Four Sub-Dimensions of Stereotype Content: Explanatory Evidence from Romania

Adrian Stanciu

Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences

Abstract

Extant research has focused on a two-dimensional structure of stereotypes wherein warmth and competence are relevant evaluative dimensions. Recently, researchers have theorized about more intricate structures (e.g., three- or four-dimensional; Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007). In the present paper we present two studies that use a data-driven approach to explore this possibility. Using student and non-student samples from a combined emic-etic study in Romania, a South-East European country formerly part of the Communist bloc, we found systematic evidence that warmth and competence stereotype dimensions contain two sub-dimensions each – *friendliness* and *trustworthiness* (warmth), and *conscientiousness* and *efficacy* (competence). By means of Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA), we show that models with four sub-dimensions fit the data better than two-dimensional models. Our findings contribute to the development of the Stereotype Content Model by allowing for more comprehensive evaluation of others.

Keywords: Stereotype Content Model, warmth, competence, sub-dimensions, combined emic-etic, Romania

There are two generally accepted dimensions of stereotype content: warmth and competence (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). However, recent research has suggested that the structure of stereotype content may be more intricate. One possibility is an additional and separate evaluative dimension, such as morality, loosely understood as what it means to be human (Leach et al., 2007; Vaes & Paladino, 2009). Another promising possibility is the existence of sub-dimensions within warmth and/or competence (Szymkow, Chandler, Ijzerman, Parzuchowski, & Wojciszke, 2013). For example, while terming warmth as communion and competence as agency, Szymkow and colleagues (2013) suggest that the former dimension may contain sociability and morality sub-dimensions, and the later dimension may contain competence and dynamism sub-dimensions. However, these efforts have been largely theoretical. We address this limitation using a data driven approach to explore whether warmth and competence dimensions can be broken down into distinct sub-dimensions in a combined emic-etic study design where indigenous in-depth information complements cross-culturally assessed information.

To explore the existence of sub-dimensions in the content of stereotypes, we conducted analyses on data sets collected in two studies in a culture that has been largely overlooked in this area: Romania. In the following sections we provide a brief theoretical background for the two-dimensional (warmth and competence) stereotype structures, evidence for three and four dimensions, and details about the studies. Finally, we describe our findings in terms of theoretical contributions to the field of stereotype content.

Warmth and Competence – A Brief Theoretical Background

Stereotypes represent beliefs about characteristics of members of social groups (Hilton & von Hippel, 1996). Stereotypes about certain groups are based on two evaluative factors – social relatedness and individual motivations (Abele & Wojciszke, 2013). According to the Stereotype Content Model (SCM), the evaluation of a group's social relatedness constitutes the warmth dimension of the stereotype, while the evaluations of individual group member's achievements form the competence dimension (Fiske et al., 2002). A social group is positively stereotyped when it is perceived to have both warmth and competence attributes (e.g., women, Fiske et al., 2002, Study 2). A social group is negatively stereotyped when it is perceived to lack both warmth and competence attributes (e.g., welfare recipients, Fiske et al., 2002, Study 2). Furthermore, the understanding of stereotypes in terms of warmth and competence has allowed for an explanation of less straightforward stereotypes – ambivalent stereotypes, which are simultaneously positive and negative. A group is ambivalently stereotyped when it is perceived to have warmth attributes but to lack competence attributes (e.g., elderly, Fiske et al., 2002, Study 2) or vice versa (e.g., rich, Fiske et al., 2002, Study 2).

Beyond Warmth and Competence - A Combined Emic-Etic Exploration

Recent research has suggested that the content of stereotypes may, in fact, have a more complex structure than the two dimensional model. For instance, Leach and colleagues (2007) suggested morality as a separate evaluative dimension of in-group stereotypes. Additionally, Brambilla, Rusconi, Sacchi and Cherubini (2011) have proposed morality as a sub-domain within the warmth dimension, along with sociability. Notably, Szymkow and colleagues (2013) have used experimental approaches to suggest that both warmth and competence stereotype dimensions may have sub-dimensions. Specifically, they describe sociability and morality attributes as sub-dimensions of warmth, and competence and dynamism (i.e., being active and persistent) as sub-dimensions of agency (the terms they use for competence).

