



Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação

Universidade de Coimbra

2017/2018

---

# **Predicting workplace perceived discrimination and religious prejudice through luso-tropicalism, values and individualism/collectivism**

---

**Maria Moura Pinheiro**

mmpinheiro95@gmail.com

**Master's Dissertation**

**European Master in Work, Organizational, and Personnel Psychology**

Home University: Universidade de Coimbra

Home Tutor: Professor Joaquim Pires Valentim

Host University: Universitat de València (Estudi General)

Host Tutor: Professor Yolanda Estreder Ortí

### Abstract

The present investigation aimed to study the psychosocial issues of prejudice related to religion and discrimination towards immigrants in the Portuguese society, more specifically, in the work context in Portugal. Thereby, we assessed to what extent attitudes towards religious groups and perception of discrimination towards immigrants in the workplace were related with luso-tropicalism dimensions, human values and individualism/collectivism. To this end, a questionnaire was applied to a sample of 234 Portuguese workers of diverse organizations in Portugal. Principal Components Analyses (PCA) were run on the instruments of Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism, Individualism/Collectivism, Human Values, Attitudes towards Religious Groups and Perception of Discrimination. Using the results obtained with PCA, multiple regressions were run to test the established hypotheses. The results showed that social representations of luso-tropicalism, individualism/collectivism and human values were significant predictors of discrimination perception, but not of religious prejudice. Cultural integration was, for the first time, associated with discrimination, being able to negatively predict both undercover and blatant hostilities. Furthermore, the outcomes showed that kindness towards immigrant workers could be positively predicted by horizontal collectivism and self-transcendence. Inversely, undercover hostility could be negatively predicted by self-transcendence, meaning that self-transcendence tends to increase when unnoticed discriminatory behaviours in the workplace tend to diminish. In the end, the results are discussed taking into consideration the challenges that culturally diverse environments generate in organizations.

**Key-words:** social representations of luso-tropicalism, religious prejudice, perception of discrimination, human values, individualism and/or collectivism, workplace.

**Acknowledgments**

*Ao Professor Doutor Joaquim Pires Valentim, pela dedicação com que orientou este trabalho ao longo dos últimos dois anos e por todos os conhecimentos facilitados*

*À Professora Doutora Yolanda Estreder Ortí, pela preocupação e pelo empenho com que coorientou esta investigação durante o período de mobilidade.*

*À equipa do Mestrado Europeu em Psicologia do Trabalho, das Organizações e dos Recursos Humanos, em especial aos Professores Doutores Leonor Pais, Carla Carvalho, Paulo Renato Lourenço, Teresa Rebelo, Nuno Rebelo dos Santos e Bruno de Sousa.  
Obrigada por todas as lições, académicas e pessoais!*

*À Cláudia Figueiredo, por me explicar os comos e os porquês da estatística.*

*Aos meus pais e ao Memé, por todo o amor, por todo o apoio e por toda a ajuda, não só durante estes últimos dois anos, mas durante os últimos vinte e dois.*

*Ao Miguel, pela paciência infinita e por todo o carinho.*

*Às MVP's, por todas as horas de trabalho, por todos os cafés, conversas, partilhas de receios, expectativas e desabafos. Foi bom crescer ao vosso lado!*

*À ESN e em especial ao DN, por me saberem distrair tão bem a todas as horas.*

*Aos meus afilhados e às minhas madrinhas, por sempre me acolherem maravilhosamente em suas casas.*

*Às amigas do Daqui é só para cima, por melhorarem as minhas manhãs, todos os dias!*

*A todos os participantes deste estudo, por despenderem algum do seu tempo para me ajudar nesta caminhada.*

*Aos amigos e companheiros de todos os dias e de todas as noites, por terem feito parte destes cinco anos inesquecíveis.*

*À cidade que me viu nascer e crescer, por tudo isto.  
Obrigada, Coimbra!*

**Index**

1. Introduction.....	4
2. Literature Review.....	7
2.1. Prejudice and Discrimination at work.....	7
2.2. Religion and Religious prejudice.....	10
2.3. Luso-tropicalism as an ideology of the Portuguese colonialism.....	11
2.4. Individualism-Collectivism.....	14
2.5. Human Values.....	15
3. Aims and contribution to the knowledge.....	16
3.1. Hypotheses.....	17
4. Method.....	18
4.1. Sample.....	18
4.2. Measures.....	19
4.3. Procedures.....	22
4.3.1. Data collection procedures.....	22
4.3.2. Preliminary Statistical procedures.....	22
4.3.3. Statistical procedures.....	23
5. Results.....	24
5.1. Psychometric properties.....	24
5.2. Regression analyses.....	32
6. Discussion.....	36
6.1. Limitations and further research.....	41
7. Conclusion.....	42
References.....	45
Annexes.....	55

## 1. Introduction

Contemporary globalization accelerated the speed and scale of migration and mobility in the whole world (Marozzi, 2016). Nowadays, organizations need to deal with these new dynamics and with the consequences they bring to the work environment, such as ethnically diverse teams with generational, gender and religious differences - ready to completely change the workforce and the way it used to function (Edun, 2015).

As a matter of fact, globalization did not only accelerate migration, but it also changed its patterns (Gilarioni, D'Odorico & Carrillo, 2015; Logan & Zhang, 2010). As some authors believe, it is possible to differentiate the post-colonial migrations from the other forms of migration. Whereas the first type goes back to the 1950s and involves large numbers of relatively homogenous groups of people arriving to countries with which they have an historical connection, the other forms of migration (that have always existed but are now more common) see people from many different places arriving to countries with which they have no previous connection, having diverse motives to engage in such change, for instance economic or security crisis. This originates what Vertovec (2007) named "superdiversity": individuals with distinct ethnicity, immigration status, rights and entitlements, labour market experiences, gender, age and religion (Marozzi, 2016).

With this, the world of work evolved and the diversity we can find on it today totally reflects the multicultural composition of the society as a whole. However, the society does not always have attitudes, values and behaviours of acceptance and valorisation towards this pluralism. The raise of negative attitudes and actions towards the other that is "different" turned the focus of recent investigation to workplace prejudice and discrimination (Avery, McKay, & Wilson, 2008; Murray & Syed, 2005; Tung, 2008). Such an increase of diverse workforces and environments made this field become an area of interest for both scientists and practitioners, and we believe it is important to study this thematic, but not only in order to create awareness to the topic. In fact, it is also important to study discrimination in the workplace because it can mitigate the potential of an organization, increase its costs, and intensify turnover, as workers feel distressed, demotivated and unsatisfied (Essed, 1991; Feagan, 1991; Forstenlechner & Al-Waqfi, 2010; Hofhuis, Van der Zee & Otten, 2013), not willing to engage in hostile environments. Aside from the aforementioned reasons, understanding how other cultures are accepted in the Portuguese work context is also of great relevance for the scientific community, not only because Portugal is an intervenient of today's migration flows (receiving a

considerable number of immigrants), but also because it has a long colonization past. This feature of the Portuguese History gave rise to the social representation of Luso-tropicalism, a well established idea of absence of prejudice on the part of Portuguese people, suggesting that they are welcoming and non-discriminatory, which will be studied in this dissertation.

Numerous studies have examined discrimination based on race, ethnicity, and gender, and its impact on various outcomes related to work and employment, especially since the 1970's economic recession, when the scientific community started to be curious about discrimination issues due to the migration flows of that epoch (Marozzi, 2016; Strabac & Listhaug, 2008). However, literature addressing religious discrimination and prejudice in the workplace is still limited (Cintas, Gosse & Vateville, 2013; Edun, 2015; Ghuman, Ryan, Barclay & Markel, 2013; Forstenlechner & Al-Waqfi, 2010), especially in Europe, even though this issue already has its own European legislation (European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, 2006a, 2006b; Forstenlechner & Al-Waqfi, 2010). As previously mentioned, these discriminative situations negatively affect the well-being of individuals (Essed, 1991; Feagan, 1991; Forstenlechner & Al-Waqfi, 2010; Hofhuis, Van der Zee & Otten, 2013) causing some victims to report them to the authorities, originating serious lawsuits and legal claims. Thus, the necessity of legally regularizing these acts emerged. Notwithstanding the concern by the competent authorities, the scientific community still did not show the correspondent interest and preoccupation with the issue.

Nonetheless, over the last decades, some studies have emphasized variances in the strength of anti-immigrant attitudes among European countries (European Commission, 2014; Poletti & Regalia, 2014). In fact, the debates around immigration are consistently re-ignited during times of recession, such as after the 2007/2008 recession, and other traumatic events, such as terrorist attacks, lately affecting Europe. Particularly for Poletti and Regalia (2014) these events make the national cultures perceive immigrants as threats to their welfare, sustainability and security (Marozzi, 2016), possibly increasing hostile attitudes towards them. Inclusively, the Eurobarometer survey (European Commission, 2012) showed that 52% of Europeans agreed that, as a result of the economic crisis, discrimination in the labour market on the grounds of ethnic origin has increased. Furthermore, 42% felt that discrimination on grounds of religion or belief is widespread (European Commission, 2008). However, from the data of the European Social Surveys (ESS) of 2002/2003 and 2014/2015 it was possible to verify a tendency of openness towards immigrants through Europe, corroborating the idea that

the increase of immigration, particularly people from different ethnical groups and from poor non-European countries, does not necessarily have a significant impact on attitudes (European Social Survey, 2014; Ramos, Louceiro & Graça, 2016). There is no national consensus about being favourable or unfavourable toward immigrants. As a matter of fact, in Portugal, the tendency is 59% and 41%, respectively, and the ESS (2014/2015) showed that Portuguese people are less favourable to the entrance of Muslim immigrants when compared to other groups (different ethnical groups and poor non-European countries), giving more relevance to ethnical aspects than the European average (Ramos, Louceiro & Graça, 2016). Nonetheless, no increment was proven since the ESS of 2002/2003.

Moreover, both prejudice and discrimination are known for negatively impacting employee motivation and performance (Forstenlechner & Al-Waqfi, 2010), even causing feelings of being worthless, helpless, powerless, looked down upon, sad, and fearful (Essed, 1991; Feagan, 1991). Hence, cultural diversity in the workplace became a topic of great interest because of the positive consequences it can have when appropriately managed (Hofhuis et al., 2013). The present study can be characterised within social/demographic diversity (Christian, Porter & Moffitt, 2006; Simons & Rowland, 2011), which looks at diversity with respect to attributes that are relatively enduring (or even observable) and that are not related to performance (such as gender, ethnicity, age, disability or religion).

As stated before, very few studies performed a rigorous statistical assessment of the issue in the work environment, which is one of the purposes of this paper: to examine if perception of discrimination towards immigrants and religious prejudice exist in the Portuguese workplace. Moreover, as our main aim, we intend to analyse whether or not these can be predicted by luso-tropicalism, human values and individualism/collectivism. These concepts and the explanation of the hypotheses formulation will be further developed in the next section: Literature Review. Thereafter, the aims and contributions to the knowledge will be presented in-depth, followed by the formal hypotheses. Then, in the Method, the instruments, their application and analysis will be thoroughly described. Another aim of this study was to conduct exploratory analyses to the instruments. Their factorial structures are available in the Results section, along with the hypotheses testing, that will be further debated and interpreted in the Discussion part. In the end, there will be a reflection of the challenges that cultural diversity generates in organizations.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Prejudice and Discrimination at work

According to some authors (Gondim et al., 2013; Sennett, 1998) what explains mobility flows in the world are phenomena such as hunger, violence and political persecution, allied to the hope of finding happiness in other lands. For instance, Marozzi (2016) believes that migration to Europe will continue due to push and pull factors associated with political and socio-economic situations of certain countries - such as authoritarian regimes that potentiate asylum movements or high unemployment rates that force job seekers to find opportunities abroad. However, these flows are always susceptible to intolerance, exclusion and discrimination from the host countries (Gondim et al., 2013). Although migrants can bring useful skills and compensate labour shortages (Quintini, 2011), they can also be seen by natives as a threat both to their well-being and to the national sustainability, especially in countries in which unemployment rates are increasing (Marozzi, 2016).

In a world with fading barriers, not only at territorial levels, but also at social, political, economic and cultural ones, a need to reorganize relationships between countries emerges (Brown, 1995; Gondim et al., 2013; Sennett, 1998). However, this new format brings psychosocial consequences such as the increased competition in the labour market, not only between compatriots but also with foreigners (Brown, 1995). This new perception of competitiveness activates social identity and triggers a set of emotions towards foreigners associated with discriminatory behaviours at the workplace and even hostility (Gondim et al., 2013).

Prejudice can be defined, although not consensually, as an “antipathy based on faulty and inflexible generalization that may be felt or expressed, towards a group or an individual that belongs to a group” (Allport, 1954, p.10). In other words, prejudice resides in the belief that a person has the negative characteristics of the group to which he/she belongs (Allport, 1954). Discrimination can, sometimes, be understood as a synonym of prejudice (Brown, 1995; Gondim et al., 2013). However, discrimination refers to a behaviour or to the intention to act in order to differentiate the elements of the in-group from the ones of the out-group (Ensher, Grant-Vallone & Donaldson, 2001; Gondim et al., 2013) due to their “race”, skin colour, ethnic origin, age or even religion (Forstenlechner & Al-Waqfi, 2010). In 1983, Tajfel enhanced the influence stereotypes would have in discriminatory behaviours, defining stereotypes as socially shared beliefs about the nature of both the in-group and the out-group that would trigger specific

actions towards the out-group. Those actions would be determined by prejudices, by the social category in which the individual would be placed and by the level of identification with it (Tajfel, 1981, 1983). The higher the level of identification with the group, the higher the tendency to positively differentiate the in-group from the out-group, where the out-group is composed of the people belonging to the foreigner's social category (Gondim et al., 2013).

Nowadays, with the increment of foreigner citizens, it is important to understand the workplace behaviours that lead to perceived discrimination for two main reasons: (i) employee's perceptions can seriously affect the individual, the group or the organization as a whole (Goldman, Gutek, Stein & Lewis, 2006; Gutek, Cohen & Tsui, 1996; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind & Perhoniemi, 2007; Mays, Coleman & Jackson, 1996; Sanchez & Brock, 1996), and (ii) discrimination has become more subtle, elusive and condescending, being difficult to identify, document and expose (Dixon, Levine, Reicher & Durrheim, 2012; Dovidio, 2001; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1983, 1991, 1998; Hamberger & Hewstone, 1997; Noh, Beiser, Kaspar, Hou & Rummens, 1999; Pager, 2007). What once were violent acts of discrimination are now more camouflaged, and modern racism is more indirect and rationalized (Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh & Vaslow, 2000; Edun, 2015). Discrimination can take place at any time: before the employment (access discrimination) – not providing equal opportunities to all the candidates – or after the signature of the employment contract (treatment discrimination) – not offering equal opportunities in promotion, training, pay, lay off or termination.

The scale developed by Gondim et al. (2013) was based on the previous work of Hirigoyen (2001) on moral harassment and aimed to assess the relations between the threat perception (i.e., symbolic, economic and of safety) and the behavioural tendencies of kindness and hostility towards the foreign group.

As it was proven in the literature, despite being different constructs, prejudice and discrimination are expected to have a relationship (Bodenhausen & Richeson, 2010), since prejudice has traditionally been studied in relation to hostility behaviours (discrimination) (Dixon et al., 2012). In fact, since the end of World War II, the concept of prejudice became central to the explanation of a range of social problems, including discrimination, inequality, ideological extremism, and genocide (Dixon et al., 2012). Prejudice research "spread like a flood both in social psychology and in adjacent social sciences" (Allport, 1950, p. 4) and as the promotion of intergroup harmony has always been a fundamental objective of many researchers, this concept immediately became essential to the study of intergroup relations.

