



ISCTE – University Institute of Lisbon IUL

School of Social Sciences

Department of Social and Organizational Psychology

The Effect of Negative and Positive Contact on Prejudice Reduction in Portuguese
Adolescents in the School Context

By Anna Pegna

Dissertation submitted as partial requirement for the conferral of
Master in Psychology of Intergroup Relations

Supervisor: Doctor Mauro Bianchi, Assistant Invited Teacher

Co – Supervisor: Doctor Ricardo Borges Rodrigues, Assistant Invited Teacher

June 2018

I. Abstract

Drawing from the contact hypothesis, the present research examines the effect of positive and negative contact on intergroup attitudes of white and black secondary school adolescents in Portugal ($N = 85$). Both majority and minority groups are examined in a longitudinal design. Cross-lagged regression analyses shows that the "from contact to less prejudice" path is confirmed only for majority group students, for whom positive contact was effective in intergroup bias reduction. Negative contact predicts negative intergroup attitudes for both groups, with a strongest effect for the minority group member. In comparison, emerged that for majority group students, positive contact is more influential on bias reduction. For minority group students, negative contact is more powerful in increasing negative intergroup attitudes more than the positive contact is to its reduction, and the opposite path was found too, as intergroup bias was a predictor of negative contact. These results underline the importance of analysing both positive and negative intergroup contact effects on ethnic prejudice, considering that the potential of negative contact in the increase of prejudice was largely neglected in the area of intergroup relations.

Keywords - Contact Hypothesis, Positive Contact, Negative Contact, Prejudice, Intergroup Relations, Adolescents

II. Index

I. Abstract.....	i
II. Index.....	ii
III. Index of Tables.....	iii
1. Introduction.....	4
2. Theoretical Framework.....	9
2.1 Historical Excursus: Prejudice in Social Psychology.....	9
2.2 Prejudice Reduction: The Contact Hypothesis.....	14
2.3 Intergroup Contact in School Environment.....	18
2.4 Extending the Contact Hypothesis: The Role of Negative Contact on Prejudice....	21
3. The present research.....	27
3.1 Objectives.....	27
3.2 Hypotheses.....	29
4. Method.....	31
4.1 Participants.....	31
4.2 Procedures.....	31
4.3 Measures.....	32
5. Results.....	34
5.1 Preliminary Analyses.....	34
5.2 Cross Lagged Effect – Casual Relation between Variables.....	38
6. Discussion.....	43
7. Limitations and Future Directions.....	46
8. References.....	50
9. Annex.....	59
9.1 Annex A - Questionnaire.....	60
9.2 Annex B – Informative Consent.....	73

III. Index of tables

Table 1 - Means and Standard Deviations	36
Table 2 – Intercorrelations Between Variables	37
Table 3 – Intercorrelations Between Time 1 and Time 2	40
Table 4 – Cross-Lagged Regressions.....	42

1. Introduction

In the last decades of the 21st century, a series of political and social events have brought to light the problem of prejudice and racism. Social sciences have shown a growing interest in the analysis of phenomena such as racism, ethnocentrism and prejudice, interest due to the events that have marked the history of the 20th century and whose peak is represented by the Second World War. Since then, the study of prejudice has become the concept around which had been articulated the reflection within the Psychology of Intergroup Relations. For social psychologists, after World War II and the shock of the Holocaust, prejudice is conceptualized as the key concept for the analysis of social problems such as racism, discrimination, ideological extremism and genocide (Dixon & Levine, 2012).

The contemporary political scenarios in Europe have aroused deep concern. We are witnessing an exacerbation of xenophobic positions in the political debate, the closing of borders, the construction of the “migrant emergency” and the media discourse of the *other* - and of the alterity in general - as threatening and dangerous.

DuBois, in 1903, wrote: “the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the colour line” (p.29). Although common sense suggests that it is a phenomenon in decline compared to the past, ethnic prejudice is still pervasive. In fact, far from being anachronistic, it is a complex social phenomenon, whose analysis cannot ignore the relevance of contextual, institutional, ideological, economic and historical aspects.

It can be said that skin colour is not a neutral value at all, but rather that its meaning is historically inserted in a symbolic and social field, in which it is interpreted according to specific interests and social hierarchies (Giuliani & Lombardi-Diop, 2013). To date, Dubois's words seem more contemporary than ever.