Together, these studies have suggested that the content of stereotypes is structurally more intricate than previously thought. To the best of our knowledge, no study has empirically tested this hypothesis from a combined emic-etic approach (Cheung, van de Vijver, & Leong, 2011). Essentially, an emic-etic study is particularly valuable because it combines information from within culture (emic) and scientific information validated in other culture (etic).

The Present Studies

Social psychological research has been criticized for over relying on Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Developed samples (WEIRD, Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). To address this limitation and contribute to diverse research on the content of stereotypes, we focused on Romania, a South-East European country with a population of approximately 20 million (Institutul Național de Statistică, 2011). According to Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkow, 2010), Romanian culture can be described as accepting of hierarchical order, highly avoidant of uncertainty, collectivistic, highly cynical, valuing care for others and quality of life, and endorsing mixed impressions about the past and future. As a former communist state, Romania is at the right pole of the left-right political continuum, highly endorses religiosity (Voicu & Voicu, 2007) and authoritarianism (Gavreliuc, 2011) making the country a particularly interesting context to study stereotypes. To the best of our knowledge there is no published research on the content of stereotypes in Romania (Stanciu, Cohrs, Hanke, & Gavreliuc, 2015).

In the present studies, we apply combined emic-etic approach within Romanian samples to explore whether warmth and competence stereotype dimensions contain sub-dimensions. In Study 1, we explore whether four sub-dimension structure fits the data better than the currently accepted two-dimensional stereotype structure for two selected social groups. In Study 2, we replicate the Study 1 by extending it to 23 different social groups.

The studies we report here used data sets that were collected for the purpose of investigating whether there can be a within-culture variation in the content of stereotypes in Romania (Stanciu et al., 2015). The approach and the study design have allowed us to conduct the present exploration without overlapping with the goal of the studies by Stanciu

and colleagues (2015). For simplification purposes, in the remaining sections, we will refer to this study as the "initial" or "original" study.

Study 1

The present data was collected for the purpose of adapting stereotype content scales (two dimensions) in Romania. We selected the most frequently occurring warmth- and competence-related items from 14 different studies. In the item selection stage, we identified patterns of item loadings that were consistent with three and four dimension models of stereotype content (Leach et al., 2007; Szymkow et al., 2013). We therefore decided to systematically explore the possibility of a four sub-dimension structure of stereotype content. Using a series of Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) and Multi-Group Comparisons (MGC), we tested whether a four sub-dimension structure describe our data set better than a two dimensional structure (Schreiber, Stage, King, Nora, & Barlow, 2006).

Method

Participants and Procedure. Participants were 90 Romanian students and nonstudents from four cities (49% women) with an average age of M_{age} = 23.42 years (SD = 7.07) (see Table 1) recruited by research assistants within classrooms. The nonstudent participants were recruited either by student assistants or via a snow ball technique using students as the starting point. All participants were eligible for a chance to win a monetary reward of 20 Euro.

Measurement. From 14 different studies of stereotype content, Stanciu and colleagues (2015) identified the 22 most frequently reported warmth- and competence-related items. Prior to statistical analyses they translated the items and study instructions from English into Romanian by a) having two independent English-Romanian bilinguals making the translation from English into Romanian and b) having the principal investigator and a third bilingual referee back-translating from Romanian into English (Hambleton & Zeniski, 2010). Discrepancies between the forth- and back-translation were resolved by common agreement among translators. Using CFA, they identified 11 items that reliably measure warmth and competence stereotype dimensions in Romania. Based on that finding, in the present study, the warmth-related items were: *likeable, warm, amusing, good-natured, well-intentioned,* and *honest*. The competence-related items were: *competent, efficient, independent, conscientious,* and *organized*. Participants were asked to use these items to evaluate two randomly selected social groups (Romanians and old people) on a 5-point Likert scale (1 – *strongly disagree*, 5 – *strongly agree*). For example, "As viewed by today's Romanian society, Romanians are friendly".