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

Adhering to prejudice is related with having pre-conceived ideas, attitudes and beliefs that might conduct to discrimination (the behavioural form of those negative ideas or beliefs), but not mandatorily (Allport, 1954; Brown, 1995; Edun, 2015; Gondim et al., 2013). A person who adheres to prejudice might not act according to its negative attitude or belief, therefore, one can have a negative pre-conceived idea about a certain group without being discriminatory towards it. However, it is known that discriminatory behaviours have, on its basis, prejudiced attitudes (Bodenhausen & Richeson, 2010). In psychological terms, bias includes all three components of an attitude (affective, cognitive and behavioural), in which the affective component is prejudice and the behavioural is discrimination (Eagly & Chaiken, 1998; Mackie & Smith, 1998a; Petty & Wegener, 1998; Wilder & Simon, 2001). Although discrimination is mainly behavioural, it derives from the cognitive and affective dimensions, being the three components intertwined and interdependent. According to Brewer (1999) discrimination could be defined as a differential treatment of individuals based on their groups. However, such treatment could be motivated by prejudice. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that prejudice and discrimination are usually related with each other.

Nonetheless, both discrimination and prejudice can have different focuses, such as gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, disability or religion (Christian et al. 2006; Edun, 2015; Ekici & Yucel, 2015; Ruggs et al., 2013; Simons & Rowland, 2011), and the European Legislation even has different directives for each one of them, which arises the possibility of prejudice and discrimination to be related only when their focus is the same. This means that, for instance, prejudice towards immigrant workers will only be related with discrimination if it targets that same group; if prejudice is towards religious groups it is not guaranteed that it will have a relationship with discrimination towards immigrant workers, because religious groups and immigrant workers are distinct focuses. Therefore, using separate measures, we want to test whether or not discrimination towards foreign workers is related with prejudice, in particular, prejudice towards religious groups in the workplace.

Furthermore, since prejudice has been proven to be positively correlated with some of the Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism factors (Harmonious relations, Ability to adapt and Colonial past) (Valentim & Heleno, 2018), which will be explained later in this section, it will be explored if these same dimensions can be positively correlated with perceived discrimination as well, more properly, with the Hostility dimension.

## **2.2. Religion and Religious Prejudice**

The question whether religion encourages or discourages prejudice continues to elicit debate and engender research, as some variables can promote it (such as fundamentalism, more frequent church attendance, or religious particularism) and others can mitigate it (religious pluralism or higher quest religious orientation) (Abu-Raiya, 2013). However, in the workplace context, with the increased religious diversity of the workforce, associated with an intensification of the expression of religious beliefs, prejudice and hostility behaviours (discrimination) tend to upsurge (Cintas et al., 2013; Ghuman et al., 2013). Therefore, there is a clear need for employers to understand and address these issues in the workplace. The lack of empirical research in this area points to a critical gap in the understanding of workplace religious prejudice and discrimination (Ghuman et al., 2013).

A more recent definition of prejudice is given by Giddens and Sutton (2013) as preconceived ideas about an individual or a group that are difficult to be altered even with the income of additional information. Under that line, we will investigate religious prejudice in the Portuguese workplace. Although this type of research is more common in the United States of America, especially since the 9/11/2001 attacks – that increased the number of complaints and legal claims associated with Islamophobia –, only in the last decade it has become more well-established in Europe (Forstenlechner & Al-Waqfi, 2010). Despite the efforts governments have made, prejudice against various groups in the European Union (EU) is profuse (Ekici & Yucel, 2015) and has been conceptualized as an attitude consisting of negative feelings, beliefs, and behavioural intentions toward other social groups (Dovidio, Kawakami & Gaertner, 2000), especially Jews and Muslims.

Our baseline will be the work developed in 2013 by the Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding [TCIU] (2013) in which religion is seen as relevant and as a factor that should be taken into account in the workplace, not only because it is a theme that has been debated at a worldwide level, but also because no individual likes to feel unfairly treated due to his/her religious beliefs. The work environment is one of the places where those differences should be neutrally managed or even positively seen and used to bring success to the organization itself and its employees (TCIU, 2013). According to the authors, organizations should be responsible for neutralizing religious prejudice behaviours as well as for fulfilling the religious needs of their employees. People of all faiths, including those who belong to the “majority” of a given country and not only to the “minorities” have religious needs that require

a response in the workplace: accommodation, that also stands for ending religious bias, prejudice and discrimination (TCIU, 2013). In this thesis, we are going to analyse whether or not the Portuguese workers of our sample are, at least, neutrally treated in their workplace, and if not, which religious groups suffer more prejudice according to our sample. As religiosity is an important cultural trait of a country and there is a negative correlation between the religiosity of a nation and tolerance among religious out-groups (Guiso, Sapienza & Zingales, 2003), it would be expectable that in the Portuguese context, traditionally Catholic-based, we would find unfavourable attitudes towards other religion out-groups (Ekici & Yucel, 2015). Interestingly, this can go against the social representation of luso-tropicalism, that as we will see in the next subsection, is related with the socially disseminated idea that the Portuguese people is non-discriminatory and welcoming of people belonging to other cultures, ethnical groups or countries.

As some authors defend that prejudice has determinants at both the individual level (micro-level) and country level (macro-level) (Allport, 1950; Ekici & Yucel, 2015), we thought it would be interesting to insert variables that could be related with these two slopes of prejudice. Therefore, we decided to insert scales that could assess human values and the national culture: Valentim and Helkama's short version of the Portrait Values Scale (2005) and Triandis and Gelfand's Individualism/Collectivism scale (1998), respectively.

### **2.3. Luso-tropicalism as an ideology of the Portuguese colonialism**

Luso-tropicalism is studied as a social representation whose origin is recognized as being related to the Portuguese colonialism (Pinto, 2009) associated to the idea of absence of prejudice on the part of Portuguese people, suggesting that they are welcoming and non-discriminatory, having a pre-disposition to accept other cultures (Valentim, 2003, 2005, 2011) and living harmoniously with them (Němec, 2005), being able to "mingle with peoples from the tropics" (Valentim, 2011, p. 181). This "diffuse ideology" (Alexandre, 1993, p.65), aside from being part of the representations of the country's national identity, is often used to describe the relationships Portuguese people establish with other peoples, particularly with Africans, with whom Portugal shares a colonial past. Even though the decolonization process is finished, this "special skill" is still considered as a "national trait", associated to the geographic localization of the country. Therefore, to study the absence or presence of the luso-tropicalist ideas in the common sense, the social representation theory seems the most legit to apply, since it intends to "clarify the domain of concrete, real thought of the individuals about

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

a social object without feeding prejudices about the ‘illogical’ or ‘irrational’ character of current reasoning” (Moscovici, 1976, p. 245-246). This luso-tropicalism myth, as some historians recall it (Alexandre, 1993) was, and still is, disseminated in the Portuguese society. Hence, according to its conceptualization, the social representation approach is suitable to study how that abstract concept was appropriated by the common sense, and spread amongst it (Valentim, 2011; Valentim & Heleno, 2018).

The fact that this colonial ideology is still present in the Portuguese society is proof that this social representation passes from generation to generation, and this can be explained by the concept of social or collective memory. Social or collective memory theory explores the connection between social identity and historical memory, inquiring about how and why people think of themselves as members of a group with a shared past (French, 1996). In fact, social memory focuses on the construction of boundaries, a process that reveals the multiplicity of meanings individuals attach to shared experiences. According to Marques, Páez and Serra (1997) one of the ways of processing memories of traumatic events is through the transgenerational transmission of information and through the collective reconstruction of the past, in which individuals repress or distort what was negative, creating a positive image of the events. Social memory was studied in the context of the Portuguese colonial war and showed results that indicated that while a majority of veterans talked very little or not at all, and, in any case, in a negative way about the war, a minority talked much more frequently and in a positive way, generating a more positive image. Subsequently, as the frequency of hearing about the issue was related to the perception of social integration and positive experience, some form of positive reconstruction of the colonization might emerge (Marques et al., 1997). In this same study it was possible to verify that subjects who had closer acquaintances involved in the war recognized the violence of the colonization. However, people without these direct relationships and contacts proved to have a rather positive idea of the colonization of Africa. This might explain why the social representation of luso-tropicalism is still so scattered in the Portuguese society.

The original concept of Luso-tropicalism was developed by Gilberto Freyre, a Brazilian sociologist, who, in 1933, wrote *Casa Grande & Senzala* with the main objective of praising the Brazilian culture in a new and innovative way (Pinto, 2009). In this book, the author proposed a new identity of the Brazilian people, with a positive view on the racial and ethnic crossbreeding problems. Before Freyre, the social thinking emphasized the necessity of a

scientific racism that could justify the social superiority of the white man in the Brazilian culture. However, with Freyre, racial integration started being perceived as the source of many civilizational possibilities (Freyre, 1933; Pinto, 2009). In other words, miscegenation was a core aspect of tropical civilizations (Pinto, 2009), such as Brazil, in which the Portuguese was seen as the colonizer hero, carrier of a specific set of colonization practices that make him unique in this historical experience. In 1940, Freyre wrote *O mundo que o português criou* (The world the Portuguese created) where he amplified his hypothesis about the particular character of the Portuguese colonization to all the cases of Portuguese presence in foreign territories, supporting the idea of a “lusophone community” much wider than Brazil itself.

Luso-tropicalism could be based on the premise that while the white Portuguese tried to civilize the natural habitants of Brazil, these civilized him back (Pinto, 2009). Portugal could not be seen as an untouchable white and European nation anymore because it was influenced throughout the colonization process (Pinto, 2009). The Portuguese of Freyre was interracial, therefore, he could never build a white and European Brazil, being that both Brazil and Portugal were “parts equally alive of the same luso-tropical reality (...) being ahead the formation of a third man or a third culture – symbiotically luso-tropical” (Freyre, 1961, p. 88). According to Freyre, Portugal took its colonization to the extreme as none European ever did, “renouncing its ethnic and cultural purity, in favour of hybrid forms of man and culture” (Freyre, 1961, p. 88).

Resuming, luso-tropicalism was related with the idea of Portuguese people having particular skills for maintaining harmonious relations with other peoples, adapting to the tropics and lacking prejudice – an idea that is still represented in the common sense of the contemporaneous Portuguese society. However, this last assumption regarding lack of prejudice was not verified in the literature. Portuguese individuals who adhered to luso-tropicalist ideas were supposed to express lower levels of prejudice and higher levels of friendliness towards non-Portuguese groups. However, some studies showed it would not necessarily prevent prejudice (Pereira, Barros, Torres, & Valentim, 2015; Valentim, 2003; Valentim & Heleno, 2018; Vala, Lopes, & Lima, 2008), and it could even potentiate it (Pereira et al., 2015). According to Valentim and Heleno (2018) adhering to luso-tropicalism was indeed associated with prejudice, contradicting the idea of “prejudice absence” in the Portuguese people. In the aforementioned study, only one factor - cultural integration - had no correlation with prejudice. All other factors (harmonious relations, colonial past and ability to

adapt) were positively correlated with it (Valentim & Heleno, 2018). Hence, it remains pertinent to include luso-tropicalism as a variable in the study of any type of prejudice (towards other nations, cultures or even religions) in the Portuguese population.

Additionally, it is referred in the literature how – according to luso-tropicalism – the Portuguese colonization of the tropics was Christocentric, and not so ethnocentric, always looking for “the equality of men before God”, notwithstanding ethnicity (Castelo, 2011; Pinto, 2009, p. 155; Salazar, 1989). Under this line, the phenomenon of luso-tropicalism consists not only of racial miscegenation, but also of miscegenation in cultural and social dimensions, such as religion, when mutual influences create a new cultural entity and it all becomes more ideological, rather than material (Castelo, 2011). Therefore, it seemed pertinent to insert the topic of religion in this dissertation, as it can be so deeply related to the social representations of luso-tropicalism but has scarcely been studied in that scope before (Valentim 2003, 2005, 2011).

#### **2.4. Individualism-Collectivism**

Hofstede (1984) proposed, for the first time, studying values at a cultural level. Defining values as “a broad preference for one state of affairs over others” (p. 389), the author considered values as core elements of life, analysing their order of priority regarding the culture in which individuals would be placed. Culture, in turn, would act as a mental program that would instruct people on their actions, thoughts and feelings, partially determining the socialized behaviour. Hofstede (1997) observed four central dimensions of cross-cultural variations: (i) distance to the power, (ii) avoidance of uncertainty, (iii) masculinity and femininity, and (iv) individualism and collectivism. The fourth dimension could express to what extent individuals of a specific society could evaluate themselves as responsible or independent of other individuals, defining two types of societies: individualist and/or collectivist societies. The first style of society had a personal orientation, in which the social ties between individuals would be loose. In the second type, the focus was more interpersonal, having a prevalence of the group interest over the individual interest, which means that people would be integrated in a cohesive and strong way, protecting each other in exchange for unquestionable loyalty (Hofstede, 1984; McSweeney, 2002).

According to Ferreira, Assmar and Souto (2002), both individualism and collectivism can be seen as indicators of national cultures. Previous investigation of Triandis (1989, 1990a, 1990b, 1994a, 1994b, 1995, 1996) and collaborators (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai &

Lucca, 1988; Triandis et al., 1986; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; Triandis, Leung, Villareal & Clack, 1985; Triandis, McCusker & Hui, 1990), demonstrated that individualism/collectivism can be seen as a pattern of cultural differences potentially useful to explain the variability of social behaviours, as if they are cultural syndromes that include beliefs, values, norms, attitudes and auto-definitions that identify a society, a national culture. Individualism and/or Collectivism can coexist, but one of them will always be predominant in a certain culture (Triandis, 1994b). As some authors believe prejudice is also composed of a country-level determinant (Allport, 1950; Ekici & Yucel, 2015) - with certain cultural traits affecting the level of prejudice across countries - we decided to insert this variable, believing that the individuals of our sample could show the Collectivist tendency of Portugal (Hofstede, 1984) and that this could be positively related with both Luso-tropicalism ideologies of cultural integration and workplace kindness towards foreign workers, and negatively related with prejudice attitudes towards religious groups.

Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk and Gelfand (1995) proposed that both individualism and collectivism could be explained through a vertical or horizontal dimension associated to the importance that is attributed to social relations. Thereby, four cultural typologies emerge: (i) horizontal individualism, people are moved by the desire of being unique and distinct of the groups they are in, although they do not worry about having a higher status than others; (ii) vertical individualism, people want not only to be different and unique, but also want a higher status; (iii) horizontal collectivism, they see themselves as similar to the others who also integrate their groups and prioritize the group goals; however, they do not easily submit to authority; and (iv) vertical collectivism, the individuals are able to sacrifice their personal interests to favour the collective welfares, as well as they show themselves as willing to submit to authority (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Before forging ahead, it is important to highlight that these individualism/collectivism values can also be interpreted according to Schwartz' values theory (2005). Actually, individualism/collectivism can be seen as the broader and generalized organization of human values, which will be further developed in the next subsection.

## **2.5. Human values**

Values are considered as being a crucial element to explain human behaviour, having a deep influence on people's lives (Granjo & Peixoto, 2013). The study of its conceptualization started with Moris (1956) and Dempsey and Dukes (1966) (Braithwaite & Scott, 1991).