In the European Union, Eurobarometer data of 2015 report that 64% of respondents believe that ethnic discrimination is the most widespread type of discrimination in Europe, given an increase of 8 percentage points compared to the 2012 survey (European Commission, 2015). 50% of Europeans believe that discrimination against religious minorities is increasing. Regarding social equality, data relative to the work context are also indicative: 46% of interviewed argue that skin colour or ethnic origin of a candidate, represents a disadvantage in the recruitment process for a work position, and 18% say they would feel uncomfortable if the highest political position in their country was covered by a person of different ethnic origin from their own. Parallel to these negative data, it emerges that 70% of respondents declare

to have friends or acquaintances of religious faith or ethnicity different from their own (European Commission, 2015). Contrary to the past, in the European Union the phenomenon of migration is currently considered and perceived no longer as transitory, but as a fully structuring element. Parallel to this, taking up the concept of the “colour line”, the meaning of whiteness and white privilege represent themes that the social sciences have contributed to delineate in recent decades. The Eurobarometer data confirm that the increasing diversity of the European population brings to question important challenges related to social inclusion and, between social sciences, psychology has effectively accepted the urgent need of decoding the problem of race, ethnic prejudice and intergroup relations.

Portugal, for a long time known mainly as a land of emigration, witnesses a first immigration flow starting from the 60-70's. This flow involved Luso-Africans and Portuguese returning from the former colonies, after the independence of the Portuguese colonies in Africa. Since the early years of 2000, there has been a diversification of the phenomenon, with the intensification of immigration of populations from Eastern Europe. Portugal thus becomes a more plural society only in recent times. Similarly, only recently has there been a great improvement in scientific productions in many research domains within the social sciences, resulting from the increased interest in migrations, ethnicity and intergroup relations (Machado & Azavedo, 2009).

A large part of scholars in social psychology sustains that the problem of race and racism continues to be a central element in the analysis of intergroup relations, as in the understanding of how the symbolic construction of race determines our subjectivity. Within the literature, it can be observed the tendency to the indistinct use of the terms “racism” and “prejudice”. The two concepts, however, present substantial differences (Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson & Gaertner, 1996).

It's possible to refer to prejudice in relation to an individual, while the term racism is used to indicate a broader construction that connects personal beliefs and practices with institutional norms. In fact, it can be said that racism is a structure, a network of social, political, institutional, economic and ideological relationships that can heavily influence the lives of people who are perceived as belonging to certain groups (Dixton & Levine, 2012).

Prejudice refers to the negative attitude towards an individual caused by his group membership (Allport, 1954). The tendency of human beings to construct functionally discriminating categories of belonging based on different characteristics, is a cognitive process well known in social psychology. These categories can vary arbitrarily, as do the boundaries that define them.

Social consensus on the definition of these groups and their borders plays a decisive role. In fact, the higher the social consensus, the more universal, timeless, and ahistorical the categories will appear. One of the most emblematic examples of this process can be observed in the process of social construction of race.

This thesis will refer to ethnic groups as elements resulting from socially shared constructions. Every social construction supports certain models of action and excludes others, giving rise to the creation of what is normative. In this conceptual framework, it is interesting to note that the process of constructing whiteness as normative, (a strongly hegemonic construction also in Portugal), presents elements in common to the conception that sees gender norms and sexual norms as biologically natural (Giuliani & Lombardi-Diop, 2013).

One of the models of action that can result from the social construction of race is the discrimination, definable as the difference in the treatment of individuals based on their belonging to certain racial groups, from which the white privilege comes. However, the biological division of human beings is a recent phenomenon in human history. On the contrary, discrimination based on economic, cultural or social diversity is very old, and the division of human beings into races is an attempt to provide a justification for such discrimination. In fact, the social context plays a crucial role in determining the meanings of whiteness and colour and in the relative construction of oppressive and inequalitarian dynamics aimed at maintaining the balance of power, both material and symbolic.

In this thesis will be analysed the relationship between inter group contact and ethnic prejudice in adolescents in the school context. The environment examined is characterized by great ethnic heterogeneity, and the main theoretical assumption is the Contact Hypothesis of Gordon Allport (1954).

In the literature, a large body of research has empirically tested the Contact Hypothesis with adults; less common are the studies that analysed adolescents. In the same way, there are few researches that have examined both groups involved in the contact, and even more rare those that have analysed the two forms of contact, namely the positive contact and the negative contact.

