin, the Jews are a nomadic group, incapable of founding their own civilization or of integrating with other peoples. The Jews are a foreign group distinguished by a typical way of acting (they commit “Jewisms”), which reveals their sarcastic, devious, and insidious nature to which they remain faithful at all times. The peculiar ambivalence of the overall picture is emphasized by the co- presence of conflicting attributes. On the one hand, the Jews are mediocre, cowards, and shirkers, whereas on the other, they are so good at spying and cleverly manipulating that they are held responsible for the ongoing war. The rich and influential Jews enjoy favoritism in spite of being a despised race. They are disloyal and traitors, portrayed as dangerous moral and intellectual poisoners who pretend they are fighting for equality but actually in order to destroy other populations. There are several dehumanizing categories of analysis: The Jews are waste, the biological components of their

race are of lower-class origin. They are also pictured as demonic and diabolic creatures that practice necromancy.

Blacks and Half-Castes are defined by a few, yet significant categories (see Appendix A, fifth dimension). Blacks are stupid, weak, and far from the physical prototype regarded as the ideal of humanity. Half-Castes, specifically, are abhorrent, repugnant, and destructive. However, both groups share the negative physicality—an outer sign of (inner) degradation. Finally, the French group is predominantly explained by the fourth dimension. It is depicted by means of both idiosyncratic traits (empty, Celtic, infertile, negative political ideas) and shared traits, such as “abandonment of the race’s dignity” (shared with the English group), being a cross-bred and heterogeneous race, enemies (shared with the English and the Jewish groups), and decadent (Blacks, Half-Castes, and the English).

Discussion

Results generally met our expectations. A prejudice of admiration was found toward the ingroup and its ideal reference point. As previously illustrated, the first dimension shows the fundamental opposition between Us and Them, friends and enemies, ingroup and outgroup. The Italians and, less saliently, the Aryans are depicted by means of positive characteristics. They are the sums of the best of “Aryanism” and “Romanity,” i.e., those considered ideal prototypes of humanity. Their superiority to other peoples is re-affirmed by the glorification of their civil, intellectual, and artistic supremacy. The Italian people’s humaneness is strongly underlined. The uncritical positivity of the judgments related to the ingroup bears witness to the presence of an uncritical prejudice of admiration, consisting of “competence” attributes (intellectual, civil, political, artistic, and military), as well as “warmth” attributes (kindness, humaneness, relationally skilled).

The judgments toward the enemy outgroups encompass negative attitudes that primarily take the form of the envious prejudice. One can clearly note an ambivalent attitude, which is a mix of disparagement and fear, toward the English, but above all, toward the Jews. The English people are powerful external enemies, while the Jews are both internal and external enemies. The Jews are described as extremely competent, not only in terms of their trade and business skills (rich, influential), but first and foremost for their ability to spy and manipulate. The Jewish group representation illustrates how the Fascist environments had incorporated the image of the “Jewish conspiracy” spread by The Protocols of the Elders of Zion during the 20 years preceding the WWII (Volpato & Durante, 2009). This makes them highly dangerous—a perception exacerbated by negative characteristics linked to the low end of the “warmth” dimension: The Jews are depicted as devious, shrewd, deceptive, and even diabolic. Thus, members of this group are detested and feared at the same time (see also Glick, 2005).

An attitude that is just as negative also emerges toward the French, Half-Castes, and Blacks. French people are a white racial group, despised because it failed in defending its racial purity, mixing with races considered inferior. However, the derogation toward both Half-Castes and Blacks differs slightly, as they are both considered incompetent, but the stupidity and weakness of the Blacks differs from the Half-Castes who are perceived as abhorrent, repugnant, and able to damage others. We must keep in mind that the Fascist and Nazi ideologies regarded every racial cross-breed as the result of “acts against nature.” Hence, Half-Castes were often accused of corrupting the precious good of racial purity, which is also why Half-Castes were believed to be socially dangerous. However, the absence of both warmth and competence co-locates these groups in the contemptuous prejudice cell.

Conversely to what was expected, no clear paternalistic prejudice appeared. Fascists found no groups worthy of pity and sympathy. As mentioned, paternalistic prejudice targets low-

status, non-competitive groups, perceived as warm, but incompetent. For historical reasons (see the “General Discussion” section), Italians had no positive interdependence with any of the outgroups described in the articles analyzed. In our data, indeed, warmth traits were exclusively attributed to Italians and Aryans. Therefore, our finding is consistent with the SCM prediction, namely, that stereotypes depict outgroups as warm when perceived as non-competitive with others. No groups were seen as cooperating, except Aryans.

STUDY 2

Study 1 indicated that the content of texts published during the Fascist era can be interpreted using the SCM. However, it could be argued that the categories of analysis discussed above were subjectively judged by the authors, to be competence- and warmth-related traits. Note that all the extracted categories were interpreted according to the context in which they were found. Nonetheless, the interpretations were not supported by empirical evidence. In order to test the reliability of our interpretations, Study 2 aimed to investigate whether the categories illustrated above would be judged as expressing competence and warmth by independent judges, and clustered in ways that replicated the groups’ descriptions found in Study 1.

Method

Participants—University of Milan–Bicocca undergraduates ($N = 96$; 27 male, 68 female, and 1 who did not indicate gender; mean age = 22.02), recruited from various psychology courses, volunteered to complete a questionnaire. All participants were told that the study concerned the evaluation of behaviors, traits, and descriptions that referred to unknown individuals. Participants were unaware of the study’s aim and did not know the origin of the categories.

Questionnaire and Procedure—Among the descriptive categories of analysis emerging from Study 1 (see Appendix A), some are no longer used in Italian, especially those that directly referred to Fascism, or that were used during the Fascist era and then disappeared (see Volpato et al., 2007). In order to keep participants unaware of the categories’ origin, we excluded categories concerning race (e.g., Aryan race, multiform race, time-honored race), the Roman Empire (e.g., Roman spirit), the WWII political situation (e.g., hate Rome and the Rome–Berlin axis, allied to the Germans, Bolsheviks), colonialism (e.g., different colonization), and those that were considered as too vague (e.g., positive social characteristics, negative physical characteristics). This selection gave rise to 53 categories that were used in Study 2.