People usually refer to values as a conception of what is desirable, influencing decision

making, actions and behavioural evaluation. Thereby, values can be defined as concepts or beliefs about desired behaviours or states that are trans-situational, guiding, selecting and/or evaluating behaviours and situations. Furthermore, values are orderly organized according to their relative importance (Allport, Philip & Gardner, 1960; Levy & Guttman, 1974; Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987). Schwartz (2003) defined values as “basic orientations presumed to underlie and influence individual variation” that can “provide predictive and explanatory power in the analysis of attitudes, opinions and actions”, as well as “reflect a major social change in societies and across nations” (p. 261). However, these characteristics were part of all values in general and could not help to distinguish amongst them. What could differentiate them was their motivational content (Schwartz, 1992, 1994a, 1994b, 2003, 2005). Under this scope, a number of authors argued that religiosity is one of the strongest determinants of individual values (Cui, Jo, Na & Velasquez, 2015; Huffman, 1988), meaning that religion shapes the moral values of the individual, influencing his/her behaviours and attitudes. Hence, his/her attitudes and behaviours can be the expression of those values that are deeply associated with his/her religious belief. This raised our curiosity on how human values could be related with both prejudice and discrimination.

Schwartz motivational theory (1992, 1994a, 1994b) was, in its beginning, a reformulation of Rokeach’s theory of basic human values and identified ten basic motivational values common to individuals, irrespective of their cultural context, organized in a circle: power, realization, hedonism, stimulation, auto-centration, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity and safety. The importance attributed to each of these values would depend on the importance the individual would attribute to them in his/her priority system (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990). Being that those motivational values are dynamically interrelated, the actions that one needs to take to fulfil a certain value can be in conflict or in consonance with the fulfilment of another value (Granjo & Peixoto, 2013). In other words, values that are closer to each other in the circular model have similar motivations, while values that are apart have antagonistic motivations (Granjo & Peixoto, 2013; Schwartz, 1992, 1994a, 1994b).

### **3. Aims and contribution to the knowledge**

The present investigation has three main aims: (i) to explore the factorial structure and psychometric properties of the instruments in order to improve them in this and future studies, (ii) to ascertain whether or not there is religious prejudice in the Portuguese labour context and

(iii) to attest the predictive value of social representations of luso-tropicalism, individualism and/or collectivism, and human values in religious prejudice and discrimination towards immigrant workers in the Portuguese workplace.

In that scope, we will investigate the existence, or not, of religious prejudice in the studied Portuguese workplace and, if such presence is found, we will analyse which religious groups are more discriminated in our sample. The decision of studying these was made considering the little literature about religious prejudice in the Portuguese workplace (TCIU, 2013), and the fact that Luso-tropicalism is a construct that needs further research (Heleno, 2015; Silva, 2015; Valentim & Heleno, 2018). Likewise, human values are scarcely approached in literature when it comes to explaining discrimination and prejudice (Schwartz, 2003, 2005), especially in the Portuguese work environment. Therefore, another aim of this investigation was to explore the gaps of the literature identified in the previous sections.

Specific instruments to assess the aforementioned religious prejudice in the Portuguese workplace were not found. Thus, it was possible to adapt examples and scenarios found in the literature related to prejudice towards immigrants (TCIU, 2013) to the Portuguese language and to the Portuguese society (considering the religious and non-religious groups present in the country), therefore developing a new instrument that could evaluate attitudes towards different religious and non-religious groups.

### **3.1. Hypotheses**

The hypotheses were formulated taking into consideration more than one predictor at the same time, since the aim was to measure their joint impact through the use of multivariate statistical procedures. According to the logical rationale previously assumed, these are the hypotheses to be tested:

*Hypothesis 1:* Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism (cultural integration), Individualism/Collectivism (horizontal collectivism, vertical collectivism) and Values (self-transcendence, self-enhancement, openness to change) positively predict workplace kindness towards foreign workers.

*Hypothesis 2:* Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism (harmonious relations, ability to adapt, colonial past), Individualism/Collectivism (horizontal individualism, vertical individualism) and Values (conservatism) positively predict workplace hostility towards foreign workers.

*Hypothesis 3:* Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism (harmonious relations, ability to adapt, colonial past), Individualism/Collectivism (vertical individualism, horizontal individualism), Values (conservatism) and Perceived discrimination (hostility) positively predict prejudice attitudes towards Religious Groups.

*Hypothesis 4:* Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism (cultural integration), Individualism/Collectivism (horizontal collectivism, vertical collectivism), Values (self-transcendence, self-enhancement, openness to change) and Perceived discrimination (kindness) negatively predict prejudice attitudes towards Religious Groups.

In order to test these hypotheses, an investigation method was delineated. Its details will be further developed in the next section.

## 4. Method

### 4.1. Sample

This convenience sample is composed of 234 participants of Portuguese nationality that were working in Portugal, in different sectors and activity areas, at the time they answered the questionnaire: 95 of them answered the on-line format questionnaire while 139 answered the paper-and-pencil format. It is important to refer that the sample is not representative of the Portuguese working population, due to its size and due to the sex and age distribution.

Analysing the sociodemographic data, 69.2% ( $n=162$ ) of the participants are female and 30.8% ( $n=72$ ) male. Regarding the working situation, the majority of the respondents is a full-time worker ( $n=217$ ; 92.7%) and in terms of level of education 8.5% ( $n=20$ ) have the 9<sup>th</sup> grade or less, 72.7% ( $n=170$ ) have at least a bachelor's degree, 17.5% ( $n=41$ ) have a master's degree and 13.7% ( $n=32$ ) have a PhD.

Regarding Religion, the majority is Catholic ( $n=121$ ; 51.7%). However, 23.1% reported to be Christian ( $n=54$ ) not discriminating between being Catholic, Protestant or Orthodox. Our sample is also composed of 25 agnostics (10.7%) and 21 atheists (9%), with only one Muslim (0.4%) and two Protestants (0.9%).

The average age is 42.89 ( $SD=10.477$ ; min=18; max=66) with six missing data and the average number of years working in the present organization is 13.66 ( $SD=10.362$ ; min=0; max=45) with five missing data. The majority of our sample is married ( $n=119$ ; 51.3%), followed by single ( $n=66$ ; 28.4%), divorced ( $n=24$ ; 10.3%), non-marital partnership ( $n=15$ ;

6.5%), separated ( $n=4$ ; 1.7%) and widow ( $n=4$ ; 1.7%), with two missing data. For the political orientation, with five missing values, 38.7% ( $n=89$ ) show a tendency to be left-winged, 20.8% ( $n=49$ ) tend to the right-wing side, 19.7% ( $n=46$ ) are in between and 19.2% ( $n=45$ ) do not position themselves in the scale. For last, 62.8% ( $n=147$ ) have children while 35.5% ( $n=83$ ) do not, taking into account that for this we had four missing values.

#### 4.2. Measures

The questionnaire (Annex 1) included the following scales: Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism (SRL) (Valentim & Heleno, 2018); a Portuguese version of Individualism/Collectivism (IND/COL) that was adapted for this research (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998); Human Values (Schwartz, 2003: Portuguese version Valentim & Helkama, 2005); Attitudes towards Religious Groups that was specifically created for this study, having as baseline the work of Valentim and Heleno (2018); and Perception of Discrimination (Gondim et al., 2013). It was also included one question of the European Study of Values for Portugal about the importance of different life areas (Cabral, Ramos & Vala, 1999) and two religion indexes from the TCIU (2013), that were translated to Portuguese, related with attendance to religious ceremonies and comfortability in talking to others about religion. Likewise, a Portuguese version of Attitudes towards Religion was specifically developed for this research. However, it was only used to characterize the sample.

Additionally, the questionnaire included a sociodemographic section, with questions about age, sex, nationality, marital status, number of children, level of education, profession, the religion of the individual, his/her political orientation, type of work (part-time, full-time, volunteer, among others) and tenure in the present organization.

The Scale of Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism was composed of 17 items about the Portuguese people, in which individuals answered according to their opinion using a Likert scale ranging from 1 – *Totally disagree* to 7 – *Totally agree*. The research using this version with 17 items (Valentim & Heleno, 2018) pointed out four dimensions: (i) *Harmonious relations* ( $\alpha=.77$ ) that included five items related with the harmony lived in Portugal (i.e., *It is part of the Portuguese tradition to have good relationships with people of other cultures*), (ii) *Colonial past* ( $\alpha=.74$ ) that was related with the good colonial past of Portugal, being composed of 4 items (i.e., *The Portuguese colonization did not have the oppressive character that could be seen in other nations*), (iii) *Ability to adapt* ( $\alpha=.70$ ) with 6

items associated with the easy adaptation of Portuguese people to the tropics and the easy adaptation of foreigners to Portugal (i.e., *Along the colonization, the Portuguese people showed a singular capacity to adapt to the life in the tropical regions*) and (iv) *Cultural integration* ( $r=.37$ ) that referred to two items related with the integrative characteristics of the Portuguese people (i.e., *Nowadays, the harmony between Portuguese people and people from other cultures is small, compared with other countries*; reversed item). For this scale, four items needed to be reversed, namely, the items 9, 10, 15 and 16 (see Annex 1).

The Scale of Individualism/Collectivism (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) included 16 items related with what people think about themselves and about their relationship with others. Individuals needed to select the number that best described his/her opinion from 1 – *Never/ Definitely not* to 9 – *Always/ Definitely yes* of a Likert scale. The dimensions/factors found were four, each one equally composed of four items: (i) *Horizontal individualism* ( $\alpha=.81$ ) – in which people were moved by the desire of being unique and distinct of the groups they were in, although they do not worry about having a higher status than others (i.e., *I'd rather depend on myself than others*), (ii) *Vertical individualism* ( $\alpha=.82$ ) – where people wanted not only to be different and unique, but also wanted a higher status (i.e., *It is important that I do my job better than others*), (iii) *Horizontal collectivism* ( $\alpha=.80$ ) – in which people saw themselves as similar to the others who were also integrating their groups and prioritized the group goals; however, they did not easily submit to authority (i.e., *If a co-worker gets a prize, I would feel proud*) and (iv) *Vertical collectivism* ( $\alpha=.73$ ) – where individuals were able to sacrifice their personal interests to favour the collective welfare, as well as they were willing to submit to authority (i.e., *Parents and children must stay together as much as possible*).

About Human Values, the scale that was used in this investigation was a short version of the Portrait Values Scale (PVS) developed by Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess and Harris (2001) composed of 21 items and adapted to the Portuguese language by different authors (Granho & Peixoto, 2013; Valentim & Helkama, 2005), in which individuals were asked to show to what extent the described person was similar to them, selecting a number from 1 – *Nothing like me* to 6 – *A lot like me*. This scale had four dimensions, namely: (i) *Self-enhancement* ( $\alpha=.70$ ) associated with self-interest (i.e., *It is important to him to be rich. He wants to have a lot of money and expensive things*) involving the values of power and realization, composed of two items each (ii) *Self-transcendence* ( $\alpha=.71$ ) related with interests

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

of others (i.e., *It's very important to him to help the people around him. He wants to care for other people*), including the values of universalism (three items) and benevolence (two items), (iii) *Openness to change* ( $\alpha=.74$ ) encompassed independent action, thought and feeling, and readiness for new experiences (i.e., *Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to her. She likes to do things her own original way*), containing the values auto-centration, stimulation and hedonism, each one constituted by two items, and (iv) *Conservatism* ( $\alpha=.69$ ) comprised self-restriction, order and resistance to change (i.e., *It is important to him always to behave properly. He wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong*), including the values tradition, conformity and safety, each one composed of two items as well (Granjo & Peixoto, 2013; Schwartz, 2003).

Attitudes towards Religion was a scale where 15 situations of religious discrimination in the workplace were described (i.e., *I was discouraged from wearing facial hair, certain hair styles or clothing that are part of religious identity*). There were three answering choices: 1 – *Already happened to me*, 2 – *Happened to another person* and 3 – *I do not know/ Does not apply*. However, in this instrument it was possible to select more than one option, this means that the possible answers were: select only option 1, only option 2, both option 1 and 2, and only option 3. The frequency of the answers per item was measured.

Attitudes towards Religious Groups encompassed a Likert scale that ranged from 1 – *Extremely favourable* to 7 – *Extremely unfavourable*. In this instrument, the participants were asked to give their opinion in relation to the hiring of people from seven different religious groups in their workplace (such as Catholics, Muslims and Jehovah's witnesses) and two non-religious groups (Atheists and Agnostics), with whom they would need to work and interact. A 10<sup>th</sup> option was given in which the individual could write another religion/Church that was not mentioned before in that scale. The decision of choosing those groups and of splitting Christians into Catholics, Orthodoxies and Protestants was related with the data obtained in the last Portuguese *Censos*, in 2011. The scale was expected to have one factor only in order to be used as a global mark composed of the mean of the scores obtained in the nine items.

Lastly, in the measure Perception of Discrimination (an adaptation of the scale developed by Gondim et al., 2013) a set of 21 behaviours practiced by Portuguese workers towards immigrant workers were listed. Individuals were asked to select the option that would best describe their opinion about those behaviours, using a Likert scale ranging from 1 – *Completely disagree* to 7 – *Completely agree*. In the original study (Gondim et al., 2013) the

scale was composed of 22 items and the authors found two dimensions, each one constituted by 11 items: (i) *Hostility* ( $\alpha=.89$ ) – related with behaviours of social withdrawal and few intergroup cordiality that included items referring to ignoring the new workers, give them nicknames and additional tasks, spread rumours and avoid greeting them (for example, *To form “cliques” with other co-workers in order to isolate the immigrant workers*) and (ii) *Kindness* ( $\alpha=.72$ ) – related to behaviours of intergroup approximation that comprised items associated with trying to make friendships with the new workers, complimenting them, trying to learn with them and talking nicely about them (for example, *Compliment them when they fulfil a task in a competent way*).

### **4.3. Procedures**

#### **4.3.1. Data collection procedures**

The individuals who answered the questionnaire consented being part of the investigation and data was collected between February 2017 and May 2017. Some individuals were asked to fill in the online format to ease the process of collecting data at distance. The participation was volunteer and all matters of confidentiality and anonymity were granted.

The statistical analyses were run in the IBM SPSS (v.22) in which we ran the Principal Component Analyses (PCA), calculated the internal consistence indexes through the Cronbach’s alpha for each dimension of the instruments, and ran the multiple regressions.

#### **4.3.2. Preliminary statistical procedures**

In the first place, we looked at the pattern of missing values of our initial sample: composed of 236 individuals. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) stated that deletion of cases was a reasonable choice if the “pattern appears random and if only a very few cases have missing data, and those cases are missing data on different variables” (p. 71), so we deleted two subjects that had more than 10% of missing answers (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2006). Therefore, our analyses were conducted with a final sample of 234 individuals (95 answered the on-line format questionnaire and 139 answered the paper-and-pencil format).

According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) when we substituted less than 5% of missing data in each variable, we are probably in the presence of a random pattern, meaning that the problems are “less serious and almost any procedure for handling missing values yields similar results” (p. 63). However, to affirm that the data are missing randomly, a test should be conducted through the SPSS MVA (Missing Values Analysis): Little’s MCAR test

(Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). We applied it to each one of our instruments deciding that then we would estimate (impute) missing values and use the estimates during the data analysis. We decided to impute the missing values in two different ways according to the randomness of the distribution: through Regression method when the missing pattern was random (Little's MCAR test  $p\text{-value} > .05$ ) and when the distribution was not random ( $p\text{-value} < .05$ ) we used the Expectation-Maximization algorithm (EM) (Hair et al., 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Both Individualism/Collectivism and Attitudes towards Religious Groups showed no missing values. However, the other three main instruments had at least one. In Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism, per variable, we only substituted up to 0.9% of the missing values (<5%) and they had a random distribution [ $\chi^2_{(111)} = 107.051$ ;  $p = .588$ ], so the replacement was made by the Regression method. The Perception of Discrimination also showed a random distribution [ $\chi^2_{(20)} = 2.413$ ;  $p = 1$ ], using the Regression method in the imputation process as well, but we only replaced up to 0.4% of the missing values per variable (<5%). For last, in Human Values, per variable, we only substituted up to 0.4% of the missing values as well (<5%), but in this case the missing pattern was not random [ $\chi^2_{(58)} = 78,124$ ;  $p = .040$ ] and the replacement technique was the EM algorithm.