Results

To examine whether warmth-related items and competence-related items pertain to distinct sub-dimensions, we performed a series of CFAs. The items were allowed to load as follows: good-natured, well-intended, and honest on the sub-

Table 1

Detailed Sample Descriptions, Study 1 and Study 2

			Study 1					Study 2			
	n	M_{age}	SD_{age}	% females	% non-students	n	M_{age}	SD_{age}	% females	% non-students	*Total* N
Bucharest	19	25.58	3.72	47.37	52.63	61	23.87	4.50	62.30	36.07	80
Iași	14	25.79	12.82	57.14	35.71	57	22.35	3.60	70.18	27.88	71
Timișoara	34	21.94	4.91	58.82	32.35	165	24.41	8.38	60.00	12.50	199
Tîrgu-Mureș	23	22.39	6.76	52.17	47.83	23	23.35	6.07	56.52	30.43	46
N	90	23.42	7.07	49.00	41.11	306	23.91	6.98	61.90	27.10	396

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation; Bucharest = located in the Center-South region, is the capital and largest city in Romania; Iași = largest city in the East region; Timișoara = largest city in the West region; Tîrgu-Mureș = middle size city in the Center-North region, has Hungarian ethnicity as the second largest ethnic group after Romanians (44.9 %)

Table 2

Descriptives for Stereotype Dimensions and Sub-dimensions, Study 1 and Study 2

Target group	Dimension	M (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Study 1	1.Warmth	3.16 (.76)	.81					
	2.Friendliness	3.22 (.88)	.87**	.73				
	3.Trustworthiness	3.09 (.87)	.87**	.52**	.79			
	4.Competence	2.78 (.76)	.59**	.51**	.53**	.76		
	5.Conscientiousness	2.88 (.90)	.55**	.38**	.59**	.77**	.75	
	6.Efficacy	2.71 (.89)	.47**	.47**	.35**	.90**	.43**	.69
Study 2	1.Warmth	3.03 (.03)	.93					
	2.Friendliness	3.05 (1.02)	.94**	.86				
	3.Trustworthiness	3.01 (1.06)	.95**	.79**	.92			
	4.Competence	2.98 (.93)	.74**	.71**	.69**	.89		
	5.Conscientiousness	3.00 (1.00)	.74**	.69**	.71**	.94**	.85	
	6.Efficacy	2.95 (.99)	.64**	.64**	.57**	.94**	.75**	.80

Note. All values are based on pooled data sets: Study 1 = pooled after two social groups, $N = 170$;
Study 2 = pooled after 23 social groups, $N = 6941$; ** = significant at $p < .05$;
Correlations = based on two-tailed tests; Scale reliabilities are on the main diagonals in italics;
M = mean; SD = standard deviation

dimension of trustworthiness; likeable, warm, and amusing on friendliness; competent, efficient, and independent on efficacy; and, conscientious and organized on conscientiousness. We allowed for all possible correlations among latent constructs and considered improvement in the goodness-of-fit indices of the four-dimension model relative to the two-component model. To assess model fit we examined Chi-Square (χ^2), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). We considered the following cut-points as evidence for satisfactory model fit: χ^2, $p > .05$; CFI > .95; RMSEA < .07; SRMR < .08 (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008). To assess the improvement in model fit from the two–component model to the four-component model (nested models), we examined the Chi-Square change (Dχ^2). We considered a significant Dχ^2 as evidence for improvement in model fit of the four sub-dimension model over the two dimension model (Kline, 2011, p.215).

     For "Old people", the four components model showed good fit, $\chi^2 (38) = 50.73$, $p = .08$; CFI = .96; RMSEA = .06; SRMR = .07; and had a significant improvement over the two components model, D$\chi^2(5) = 28.98$, $p < .001$. Similar patterns emerged for the evaluations of Romanians – the four latent construct had marginally satisfactory fit, $\chi^2 (38) = 66.74$, $p < .05$; CFI = .91; RMSEA = .10; SRMR = .05 and improvement over the two component model, D$\chi^2(5) = 28.47$, $p < .001$.

     To test the stability of the four sub-dimension structure across two social groups, we examined its metric and structural equivalence (e.g., van de Schoot, Lugtig, & Hox, 2012). A stable structure requires that factor loadings of the observed variables onto the hypothesized components as well as the covariances among components are the same across the groups. Formally, we examined the model with no equality constrains (configural model). We constrained the factor loadings to be equal across groups (metric model) and the covariances to be equal across the groups (structural model). We considered no improvement in the goodness-of-fit indices of the metric model relative to the configural model as evidence for metric equivalences; and no improvement in the goodness-of-fit indices of the structural model relative to the metric model as evidence for structural equivalence.