Two questionnaires were designed, one for the competence ratings, one for the warmth ratings: Participants rated the 53 categories on either competence ($n = 48$) or warmth ($n = 48$). In the former case, participants read the following question: “How competent, confident, capable, and skillful are individuals with the characteristics listed below?” In the latter case, participants read “How friendly, warm, sincere, and good-natured are individuals with the characteristics listed below?” Participants made their evaluations using 9-point scales (1 = not at all; 5 = neutral; 9 = extremely). The order of categories’ presentation was reversed to create another version of each questionnaire. Hence, participants were randomly assigned to four versions. At the end, participants were debriefed, thanked, and dismissed.

Results

Preliminary analyses showed no significant main effect or interaction for order of presentation, $F_s(1, 86) \leq 1.42, p_s > .15$. For each of the 53 categories, means were calculated across participants, for each condition separately (see Appendix B). According to these means, the 53 categories arrayed on a two-dimensional Competence x Warmth space. A

hierarchical cluster analysis (Ward's method) was applied to the trait means. This analysis helped us to determine the best-fitting number of clusters. The agglomeration statistics from the hierarchical analysis pointed to a five-cluster solution as the best fit for the 53 categories. Then, a k-means cluster analysis was run in order to examine which trait fit into which cluster.

As reported in Figure 2, Cluster 1 comprised 14 traits: Humane, Mediterranean, European, artists, united, faithful to their nature, foreigners, carriers of civilizations, sarcastic, oriental, influential, good-looking, rich, pioneers. Cluster 2 comprised 10 categories: Weak, Christians, stupid, mediocre, necromancers, enjoy favoritism, do not have their own civilization, complaining, nomadic, miserable. A further cluster comprised 10 categories: Crucifiers, dangerous, shirkers, despised, charged with misdeeds, abhorrent/repugnant, manipulative, do not integrate, denying positive values, cowards. Cluster 4 included five categories: Intelligent, hard-working, independent, strong/proud, cunning/shrewd. The remaining 14 categories ended up in Cluster 5: Materialists, spies, opportunists, greedy, devious/insidious, moral and intellectual poisoners, dishonest/corruptors, conspirators, laying claim to world dominance, demonic/diabolic, destructive, traitors, loan-sharks, warriors. As a first glance, competence and warmth dimensions differentiated among five clusters that meaningfully and reliably accounted for the 53 categories.

Comparing the five clusters' centroids (see Table 1), results showed that Cluster 4 was the cluster with the highest competence ratings ($M = 7.36$, $SD = 0.51$) and differed significantly from all the other clusters on this dimension ($M_s = 3.99 - 5.56$, $ps < .01$). Cluster 5 had the lowest warmth rating ($M = 2.90$, $SD = 0.61$) and differed significantly on this dimension from Clusters 1, 2, and 4 ($M_s = 4.56 - 5.53$, $ps < .001$). With the exception of Cluster 2, paired *t*-tests constantly revealed a significant difference between competence and warmth within clusters $t_s > 5.56$, $ps < .01$). Interestingly, four clusters out of five scored higher on competence than on warmth, but this matters less than the clusters' standing on each dimension, relative to other groups.

SCM hypothesizes four types of prejudice arising from the combination of the socio-structural factors: Two types are defined as non-ambivalent, and two as ambivalent (low ratings on one dimension—either warmth or competence—coupled with high ratings on the other). As noted, Cluster 4 was the highest on competence and medium on warmth: High-High-Competence/Medium-Warmth (HHC/MW; competence $M = 7.36$, $SD = 0.51$; warmth $M = 5.15$, $SD = 0.48$). Cluster 1 scored lower but still high on competence ($M = 6.30$, $SD = 0.42$) and even more so than on warmth ($M = 5.53$, $SD = 0.58$; see Table 1 for significance of within-cluster comparisons). However, the warmth mean was high too and above the neutral point of the scale. Hence, this cluster could be seen as HC-HW. Both are unambivalently high on both dimensions.

On the contrary end were the unambivalently low clusters. Cluster 2, although low on both dimensions, scored higher on warmth ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 0.51$) than on competence ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 0.74$). This cluster could be seen as LC-MW. Cluster 3 is LC-LW (competence $M = 4.34$, $SD = 0.53$; warmth $M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.46$).

Finally, only one truly ambivalent cluster appears: Cluster 5 is HC-LLW (competence $M = 5.56$, $SD = 0.50$; warmth $M = 2.90$, $SD = 0.61$). Hence, the traits included in each cluster give rise to both ambivalent and non-ambivalent stereotype contents when used to describe social groups as hypothesized by SCM, although in this setting, no clusters appeared as high warmth, low competence.

Discussion

Study 2 supported our interpretation of the Study 1 data. In fact, the categories emerging from Study 1 were judged to express competence and warmth by independent judges. Furthermore, categories clustered in ways that were similar to the group descriptions found in Study 1. Cluster 1 (HC-HW) and Cluster 4 (HHC-MW) comprised nearly all the positive categories used by *La Difesa della Razza* to describe the ingroup (humane, Mediterranean, artists; Cluster 1) and its ideal group—the Aryans (e.g., hard-working, strong/proud, intelligent; Cluster 4). Indeed, the clusters' means are high on both dimensions, as in the admiration stereotype. With reference to the traits included in Cluster 1, recent studies (see Volpato et al., 2007) illustrate how these features still characterize the self-stereotype held by Italians. However, some traits differed from those used by *La Difesa della Razza* to describe the ingroup, such as “oriental,” “faithful to their nature,” “sarcastic,” “influential.” These categories were used by the Fascist magazine to describe the Jews, and they were probably used to increase the perception of threat coming from such a group, portrayed as extremely competent, but lacking in warmth. In fact, participants rated the aforementioned categories as competence-related traits (see Appendix B). In today's language, these are traits that individuals could use to describe their ingroup—with the exception of “oriental”—because, when extracted from the context where we found them, they are indeed positive terms. “Oriental” probably evoked the Asians, stereotyped as very competent (see Fiske et al., 2002; Lee & Fiske, 2006).