#### 4.3.3. Statistical Procedures

In this investigation we ran Principal Components Analyses (PCA) for the five main instruments: Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism, Individualism/Collectivism, Human Values, Perception of Discrimination and Attitudes towards Religious Groups. After finding the factors/dimensions that were present in our sample, we checked for correlations and then we ran multiple regressions to ascertain whether or not there were significant relations between them. As independent variables the dimensions/factors of Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism, Human values and Individualism/collectivism were used. The dimensions of the Measure of Perception Discrimination and the scores of the instrument Attitudes towards Religious Groups were considered as dependent variables of the aforementioned regressions.

*Psychometric analysis:* As it was stated before, our investigation starts with an analysis of the psychometric properties of our five main instruments repeating the procedures that the original authors stated in the literature, in order to provide an adequate "empirical solution" of their factorial structure to this particular sample (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p.28).

In order to retain the factors obtained in the Principal Components Analyses, we decided to apply the cut-off point of 0.45 to the factor loadings. This value was defended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) and by Comrey and Lee (1992) as fair, meaning that all items that score below this value were eliminated. The cross-loading rule we established, also taken from Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), consists of the elimination of items that score in a significant way in more than one factor (with a difference  $<0.10$  in the factor loadings).

*Hypotheses analysis:* The second step of our investigation is the hypotheses analysis that started with the calculation of correlations between all the dimensions of our measures (all variables). Previously to the analysis of the hypotheses themselves, the regression's assumptions were checked: multicollinearity of the predictors, independence of errors and normality of the residuals. Only after meeting these assumptions the multiple linear regressions were run, using all predictors at the same time in a multivariate analysis.

## 5. Results

### 5.1. Psychometric properties

*Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism:* Repeating the procedures of the original authors, for this scale we used PCA with a varimax rotation in which the initial solution pointed out four factors, such as the literature suggested. However, the items within Factor 1 and Factor 2 were a mixture of the items of two factors of the literature: *Harmonious relations* and *Ability to adapt*. Furthermore, in semantic terms it was difficult to explain this structure. Therefore, we decided to make a new PCA forced to three factors in which the items that were initially part of Factor 1 and Factor 2 aggregated themselves in one single factor (the new Factor 1), which we can call *Harmony and ability to adapt*. Factor 2 was named *Colonial past* and Factor 3 was *Cultural integration*, in accordance with the literature (Valentim & Heleno, 2018). This solution had adequacy indicators that let us proceed with the calculations (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin=.873; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity,  $\chi^2_{(136)} = 1551.536, p < .001$ ).

The three components extracted explained 54.882% of the variance. The first dimension was composed of 12 items, with factorial loadings ranging between .746 and .473, explaining 26.998% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 4.590). The second dimension explained 15.534% of the variance (Eigenvalue=2.641) and was composed of three items, with factorial

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

loadings ranging between .656 and .833. The third and last dimension explained 12.350% of the variance (Eigenvalue=2.100) and had two items with the same factor loading .810. According to the literature (Valentim & Heleno, 2018), the second factor, *Colonial Past*, was composed of four items, but in this analysis one of them (item 8) moved to the first factor (*Harmony and ability to adapt*) (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Summary of PCA results for Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism.

Items	Factor Loadings		
	Harmony and ability to adapt	Colonial past	Cultural integration
Item 5	<b>.746</b>	.211	.241
Item 7	<b>.666</b>	-.019	.203
Item 4	<b>.642</b>	.190	.344
Item 11	<b>.627</b>	-.082	-.040
Item 12	<b>.623</b>	.521	-.142
Item 2	<b>.620</b>	.153	.277
Item 1	<b>.585</b>	.064	.242
Item 13	<b>.568</b>	.139	-.269
Item 3	<b>.561</b>	.527	-.163
Item 8	<b>.560</b>	.443	.027
Item 14	<b>.545</b>	.258	-.016
Item 6	<b>.473</b>	.217	.101
Item 15	-.072	<b>.775</b>	.219
Item 17	.392	<b>.756</b>	-.141
Item 10	.076	<b>.684</b>	.483
Item 9	.136	.077	<b>.810</b>
Item 16	.122	.035	<b>.810</b>
Eigenvalues	4.590	2.641	2.100
% of variance	26.998	15.534	12.350

All communalities revealed satisfactory results, except item 14 that presented a value lower than the cut-off point (.40) in the communalities (.364) as well as item 6 (.282). The corrected item-total correlations were all satisfactory, which is one of the reasons why the aforementioned items could be accepted (their corrected item-total correlation values are .512 and .452 for items 14 and 6, respectively).

For this same instrument, Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism, the factor *Harmony and ability to adapt* had a Cronbach's alpha of .872 (Table 6). The *Cultural integration* factor was composed of two items with a high correlation ( $r = .538, p < .001$ ) and

the last factor, *Colonial past*, had a Cronbach's alpha of .722, being all of them above the cut-off point .60 (Devellis, 2003) and close to the values stated in the literature (Valentim & Heleno, 2018).

*Individualism/Collectivism*: For this scale we used PCA with an oblimin rotation in which the initial solution pointed out four factors, such as the literature suggested. One item (item 4) was deleted due to the cross-loading rule: it was scoring in two factors with a difference  $<.10$ , namely, in Factor 1 (.424) and in Factor 4 (.416) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The final solution was composed of 15 items and had adequacy indicators that let us proceed with the calculations (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin=.849; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity,  $\chi^2_{(120)} = 1700.262$ ,  $p < .001$ ) because all other items were arranged in four factors according to what was presented in the literature (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

The first dimension was composed of four items, with factorial loadings ranging between .764 and .846, explaining 36.488% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 5.473). The second dimension explained 14.779% of the variance (Eigenvalue= 2.217) and was composed of four items, with factorial loadings ranging between .656 and .833. The third dimension explained 8.800% of the variance (Eigenvalue=1.320), being composed of four items with factor loadings ranging between .454 and .866. Finally, the last dimension had factor loadings ranging between .736 and .847, was composed of three items and explained 7.417% of the variance (Eigenvalue=1.113). All communalities and corrected item-total correlations revealed satisfactory results, except item 16 that presented a value close to the cut-off point in the communalities (.384), but it was still considered acceptable because its item-total correlation was satisfactory (.427) (Table 2).

The first factor was denominated *Horizontal Collectivism*, the second was *Vertical Individualism*, the third was *Vertical Collectivism* and the fourth and last one was *Horizontal Individualism*, as in the literature (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). All factors revealed high Cronbach's alphas, ranging between .772 and .856 (Table 6), respecting the cut-off point .60 (Devellis, 2003) and being close to the values stated in the literature as well (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

**Table 2:** Summary of PCA results for Individualism/Collectivism.

Items	Factor Loadings			
	Horizontal Collectivism	Vertical Individualism	Vertical Collectivism	Horizontal Individualism
Item 10	<b>.846</b>	-.018	.002	-.073
Item 12	<b>.825</b>	.036	-.078	-.027
Item 9	<b>.809</b>	-.087	.039	-.100
Item 11	<b>.764</b>	.154	-.126	.212
Item 8	-.009	<b>.833</b>	.136	.033
Item 7	-.026	<b>.747</b>	-.122	-.071
Item 6	-.077	<b>.730</b>	-.271	-.049
Item 5	.208	<b>.656</b>	.021	-.157
Item 15	-.089	.101	<b>-.866</b>	.048
Item 13	.047	-.002	<b>-.828</b>	.040
Item 14	.108	.000	<b>-.743</b>	-.136
Item 16	.216	-.069	<b>-.454</b>	-.144
Item 2	-.154	.004	-.144	<b>-.847</b>
Item 1	.204	-.006	-.002	<b>-.759</b>
Item 3	.013	.207	.075	<b>-.736</b>
Eigenvalues	5.473	2.217	1.320	1.113
% of variance	36.488	14.779	8.800	7.417

*Human Values:* For this measure we ran PCA with promax rotation, as it was done in the literature (Granjó & Peixoto, 2013) but in the initial solution, instead of four factors, six factors emerged with Eigenvalues > 1. After analysing the Cattell's Scree Test, we decided that four factors should be retained, therefore, we decided to force a four factors' PCA. The items 6 (.421), 5 (.429), 15 (.440) and 14 (.436) were eliminated in successive steps after checking that their factor loadings were below .45 that we adopted as cut-off point (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Then, we repeated the PCA and the final solution had 17 items and presented adequate values in the matrix's and sample's indicators (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin=.765; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity,  $\chi^2_{(136)} = 1005.086, p < .001$ ).

The first dimension was composed of seven items, with factorial loadings ranging between .514 and .770, explaining 24.249% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 4.122). The second dimension explained 12.015% of the variance (Eigenvalue= 2.043) and was composed of four items, with factorial loadings ranging between .664 and .751. The third dimension, with three items, explained 9.676% of the variance (Eigenvalue=1.645) and its factor loadings ranged between .491 and .862. The last dimension was also composed of three items with factor

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

loadings ranging between .586 and .680 and explaining 8.050% of the variance (Eigenvalue=1.368). This instrument had four items that were deleted due to their low factor loadings (<.45), namely, items 5, 6, 14 and 15. However, the items that remained were almost all allocated in the correct dimensions, except for item number 1 that has moved from the third factor, *Openness to change*, to the first factor, *Self-transcendence* (Table 3).

**Table 3:** Summary of PCA results for Human Values.

Items	Factor Loadings			
	Self-transcendence	Self-enhancement	Openness to change	Conservatism
Item 8	<b>.770</b>	-.097	-.172	-.051
Item 3	<b>.754</b>	-.141	.013	-.124
Item 12	<b>.701</b>	.075	.111	.124
Item 19	<b>.618</b>	-.198	.069	.231
Item 9	<b>.579</b>	-.156	.025	.231
Item 18	<b>.577</b>	.112	.054	.133
Item 1	<b>.514</b>	.363	-.083	-.355
Item 4	.092	<b>.751</b>	-.085	-.095
Item 17	-.154	<b>.709</b>	-.011	.284
Item 13	-.077	<b>.678</b>	.189	.115
Item 2	-.216	<b>.664</b>	.042	-.126
Item 21	-.075	-.094	<b>.862</b>	.119
Item 10	.001	.115	<b>.817</b>	-.054
Item 11	.302	.181	<b>.491</b>	-.189
Item 7	.009	.137	.008	<b>.680</b>
Item 20	.089	-.196	.068	<b>.671</b>
Item 16	.168	.420	-.182	<b>.586</b>
Eigenvalues	4.122	2.043	1.645	1.368
% of variance	24.249	12.015	9.676	8.050

On the one hand, the only communality showing a value lower than the cut-off point (.40) was item 9 (.391), which is acceptable because of its closeness to the limit value. On the other hand, corrected item-total correlations revealed low results in some items, namely 1 (.379), 2 (.358), 7 (.377), 16 (.393) and 20 (.287). From these five items the one that could be in the position of not being accepted was item 20, because all the others were close to the cut-off point (.40). However, we considered it acceptable due to its high factor loading (.671) and

due to its communality value (.481).

The first factor is denominated *Self-transcendence*, the second is *Self-enhancement*, the third is *Openness to change* and the fourth and last factor is named *Conservatism*. All these nomenclatures and factors coincided with the ones in the literature (Schwartz, 2003).

This measure showed acceptable Cronbach's alphas for three of its factors (*Self-transcendence*, *Self-enhancement* and *Openness to change*) that were similar to the literature (Grano & Peixoto, 2013; Schwartz, 2003). The fourth factor, *Conservatism*, revealed a Cronbach's alpha below the cut-off point .60 ( $\alpha=.544$ ), therefore, it was eliminated from our analysis (Table 6).

*Attitudes towards Religion:* This instrument did not show an interpretable factorial structure, and as a consequence, it was treated differently, only being useful to characterize the sample. A frequency analysis of the instrument was run (TCIU, 2013) showing that for each one of the 15 items of workplace religious discrimination attitudes, there was at least two people from our sample that knew it had "happened to another". The two most stated as "already happened to me" were items 6 (*Had jokes made about your religious beliefs, practices or dress*) ( $n=32$ ) and 7 (*Were required to work on a religious holiday*) ( $n=58$ ). Items 1, 11 and 15 also showed some incidence. For item 1 (*Were discouraged from wearing facial hair, certain hair styles or clothing that are part of religious identity*), seven individuals stated it had already happened with them and 19 knew it had happened with someone else. In item 11 (*Refused to fulfil a task due to religious motives*), six participants answered it had already happened to them, while 25 stated they knew it had already happened with another. Finally, for item 15 (*Experienced or witnessed a conflict between a coworker with strong religious beliefs and a non-religious coworker*), four subjects stated it happened to them, while 19 knew that had occurred to someone they know. Hence, these results indicate that religious discrimination does occur in the Portuguese workplace.

*Attitudes towards Religious Groups:* For this new instrument a PCA with no rotation was applied. The results showed only one factor composed by the nine items with factor loadings ranging between .799 and .959, which is considered as excellent according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). This structure explained 78.936% (Eigenvalue= 7.104) of the variance and adequacy indicators let us proceed with the calculations (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin=.917; Bartlett's

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

Test of Sphericity,  $\chi^2_{(36)} = 2851.415, p < .001$  (Table 4). All communalities and corrected item-total correlations revealed satisfactory results. Furthermore, Cronbach's alpha was excellent (Table 6) and clearly above Devellis' (2003) cut-off point (.60).

**Table 4:** Summary of PCA results for Attitudes towards Religious Groups

Items	Factor Loadings
	Favourability
Item 3	<b>.959</b>
Item 2	<b>.948</b>
Item 4	<b>.940</b>
Item 9	<b>.898</b>
Item 6	<b>.892</b>
Item 8	<b>.880</b>
Item 1	<b>.858</b>
Item 5	<b>.807</b>
Item 7	<b>.799</b>
Eigenvalues	7.104
% of variance	78.936

*Perception of discrimination measure:* In the Perception of Discrimination Measure we applied a PCA with an oblimin rotation that brought us a different structure of the one found in the literature (Gondim et al., 2013). The initial solution showed five factors with Eigenvalues  $> 1$  while the literature stated the existence of only two. However, the Cattell's Scree Test pointed out the retention of three components. Forcing the PCA to arrange the items within three factors, three items needed to be deleted in successive steps due to the fact that their loadings were below .45 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), namely, items 13 (.273), 3 (.357) and 14 (.272). Item 1 was also a problem due to its negative loading in a factor with only positive ones. Therefore, it was also eliminated but not due to statistical reasons, but semantic ones, probably related with the interpretation the respondents made of that item.

After withdrawing the aforementioned items, the final solution had 17 items and presented adequate values in the matrix's and sample's indicators (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin=.820; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity,  $\chi^2_{(136)} = 1344.322, p < .001$ ). The first dimension was composed of nine items, with factorial loadings ranging between .495 and .706, explaining 29.323% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 4.985). The second dimension explained 13.039% of the variance (Eigenvalue= 2.217) and was composed of four items, with factorial loadings ranging between

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

.547 and .902. The third and last dimension explained 9.250% of the variance (Eigenvalue=1.573) with four items as well, and with factor loadings ranging between .572 and .830 (Table 5).