     The configural model showed satisfactory fit indices, $\chi^2(76) = 117.48$, $p < .05$; CFI = .94; RMSEA = .06. The metric model had good fit, $\chi^2(87) = 122.20$, $p < .05$; CFI = .95; RMSEA = .05 and good model comparison values, Dχ^2 (11) = 4.72, $p = .94$. These results implied that the factor loadings were similar across the two groups. Finally, the structural model had satisfactory fit, $\chi^2(92) = 127.09$; $p < .05$, CFI = .95; RMSEA = .05 and good model comparison values, D$\chi^2(5) = 4.88$, $p = .43$. This implied that the covariances among the four components were similar across groups.

     Finally, and as can be seen in Table 2, the scale reliabilities were satisfactory (value range: $a_{Efficacy} = .69$ and $a_{Warmth} = .81$). Unsurprisingly, there were high correlations between each original stereotype component and its sub-dimensions. The correlations among the sub-dimensions were acceptable (e.g., friendliness–trustworthiness: $r = .52$).

Study 2

     In Study 2, we sought to rule out the possibility that

The Study 1 finding was incidental and specific to old people and Romanians (for a recommendation towards reproducibility of social psychological research see Nosek, Spies, & Motyl, 2012). To this end, we tested the validity of the four sub-dimensions structure of stereotypes with a different sample of participants, and by extending the number of social groups to 23. As in Study 1, the social groups were relevant in the Romanian culture (Stanciu et al., 2015), and included students, politicians, Roma people, ethnic minorities, family, workers, old people, Maghiari, rich people, poor people, delinquents, unemployed people, religious minorities, pensioners, rockers, manelişti, people with HIV/AIDS, people with disabilities, drug addicts, homosexuals, men, Basarabeni, and women (see Table 3).[1]

Method

Participants and Procedure. Participants were 306 Romanian students and nonstudents in four cities (61.90 % women) with an average age of $M_{age} = 23.91$ ($SD = 6.99$) (see Table 1). The study procedure from Study 1 was used. All participants were eligible to enter a lottery for a monetary reward (30 Euros).

Measures. The same measures, answer options, and study instruction were used as in Study 1. To have three items measuring each sub-dimension, we included the item *diligent* to the measure of competence (and conscientiousness). The participants were asked to use these 12 items to evaluate the 23 social groups.

Results

     A series of CFAs were performed on the 12 items to examine how well they fit the theoretical model of the SCM (i.e., warmth and competence) and whether the four sub-dimension structure found in Study 1 (i.e., friendliness, trustworthiness, efficacy, and conscientiousness) could be replicated separately for each evaluated social group. The same statistical package, guidelines, and goodness-of-fit indices were used as in Study 1. First, we estimated the SCM with the warmth-related and competence-related items allowed to load on the theorized construct. Second, we estimated the four sub-dimension structure. Each item was allowed to load on the latent construct that was found in Study 1. All latent constructs were allowed to correlate across estimated models. As seen in Table 3, in the majority of cases, the models with two latent constructs showed good model fit indices. However, relative to these models, the four latent construct models showed improvement in model fit. Whereas in some cases, the improvement was towards a sound goodness-of-fit (e.g., "Old people": ΔCFI = .08, ΔRMSEA = .05, ΔSRMR = .03), in others, it was negligible (e.g., "Maghiari": ΔCFI = .01, ΔRMSEA = .01, ΔSRMR < .01).

[1] Manelişti = Romanian cultural specific social group characterized by social marginality and a preference for Oriental music; Maghiari = Romanian cultural specific social group characterized as Romanian born with Hungarian ancestry; Basarabeni = Term used by Romanians to refer to citizens of Republic of Moldova, formerly part of Romania. For more detailed description see Stanciu and colleagues (2015).