Cluster 2 (LC-MW) grouped together many traits used to depict Blacks and Half-Castes (e.g., weak, mediocre, stupid), and interestingly, “Christians” was among these terms. However, looking at the means reported in Appendix B, this “Christian” category itself did not significantly differ from the neutral point of the scale in both conditions. Hence, no derogation was associated with this term by our participants. Cluster 2 also included a few traits used by the Fascist magazine to describe the Jewish group, namely, “enjoy favoritism,” “do not have their own civilization,” “nomadic,” and “necromancers.” Despite the fact that these traits were rated as expressing low warmth (see Appendix B), this is the only cluster that scored higher on warmth than on competence (although not significantly). The overall results seem to place this LC-MW cluster in the contemptuous stereotypes but slightly toward the paternalistic ones, if there were any in this sample.

Nearly all the descriptive categories of Cluster 3 (LC-LW) and Cluster 5 (HC-LLW) were used by the Fascist magazine with reference to the Jewish and the English groups. The clusters' centroids scored higher on competence than on warmth, as in almost all the other stereotypes here. The interesting differences between these two clusters are worth noting because they differentiate on competence; the traits included in Cluster 3 were qualitatively different from those in Cluster 5. For instance, the low-low Cluster 3 includes some dehumanizing characteristics (e.g., abhorrent/repugnant, despised). Furthermore, all traits expressed both lack of warmth and some lack of competence (e.g., shirkers, cowards). Even if the difference between competence and warmth was significant within this cluster, these traits seemed to be particularly disparaging on both dimensions.

Cluster 5, instead, grouped together traits that denoted competence, ability, however aimed to damaging others (e.g., greedy, opportunists, spies, dishonest/corruptors). These categories probably served to increase the perception of threat coming from the Jews and the English. “Warriors” is among these traits: Despite the fact that being a warrior was considered as positive and desirable by the Fascist and Nazi régimes, currently it is not necessarily a positive feature to attribute to the ingroup (as it was done by *La Difesa della Razza*). It is likely that the trait “warriors,” included in Cluster 5, evoked its synonym “soldiers” in our participants. This is probably the reason why we found this trait in the HC-LLW cluster.

Study 2 not only supported our interpretation of Study 1 results in terms of competence and warmth, but it showed, furthermore, that many traits used by the Fascist magazine could be used today in a similar way.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present study is a piece of psychosocial research conducted on archival data, indicating that this type of data can further our understanding of intergroup relationships. Moreover, our main goal was reached, in that the results fit the SCM, showing its strength in interpreting intergroup dynamics, even when looking at the past. In fact, SCM proved to be a satisfactory theoretical framework for interpreting our results.

A recently developed model, the BIAS Map (Behaviors from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes; Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007; see also Cuddy et al., 2008) seems relevant to the final discussion of the present work. The BIAS map is a structural map of negative and positive discriminatory behavioral tendencies and of their associated stereotypes, emotions and social structural relations. The model identifies four patterns of discrimination that are the result of the combination of two bipolar dimensions, active/passive and facilitation/harm. These are considered the basic dimensions according to the literatures on aggression (Buss, 1961) and on interdependence (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) respectively. The patterns are active facilitation, passive facilitation, active harm, and passive harm. Cuddy et al. (2007) hypothesize that each combination of warmth and competence is associated with specific intergroup behavioral tendencies; warmth is considered the stereotypical trait responsible for active facilitation and harm, whereas competence triggers passive facilitation and harm.

Working on historical archives also implies that the behavioral consequences of certain stereotypes can be considered, because these consequences are known. Thus, it is possible to link our findings to the BIAS Map, although in a speculative way.

It is plausible to say that in our data admiration led to both active and passive facilitation between Italians and Aryans (passive association and cooperation, active helping and protection). The images of these groups conveyed by *La Difesa della Razza* were functional to the Fascist régime's policy: These representations fit the régime's plan of constructing and reinforcing the Italian collective identity. It is important to point out that one of Mussolini's main goals was to incorporate the "Italian race" among those races considered as physically and psychologically superior (see Volpato, 2000).

As illustrated above, the targets of envious prejudice were the Jews and the English. According to historians, Italians did not have strong anti-Semitic feelings (Arendt, 1963; De Felice, 1988; Sarfatti, 2000). In Italy the Jews were a very small group (in the 1930s they were around 45 000, namely, 1% of the Italian population). They were a well-educated, wealthy and an influent minority. Indeed, in the first 20 years of the XX century, one prime minister and several ministers and mayors (e.g., Ernesto Nathan, mayor of Rome from 1907 to 1913) were Jews. Thus, the régime needed to create and spread a prejudice against the Jews in order to justify their persecution, which started in the Fall 1938, after the alliance with Hitler. To remove the Jews from Italian society, the perception of threat needed to be increased. In fact, in our data, the Jews were identified as the enemy, i.e., a powerful and subtle minority, able to destroy the national community, and, most importantly, lacking in warmth. According to the BIAS Map, the absence of warmth links to active forms of harm: The Jews' genocide during WWII is probably the most extreme form of active harm, and the Fascist régime was actively involved in the deportation of the Italian Jews to concentration camps.

Concerning the English, they were seen as military and politically competent, as much as lacking in warmth. There was a hostile relationship between Italians and English people from 1938 to 1943, and the active harm on the battlefields seems to confirm the predictions of the BIAS Map once more.

The French, Half-Castes, and Blacks seemed to be targets of contempt. The contemptuous attitude toward the French group reflected the perception of their political and military weakness, along with their “promiscuity” with the non-white races. This attitude prepared and sustained the aggression that took place 10 June 1940, when Italy declared war on France, which was already exhausted by the Nazi army. Once again, the absence of warmth led to active harm.