**Table 5:** Summary of PCA results for Perception of Discrimination.

Items	Factor Loadings		
	Kindness	Blatant hostility	Undercover hostility
Item 12	<b>.706</b>	.020	-.077
Item 2	<b>.651</b>	-.177	-.066
Item 4	<b>.643</b>	-.025	-.170
Item 5	<b>.641</b>	-.045	-.042
Item 21	<b>.635</b>	.064	-.189
Item 15	<b>.590</b>	.060	-.112
Item 11	<b>.581</b>	-.041	-.184
Item 6	<b>.529</b>	-.174	.208
Item 19	<b>.495</b>	.157	.139
Item 18	.050	<b>.902</b>	-.107
Item 17	.013	<b>.869</b>	.042
Item 16	.094	<b>.720</b>	.155
Item 20	-.277	<b>.547</b>	.035
Item 10	-.063	.006	<b>.830</b>
Item 8	-.065	.045	<b>.778</b>
Item 9	.001	-.003	<b>.764</b>
Item 7	-.072	.063	<b>.572</b>
Eigenvalues	4.985	2.217	1.573
% of variance	29.323	13.039	9.250

Most communalities and corrected item-total correlations revealed satisfactory results, except items 6, 7, 15 e 19 that presented values close to the cut-off point in the communalities (.304, .378, .387 and .235, respectively), and items 6 and 19 also showed low values in corrected item-total correlations (.355 and .308, respectively) but they were still considered due to their acceptable factor loadings (.529 and .495).

The first factor was denominated *Kindness*, such as the one in the literature (Gondim et al., 2013). We decided to name the second factor *Blatant Hostility* – that refers to behaviours where discrimination is clear and noticed by others – and the third one *Undercover Hostility* – that includes discriminatory behaviours that can pass unnoticed in the workplace. In the empirical literature no differentiation had appeared before in the *Hostility* factor, meaning that

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

the items we have in *Blatant* and *Undercover Hostility* were usually saturated in one factor only (Gondim et al. 2013). However, as some authors have stated, discrimination has gained more subtle, elusive and condescending forms, being difficult to identify, document and expose (Dixon et al., 2012; Dovidio, 2001; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1983, 1991, 1998; Hamberger & Hewstone, 1997; Noh et al., 1999; Pager, 2007), and our results corroborate it. The three factors of our Perception of Discrimination measure had internal consistence values ranging between .774 and .812 (Table 6). However, both *Undercover Hostility* and *Blatant Hostility* could increase their Cronbach's alphas if one item of each was deleted (items 7 and 20, respectively), but those items proved to be important in the factorial analysis, with satisfactory factor loadings above .45 (.607 and .601, respectively) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

**Table 6:** Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha$ ), mean ( $M$ ) and standard deviations ( $SD$ ) by dimension.

Measure	Dimension	$N$ items	$\alpha$	$M$	$SD$
Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism (Scale range: 1-7)	Harmony and ability to adapt	12	.872	4.770	.679
	Colonial past	3	.722	3.834	.957
	Cultural integration	2	— <sup>a</sup>	4.756	.948
Individualism/ Collectivism (Scale range: 1-9)	Horizontal individualism	3	.772	6.500	1.433
	Vertical individualism	4	.805	4.304	1.708
	Horizontal collectivism	4	.856	7.316	1.205
	Vertical collectivism	4	.789	6.733	1.469
Human values (Scale range: 1-6)	Self-transcendence	7	.776	4.780	.683
	Self-enhancement	4	.677	3.481	.858
	Openness to change	3	.681	4.565	.896
	Conservatism	3	.544	3.345	1.040
Perception of discrimination (Scale range: 1-7)	Kindness	9	.812	5.859	.912
	Undercover hostility	4	.774	1.420	.869
	Blatant hostility	4	.787	1.562	1.081
Attitudes towards Religious Groups (Scale range: 1-7)	Favourability	9	.966	5.147	1.278

<sup>a</sup>This value is absent because it was not possible to determine the internal consistence index of this dimension, since it was only constituted of two items; the alternative was to calculate a correlation coefficient between them, which in this case was  $r = .538$  ( $p \leq .001$ ).

## 5.2. Regression analyses

The original hypotheses formulated in the Introduction were not fully tested in behalf of two main reasons: (i) the PCA analyses results of the Luso-tropicalism and Perception of

Discrimination scales did not coincide with the literature, with factorial structures differing from the ones that were expected, as explained before, and (ii) not all dimensions of the dependent and independent variables that constituted the initial hypotheses proved to be correlated (Table 7). As not all predictors included in the models were seen as significant in contributing to explain Perception of Discrimination dimensions (*kindness*, *undercover hostility* and *blatant hostility*) and Attitudes towards Religious Groups (Table 7), there was the necessity of adapting the original hypotheses (that were formulated according to the literature) to the new factorial structures and to the dimensions that proved to be correlated.

For Hypotheses 1 e 2 we found some statistically significant correlations (Table 7) between some dimensions of Perception of Discrimination and other variables, such as Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism (*harmony and ability to adapt*, *colonial past* and *cultural integration*), Individualism/Collectivism (*horizontal collectivism*) and Human values (*self-transcendence* and *openness to change*), that we use as independent variables. Although not all of the Perception of discrimination dimensions (*kindness*, *undercover hostility* and *blatant hostility*) had statistically significant correlations with the aforementioned independent variables, all of them were maintained in the regression models because this option would enable us to better compare the results (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). It is important to mention the division of the hostility dimension into two, meaning that the tested models were three: one using *kindness* as dependent variable (Pearson's correlations ranging between .042 and .292), other using *undercover hostility* (Pearson's correlations ranging between -.063 and -.276) and another one using *blatant hostility* (Pearson's correlations ranging between -.088 and -.157).

Regression analyses were conducted to explore the impact Luso-tropicalism, Individualism/ Collectivism and Human Values had in perceived discrimination towards immigrant workers in the workplace. Before this procedure, multiple regression assumptions were assessed: residuals normality, multicollinearity and independence of errors, and these showed no important restraints to the use of the current data for the regression analyses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

The results revealed that all predictors produced significant models in each perception of discrimination component. The first regression, concerning workplace *kindness*, explained 13.5% of the variance, the second one, for *undercover hostility*, 10% and the third and last, concerning *blatant hostility* accounted 9.3% of the variance, showing modest differences between them.

**Table 7:** Correlations (2-tailed Pearson  $r$ ) between all variables.

Measure	Dimension	SRL			IND/COL				ESS			MPD			ATRG		
		HAA	CP	CI	HI	VI	HC	VC	ST	SE	OC	C	K	UH	BH	F	
Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism (SRL)	Harmony and ability to adapt (HAA)	-	.500***	.242***	.180**	.310***	.075	.195**	.044	.093	.159*	.208***	.132*	-.059	.133*	-.018	
	Colonial past (CP)		-	.262***	.084	.105	.020	.016	-.056	-0.074	-.007	.083	.042	-.063	.146*	-.017	
	Cultural integration (CI)			-	-.044	-.092	.007	-.085	.035	-.002	.094	-.080	.152*	-.154*	-.157*	.006	
Individualism/Collectivism (IND/COL)	Horizontal individualism (HI)				-	.498***	.320***	.408***	.202**	.265***	.246***	.184**	.071	-.056	-.016	.057	
	Vertical individualism (VI)					-	.238***	.423***	.017	.473***	.145*	.262***	.027	.006	-.059	-.065	
	Horizontal collectivism (HC)						-	.498***	.343***	.152*	.179**	.174**	.234***	-.088	-.075	.171*	
	Vertical collectivism (VC)							-	.234***	.186**	.174**	.417***	.085	-.051	-.048	.055	
Human values (ESS)	Self-transcendence (ST)								-	.203**	.382***	.273***	.292***	-.276***	-.126	.154*	
	Self-enhancement (SE)									-	.244***	.272**	.073	-.080	-.046	-.010	
	Openness to change (OC)										-	.088	.179**	-.144*	-.107	.126	
	Conservatism (C)											-	.083	-.027	.019	.106	
Perception of discrimination (MPD)	Kindness (K)												-	-.393***	-.225***	.153*	
	Undercover hostility (UH)													-	.320***	-.095	
	Blatant hostility (BH)														-	-.054	
Attitudes towards Religious Groups (ATRG)	Favourability (F)																-

\*\*\* $p \leq .001$ ; \*\* $p \leq .01$ ; \* $p \leq .05$

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

**Table 8:** Multiple regression analyses for Hypotheses 1 and 2.

	Kindness			Undercover Hostility						Blatant Hostility								
	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>F</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>F</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>F</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$
Models	.367	.135	5.880				.317	.100	4.215				.305	.093	3.885			
Harmony and ability to adapt				.117	.098	.087				.021	.096	.016				.220	.119	.138
Colonial past				-.023	.070	-.024				-.046	.068	-.050				.148	.084	.131
Cultural integration				.120	.062	.124				-.122	.061	-.133*				-.246	.076	-.216**
Horizontal Collectivism				.110	.050	.145*				.049	-.020	-.301				-.056	.061	-.063
Self-transcendence				.288	.094	.216**				-.325	.091	-.256***				-.109	.114	-.069
Openness to change				.046	.069	.045				-.032	.067	-0.033				-.085	.084	-.070

\* $p \leq .05$ ; \*\* $p \leq .01$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq .001$

Regarding workplace kindness, the model was statistically significant ( $R = .367$ ;  $R^2 = .135$ ;  $F_{(6,227)} = 5.880$ ;  $p < .001$ ), however, considering the predictors as a whole in the regression coefficients analysis, only two of them were statistically significant, namely, *self-transcendence* and *horizontal collectivism*, in ascending order (Table 8).

For the second analysis, concerning *undercover hostility* in the workplace, the model was statistically significant as well ( $R = .317$ ;  $R^2 = .100$ ;  $F_{(6,227)} = 4.215$ ;  $p < .001$ ), however, similarly to what happened in the previous hypothesis, only two out of the six predictors were statistically significant in the regression coefficients analysis, namely, *self-transcendence* and *cultural integration*, being the first one the variable with a stronger impact in predicting *undercover hostility* (Table 8). In this case, both *self-transcendence* and *cultural integration* tended to diminish when *undercover hostility* increased.

The third model belonging to Perception of discrimination regards *blatant hostility*. Once again, the model was statistically significant ( $R = .305$ ;  $R^2 = .093$ ;  $F_{(6,227)} = 3.885$ ;  $p = .001$ ). Yet, in this regression coefficients analysis only one predictor was statistically significant: *cultural integration* (Table 8) and also inversely related, as it happened with *undercover hostility* and its predictors, meaning that the higher the punctuation in *cultural integration*, the smaller the punctuation of *blatant hostility*.

Regarding Hypotheses 3 and 4, the statistically significant correlations (ranging between  $r = .153$  and  $r = .171$ ) that were found did not permit the total confirmation of the initial formulation. Explaining it more properly, there were significant correlations between Attitudes towards Religious Groups (our dependent variable for these models) and other variables, such as Individualism/Collectivism (*horizontal collectivism*), Human values (*self-transcendence*) and Perception of Discrimination (*kindness*), but no correlation was found with any component of Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism. Considering this finding, the multiple regression was run without the Luso-tropicalism variable, exploring the impact of Individualism/Collectivism, Human Values and Perception of Discrimination in workplace religious prejudice. Before this procedure, multiple regression assumptions were assessed: residuals normality, multicollinearity and independence of errors, and these showed some constraints, especially in the normality assumption that was slightly violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). However, this parametric statistical technique was considered sufficiently strong and robust to accept small violations of regression's assumptions (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

The results revealed that all predictors produced a significant model ( $R = .221$ ;  $R^2 = .049$ ;  $F_{(3,230)} = 3.929$ ;  $p = .009$ ). However, this model explained a low level of variance, only 4.9% and none of the predictors stood out for having a statistically significant effect in this regression. Their effects were similar and all non-significant (Table 9). Under this model a lot of variance remained unexplained.

**Table 9:** Multiple regression analyses for Hypotheses 3 and 4.

	Attitudes towards Religious Groups					
	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>F</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$
Model	.221	.049	3.929			
Horizontal Collectivism				.126	.073	.119
Self-transcendence				.157	.132	.084
Kindness				.142	.095	.101

## 6. Discussion

The study of the factorial structure of the instruments showed us results somewhat different from the original ones. The PCA analyses revealed some differences in relation to the number of items to be retained in the measures of Individualism/Collectivism (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), Human Values (Granjo & Peixoto, 2013; Schwartz, 2003) and Perception of Discrimination (Gondim et al., 2013), but the structures that emerged from those same analyses were highly interpretable, meaning that those differences were not strong enough so that they could compromise our calculations. Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism and Attitudes towards Religious Groups had no items deleted and also showed highly interpretable factorial structures.

Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism revealed a factorial structure analogous to the original one (Valentim & Heleno, 2018). All 17 items were maintained and were distributed through three factors, being that two of the original factors became one factor only, and the other two were replicated (*cultural integration* and *colonial past*). The items of the first two original factors, which should coincide with the factors *harmonious relations* and *ability to adapt*, comingled in one factor only that was named *harmony and ability to adapt*. The emergent structure became semantically interpretable.

The Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism scale was originally applied to a sample of 148 Portuguese students from Human and Social Sciences of the University of Coimbra with ages ranging between 17 and 61 years old ( $M = 20.34$ ;  $SD = 5.71$ ), being 88.50%

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

of them female. The present sample was significantly different, being composed of 234 Portuguese workers, working in different organizations across Portugal and with different professional specializations. Although both samples were in its majority composed of women, age differences were evident: this sample was considerably older than the original one, with individuals aged between 18 and 66 years old ( $M= 42.89$ ;  $SD= 10.47$ ). These dissimilarities in the characterization of the sample could be the explanation for the changes in the factorial structure of the instrument. Another possible reasoning for such dissimilarities may be explained by the recalling of the concept of social or collective memory. As defined in the literature review, social memory focuses on the construction of meanings that individuals attribute to shared experiences (French, 1996; Marques et al., 1997). One of the ways of processing memories of traumatic events, such as the colonization of Africa and the war that followed, is through the transgenerational transmission of information and through the collective reconstruction of the past, in which individuals repress or distort what was negative, creating a positive image of the events. This originated a positive reconstruction of the colonization by the ones without any closer acquaintances involved (as victims or actors) in the colonial war (Marques et al., 1997). Contrarily to that, the present sample is composed of a considerable number of individuals that lived closer to the epoch which might imply the likelihood of having closer acquaintances involved in the war (even though this was not assessed), being more able of acknowledging the violence of the colonization. Therefore, whereas the older respondents might have a different vision and comprehension of the items related with this topic (e.g., item 3, *The Portuguese colonial history was characterized by the cultural integration with the colonized people*), a younger sample, composed of students, might think positively about it, due to the transgenerational reconstruction of meaning (Marques et al., 1997).

For Individualism/Collectivism we applied a PCA with an oblimin rotation, according to the original authors, that showed a factorial structure that corresponded to its initial one (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998), with only one alteration: item 4 was deleted due to its low factor loading ( $<.45$ ). Nonetheless, the present factorial structure managed to satisfactorily explain the variance and showed to be a reliable measure, with Cronbach's alphas higher than the .60 cut-off, similarly to the original ones (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

Human values was the measure that presented the factor with the lowest Cronbach's alpha of the instruments (*conservatism*,  $\alpha=.544$ ). Using the same method of the original authors

(Granjo & Peixoto, 2013; Schwartz, 2003), PCA with promax rotation, the factorial structure revealed four components according to the literature: *self-transcendence*, *self-enhancement*, *openness to change* and *conservatism*.

In the course of this investigation a new instrument was created: Attitudes towards Religious Groups and it was the first time its factorial structure was assessed. The decision of using PCA for its study was related with the fact that all other instruments were analysed through this same methodological procedure. However, for this particular case, no rotation was applied. As expected, only one factor was retained, interpreted as *favourability*, that could explain a large percentage of variance (78.936%) and that had a high Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha=.966$ ), which implies a strong reliability and internal consistence.