Table 3

Model Fit Indices for Two and Four Factor Models, Separately for Each Evaluated Group

Target group	2 Factor Model				4 Factor Model			
	χ^2/df	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	χ^2/df	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Students	3.35	.92	.09	.06	2.19	.96	.06	.05
Politicians	3.47	.93	.09	.05	2.41	.96	.07	.04
Roma people	5.03	.91	.11	.05	3.92	.94	.10	.05
Ethnic minorities	2.92	.97	.08	.03	2.38	.98	.07	.02
Family	2.32	.94	.09	.04	2.91	.96	.08	.04
Workers	3.17	.94	.08	.05	2.33	.97	.07	.04
Old people	4.86	.89	.11	.07	2.46	.96	.07	.04
Maghiari	2.99	.97	.08	.03	2.69	.97	.07	.03
Rich people	2.89	.97	.08	.03	2.71	.97	.07	.05
Poor people	4.56	.91	.11	.06	2.99	.96	.08	.04
Delinquents	4.33	.90	.10	.06	3.39	.93	.09	.05
Unemployed people	4.03	.90	.10	.06	3.29	.93	.09	.06
Religious minorities	4.28	.91	.14	.06	2.97	.95	.08	.05
Pensioners	3.65	.92	.03	.06	2.68	.95	.07	.04
Rockers	2.89	.96	.08	.04	2.67	.96	.07	.03
Manelişti	2.42	.97	.07	.03	2.38	.97	.07	.03
People with HIV/AIDS	4.11	.94	.10	.05	3.36	.96	.09	.04
People with disabilities	6.28	.94	.13	.05	3.51	.96	.09	.04
Drug addicts	3.85	.93	.10	.04	3.04	.95	.08	.04
Homosexuals	3.55	.96	.09	.03	3.41	.96	.09	.03
Men	5.97	.85	.13	.07	2.69	.95	.07	.05
Basarabeni	4.35	.93	.10	.05	3.32	.95	.09	.04
Women	4.62	.89	.11	.06	3.18	.94	.08	.05

Note. Estimation = Maximum Likelihood; 2 Factor Model = warmth and competence; 4 Factor Model: Friendliness, Trustworthiness, Conscientiousness, and Efficacy; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; Maghiari = Romanian born with Hungarian ancestry; Manelişti = Group characterized by social marginality and preference for Oriental music; Basarabeni = Term used by Romanians to refer to citizens of Republic of Moldova

General Discussion

Using data sets that were collected in a combined emic-etic study in Romania, and based on a data driven approach, we examined a four sub-dimension structure of stereotype content. Results from Study 1 indicated that, for evaluations of two randomly selected social groups (Romanians and old people), a four sub-dimension structure fit the data better than a two-component structure. In Study 2, we were able to replicate this finding using a different sample and with an extended selection of social groups. Together, results provide evidence that the warmth stereotype dimension has friendliness and trustworthiness as sub-dimensions, and that the competence stereotype dimension has efficacy and conscientiousness as sub-dimensions.

Four Sub-Dimensions are Not Two Dimensions

Similar to past research, we suggest that each of the two traditional SCM dimensions can be further disentangled (Leach et al., 2007; Szymkow et al., 2013). Our approach differs from other similar efforts by the fact that the conclusions about sub-dimensions are data-driven as opposed to theory-driven. The assumption that warmth and competence are universal constructs assisted the item selection procedure (see Study 1). As such, based on existent literature, we selected items used in studies across cultures and contexts (e.g., mental illness patients and age groups). For example, in a study conducted in the U.S., Fiske and colleagues (2002) assessed the warmth dimension using the following items: friendly, well-intentioned, trustworthy, warm, good-natured, and sincere. Conversely, in a study conducted in Germany, the same dimension was measured via likeability, warmth and good-naturedness (Asbrock, 2010). The overlap in the stereotype content across these studies is evident: both contain aspects of being warm and good-natured. Although both items are informative for the warmth stereotype dimension, the present set of studies goes a step beyond, suggesting that each of these pertains to a more intricate stereotype structure. Thus, we argue that results from previous studies cannot be compared if they use measures that tap into distinct sub-dimensions.

Four Sub-Dimensions are Important in Intergroup Relations

Fiske (2012) exemplified the importance of warmth and competence with the dark alley scenario. In that scenario, a woman who walks home during the night in a dark alley sees a stranger approaching her. First, the woman needs to identify whether the stranger possess a threat. Second, she needs to assess whether the stranger can enact his/her intentions. Imagine, however, that the stranger approaches the woman in a friendly manner but with untrustworthy intentions.