The contempt we found in Study 1 toward Half-Castes and Blacks is also linked to history. As mentioned above, conversely to what was expected, no paternalistic prejudice appeared toward these groups. It is worth noting that a paternalistic attitude was expressed by the first generation of colonialists. Before the Fascist era, paternalism was the predominant attitude: It revolved around the “white man’s burden” ideology, which attributed European superiority to cultural elements rather than to biological reasons, implying its relative and thus modifiable nature. The privileged target of paternalism were African women, whose image, in line with the “porno-tropics tradition” (McClintock, 1995), was based on savage and sexual dimensions. This image was conveyed by the media in order to encourage the migration of Italian workers to the colonial territory. This kind of propaganda emphasized the *madamato*, that is, the concubinage between Italian men and African women, in other words, “a domestic arrangement based on sexual service and gender inequalities” (Stoler, 1991, p. 60; see also Barrera, 1996, 2002).

After the Ethiopian invasion, the Italian Fascist régime abandoned the paternalistic attitude, adopting a blatant racist policy. The racial legislation began in 1937 with a decree outlawing “relations of a conjugal nature” between Italian men and African women. Therefore, the *madamato* became a crime, it was forbidden to legalize children that were born from a liaison between “empire citizens” and “subjects,” and apartheid was established. Beside the alliance with the Nazis, which imposed the end of the inter-racial tolerance, this change was also due to the need to justify the invasion of Ethiopia considered to be a new land for poor Italian farmers (Volpato, 2008). In fact, Italian colonialism has been defined as a “demographic imperialism” (Labanca, 2002). It began rather late and was very brief: Italy was the last European country to try establishing a colonial empire, although very limited in time (60 years, from the end of the XIX century up till WWII), and space (Libya, Somalia, Ethiopia, and Eritrea). Its main goal was, indeed, to find a way out for excessive Italian man power. For this reason, Italians had no interest in exploiting the native people, a situation that could have led to slavery, which can be considered as the most meaningful example of paternalism. Note that, after the racial legislation, the Fascist régimes, perhaps like other authoritarian régimes, proved incapable of pity toward any outgroups. Instead, as colonialists, Italians perceived the native people as competitors for the resources of the African territory.

The contemptuous prejudice was the ideological pivot of these kind of politics. It was the expression of the belief that European superiority was based on an unchangeable biological determinism. *La Difesa della Razza*, founded in 1938, reflected this new political trend, therefore, not conceding any space to paternalistic attitudes. The forms of active harm enacted by Italians in the colonies (massacres, mass exterminations, deporting; see Del Boca, 1992, 2005) support the BIAS Map hypothesis concerning low warmth and active harm.

However, the absence of paternalism is an interesting finding, which could be further investigated in future studies. For instance, was the Fascist régimes documented lack of pity an idiosyncratic attribute of this particular régime? Or is it a typical feature of totalitarian régimes in general, which, in order to endure and to justify the system (Jost & Banaji, 1994), need to make intergroup boundaries impermeable (see Social Identity Theory (SIT); Tajfel, 1981) using ideologies based on univalent attitudes (e.g., contempt)? Furthermore, paternalistic ideologies are most likely to be employed in situations in which the social system is relatively stable, while, when stability breaks down, other forms of social control are needed (Jackman, 1994). In the present work, we analyzed texts written between 1938 and 1943, hence, in a situation of dramatic change: The stability in Italy was undermined both at a national and at international levels (e.g., the Ethiopian war, the anti-Semitic campaign; the alliance with the Nazis, the planning of WWII, respectively). Further research in situations of stability could help to understand the way paternalistic ideologies work with regard to totalitarian régimes.

Finally, it is worth noting that our results fit the stereotype functions as proposed by Tajfel (1981). According to the author, stereotypes serve to reinforce ingroup identity in an uncertain and difficult situation. They also serve to justify discriminatory and violent ingroup behaviors. Finally, Tajfel talks about social causation in terms of a need to comprehend “complex, and usually distressful, large scale social events” (Tajfel, 1981, p. 156). In such cases, facts are often explained on the basis of the spread of perverse beliefs (i.e., stereotypes), considered to be the cause of the event and, at the same time, to be explanations for everything that took place during the event. The content of the articles analyzed in the present work supported the existence of these needs. It would seem that insecure social identities were at work, leading the articles’ authors to engage in several comparisons with derogated groups in order to positively differentiate their ingroup. Besides the need to reinforce the ingroup image, and the need to justify violent behaviors perpetrated in the colonies and on the battlefield, the stereotypes conveyed by *La Difesa della Razza* helped Italians to make sense of complex events they were dealing with, such as the international isolation following the invasion of Ethiopia, the alliance with Nazi Germany, and the preparation of—and intervention in—WWI. Stereotypes thus helped to shift the blame on outgroups. Furthermore, the uncritical positive ingroup descriptions, in contrast to the uncritical negative outgroups ones found in the Fascist magazine, seemed to justify the system (Jost & Banaji, 1994): They served the régime to address critiques and protests outside, and to maintain the status quo inside. Additionally, they served as legitimizing myths for the group dominance hierarchy that Fascism endorsed (see Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

In conclusion, both the SCM and the BIAS Map based their predictions on the socio-structural factors. In previous studies, the SCM framework has proved to be applicable across cultures, predicting how groups are likely to be stereotyped on the basis of the structural relations with other groups in their society (Cuddy et al., 2009). Applying the same systematic framework to historical data provided a further contribution to the model: The SCM principles apply across history and politics.

REFERENCES

- Alexander MG, Brewer MB, Herrmann RK. Images and affect: A functional analysis of outgroup stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1999; 77:78–93.
- Altemeyer, B. *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 1988.
- Arendt, H. *Eichmann in Jerusalem. A report on the banality of evil*. New York: The Viking Press; 1963.