The measure that showed more alterations when compared with the literature was Perception of Discrimination. This scale was originally applied to a sample of 89 subjects, mainly men (59%) and 74% ( $n=66$ ) of them were inserted in the labour market. Its factorial structure was assessed through PCA, emerging two components: *kindness* and *hostility* (Gondim et al., 2013). The obtained results in the present research, although different, were relevant and meaningful. Using the same methodology (PCA with oblimin rotation) three components were retained: *kindness* (coinciding with the original authors) and two others of hostility that we interpreted as *undercover hostility*, related with discriminatory behaviours towards immigrants that were possible to "camouflage" in the workplace, such as *Avoiding saluting them* (item 10); and as *blatant hostility*, associated with discriminatory behaviours towards immigrant workers that were totally transparent, such as *Making threatening phone calls* (item 18). We supposed this differentiation in the factorial structure could be strongly related with our sample characteristics, that in many ways differs from the one of Gondim et al. (2013): it is composed of only Portuguese individuals (instead of Brazilian), all of them were working in Portugal at the time they filled in the questionnaire and the majority of the respondents were women ( $n=162$ ; 69.2%). The fact that all the respondents were workers (92.7% full-time) could make them get another insight of the workplace, in which the behaviours corresponding to *undercover hostility* can be more easily accepted or even practiced more often with new non-immigrant workers as well (e.g. item 8: *Ignore their presence, addressing to the others that are present*).

As far as we know, the innovative aspect of this research consists on the fact that it is the first one trying to relate, in a Portuguese workers sample, aspects such as social

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

representations of Luso-tropicalism, self-perceptions of individualism and collectivism, human values, discrimination perception and religious prejudice, simultaneously, in a multivariate analysis.

As explained in the Results section, there was the necessity of adapting the original hypotheses to the new factorial structures of the instruments and to the predictors that were seen as significant in contributing to explain Perception of Discrimination dimensions (*kindness, undercover hostility and blatant hostility*) and Attitudes towards Religious Groups. Nonetheless, we can affirm that our four hypotheses were partially supported.

The Perception of discrimination models were subdivided into three, in which the predictors remained the same, in order to permit comparability between them, changing the dependent variables only. The first one had *kindness* as dependent variable, the second one had *undercover hostility* and the third one had *blatant hostility*. Although the findings show that all models were statistically significant, not all predictors had the same impact in the respective dependent variable. There were considerable differences in the magnitude of the variance explained between the three models: *kindness* had the highest value (13.5%) and *blatant hostility* the lowest (9.3%).

The results showed that *kindness* towards immigrant workers was positively predicted by *self-transcendence* and *horizontal collectivism*. In ascending order, the statistically significant predictors were *self-transcendence* and *horizontal collectivism*, meaning that an individual punctuating higher in *kindness* tends to demonstrate more interest in others, exteriorizing the values of benevolence and/or universalism.

Similarly to the previous one, the model for *undercover hostility* was statistically significant. The results showed that *self-transcendence* and *cultural integration* could negatively predict *undercover hostility*. However, these predictors were not playing the same role in the equation: *self-transcendence* had the strongest impact in the dependent variable. This means that when *self-transcendence* (to exteriorize the values of benevolence and/or universalism) and *cultural integration* increase, (to believe that “other” Portuguese people are good at integrating people from other cultures) unnoticed discriminatory behaviours in the workplace tend to diminish.

Lastly, the same happened with *blatant hostility*. The model was significant but not in its totality. Apart from the change of the dependent variable, the difference between this hypothesis and the previous ones is that, for this case, only one predictor was statistically

significant on having a negative impact in *blatant hostility*. This predictor was *cultural integration*, meaning that high punctuation in this variable tends to involve low punctuation in blatant hostility.

All these findings suggest that workplace *kindness* towards immigrant workers is the factor of Perception of Discrimination that can be better explained by the variables that were used in this investigation as predictors, being the first model the most accurate.

The two models regarding both forms of hostility showed that this discriminatory attitude was negatively associated to the same social representation of luso-tropicalism dimension: *cultural integration*. According to Valentim and Heleno (2018), it was expected that this factor would be the only one not correlating with prejudice. But now, it was verified that *cultural integration* has the capability of negatively predicting hostility, meaning that people who tend to think of Portuguese people as more cultural integrative tend to express lower levels of discrimination towards immigrant workers - according to the results we obtained for our dimensions of *undercover* and *blatant hostilities* towards immigrants, at behavioural levels. This constitutes an advance in the knowledge about the impact that social representations of luso-tropicalism have on discriminatory behaviours at the workplace, since people who believe that the Portuguese are welcoming and non-discriminatory in the *cultural integration* factor tend not to act in a discriminant way in the workplace.

Concerning prejudice attitudes towards religious groups the results showed a low value of explained variance (4.9%). Regarding the coefficients, none of the predictors had a significant impact or stood out due to its statistical significant effect. These findings suggested the existence of other variables (not assessed in this investigation) that could better explain Attitudes towards Religious Groups. Furthermore, the quantity of unexplained variance can imply that this variable may occupy other possible roles in this research (e.g., being a moderator).

Concluding, we can affirm that the hypotheses were partially supported, being that the tested models proved to be significant. However, only some of the predictors had a statistical impact in the perception of discrimination dimensions, and none of them was statistically significant in attitudes towards religious groups. Nonetheless, it was possible to verify the existence of religious discrimination in the Portuguese workplace, as well as religious prejudice, especially towards Muslims (28 subjects selected not being favorable to the entrance of someone of this religious group in the workplace) and Jehovah Witnesses (34 subjects

selected not being favorable to the entrance of someone of this religious group in the workplace). People are discriminated due to what they dress, what they eat, traditions they follow, ways of life and religious practices and it was already shown by other authors that Muslims were disadvantaged, especially in a host country (Ekici & Yucel, 2015; Forstenlechner & Al-Waqfi, 2010). However, the Jehovah Witnesses data is new, and is probably related with the Portuguese context.

Furthermore, on each one of the other options there were at least two individuals that selected not being favourable to the entrance of someone of that group in their workplace. Finally, contrarily to what we found in the literature (Dixon et al., 2012; Edgell, Gertis & Hartmann, 2006), in our sample, Agnostics and Atheists (non-religious groups) are not more prejudged than religious groups.

Although the literature has shown a positive correlation between three organizing principles of social representations of luso-tropicalism (*harmonious relations, ability to adapt and colonial past*) and prejudice (Valentim & Heleno, 2018), this relation was not replicated in our study. These results can be explained evoking two research conditions: the present sample is composed of adult workers - in the study of Valentim and Heleno (2018) the sample was composed of students - and a specific type of prejudice is assessed: religious prejudice - whereas Valentim and Heleno (2018) operationalized prejudice of different content: prejudice towards Africans. Additionally, it is important to emphasize that religious prejudice corresponds to a phenomenon that is, nowadays, under a lot of attention (TCIU, 2013). However, it is of extreme complexity. Therefore, it is important to know and conclude not only about the variables that can explain it, but also the variables that cannot. Being this a pioneering study, further research is needed.

### **6.1. Limitations and further research**

There are some limitations to address to this investigation. Firstly, the fact that we did not insert control variables in our hypotheses. Yet, this choice was associated with the fact that we were not interested in studying those effects for now, but rather the general effect without differentiation in terms of demographic variables.

Another limitation of this study is its cross-sectional design. However, under the circumstances this project was built (as a master thesis), not a lot of time was available for collecting data. Therefore, future investigations should try to collect a representative sample of

the Portuguese working population. Additionally, it would be interesting to make a longitudinal research that could compare the anti-immigrant attitudes after and before a critical or traumatic event. In this same scope, the use of self-assessment measures can also be pointed out as a restriction of this study, due to the social desirability of the answers (Johnson & Van de Vijver, 2003). Further research should include other type of data, such as information of the respondents' supervisor, field work (such as going to their respective workplaces and observe their behaviours) (Lee, Mitchell & Sablynski, 1999) or the use of brain imaging (Phelps & Thomas, 2003). Due to our self-reported information collected in the same period of time we are in the presence of a well-known limitation: Common Method Variance. Nevertheless, it has its benefits, such as permitting a big data collection in a short amount of time and a standardized interpretation of it.

## **7. Conclusion**

As far as we are concerned, this was the first time that these variables were tested all together, and it was also the first time that religious prejudice was studied in the Portuguese workplace. Therefore, it is important to emphasize the necessity of deepening the study of these variables, such as Social Representations of Luso-tropicalism and Religious Prejudice (e.g., exploring its role as a moderator), in the Portuguese workplace: in different sectors, different professional areas, different organizations (of different sizes and structures) and different geographical areas. Samples with more amplitude and variability can be a source of new discoveries (Brewer 2000). Additionally, studies in this area usually assess religious prejudice coming solely from other religious groups (Abu-Raiya, 2013), whereas in this investigation we also took into consideration non-religious people. Atheists and agnostics are growing in number (Kosmin & Keysar, 2009) and some studies showed that nonbelievers face greater negative prejudice than almost any other group (Edgell et al. 2006), which in this study was verified.

Our findings suggest a look back at the lifeline of the phenomena involved in this investigation. It is possible to establish a sequence that links colonialism, migration and religious diversity in the Portuguese culture and History (Freyre, 1933). In terms of representations, Portugal has always been socially known for its long colonization history (Pinto, 2009; Valentim & Heleno, 2018). Migration has always existed, but now it became a much broader occurrence at a worldwide level (Edun, 2015; Marozzi, 2016; Sennett, 1998), whether it is volunteered or forced (for instance, refugees are forced to migrate due to political

reasons or conflicts in their countries) (Gilardoni et al., 2015; Logan & Zhang, 2010; Marozzi, 2016). Taking a glance at the present, this last type, forced migration, has become more common in our society, which brings us to issues related to the mobility of people with determined beliefs to countries or places where those same beliefs are minorities and not always respected or well accepted (European Commission, 2008, 2012, 2014b; Hofhuis et al., 2013; Poletti and Regalia, 2014; TCIU, 2013). As individuals move to other countries, it becomes essential to ensure their integration in the society, and many times this process starts with the opportunity of finding a job, a workplace (Edun, 2015; Gondim et al., 2013; Marozzi, 2016). This is why this investigation is important, because it relates all these topics that are so present and interrelated in the contemporaneous society (Avery et al., 2008; Murray & Syed, 2005; Tung, 2008; Sennett, 1998), giving to the community important insights about the development of the issue in Portugal, more particularly. These are matters that nowadays bring challenges to organizations: the coexistence of workers of diverse nations who belong to different cultures and that many times entail different beliefs with which others are not used to deal with.

The current study corresponded to the possible expectations of a pioneering research. Nonetheless, it is composed of innovative features that should be emphasized, such as the new instrument to measure religious prejudice, the testing of the five variables simultaneously, the exploration of the gaps in the literature, and the introduction of this thematic of prejudice and discrimination in the research field of the Portuguese work context. Another strength of this work consists of the presence of instruments with satisfactory indexes of reliability and validity in the areas of social representations of luso-tropicalism, self-perceptions of individualism and collectivism, human values, discrimination perception and religious prejudice. Additionally, the fact that some of our hypotheses were partially corroborated reinforced the pertinence and meaning of the relations found between the variables.

The factorial analyses, in some cases, revealed singular results, such as the Perception of Discrimination measure, in which the original dimension *hostility* was divided into two different hostilities for this sample (*undercover* and *blatant*). The multiple regression analyses suggested that social representations of luso-tropicalism, individualism/collectivism and human values are significant predictors of discrimination perception, but not of religious prejudice. *Cultural integration* (to believe that “other” Portuguese people are good at integrating people from other cultures) was, for the first time, associated with discrimination,

being able to negatively predict both *undercover* and *blatant hostilities*. Furthermore, the outcomes showed that individuals punctuating higher in workplace *kindness* reported to engage more easily in behaviours related with the interest of others, exteriorizing the values of benevolence and/or universalism. Contrarily to this, individuals scoring higher in *self-transcendence* reported to engage less in unnoticed discriminatory behaviours in the workplace. However, it was not possible to obtain equally strong results for attitudes towards religious groups.

The conceptualization and operationalization of religious prejudice at the workplace took its “first steps” in Portugal within the scope of this investigation. Furthermore, this research also makes a significant contribution to the studies on discrimination perception towards immigrant workers in the Portuguese workplace. Due to the fact that these are part of the problems and difficulties that work environments need to surpass today in order to be successful tomorrow, it looked pertinent to study them in this national context, as Portugal is also a country affected by globalization and by the new mobility flows of the world.

At the present time, there is a clear need of knowing how to deal with a diversified workplace and how to accommodate the dissimilarities that might emerge due to cultural reasons, including religious ones. Over and above its relevance in the scientific field, this research also had the intent to sensitize the community to these mobility questions that have accompanied not only the Portuguese History, but the Human History.

## References

- Abu-Raiya, H. (2013). On the Links between Religion, Mental Health and Inter-religious Conflict: A Brief Summary of Empirical Research. *The Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences*, 50(2), 130-139.
- Alexandre, V. (1993). Portugal em África (1825-1974): Uma perspectiva global. *Penélope*, 11, 53-66.
- Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.
- Allport, G. W. (1950). Prejudice: A problem in Psychological and Social causation. *Journal of Social Issues*, 6, 4-23.
- Allport, G. W., Philip, E. V., & Gardner, A. L. (1960). *A study of values*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Athayde, R.A. (2012). *Medidas implícitas de valores humanos: Elaboração e evidências de validade* (Unpublished master thesis). Universidade Federal da Paraíba, Brasil.
- Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., & Wilson, D. C. (2008). What are the odds? How demographic similarity affects the prevalence of perceived employment discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 235-249.
- Bodenhausen, G., & Richeson, J. (2010). Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination. In R. Baumeister & E. Finkel (Eds), *Advanced Social psychology: the state of the science* (pp. 341-383). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Braithwaite, V. A., & Scott, W. A (1991). Values. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver & L. S. Wrightsman (Org.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 661-753). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: In group love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 429-444.
- Brewer, M. B. (2000). Research design and issues of validity. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pp. 3-16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 81, 72-97.
- Brown, R. (1995). *Prejudice: Its social psychology*. Malden, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Castelo, C. (2011). *Uma incursão no lusotropicalismo de Gilberto Freyre*. Blogue de História Lusófona, 261-280. Retrieved from: [http://www2.iict.pt/archive/doc/bHL\\_Ano\\_VI\\_16\\_Claudia\\_Castelo\\_Uma\\_incursao\\_no\\_lusotropicalismo.pdf](http://www2.iict.pt/archive/doc/bHL_Ano_VI_16_Claudia_Castelo_Uma_incursao_no_lusotropicalismo.pdf)

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

- Christian, J., Porter, L. W., & Moffitt, G. (2006). Workplace diversity and group relations: An overview. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 9(4), 459-466.
- Cintas, C., Gosse, B., & Vatteville, E. (2013). Religious identity: a new dimension of HRM? A French view. *Employee Relations*, 35(6), 576-592.
- Comrey, A. L. & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cui, J., Jo, H., Na, H., & Velasquez, M. G. (2015). Workforce Diversity and Religiosity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128, 743-767.
- Dempsey, P. & Dukes, W. F. (1966). Judging complex value stimuli: An examination and revision of Morris's "Paths of Life". *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 26, 871-882.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: theory and applications* (2nd ed. Vol. 26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dixon, J., Levine, M., Reicher, S., & Durrheim, K. (2012). Beyond prejudice: Are negative evaluations the problem and is getting us to like one another more the solution? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 35(6), 411-425.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1983). Racial attitudes and the effects of a partners race on asking for help. In B. M. DePaulo, A. Nadler, & J. Fisher (Eds.), *New directions in helping* (Vol. 2, pp. 285-303). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1991). Changes in the nature and assessment of racial prejudice. In H. Knopke, J. Norrell, & R. Rodgers (Eds.), *Opening doors: An appraisal of race relations in contemporary America* (pp. 201-241). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1998). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The causes, consequences, and challenges of aversive racism. In J. Eberhardt & S.T. Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 3-32). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Reducing contemporary prejudice: Combating explicit and implicit bias at the individual and intergroup level. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination. The Claremont symposium on applied social psychology* (pp. 137-163). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dovidio, J.F. (2001). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: the third wave. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 829-49.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1998). Attitude structure and function. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 269-322). New York,

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

NY: MacGraw-Hill.