Our findings reveal that the warmth dimension encompasses two sub-dimensions: friendliness and trustworthiness. This distinction is important in intergroup relations because it allows for a more sensitive evaluation of one's sociability. While the warmth dimension indicates whether one is sociable, the two sub-dimensions give clarifications about the motives of one's sociability. For example, someone can be friendly but untrustworthy (e.g., Casanova), and someone could be unfriendly but trustworthy (e.g., Puritans; Szymkow et al., 2013). In the above scenario, the woman has to identify whether the stranger poses a threat. However, she has to evaluate two contrasting attributes – friendliness but untrustworthiness. Whether the woman is successful in fleeing the potential threat depends on her ability to identify the untrustworthy intentions of the stranger.

Our findings indicate that the competence stereotype dimension encompasses two sub-dimensions: conscientiousness and efficacy. This distinction is important in intergroup relations because it provides a more accurate evaluation of one's competence. Someone can be conscientious but inefficacious (e.g., a disabled person), and someone could be unconscientious but efficacious (e.g., actionists). Imagine that the stranger in the dark alley scenario has a visible handicap. In this scenario, the woman has to decide whether the visible handicap is a clear sign of inefficaciousness and whether there are signs that the stranger has conscientiously planned his/her action (e.g., timing, signs of weapons, etc.).

Whereas, conscientiousness is associated with efficacy, contextual cues can impede one's efficacy (Chen, Casper, & Cortina, 2001). Consider, for instance, a scenario where members of a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) seek to gain freedom of speech in a totalitarian regime. First, members of the NGO have to prepare a set of actions, second, to successfully implement them. However, due to the strict political climate, their goal may never be attained. In this case, while they are conscientious, they are not efficacious.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

We examined data from a combined emic-etic research approach conducted in Romania (Stanciu et al., 2015). While our findings are in line with other studies (Brambilla et al., 2011) in suggesting extensions to the warmth and competence structure, the results should be generalized to other cultures or contexts with caution. The present findings provide strong support for a four sub-dimension content of stereotypes in Romania only. The findings are also based on samples with undergraduates and nonstudents. While the majority of social psychological research relies on undergraduate samples, recent critics suggest that this may be an over reliance on WEIRD samples (Henrich et al., 2010). Our findings partially respond to this critic by examining additional nonstudent samples from Romania, a country that is outside of Western societies. The problem of using undergraduate samples, however, remains. Part of our nonstudent sample was a result of a snow ball techqnique that had at its starting point students. Since this approach may have resulted in a biased sample (WEIRD), for a better examination whether this structure is valid in other contexts and samples, we recommend adopting a theoretically driven approach. One possible direction could be using an item-generation procedure similar to that in the original study by Stanciu and colleagues (2015) but examining whether the four stereotype sub-dimensions can be found within previously reported data. Another possible direction could be conducting a cross-cultural replication of this structure. Similar to works by Cuddy and colleagues (2009), one could draw samples of participants from different cultures both within and across continents. A third alternative could be to reconsider the scale construction phase altogether.

One could depart from our interpretation of the four sub-dimensions. Then, based on the respective concepts, one could generate items that potentially measure each of the sub-dimensions. The present findings are based on cross-sectional data. Social psychological theories suggest that drastic changes in the status quo of societies can affect the psychological aspects of individuals (Moscovici, 1988). Likewise, it is unclear whether the presently identified structure of stereotype content remains relevant in time, or whether it is specific to Romanian culture. Future research could test longitudinal replication studies in a large surveys, such as the World Value Survey to draw samples of participants at a specific time points and measurements.

Conclusion

We were able to show that both warmth and competence dimensions of stereotype content encompass more intricate stereotype structures. For example, the warmth dimension may be comprised of friendliness and trustworthiness sub-dimensions. The competence dimension can be comprised of conscientiousness and efficacy sub-dimensions. Although this theory is still in its incipient stage, we feel it might provide a more comprehensive understanding of how we evaluate others, and, more specifically, what criteria we use. From an applied point of view, knowing which of the four sub-dimensions of stereotype content a social group is most associated with could prove useful for more systematic interventions aimed at alleviating societal conflicts. For example, for a group that is generally perceived as untrustworthy, programs could focus on interventions to highlight their trustworthiness.