The first part of this thesis will focus on the analysis of the literature, favouring a genealogical perspective. In paragraph 2.1, the historical path that led to the current theoretical conceptualization of prejudice in Social psychology will be summarized, identifying the different waves of scholarship, which reflect the different paradigms and the various methodologies that have distinguished the study of social bias starting from the beginning of the twentieth century.

It will be underlined that in the first waves prejudice was conceived as a psychopathology, and therefore as a purely individual phenomenon, attributable to an abnormal psychic functioning and dependent on characteristics of personality, family experiences and psychodynamic processes (Dovidio, 2010).

The second wave, instead, conceptualizes prejudice as the result of normal cognitive functioning. Experiments conducted at this stage showed that it is sufficient to randomly assign individuals to different groups based on irrelevant elements, such as colour preference, to create strong ingroup favouritism and hostility towards the outgroup (Brewer, 1979; Tajfel, 1970). Then, it is assumed that prejudice and social bias have nothing of pathological, but they are the result of the normal processes of social categorization and formation of the social identity (Tajfel, 1979). In this phase the focus is therefore on the intra-individual cognitive processes and on a more intergroup-level (Dovidio, 2010).

Subsequently, arises theories on the ambivalence of prejudice expression. Such theories provided an explanatory basis for the various forms in which prejudice can be expressed. Theories of symbolic racism (Sears, 1988), modern racism (McConahay, 1986) and aversive racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986) emerged during this phase (Dovidio, 2010).

The third phase sees the development of new methodologies able to measure assumptions that previously were only hypothesised, such as implicit, automatic and unconscious attitudes. From this first part of the present theses, will emerge the possibility that scientific knowledge doesn't proceed by simple accumulation of knowledge, but that reflects specific needs of each historical moment (Kuhn, 1969; Duckitt, 2010) and that the paradigms themselves are the result of economic and cultural superstructures capable of producing not only knowledge, but also the way in which the "truth" is experienced.

The paragraph 2.2 will focus on the specific relevance of psychosocial research in the promotion of social change and emancipation. The strategy of prejudice reduction that most attracted interest among scholars of intergroup relations, the Contact Hypothesis (Allport, 1954) will be presented. Then, will be illustrated the theoretical developments that over time have enriched the original formulation, progress made possible by the numerous tests that, as will be shown, had empirically confirmed the hypothesis validity (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

The social context in which contact takes place has a decisive impact on the articulation of the prejudice reduction strategies. Considering this, in section 2.3 will be presented a review of the main research that examined the Contact Hypothesis in the school context, with a focus on cross-ethnic friendship and on the elements able to promote it.

In section 2.4, will be exposed more specifically the main theoretical and methodological nodes that more recently have been the object of interest of the contact hypothesis researchers. These latest developments aim to fill an existing gap in the literature, the substantial lack of research that examines the two dimensions of contact: the positive and the negative. Mainstream traditional research has neglected the negative contact, giving in this way an image of the social reality that inevitably results to be partial.

Starting from these premises, this study aims to deepen the conditions through which the contact produces an effective prejudice reduction. To clarify these conditions, it is necessary to consider other situational variables that have been neglected by research.

To achieve this goal, a longitudinal analysis was carried out, involving 85 students from a school in the large urban area of Lisbon, inserted in a district characterized by great ethnic heterogeneity.

The students involved in the research belonged to both groups, ethnic majority (white Portuguese) and ethnic minority group students (African descent), and the study that was carried out took into consideration the effects of intergroup contact, both positive and negative, on the interethnic attitudes of the participants.

In the second portion of this work, the experimental part will be presented; in section 3.1 the objectives of the research will be presented; section 4 will focus on the methodology and finally, in part 5, the results will be discussed.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Historical Excursus: Prejudice in Social Psychology

Since the 50's, prejudice becomes a central content in social psychology research. The first systematic articulation of the concept is observed with the founder work of Gordon Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954). The psychological study of prejudice in the twentieth century, however, went through several phases, each influenced by the historical, cultural and social climate of the time. Prejudice is defined as an unjustified negative attitude towards a group and its members. Most investigators agree that prejudice and racism occur at different levels: the individual, the interpersonal, the intergroup and at the institutional levels. In fact, there are different psychological theories that analyse prejudice by focusing on these levels: the individual, cognitive level, theories that favour the intergroup level, and socio-cultural theories. Doise (1982), for example, has identified four different levels in which the study of psychology is based, depending on the nature of the variables involved in the research: the intraindividual level, which studies how the individual analyses reality and creates an image of the social world; the intragroup level, which explores the interpersonal dynamics among multiple individuals who are part of the same group; the intergroup level: which studies the relationships between different social groups (ingroup, outgroup); finally, the social level, which takes into consideration the social processes related to the cultural and historical context in which individuals act. Therefore, for a complete understanding of a multidimensional phenomenon like prejudice, it is necessary to assume a variety of theoretical and conceptual approaches (Dovidio, 2010).