- Bakeman, R.; Gottman, JM. Observing interaction. An introduction to sequential analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1986.
- Barrera, G. Program of African Studies Working Papers 1. Evanston: Northwestern University; 1996. Dangerous liaisons: Colonial concubinage in Eritrea (1890–1941).
- Barrera, G. Colonial affairs: Italian men, Eritrean women and construction of racial hierarchies in colonial Eritrea (1885– 1941). Evanston: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University; 2002.
- Bar-Tal, D. Delegitimization: The extreme case of stereotyping and prejudice. In: Bar-Tal, D.; Graumann, CF.; Kruglanski, AW.; Stroebe, W., editors. Stereotyping and prejudice. Changing conceptions. New York: Springer-Verlag; 1989. p. 169-182.
- Bar-Tal, D. Group beliefs. A conception for analyzing group structure, processes, and behavior. New York: Springer-Verlag; 1990.
- Benzécri, J-P. L'analyse des données. L'analyse des correspondances. Vol. Vol. 2. Paris: Dunod; 1980.
- Brown R, ehajic S. Dealing with the past and facing the future: Mediators of the effects of collective guilt and shame in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 2008; 38:669–684.
- Brown R, González R, Zagefka H, Manzi J, ehajic S. Nuestra culpa: Collective guilt and shame as predictors of reparation for historical wrongdoing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2008; 94:75–90. [PubMed: 18179319]
- Browning, C. *Ordinary men: Reserve police batallion 101 and the final solution in Poland*. New York: Harper Collins; 1992.
- Buss, AH. The psychology of aggression. New York: Wiley; 1961.
- Capozza D, Volpato C. Warmth and competence dimensions in Hitler's Mein Kampf. 2009 Manuscript, under review.
- Caprariello PA, Cuddy AJC, Fiske ST. Social structure shapes cultural stereotypes and emotions: A causal test of the Stereotype Content Model. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*. 2009; 12:147–155.
- Clausen, SE. *Applied correspondence analysis*. An introduction. London: Sage; 1998.
- Cohen J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 1960; 20:37–46.
- Cuddy AJC, Fiske ST, Glick P. Behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes: The BIAS Map. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2007; 92:631–648. [PubMed: 17469949]
- Cuddy, AJC.; Fiske, ST.; Glick, P. Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The Stereotype Content Model and the BIAS Map. In: Zanna, MP., editor. *Advances in experimental social psychology*. Vol. Vol. 40. New York: Academic Press; 2008. p. 61-149.
- Cuddy AJC, Fiske ST, Kwan VSY, Glick P, Demoulin S, Leyens JPh, et al. Stereotype content model across cultures: Towards universal similarities and some differences. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 2009; 48:1–33. [PubMed: 19178758]
- Del Boca, A. L'Africa nella coscienza degli italiani. Miti, memorie, errori, sconfitte. Roma-Bari: Laterza; 1992.
- Del Boca, A. Italiani, brava gente?. Vicenza: Neri Pozza Editore; 2005.
- De Felice, R. Storia degli ebrei italiani sotto il fascismo. Torino: Einaudi; 1988.
- Doosje B, Branscombe NR, Spears R, Manstead ASR. Guilt by association: one's group has a negative history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1998; 75:872–886.
- Faloppa, F. Parole contro. La rappresentazione del «diverso» nella lingua italiana e nei dialetti. Milano: Garzanti; 2004.
- Fiske ST, Cuddy AC, e Glick P. Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2007; 11:77–83. [PubMed: 17188552]
- Fiske ST, Cuddy AC, Glick P, Xu J. A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2002; 82:878–902. [PubMed: 12051578]
- Fleiss, JL. Statistical methods for rates and proportions. New York: Wiley; 1981.

- Friedländer, S. Nazi Germany and the Jews. The years of persecution, 1933–1939. New York: Harper Collins; 1997.
- Gergen KJ. Social psychology as history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1973; 26:309–320.
- Gergen, MM.; Gergen, KJ. Historical social psychology. Hillsdale: Erlbaum; 1984.
- Glick, P. Choice of scapegoats. In: Dovidio, JF.; Glick, P.; Rudman, LA., editors. *On the nature of prejudice: 50 years after Allport*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing; 2005. p. 244–261.
- Graumann, CF.; Gergen, KJ. Historical dimensions of psychological discourse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1996.
- Greenacre, M.; Blasius, J., editors. *Correspondence analysis in the social sciences. Recent developments and applications*. London: Academic Press; 1994.
- Goldhagen, DJ. *Hitler's willing executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. New York: Knopf; 1996.
- Holsti, OR. *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading: Addison-Wesley; 1969.
- Jost JT, Banaji MR. The role of stereotyping in system-justification and production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 1994; 33:1–27.
- Kennedy, R. *Nigger: The stranger career of a troublesome word*. New York: Pantheon Books; 2002.
- Krippendorff, K. *Content analysis. An introduction to its methodology*. London: Sage; 1980.
- Labanca, N. *Oltremare. Storia dell'espansione coloniale italiana*. Bologna: Il Mulino; 2002.
- Lee TL, Fiske ST. Not an outgroup, not yet an ingroup: Immigrants in the stereotype content model. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2006; 30:751–768.
- Liu JH, Goldstein-Hawes R, Hilton D, Huang LL, Gastardo-Conaco C, Dresler-Hawke E, et al. Social representations of events and people in world history across 12 cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2005; 36:171–191.
- Liu JH, Wilson MS, McClure J, Higgins TR. Social identity and the perception of history: Cultural representations of Aotearoa/New Zealand. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 1999; 29:1021–1047.
- McClintock, A. *Imperial leather. Race, gender and sexuality in the colonial context*. London: Routledge; 1995.
- McGuire WJ. Historical comparison: Testing psychological hypotheses with cross-era data. *International Journal of Psychology*. 1976; 11:161–183.
- McGuire WJ. Use of historical data in psychology: Comments on Münsterberg (1899). *Psychological Review*. 1994; 101:243–247.
- McGuire WJ. Creative hypothesis generating in psychology: Some useful heuristics. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 1997; 48:1–30.
- Oldmeadow J, Fiske ST. System-justifying ideologies moderate status ¼ competence stereotypes: Roles for beliefs in a just world and social dominance orientation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 2007; 37:1135–1148.
- Philogène, G. *From Black to African American. A new social representation*. London: Praeger; 1999.
- Russell AM, Fiske ST. It's all relative: Competition and status drive interpersonal perception. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 2008; 38:1193–1201.
- Sani F, Bowe M, Herrera M, Manna C, Cossa T, Miao X, et al. Perceived collective continuity: Seeing groups as entities that move through time. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 2007; 37:1118–1134.
- Sarfatti, M. *Gli Ebrei nell'Italia fascista. Vicende, identità, persecuzione*. Torino: Einaudi; 2000.
- Sibley CG, Liu JH, Duckitt J, Khan SS. Social representations of history and the legitimization of social inequality: The form and function of historical negation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 2008; 38:542–565.
- Sidanius, J.; Pratto, F. *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. NY: Cambridge University Press; 1999.
- Simonton, DK. *Psychology, science, and history. An introduction to historiometry*. New Haven: Yale University Press; 1990.