- Edgell, P., Gertis, J., & Hartmann, D. (2006). Atheists as “Other”: Moral boundaries and cultural membership. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 211-234.
- Edun, A. T. (2015). *Workplace Discrimination Climate and Team Effectiveness: The Mediating Role of Collective Value Congruence, Team Cohesion, and Collective Affective Commitment*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Florida International University, United States of America.
- Ekici, T., & Yucel, D. (2015). What determines religious and racial prejudice in Europe? The effects of religiosity and trust. *Social Indicators Research*, 122, 105-133.
- Ensher, E.A., Grant-Vallone, E.J., & Donaldson, S.I. (2001). The effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(1), 53-72.
- Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding Everyday Racism*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- European Commission (2008). Special Eurobarometer 296, *Discrimination in the European Union: Perceptions, Experiences and Attitudes*, July 2008, p. 14.
- European Commission. (2012) Discrimination in the EU in 2012. Special Eurobarometer, 393. [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm). Accessed 01 April 2018.
- European Commission. (2014b). Public opinion in the European Union, first results. Standard Eurobarometer, 82. [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm). Accessed 01 April 2018.
- European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (2006a). *Muslims in the European Union – Discrimination and Islamophobia*, European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, Vienna.
- European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (2006b). *Perceptions of Discrimination and Islamophobia – Voices from Members of Muslim Communities on the European Union*, European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, Vienna.
- European Social Survey. (2014). ESS Round 7. *Technical Report*. London: ESS ERIC Headquarters, Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University London.
- Feagan, J.R. (1991). The continuing significance of race: anti-Black discrimination in public places, *American Sociological Review*, 56(1), 101-16.
- Ferreira, M. C., Assmar, E. M., & Souto, S. D. (2002). O individualismo e o coletivismo como indicadores de culturas nacionais: convergências e divergências teórico-metodológicas. *Psicologia em Estudo*, 7(1), 81-89. doi:0.1590/s1413-73722002000100011
- Forstenlechner, I., & Al-Waqfi, M. A. (2010). “A job interview for Mo, but none for Mohammed” Religious discrimination against immigrants in Austria and Germany. *Personnel Review*, 39(6), 767-784.

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

- French, S.A. (1996). What is Social Memory? *Southern Cultures*, 2, 9-18.
- Freyre, G. (1933). *Casa-Grande & Senzala: formação da família brasileira sob o regime de economia patriarcal*. Lisboa: Livros do Brasil.
- Freyre, G. (1940). *O mundo que o Português criou: aspectos das relações sociais e de cultura do Brasil com Portugal e as colónias portuguesas*. Lisboa: Livros do Brasil.
- Freyre, G. (1961). *O Luso e o trópico: sugestões em torno dos métodos portugueses de integração de povos autóctones e de culturas diferentes da europeia num complexo novo de civilização: o Luso-tropical*. Lisboa: Comissão Executiva das Comemorações do V Centenário da morte do Infante D. Henrique.
- Ghumman, S., Ryan, A. M., Barclay, L. A., & Markel, K. S. (2013). Religious discrimination in the workplace: A review and examination of current and future trends. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 28(4), 439-454.
- Giddens, A., & Sutton, P. W. (2013). *Sociology* (7th ed.). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gilardoni, G., D'Odorico, M., & Carrillo, D. (2015). *Evidence on migrants' integration in Europe, KING knowledge for integration governance*. Milan: Fondazione ISMU.
- Goldman, B.M., Gutek, B.A., Stein, J.H., & Lewis, K. (2006). Employment discrimination in organizations: antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 786-830.
- Gondim, S. M. G., Techio, E. M., Paranhos, J., Moreira, T., Brantes, C., Sobrinho, J. B., & Santana, V. (2013). Imigração e trabalho: Um estudo sobre a identidade social, emoções e discriminação contra estrangeiros. *Psicologia em pesquisa*, 7(2), 151-163.
- Granho, M., & Peixoto, F. (2013). Contributo para o estudo da Escala de Valores Humanos de Schwartz em professores. *Laboratório de Psicologia*, 11(1), 3-17. doi:10.14417/lp.699
- Guiso, L., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2003). People's opium? Religion and economic attitudes. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 50(1), 225-282.
- Gutek, B., Cohen, A., & Tsui, A. (1996). Reactions to perceived sex discrimination. *Human Relations*, 49(6), 791-813.
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., Anderson, R. & Tatham, R. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hamberger, J., & Hewstone, M. (1997). Inter-ethnic contacts as a predictor of blatant and subtle prejudice: test of a model in four West European nations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(2), 173-190.
- Helena, A. M. (2015). *Luso-tropicalismo e diversidade cultural em contexto organizacional: um estudo das representações sociais de estudantes universitários* (Unpublished master thesis). Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal.

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

- Hirigoyen, M. F. (2001). *Assédio moral: a violência perversa no cotidiano*. São Paulo: Editora Bertrand Brasil.
- Hofhuis, J., Van der Zee, K. I., & Otten, S. (2015). Measuring employee perception on the effects of cultural diversity at work: development of the -Benefits and Threats of Diversity Scale. *Quality & Quantity*, 49(1), 177–201. doi: [10.1007/s11135-013-9981-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-013-9981-7)
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Culturas e organizações. Compreender a nossa programação mental*. Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.
- Huffman, T. (1988). *In the world but not of the world: Religious alienation, and philosophy of human nature among Bible college and liberal arts college students*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Iowa.
- Human Resource Management*, 47, 91-110.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., & Perhoniemi, R. (2007). Perceived ethnic discrimination at work and well-being of immigrants in Finland: the moderating role of employment status and work-specific group-level control beliefs. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31(2), 223-342.
- Johnson, T. P., & Van de Vijver, F. J. (2003). Social desirability in cross-cultural research. *Cross-cultural survey methods*, 325, 195-204.
- Kosmin, B. A., & Keysar, A. (2009). *American Religious Identification Survey 2008*. Hartford, CT: Institute for the Study of Secularism in Society and Culture.
- Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., & Sablinski, C. J. (1999). Qualitative Research in Organizational and Vocational Psychology, 1979–1999. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55(2), 161-187.
- Levy, S., & Guttman, L. (1974). *Values and attitudes of Israeli high school youth*. Jerusalem: Institute of Applied Social Research.
- Logan, J., & Zhang, C. (2010). Global neighbourhoods: New pathways to diversity and separation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114, 1069–1109.
- Mackie, D. M., & Smith, E. R. (1998a). Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior: Crossing the boundaries. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, & C. A. Insko (Eds.), *Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior* (pp. 423-450). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Marques, J., Páez, D., & Serra, A. (1997). Collective Memory Processes Associated with Traumatic War Experiences: Social Sharing, Emotional Climate and the Transgenerational Transmission of Information in the Case of the Portuguese Colonial War. In J. Pennebaker, D. Páez & B. Rimé (Eds.). *Collective Memory of Political Events*. Hillsdale, Lawrence Erlbaum.

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

- Marrozi, M. (2016). Construction, Robustness Assessment and Application of an Index of Perceived Level of Socio-Economic Threat from Immigrants: A Study of 47 European Countries and Regions. *Social Indicators Research*, 128, 413-437, doi: [10.1007/s11205-015-1037-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-1037-z)
- Mays, V.M., Coleman, L.M., & Jackson, J.S. (1996). Perceived race-based discrimination, employment status, and job stress in a national sample of Black women: implications for health outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1(3), 319-329.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: a triumph of faith – a failure of analysis. *Human Relations*, 55(1), 89–118.
- Morris, C. (1956). *Varieties of human value*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Moscovici, S. (1976). *La psychanalyse, son image et son public* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Paris : PUF.
- Murray, P., & Syed, J. (2005). Critical issues in managing age diversity in Australia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 43, 210-224.
- Němec, J. (2005). *Luso-tropicalismo: Um fundo sólido para as relações contemporâneas entre os países de língua portuguesa?* Retrieved January 20, 2017, from [http://www.premioiberoamericano.cz/documentos/11raedicion/2doPremioXI\\_JanNemec.p df](http://www.premioiberoamericano.cz/documentos/11raedicion/2doPremioXI_JanNemec.p df)
- Noh, S., Beiser, M., Kaspar, V., Hou, V. and Rummens, J. (1999). Perceived racial discrimination, depression, and coping: a study of Southeast Asian refugees in Canada. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 40(3), 193-207.
- Pager, D. (2007). The use of field experiments for studies of employment discrimination: contributions, critiques, and directions for the future. *The Annals of the American Academy*, 609, 104-133.
- Pereira, C., Barros, C., Torres, A. R., Valentim, J. P. (2015). *O papel do preconceito e do luso-tropicalismo nas atitudes face à imigração qualificada*. In: Paper presented at the XII Luso-Afro-Brazilian Congress of Social Sciences. Lisbon.
- Petty, R. E., & Wegner, D. T. (1998). Attitude change: Multiple roles for persuasion variables. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 323-390). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Phelps, E.A., & Thomas, L. A. (2003). Race, Behavior, and the Brain: The role of Neuroimaging in understanding complex social behaviors. *Political Psychology*, 24(4), 747-758.
- Pinto, J. A. (2009). Gilberto Freyre e o lusotropicalismo como ideologia do colonialismo português (1951-1974). *Revista UFG*, XI(6), 145-160.
- Poletti, M., & Regalia, M. (2014). Economic or cultural threat? Orientations towards immigration and European integration among EU citizens and national parties over time. *KING Project - Political Science Unit Desk Research Papers*, 5. <http://www.king.ismu.org>. Accessed 01 April 2018.

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

- Quintini, G. (2011). *Over-qualified or under-skilled? A review of existing literature*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Ramos A., Louceiro, A., & Graça, J. (2016). *Migrações e Refugiados: Atitudes Sociais dos Portugueses*. [Bulletin]. Lisbon: Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Ruggs, E. N., Hebl, M. R., Law, C., Cox, C. B., Roehling, M. V., Wiener, R. L., & Barron, L. (2013). Gone fishing: I-O psychologists' missed opportunities to understand marginalized employees' experiences with discrimination. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspective on Science and Practice*, 6(1), 39-60.
- Salazar, A. O. (1989). *Pensamento e doutrina política: Textos antológicos*. Lisboa: Verbo.
- Sanchez, J.I., & Brock, P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: is diversity management a luxury or a necessity? *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 704-719.
- Santos, L.B. (2013). Prejudice, discrimination, Luso-tropicalism, Lusophony, and organizational justice in Portugal, from the point of view of Brazilian immigrants. *Revista Psicologia, Organizações e Trabalho*, 13(1), 61-74.
- Schwartz, S. H. & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 550-562.
- Schwartz, S. H. & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 878-891.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advanced and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Org.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994a). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50, 19-45.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994b). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitçibasi, S. Choi & G. Yoon (Orgs.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (pp. 85-119). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2003). A proposal for measuring value orientations across nations. In *Questionnaire Development Package of the European Social Survey* (chapter 7, pp. 259-319).
- Schwartz, S. H. (2005). Basic human values: Their content and structure across countries. In A. Tamayo & J. B. Porto (Eds.), *Valores e comportamento nas organizações* [Values and behavior in organizations] (pp. 21-55). Petrópolis, Brasil: Vozes.

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

- Schwartz, S. H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., & Harris, M. (2001). Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*, 519-542.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022101032005001>.
- Sennett, R. (1998). *The Corrosion of character: the personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. New York: Norton.
- Silva, A. F. (2015). *As emoções associadas ao luso-tropicalismo e à percepção de ameaça face aos emigrantes em contexto laboral: um estudo com estudantes portugueses*. (Unpublished master thesis). Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal.
- Simons, S. M., & Rowland, K. N. (2011). Diversity and its impact on organizational performance: The influence of diversity constructions on expectations and outcomes. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation, 6*(3), 171-182.
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Research, 29*(3), 240-275.
- Sonia Ghumman, S., Ryan, A. M., Barclay, L. A., & Markel, K. S. (2013). Religious Discrimination in the Workplace: A Review and Examination of Current and Future Trends. *Journal of Business Psychology, 28*, 439-454.
- Strabac, Z., & Listhaug, O. (2008). Anti-Muslim prejudice in Europe: A multilevel analysis of survey data from 30 countries. *Social Science Research, 37*, 268–286.
- Tabachnick, B. & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). USA: Pearson Education.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human Groups and Social Categories*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Tajfel, H. (1983). Categorização social, identidade social e comparação social. In H. Tajfel, *Grupos humanos e categorias sociais – Estudos em Psicologia Social II* (pp. 289-303). Lisboa: Livros Horizonte.
- Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding (2013). *What American workers really think about religion: Tanenbaum's 2013 survey of American workers and religion*. New York: Tanenbaum Center for Interreligious Understanding.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994b). Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitçibasi, S. Choi & G. Yoon (Orgs.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (pp. 41-51). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995.
- Triandis, H. C. (1996) The Psychological measurement of cultural syndromes. *American*

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

- Psychologist*, 51(4), 407-415.
- Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 118-128.
- Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., & Clack, F. L. (1985). Allocentric vs. idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19, 395-415.
- Triandis, H.C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultures. *Psychological Review*, 96, 506-520.
- Triandis, H.C. (1990a). Aproximaciones teoricas y metodologicas al estudio del individualismo y el colectivismo. *Revista de Psicologia Social y Personalidad*, 6, 29-38.
- Triandis, H.C. (1990b). Toward cross-cultural studies in individualism and collectivism in Latin America. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, 24, 199-210.
- Triandis, H.C. (1994a). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Triandis, H.C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Georgas, J., Hui, C.H., Marin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J.B.P., Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, H. & de Montmollin, G. (1986). The measurement of etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 257-267.
- Triandis, H.C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M.J., Asai, M. & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 323-338.
- Triandis, H.C., McCusker, C. & Hui, C.H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1006-1020.
- Tung, R. L. (2008). Do race and gender matter in international assignments to/from Asia Pacific? An exploratory study of attitudes among Chinese and Korean Executives.
- Vala, J., Lopes, D., & Lima, M. E. O. (2008). Black immigrants in Portugal: Luso-tropicalism and prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64(2), 287-302.
- Valentim, J. P. & Heleno, A. M. (2018). Luso-tropicalism as a social representation in Portuguese society: Variations and anchoring. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*.
- Valentim, J. P. (2003). *Identidade e lusofonia nas representações sociais de portugueses e de africanos*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal.
- Valentim, J. P. (2005). Luso-tropicalismo e lusofonia: uma perspectiva psicossocial. *Via Latina*, 6(2), 67-73.
- Valentim, J. P. (2011). Social psychology and colonialism: Luso-tropicalism as a social

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

representation in the context of contemporary Portuguese society. In J. P. Valentim (Ed.), *Societal Approaches in Social Psychology* (pp. 179-194). Berne: Peter Lang.

Valentim, J. P. (2015, Fevereiro). *O Luso-tropicalismo como Representação Social: Variações e Ancoragens*. Comunicação apresentada no 1º Congresso da Associação Internacional de Ciências Sociais e Humanas em Língua Portuguesa, Lisboa.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30, 1024–1054.

Wilder, D. A., & Simon, A. F. (2001). Affect as a cause of intergroup bias. In R. J. Brown & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 153-172). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

**Annexes****Annex 1 – Investigation Protocol**

Exmo. Sr. / Sra.

Proponho-lhe, de seguida, um conjunto de questões que integram uma investigação no âmbito da minha dissertação do Mestrado Europeu em Psicologia do Trabalho, das Organizações e dos Recursos Humanos, sob a orientação do Professor Doutor Joaquim Pires Valentim, da Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação da Universidade de Coimbra.