In the first place, it will be define the concept of prejudice by analysing the historical definitions of its theoretical construction, to arrive to the contemporary ones. In fact, the cultural, social and institutional climate of each epoch is decisive for the legitimization of hegemonic theories and knowledge, and to see how truth - and knowledge in itself - is constantly constructed, it is interesting to briefly go through the history of the concept of prejudice and racism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The echoes of the scientific racism of the late 1800's, together with the impulse to study human phenomena in an evolutionist, essentialist and biological perspective in the early 1900's, laid the groundwork for the development of inattentive theories about the immutability of racial characteristics and differences between races. Before World War II, in fact, the

problem of prejudice was conceived by psychologists as a problem of white people caused by black people. This perspective made the investigations focused on the presumed nature of the oppressed group and its characteristics (Dovidio, 2001).

This conception, clearly influenced by the violent colonial culture of the time and by biological determinism, theorized the existence of an alleged “primitive mentality” that would necessarily have to be dominated and controlled by the dominant group. Racism was then seen as a natural response of Western people to people of racial minorities, and the social and economic differences between groups were seen as an outright rift of biology.

It was after World War II, and after the Holocaust experience, that the first true reclassification of the concept was made: for the first time, prejudice was considered as a problem of the oppressed caused by the oppressors. The focus is no longer on people who are victim of prejudice, but now is addresses on the prejudiced person (Reicher, 2012).

It is precisely from this paradigm shift that different theoretical explanations about the origin of prejudice was developed.

The work of Adorno and colleagues, *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950) incorporates the perspective that seeks to identify and explain the origin of prejudice at the intra-individual level. The question is whether personality traits could be at the basis of the phenomenon. The work was commissioned and financed by the American Jewish Committee in 1944 and ended by Adorno in 1949. It represents a fundamental contribution at a time when intellectuals, especially those of Jewish origin, tried to understand the ideological foundations on which it bases the ethnocentrism, and, those that had determined the Nazi crimes. Adorno theorizes that the cause of prejudice is detectable at the level of intrapsychic processes. According to Adorno's perspective, the practices of socialization in childhood are the cause of the authoritarian personality. The relation with authoritarian and punitive parents can lead to the development of rigid, intolerant personalities, with high obedience to authority. The echoes of psychoanalytic theory make the theoretical background to this work, which will later be put under attack, both for methodological and theoretical reasons.

In this respect, Dovidio (2001), in his scheme of the historical stages of the study of prejudice, places this intra-individual perspective in the first wave, in which the ultimate cause of prejudice was precisely identified in the subjective components of personality. The contribution of this theoretical perspective is important, in spite of the great limitations that it presents, since it totally ignores the potential influence of structural social factors (such as the economic structure) on the etiology of racism (Dovidio, 2001).

In the wake of this theoretical tradition (with a psychoanalytic background), a more recent approach is the Social Dominance Theory (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). This theory, which also focuses on individual differences, based on the assumption that some individuals possess traits of dominant personalities and experience intergroup relationships as a competition in which it is perceived as legitimate that some groups are dominant over others. However, the second wave sees a new twist of perspective: prejudice is conceived as an unavoidable component of normal cognitive functioning. Allport's pioneering work (1954) played a key role in this paradigm shift and still represents the current theoretical point of departure of the major investigations. The Nature of Prejudice represents the first systematic articulation of prejudice concept, and it is the work that outlined the area of study of prejudice. The unprecedented value of Allport's work lies precisely in the intuition that the study of prejudice must be conducted considering the close relationship between personality and social structure in which it is inscribed. In his analysis, Allport identifies six different types of explanations on the etiology of prejudice: a historical, sociological, situational, individual, phenomenological and cognitive explanation. The central themes in which Allport organizes these explanations involve cognitive, motivational, and sociocultural processes.

Allport's emphasis on social categorization processes is unprecedented in the era. In fact, although the role of the distinction between members of the outgroup and members of the ingroup as a source of bias had already been identified, Allport identified the origin of the intergroup bias in the inevitability of the categorization of human beings as belonging to different social groups. (Dovidio, Glick & Rudman; 2005).