- Simonton, DK. Historiometric methods in social psychology. In: Stroebe, W.; Hewstone, M., editors. *European review of social psychology*. Vol. 9. Chichester: Wiley; 1998. p. 267-293.
- Simonton DK. Qualitative and quantitative analyses of historical data. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2003; 54:617–640.
- Smith, CP. Content analysis and narrative analysis. In: Reis, HT.; Judd, CM., editors. *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2000. p. 313-335.
- Staub, E. *The roots of evil. The origins of genocide and other group violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1989.
- Stoler, AL. Carnal knowledge and imperial power. In: di Leonardo, M., editor. *Gender at the crossroad of knowledge*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 1991. p. 51-101.
- Tajfel, HC. *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1981.
- Thibaut, JW.; Kelley, HH. *The social psychology of groups*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers; 1959.
- Volpato C. Italian race psychology during Fascism. *European Bulletin of Social Psychology*. 2000; 12:4–13.
- Volpato, C. Sexual abuse and colonization. The Italian case study: Psychosocial perspectives. In: Bianchi, B., editor. *Case Studies*; Venice, Italy. Symposium conducted at the International Conference on Mass Rape in the 20th Century: The Feminist Studies on Gender, Nation and Militarism; Oct. 2008
- Volpato, C.; Cantone, A. Un tout-autre: Le colonisé. Une étude de la délégitimation dans la presse fasciste. In: Sanchez-Mazas, M.; Licata, L., editors. *L'Autre: Regards psychosociaux*. Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble; 2005. p. 211-240.
- Volpato C, Contarello A. Towards a social psychology of extreme situations: Primo Levi's If This is a Man and Social Identity Theory. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 1999; 29:239–258.
- Volpato C, Durante F. Delegitimization and racism. The social construction of anti-semitism in Italy. *New Review of Social Psychology*. 2003; 2:286–296.
- Volpato C, Durante F. Empowering the Jews threat. The Protocols of the Elders of Zion. *Journal of US-China Public Administration*. 2009; 6:23–36.
- Volpato C, Durante F, Cantone A. “Popolo di poeti, di artisti, di eroi, di navigatori...” “Lo stereotipo dell’italiano in epoca fascista. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*. 2007; 34:851–875.
- Wrightsmann, LS.; Deaux, K. *Social psychology in the 80s*. Monterey: Brooks/Cole; 1981.
- Yzerbyt VY, Corneille O, Estrada C. The interplay of subjective essentialism and entitativity in the formation of stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2001; 5:141–155.

APPENDIX A

Correspondence analysis, Study 1

	Dim 1 (Inertia% = 36.7)			Dim 2 (Inertia% = 21.8)			Dim 3 (Inertia% = 15.4)			Dim 4 (Inertia% = 10.5)			Dim 5 (Inertia% = 10.4)			Dim 6 (Inertia% = 5.2)		
	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²
Italians	1.094	.500	.958	-.152	.013	.014	-.031	.001	.000									
Jews	-.952	.265	.583	-.286	.033	.043	-.899	.388	.356									
Blacks	-.464	.018	.044	1.921	.400	.577				-.1278	.257	.176	-.1278	.257	.176			
Half-Castes	-.610	.029	.082	1.474	.219	.372				2.148	.676	.543	2.148	.676	.543			
English	-.1074	.105	.215	-.1626	.313	.380												
Aryans	1.018	.054	.297													2.548	.897	.698
French										-.2803	.788	.725						
Artists	1.110	.031	.989															
Cheerful	.926	.003	.947	1.39	.001	.016	.091	.009	.006									
Crucifiers	-.969	.005	.700	-.301	.001	.052	-.430	.002	.089									
Dishonest, corruptors	-.933	.016	.726	.009	.000	.000	-.483	.006	.126									
Strong, proud, noble	.031	.031	.978	-.068	.000	.004	-.075	.000	.004									
Warriors, brave	.968	.016	.957	.007	.000	.000	.021	.000	.000									
Independent, out the invaders	1.188	.003	.814	-.214	.000	.020	-.052	.000	.001									
Pure race	1.136	.022	.963	-.246	.001	.035	.016	.000	.000									
Multiform race	1.188	.002	.814	-.214	.000	.020	-.052	.000	.001									
Exploited by Jews	.172	.002	.842	-.199	.000	.019	-.027	.000	.000									
Humane	1.188	.004	.814	-.214	.000	.020	-.052	.000	.001									
Time-honored race	1.185	.032	.912	-.211	.001	.022	-.046	.000	.001									
Of Aryan race	1.106	.021	.796	-.235	.001	.028	.039	.000	.001									
Beautiful territory	1.188	.012	.814	-.214	.001	.020	-.052	.000	.001									
Positive psychological characteristics	.982	.031	.980	-.076	.000	.005	-.002	.000	.000									
Positive social characteristics	.920	.014	.831	.009	.000	.000	-.016	.000	.000									
Roman spirit	1.188	.019	.814	-.214	.001	.020	-.052	.000	.001									
Christians	1.185	.021	.910	-.211	.001	.022	-.047	.000	.001									
Race consciousness and pride in race	1.178	.007	.970	-.205	.000	.023	-.037	.000	.001									
Different colonization	1.188	.003	.814	-.214	.000	.020	-.052	.000	.001									
Different from other people (Arabs, Slavs, French, Greek, Chinese, Russian, Germans)	1.188	.049	.814	-.214	.002	.020	-.052	.000	.001									
European	1.188	.004	.814	-.214	.000	.020	-.052	.000	.001									
Hard-working	1.179	.080	.976	-.206	.000	.023	-.038	.000	.001									
Intelligent	1.049	.027	.927	-.157	.001	.016	-.100	.000	.005									
Allied to the Germans	1.188	.010	.814	-.214	.000	.020	-.052	.000	.001									