Todas as suas respostas são importantes, pelo que é necessário que responda de acordo com o que pensa e sente acerca dos diversos assuntos em que pedimos a sua opinião. Este questionário não é um teste, não havendo respostas certas ou erradas.

Todos os dados serão confidenciais e utilizados apenas de forma agregada no âmbito da investigação.

A duração estimada de resposta a este questionário é de 15 minutos e caso surja qualquer dúvida no decorrer do mesmo, não hesite em contactar-nos através dos contactos que lhe disponibilizamos de seguida.

Renovamos os nossos agradecimentos sinceros pelo tempo que disponibilizou para este projeto.

Atenciosamente,

Maria Pinheiro  
(Mestranda da FPCE-UC)

**Contactos:**

Maria Pinheiro

E-mail: [mp.lusotropicalismo@gmail.com](mailto:mp.lusotropicalismo@gmail.com)

Mestrado Europeu em Psicologia do Trabalho, das Organizações e dos Recursos Humanos

Faculdade de Psicologia e Ciências da Educação - Universidade de Coimbra

R. do Colégio Novo, 10A, 3001-802, Coimbra

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

Por favor, preencha cuidadosamente os seguintes dados:

1. Sexo  Homem  Mulher 2. Idade \_\_\_\_\_ anos 3. Nacionalidade \_\_\_\_\_

---

4. Estado Civil:  
 Solteiro/a  Casado/a  Separado/a  Divorciado/a  União de facto  Viúvo/a

---

5. Tem filhos?  
 Não  Sim Número de filhos: \_\_\_\_\_

---

6. Situação atual em termos de trabalho:  
 Trabalhador em *part-time*  
 Trabalhador a tempo inteiro  
 Trabalhador-estudante  
 Voluntário

---

7. Profissão: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Tarefa/ Cargo que exerce atualmente: \_\_\_\_\_

9. Indique o ano em que começou a trabalhar na organização/empresa atual: \_\_\_\_\_

---

10. Qual o seu grau escolaridade?

Não completou o 4º ano ou equivalente	4º Ano ou equivalente	9º Ano ou equivalente	12º Ano ou equivalente	Licenciatura	Mestrado	Doutoramento
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

---

11. Em termos das suas orientações políticas (esquerda/direita) como se posiciona nesta escala?

Esquerda	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Direita
----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---------

Não me posiciono nesta escala

12. Como se considera em termos religiosos? Por favor, assinale com um X a opção (uma e só uma) que melhor se aplica a si.

Protestante

Católico

Mórmon

Ortodoxo

Judeu

Muçulmano

Budista

Hindu

Ateu (não acredita em Deus)

Agnóstico (não tem a certeza se existe um Deus)

Cristão

Outra religião/ Igreja (por favor, indique a designação): \_\_\_\_\_

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

Apresentamos de seguida algumas afirmações sobre os portugueses. Por favor, indique em que medida concorda com cada uma delas, assinalando com um X a opção que corresponde à sua opinião em função da seguinte escala:

1. Discordo Totalmente
2. Discordo Muito
3. Discordo
4. Nem Concordo, Nem Discordo
5. Concordo
6. Concordo Muito
7. Concordo Totalmente

		Discordo Totalmente	Discordo Muito	Discordo	Nem Concordo Nem Discordo	Concordo	Concordo Muito	Concordo Totalmente
1	As características da cultura portuguesa facilitam a integração de pessoas de outras culturas na sociedade portuguesa contemporânea.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	Comparando com os outros países europeus, pode dizer-se que em Portugal existe menos racismo.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	A história colonial portuguesa caracterizou-se pela integração cultural com os povos colonizados.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	As tensões e conflitos entre os portugueses e as pessoas de outras origens são pequenas comparadas com as de outros países.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	Faz parte da tradição portuguesa relacionar-se bem com outros povos.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	A história colonial portuguesa caracterizou-se pela mestiçagem com os povos colonizados.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	As pessoas de outras culturas são mais respeitadas em Portugal do que noutros países.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	A história colonial portuguesa foi mais pacífica e benevolente do que a de outras potências coloniais.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	As pessoas de outras culturas têm mais dificuldade em integrar-se na sociedade portuguesa do que noutros países.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10	O passado colonial de Portugal foi uma história de violência.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	De uma forma geral, a impressão que os imigrantes que vivem em Portugal têm dos portugueses é boa.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	As características dos portugueses favoreceram um processo de colonização marcado pelo convívio harmonioso entre povos.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13	De uma forma geral, a impressão que os portugueses têm dos imigrantes que vivem em Portugal é boa.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	Ao longo da história da colonização, os portugueses demonstraram uma singular capacidade de adaptação à vida nas regiões tropicais.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15	A história colonial portuguesa caracterizou-se pela exploração e segregação dos povos colonizados.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	Hoje em dia, a harmonia entre os portugueses e as pessoas de outras culturas é pequena comparada com a de outros países.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	A colonização portuguesa não teve o carácter opressivo que se verificou no caso de outras nações.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

Apresentamos de seguida um conjunto de afirmações acerca do que as pessoas pensam de si mesmas e da sua relação com os outros.

Tendo em conta uma **escala entre 1 e 9**, por favor, assinale com um X a opção que melhor traduz a sua opinião. Tenha em consideração que:

**1** significa “**Nunca**” ou “**Definitivamente Não**”

e

**9** significa “**Sempre**” ou “**Definitivamente Sim**”

Nunca  
Definitivamente Não

Sempre  
Definitivamente Sim

1	Prefiro depender de mim do que depender de outros.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2	Conto comigo a maior parte das vezes, raramente conto com os outros.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3	Frequentemente, faço as coisas à minha maneira.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4	A minha identidade pessoal, independente de outros, é muito importante para mim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5	É importante que eu desempenhe o meu trabalho melhor que os outros.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6	Vencer é tudo.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7	A competição é a lei da natureza.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8	Quando outra pessoa faz algo melhor que eu, fico tenso/a e irritado/a.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9	Se um/a colega de trabalho ganhasse um prémio, sentir-me-ia orgulhoso/a.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	O bem-estar dos meus colegas é importante para mim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11	Para mim, prazer é passar tempo com outros.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12	Sinto-me bem quando coopero com outros.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
13	Pais e crianças devem permanecer juntos o mais possível.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14	É meu dever tomar conta da minha família, mesmo quando tenho de sacrificar aquilo que quero.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	Os membros da família devem manter-se juntos, independentemente dos sacrifícios que tal exija.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
16	É importante para mim que eu respeite as decisões que os grupos a que pertença tomam	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

De seguida, descrevemos, brevemente, algumas pessoas. Por favor, leia cada descrição e coloque um X no quadrado (de 1 a 6) que mostre até que ponto é que a pessoa descrita se assemelha a si.

		Nada parecida comigo	Não é parecida comigo	Um pouco parecida comigo	Um bocado como eu	Como eu	Muito parecida comigo
1	Ter novas ideias e ser criativa/o é importante para ela/e. Ela/e gosta de fazer as coisas à sua maneira, de forma original.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	É importante para ela/e ser rica/o. Ela/e quer ter muito dinheiro e coisas caras.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	Ela/e pensa que é importante que todas as pessoas no mundo sejam tratadas de forma igual. Ela/e acredita que cada um deve ter oportunidades iguais na vida	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	É importante para ela/e mostrar as suas capacidades. Ela/e quer que as pessoas a/o admirem aquilo que faz.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	É importante para ela/e viver num ambiente seguro. Ela/e evita tudo o que possa pôr em perigo a sua segurança.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	Ela/e gosta de surpresas e está sempre à procura de novas coisas para fazer. Ela/e acha que é importante fazer uma série de coisas diferentes na vida.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	Ela/e acredita que as pessoas devem fazer o que lhes dizem para fazer. Ela/e acha que as pessoas devem seguir regras em qualquer situação, mesmo quando ninguém está a ver.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	É importante para ela/e ouvir as pessoas que são diferentes dela/e. Mesmo quando discorda delas, continua a querer compreendê-las.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	É importante para ela/e ser humilde e modesta/o. Ela/e procura não chamar a atenção sobre si própria/o.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10	Saborear os prazeres da vida é importante para ela/e. Ela/e gosta de se mimar a si própria/o.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	É importante para ela/e tomar as suas próprias decisões sobre o que faz. Gosta de ser livre e de não ter que depender dos outros.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12	É muito importante para ela/e ajudar as pessoas à sua volta. Ela/e quer cuidar do bem-estar delas.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13	Ter muito sucesso é importante para ela/e. Ela/e espera que as pessoas reconheçam o que faz.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14	É importante para ela/e que o governo assegure a sua segurança contra todas as ameaças. Ela quer que o Estado seja forte para que possa defender os seus cidadãos.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	Ela/e procura aventuras e gosta de correr riscos. Ela/e quer ter uma vida entusiasmante.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16	É importante para ela/e comportar-se sempre de forma correta. Ela/e quer evitar fazer qualquer coisa que as pessoas possam dizer que é errado.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	É importante para ela/e que os outros a/o respeitem. Ela/e quer que as pessoas façam o que ela diz.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18	É importante para ela/e ser leal aos seus amigos. Ela quer dedicar-se às pessoas que lhe são próximas.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19	Ela/e acredita fortemente que as pessoas devem proteger a natureza. Cuidar do ambiente é importante para ela/e.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20	A religião é importante para ela/e. Ela/e procura viver de acordo com as suas convicções religiosas.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	Ela/e procura todas as oportunidades que pode para se divertir. Para ela/e é importante fazer coisas que lhe deem prazer.	1	2	3	4	5	6

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

Refletindo sobre algumas situações que possam ter acontecido a si ou a outros funcionários da organização/empresa onde trabalha, ou trabalhou anteriormente, assinale uma das seguintes opções de resposta:

1. Já aconteceu comigo
2. Aconteceu com outra pessoa
3. Não tenho conhecimento/ Não se aplica

Caso a mesma situação tenha acontecido consigo (1) e com outra pessoa (2), assinale as duas colunas respectivas 1 e 2.

		1. Já aconteceu comigo	2. Aconteceu com outra pessoa	3. Não tenho conhecimento/ Não se aplica
1	Foi desencorajado/a a usar pêlos faciais, alguns cortes de cabelo ou roupas que faziam parte de uma identidade religiosa.	1	2	3
2	Não lhe foi permitido tirar um tempo, durante um dia de trabalho, para rezar ou meditar.	1	2	3
3	Participou em eventos realizados ou patrocinados pela organização/empresa no qual não havia alimentação adequada a algumas religiões (como <i>kosher e halal</i> ).	1	2	3
4	Foi desencorajado a colocar objetos, símbolos ou frases religiosas no seu ambiente de trabalho pessoal.	1	2	3
5	Esperava-se que comparecesse a celebrações ou encontros religiosos da organização/empresa.	1	2	3
6	Fizeram piadas sobre crenças, práticas ou vestuário religioso.	1	2	3
7	Foi requerido que trabalhasse durante um feriado religioso.	1	2	3
8	Foi desencorajado de formar um grupo religioso no trabalho.	1	2	3
9	Foi criticado por não comparecer em festas realizadas ou patrocinadas pela organização/empresa em períodos religiosos.	1	2	3
10	A religião foi discutida em entrevistas de emprego.	1	2	3
11	Um trabalhador recusou cumprir uma tarefa por motivos religiosos.	1	2	3
12	Um superior impediu assédio baseado na religião ou crença religiosa no ambiente de trabalho.	1	2	3
13	Foi dito que determinada profissão não era adequada para pessoas de determinada religião.	1	2	3
14	Insistiu num dia de folga para se poder dedicar à sua religião.	1	2	3
15	Houve um conflito entre um trabalhador com crenças religiosas fortes e um trabalhador não religioso.	1	2	3

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

De seguida, pedimos que nos dê a sua opinião relativamente à entrada no seu ambiente de trabalho de profissionais de diferentes grupos religiosos, com os quais teria de conviver e trabalhar.

Utilize a **escala de 1 a 7** para indicar a apreciação que faz, de uma forma geral, sobre o ingresso profissional, no seu ambiente de trabalho, de pessoas de cada um dos grupos religiosos referidos, assinalando o número que melhor traduz a sua opinião com um X.

Católicos.....	Extremamente desfavorável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremamente favorável
Protestantes.....	Extremamente desfavorável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremamente favorável
Ortodoxos.....	Extremamente desfavorável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremamente favorável
Judeus.....	Extremamente desfavorável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremamente favorável
Muçulmanos.....	Extremamente desfavorável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremamente favorável
Budistas ou Hindus.....	Extremamente desfavorável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremamente favorável
Testemunhas de Jeová.....	Extremamente desfavorável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremamente favorável
Ateus (não acredita em Deus).....	Extremamente desfavorável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremamente favorável
Agnósticos (não tem a certeza se existe um Deus)...	Extremamente desfavorável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremamente favorável
Outro: Qual?.....	Extremamente desfavorável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremamente favorável

Para além de casamentos e funerais, com que frequência comparece ou utiliza serviços religiosos? Assinale, por favor, com um X, o quadrado correspondente à opção que melhor se aplica a si.

- Mais do que uma vez por semana
- Uma vez por semana
- Uma ou duas vezes por mês
- Algumas vezes por ano
- Raramente
- Nunca

Quando o tópico da religião surge no seu ambiente de trabalho, quão confortável geralmente se sente? Assinale com um X a opção que melhor representa a sua opinião.

- Muito confortável
- De alguma forma confortável
- De alguma forma desconfortável
- Muito desconfortável

## PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION AND RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE

Indique até que ponto concorda com cada um destes comportamentos da parte dos **trabalhadores portugueses nas relações com os trabalhadores estrangeiros**. Tendo em conta uma **escala entre 1 e 7**, por favor, assinale com um X a opção que melhor traduz a sua opinião. Tenha em consideração que:

1 significa **“Discordo completamente”** e 7 significa **“Concordo completamente”**

Discordo completamente							Concordo completamente	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
1	Unir-se a outros colegas para os isolar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	Tentar fazer amizade com eles.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	Imitar o sotaque para os ridicularizar perante outras pessoas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	Ensinar o que se sabe.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	Procurar trabalhar na mesma equipa que eles.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	Evitar colocar-lhes alcunhas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	Dar instruções confusas que prejudiquem a realização das suas tarefas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	Ignorar a sua presença dirigindo-se somente a outros.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	Pedir para fazer trabalhos urgentes sem necessidade.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10	Evitar cumprimentá-los.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	Dar-lhes razão, quando concorda com as suas ideias.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	Elogiá-los quando realizam uma tarefa de modo competente.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13	Poupá-los de tarefas adicionais em comparação com os outros colegas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	Criticar excessivamente o seu trabalho.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15	Evitar induzi-los a cometer erros.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	Fazer gestos de desprezo diante deles (suspiros, olhares de desdém, encolher ombros,...).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	Estragar propositadamente algum dos seus objetos de trabalho.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18	Fazer ligações telefónicas ameaçadoras.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19	Evitar espalhar rumores a seu respeito.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20	Interrompê-los quando estão a falar com outras pessoas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21	Aproximar-se para aprender com eles.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Pedimos-lhe de seguida alguns dados sobre si. Assinale, por favor, com um X, o grau de importância que atribui a cada um dos seguintes aspetos na sua vida.

	Nada importante	Pouco importante	Importante	Muito importante
Trabalho	1	2	3	4
Família	1	2	3	4
Amigos	1	2	3	4
Tempos livres	1	2	3	4
Política	1	2	3	4
Religião	1	2	3	4
Relações amorosas	1	2	3	4
Saúde	1	2	3	4
Espiritualidade	1	2	3	4

Coimbra, Fevereiro de 2017. Muito obrigada pela sua colaboração.