References

Abele, A. E., & Wojciszke, B. (2013). The Big Two in social judgment and behavior. *Social Psychology*, *44*, 61–62. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000137

Asbrock, F. (2010). Stereotypes of social groups in Germany in terms of warmth and competence. *Social Psychology*, *41*, 76–81. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000011

Brambilla, M., Rusconi, P., Sacchi, S., & Cherubini, P. (2011). Looking for honesty: The primary role of morality (vs. sociability and competence) in information gathering. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*, 135–143. doi:10.1002/ejsp.744

Chen, G., Casper, W. J., & Cortina, J. M. (2001). The roles of self-efficacy and task complexity in the relationships among cognitive ability, conscientiousness, and work-related performance: A meta-analytic examination. *Human Performance*, *14*, 209–230. doi:10.1207/S15327043HUP1403

Cheung, F. M., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leong, F. T. L. (2011). Toward a new approach to the study of personality in culture. *American Psychologist*, *66*, 593–603. doi:10.1037/a0022389

Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., Kwan, V. S. Y., Glick, P., Demoulin, S., Leyens, J.-P., … Ziegler, R. (2009). Stereotype content model across cultures: Towards universal similarities and some differences. *The British Journal of Social Psychology*, *48*, 1–33. doi:10.1348/014466608X314935

Fiske, S. T. (2012). Managing ambivalent prejudices: Smart-but-cold and warm-but-dumb stereotypes. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *639*, 33–48. doi:10.1177/0002716211418444

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *82*, 878–902. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.82.6.878

Gavreliuc, A. (2011). *Româniile din România. Individualism autarhic, tipare valorice transgeneraţionale şi autism social [Romanians within Romania. Autarhic individualism, transgenerational patterns of values and social autism].* Timişoara, România: Editura Universităţii de Vest.

Hambleton, R.K. & Zenisky, A.L. (2010). Translating and adapting tests for cross-cultural assessments. In D. Matsumoto and F. J. R. van de Vijver (Eds.). *Cross-Cultural Research methods in Psychology.* (pp. 46-70). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *33*, 61–83. doi:10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

Hilton, J. L., & von Hippel, W. (1996). Stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *47*, 237–71. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.237

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., & Minkow, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind.* (3rd edition). McGraw-Hill USA.

Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., & Mullen, M. R. (2008). Structural equation modelling : Guidelines for determining model fit. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, *6*, 53–60. Retrieved from www.ejbrm.com

Institutul Naţional de Statistică. (2011). *Rezultate definitive ale Recensământului Populaţiei şi al Locuinţelor – 2011 (caracteristici demografice ale populaţiei) [Final results of the Household and Population Census - 2011 (population demographic characteristics)]* (Vol. 2011). Bucharest. Retrieved from http://www.recensamantromania.ro/rezultate-2/

Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modelling* (3rd ed.). New York, NY US: The Guilford Press.

Leach, C. W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 234–249. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.2.234

Moscovici, S. (1988). Notes towards a description of social representations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *18*, 211–250.

Nosek, B. A., Spies, J. R., & Motyl, M. (2012). Scientific utopia: II. Restructuring incentives and practices to promote truth over publishability. *Perspectives on Psychological Science: A Journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, *7*, 615–31. doi:10.1177/1745691612459058

Schreiber, J. B., Stage, F. K., King, J., Nora, A., & Barlow, E. A. (2006). Modeling and Confirmatory Factor Analysis results : A review. *Journal of Educational Research*, *99*, 323–337.

Stanciu, A., Cohrs, J. C., Hanke, K., & Gavreliuc, A. (2015). *Within culture variation in the content of stereotypes: Application and development of the Stereotype Content Model in an Eastern European culture.* Manuscript under review.

Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., & Baumgartner, H. (1998). Assessing measurement invariance in cross-national consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *25*, 78–107. doi:0093-5301/99/2501-0006$03.00

Szymkow, A., Chandler, J., Ijzerman, H., Parzuchowski, M., & Wojciszke, B. (2013). Warmer hearts, warmer rooms. *Social Psychology*, *33*, 350–7. doi:10.1027/0227-5910/a000147

Vaes, J., & Paladino, M. P. (2009). The uniquely human content of stereotypes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *13*, 23–39. doi:10.1177/1368430209347331

Van de Schoot, R., Lugtig, P., & Hox, J. (2012). A checklist for testing measurement invariance. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *9*, 486–492. doi:10.1080/17405629.2012.686740

Voicu, B., & Voicu, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Valori ale romînilor: 1993-2006. O perspective sociologică. [Values of Romanians: 1993-2006. A sociological perspective].* Iaşi, Romania: Institutul European.