	Dim 1 (inertia% = 36.7)			Dim 2 (inertia% = 21.8)			Dim 3 (inertia% = 15.4)			Dim 4 (inertia% = 10.5)			Dim 5 (inertia% = 10.4)			Dim 6 (inertia% = 5.2)		
	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²
Mediterranean	1.036	.005	.741	-1.137	.000	.010	.089	.000	.004									
Pioneers, travelers	1.184	.009	.924	-2.111	.000	.023	-.046	.000	.001									
Carriers of civilization, civil supremacy	1.180	.014	.975	-.207	.001	.023	.040	.000	.001									
United	1.188	.011	.814	-.214	.000	.020	-.052	.000	.001									
Charged with misdeeds	-1.007	.009	.703	-.642	.005	.221												
Greedy, money-maker, rapacious	-.998	.010	.723	-.569	.004	.182												
Opportunists, schemers, profiteers	-1.009	.013	.499	-1.073	.019	.436												
Capitalists, loan-sharks	-1.072	.110	.471	-1.184	.017	.443												
Collaborate with democracies	-1.069	.002	.486	-1.158	.003	.439												
Conspirators, subverters	-1.056	.007	.561	-.999	.080	.387												
Lay claim to world dominance	-.378	.003	.188	-.817	.016	.677												
Judases	-1.034	.034	.644	-.801	.026	.298												
Complaining, meek	-.825	.003	.438	.756	.004	.284												
Miserable, dark	-.742	.004	.253	1.272	.140	.574												
Hate Rome and the Rome-Berlin axis	-1.032	.010	.635	-.764	.007	.269												
Negative physical characteristics	-.365	.003	.045	1.628	.080	.742												
Stupid	-.533	.003	.046	2.206	.074	.607												
Rich, financially powerful	-1.004	.004	.371				-1.510	.013	.542									
Cunning, shrewd	-.976	.004	.430				-1.380	.011	.555									
Moral and intellectual prisoners, waste	-1.022	.003	.503				-1.020	.005	.323									
Commit "Jewisms" (ebreat)	-1.004	.002	.371				-1.510	.007	.542									
Lower-class biological components	-1.004	.001	.371				-1.510	.005	.542									
Communists, Bolsheviks	-.974	.006	.555				-.917	.008	.319									
Demonic, diabolic	-.956	.002	.452				1.287	.006	.530									
Shirkers	-1.004	.003	.371				-1.510	.011	.542									
Devious, insidious	-1.004	.011	.371				-1.510	.039	.542									
Influent	-1.004	.004	.371				-1.510	.013	.542									
British	-1.004	.006	.371				-1.510	.022	.542									
Instill hatred towards Aryans	-1.004	.004	.371				-1.510	.015	.542									
Manipulative	-1.016	.009	.457				-1.195	.020	.408									
Materialists	-.962	.008	.636				-.690	.006	.211									
Deny positive value, morals and God	-.928	.010	.589				-.880	.014	.342									
Necromancers	-1.004	.002	.371				-1.510	.007	.542									
Nomadic	-1.004	.002	.371				-1.510	.006	.542									
Enemies of Fascism	-1.025	.003	.517				-.958	.004	.293									

	Dim 1 (Inertia% = 36.7)			Dim 2 (Inertia% = 21.8)			Dim 3 (Inertia% = 15.4)			Dim 4 (Inertia% = 10.5)			Dim 5 (Inertia% = 10.4)			Dim 6 (Inertia% = 5.2)		
	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²
Do not have their own civilization	-.985	.003	.433				-1.211	.008	.424									
Do not integrate	-1.004	.003	.371				-1.510	.009	.542									
Despised	-1.004	.001	.371				-1.510	.005	.542									
Enjoy favoritism	-1.004	.002	.371				-1.510	.008	.542									
Levantine, Oriental	-.839	.006	.321				-1.393	.025	.572									
Dangerous, are a scourge	-.962	.009	.618				-.784	.009	.265									
Mediocre	-1.004	.001	.371				-1.510	.005	.542									
Sarcastic	-1.004	.003	.371				-1.510	.010	.542									
Faithful to their nature	-1.004	.003	.371				-1.510	.010	.542									
Traitors, disloyal	-.988	.003	.577				-.967	.005	.357									
Spies	-1.004	.002	.371				-1.510	.006	.542									
Foreign	-1.004	.002	.371				-1.510	.008	.542									
Fight for egalitarianism with destructive aims	-1.004	.001	.371				-1.510	.003	.542									
Cowards	-.989	.004	.424				-1.275	.011	.456									
Destructive, damage others				1.268	.037	.230							2.557	.216	.642	3.600	.270	.784
Weak				2.217	.085	.528							-1.625	.066	.195	1.879	.037	.490
Abhorrent, repugnant				1.432	.043	.212							3.132	.301	.697	1.661	.173	.440
Physically different				1.091	.009	.415							-1.327	.019	.423	-.607	.009	.231
Harmonious	1.143	.010	.211													1.337	.000	.346
They fight the Jews	1.160	.004	.499													1.439	.090	.358
They differ from Jews	1.130	.030	.543													1.486	.013	.374
Physically and psychologically homogeneous	.546	.003	.500													1.879	.018	.490
Nationalistic	1.108	.003	.634															
Superior	1.165	.022	.627															
Nordic	1.164	.003	.613															
Sense of honor	1.160	.003	.499															
Bourgeois	-1.004	.003	.371				-1.510	.009	.542									
Close to the English	-1.004	.006	.371				-1.510	.022	.542									
Abandonment of the race's dignity				1.436	.015	.275	2.452	.015	.549									
Decadent							1.527	.020	.261				-1.555	.007	.183			
Enemies of the Italians	-.972	.003	.478										-1.896	.036	.323			
Cross-bred, heterogeneous race	-.935	.013	.340										-1.247	.022	.422			
Empty													-1.711	.078	.609			
Celtic													-4.251	.044	.842			
Infertile													-5.681	.196	.829			
													-3.580	.117	.700			

	Dim 1 (inertia % = 36.7)			Dim 2 (inertia % = 21.8)			Dim 3 (inertia % = 15.4)			Dim 4 (inertia % = 10.5)			Dim 5 (inertia % = 10.4)			Dim 6 (inertia % = 5.2)		
	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²	Coord	Contr	Cos ²
Negative political ideas							1.371	.015	.150	-3.319	.10	.731						

APPENDIX B

Means, standard deviations, and mean differences of categories of analysis as a function of competence vs. warmth condition, Study 2

Categories	Competence condition		Warmth condition		Mean Differences
	M	SD	M	SD	
Mediterranean	5.85***	1.56	6.48***	1.47	-0.625*
Cheerful	5.50	1.89	4.79	1.79	0.708
Warriors	6.29***	1.80	4.02***	1.60	2.271***
Independent	7.88***	1.04	4.94	1.48	2.938***
Strong, proud	6.94***	1.62	4.92	1.60	2.021***
Intelligent	7.96***	1.41	5.67***	1.46	2.292***
Humane	6.72***	1.68	6.40***	1.72	0.328
European	6.38***	1.28	5.83***	1.21	0.550*
Hard-working	7.02***	1.63	5.65**	1.49	1.375***
United	6.94***	1.63	6.33***	1.26	0.604*
Crucifiers	4.58	1.96	3.73***	1.23	0.854*
Dishonest, corruptors	5.60	2.29	2.73***	1.61	2.875***
Materialists	5.56*	1.82	4.06***	1.60	1.500***
Dangerous	5.06	1.96	3.60***	1.62	1.468***
Deny positive values	4.38*	1.84	2.85***	1.22	1.529***
Traitors, disloyal	5.06	2.28	2.31***	1.15	2.751***
Moral and intellectual poisoners	5.13	2.13	2.63***	1.28	2.500***
Manipulative	6.48***	2.25	3.15***	1.90	3.333***
Cowards	3.71***	2.06	2.94***	1.29	0.771*
Cunning, shrewd	7.00***	1.77	4.58***	1.58	2.417***
Do not have their own civilization	4.52	2.10	4.27***	1.47	0.250***
Demonic, diabolic	5.08	2.22	2.50***	1.54	2.583***
Oriental	6.17***	1.48	5.06	1.69	1.104**
Rich	5.75**	1.51	4.71	1.65	1.042**
Shirkers	4.49	2.05	3.54***	1.40	0.947*
Devious, insidious	5.26	2.35	2.67***	1.51	2.589***
Influential	6.40***	2.04	5.23	1.72	1.167**
Necromancers	5.06	2.24	4.38**	1.48	0.688
Nomadic	4.29*	2.03	4.08***	1.54	0.208
Do not integrate	3.60***	1.97	3.02***	1.38	0.583
Despised	5.00	1.96	3.38***	1.41	1.625***
Enjoy favouritism	4.29*	2.35	4.44*	1.70	-0.146
Mediocre	3.77***	1.82	4.65*	1.19	-0.875**
Sarcastic	6.13***	1.57	5.23	1.55	0.896**
Faithful to their nature	6.63***	1.67	5.69***	1.26	0.938**
Spies	6.29***	2.38	3.56***	1.66	2.729***
Foreign	5.92***	1.53	5.48*	1.37	0.438

Categories	Competence condition		Warmth condition		Mean Differences
	M	SD	M	SD	
Destructive, damage others	4.56	2.34	2.33***	1.28	2.229***
Stupid	2.58***	1.92	5.00	1.19	-2.417***
Weak	3.60***	1.99	5.38	1.58	-1.771***
Miserable	3.67***	1.93	3.90***	1.60	-0.229
Complaining	3.35***	1.79	4.19***	1.33	-0.833*
Greedy, money-maker	5.98**	2.37	2.92***	1.64	3.062***
Opportunist	5.35	2.57	2.92***	1.80	2.438***
Conspirators	5.42	2.43	2.60***	1.40	2.813***
Loan-sharks	5.40	2.56	1.98***	1.34	3.417***
Charged with misdeeds	4.40*	2.02	3.73***	1.50	0.667
Lay claim to world dominance	5.00	2.53	2.54***	1.40	2.458***
Artists	6.72***	1.92	5.75**	1.49	0.973**
Christians	4.81	1.79	5.28	1.69	-0.464
Pioneers	6.51***	1.90	4.98	1.38	1.532***
Carriers of civilization	6.54***	1.99	5.51*	1.52	1.031**
Abhorrent, repugnant	3.63***	2.14	3.06***	1.59	0.563

Note: Means presented are on a 9-step scale anchored by not at all (1) and very much (9). For all means reported in the table, the difference from the neutral point of the scale (5) was computed. Means differences (competence rating - warmth rating) are reported.

*
p < .05

**
p < .01

***
p < .001.

Figure 1.

Figure 2.
Five-cluster solution, Study 2

Table 1

Competence and warmth means for each cluster, Study 2

Clusters	Competence		Warmth	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Human, Mediterranean, European, artists, united, faithful to their nature, foreigners, carriers of civilizations, sarcastic, oriental, influential, cheerful, rich, pioneers	6.30 _d	0.42	5.53 _b	0.58
2. Weak, Christians, stupid, mediocre, necromancers, enjoy favoritisms, do not have their own civilization, complaining, nomadic, miserable	3.99 _c	0.74	4.56 _c	0.51
3. Crucifiers, dangerous, shirkers, despised, charged with misdeeds, abhorrent/repugnant, manipulative, do not integrate, deny positive values, cowards	4.34 _c	0.53	3.22 _a	0.46
4. Intelligent, hard-working, independents, strong/proud, cunning/shrewd	7.36 _a	0.51	5.15 _{bc}	0.48
5. Materialists, spies, opportunists, greedy, devious/insidious, moral and intellectual poisoners, dishonest/corruptors, conspirators, lay claim to world dominance, demonic/diabolic, destructive, traitors, loan-sharks, warriors	5.56 _b	0.50	2.90 _a	0.61

Note: Within each column and row, means that do not share a subscript differ significantly, $p < .01$.