In the 1970's, Tajfel's work contributed to the analysis of the phenomenon at the macro level, defining the concept of Social Identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), today unanimously recognized as one of the fundamental processes in the development of prejudice. At the centre of Tajfel's interest was the conception of the group understood as the place of origin of social identity. Tajfel devoted himself to the study of the origins of the intergroup conflict through an experimental paradigm known as the minimal group. He demonstrated that the mere assignment to a group, although without identifiable characteristics and even in the absence of direct relations among its members, in itself is sufficient to guide the judgment of the single member in favour of the other members of his group, and to create an attitude of hostility and discrimination towards members of the outgroup.

Social categorization is a cognitive process that divides the social world into belonging and non-belonging categories. This process accentuates the perception of intra-categorical similarities and inter-categorical differences and produces differentiation on the group eval-

ation and at a behavioural level. An individual, therefore considers himself more similar to the members of the categories to which he belongs, and different from the members of the outgroup. This explains the tendency to evaluate in a stereotypical way people who are identified as belonging to a category. According to Tajfel, the concept of identity itself derives from this process. Furthermore, the high value that the individual attributes to belonging to certain groups, makes sense only when compared to the minor value he attaches to other groups. According to this theory, social comparison is the process that underlies the construction and maintenance of self-esteem, and which determines the tendency to value one's own group and to disregard the qualities of the comparison groups.

During this historical phase, prejudice is therefore considered as the result of normal cognitive functioning: categorization is a process of simplification of the complexity of the real, without which we could not store and organize the enormous amount of stimuli to which we are subjected in each second of our life. The consequence of this conceptualization is therefore the idea that prejudice is a completely normal and inevitable phenomenon, and that human beings are prejudiced.

Another huge contribution to the study of prejudice is the Sherif and colleagues work, who theorize that social bias is to be considered a group level phenomenon.

With the famous experiment on summer camps, they showed that intergroup conflict has material and realistic roots, coming to the point of theorizing that discrimination is the product of economic relations between groups. Sherif proposes that group competition, in which the success of a group is possible only through the failure of the other group, favours the development of bias and the creation of negative stereotypes about the outgroup. The intergroup relations which are not characterized by competition, but characterized by superordinate goals and cooperative behaviour, can reduce the bias (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood & Sherif, 1961).

After this phase, implicit prejudice theories arose in response to the evidence of the methodological problematic of the cognitivist approach, an approach that proved incapable of making consistent the relationship between declared attitudes and behaviours. The third wave of the study of prejudice sees a further change of perspective: the emphasis is on the multidimensional aspects of the prejudice and the research methodologies it uses can measure constructs that were previously only hypothesized (Dovidio, 2010). The problematic knot is making consistent the relationship between declared attitudes and behaviours.

The importance of the implicit aspects in prejudice expression, in attitudes and beliefs, is the key concept on which contemporary theories on racism are based: the theories of

symbolic racism, modern racism, and aversive racism. All these theories have a common basis: the affirmation of the existence of two types of prejudice: an explicit form (direct, warm, conscious) and an implicit one (indirect, subtle, cold, unconscious)

The current theoretical contributions of the study of prejudice, also, more explicitly examine the intergroup level and underline the importance of contextual aspects. Furthermore, the focus on the consequences of prejudice and on the effects that stigmatization generates in target people has assumed central importance.

On the methodological level, the techniques of investigation of neuropsychological functionality, such as Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI), have contributed to delineate the brain functions involved in prejudice and to consolidate a multidisciplinary and multidimensional approach to the study of this phenomena (Dovidio, 2010).

Finally, starting from the second half of the twentieth century, numerous critical issues were developed that brought to light the problem of positioning and the need to give voice to the perspectives that were systematically silenced in the history of hegemonic psychology (among these recent lines of research can be emphasized the critical race theory and the black psychology).

As evidenced by the above analysis of the different historical phases of the study of prejudice, in fact, even in this area of research, ideology often overlapped with scientific knowledge.

2.2 Prejudice Reduction: The Contact Hypothesis

The Contact Hypothesis has been the core subject of analysis in the Social Psychology of Prejudice of the last 60 years and represents one of the most effective strategies for prejudice reduction. As discussed above, prejudice is a multidimensional phenomenon, that involves cognitive, affective and social components. It refers to individual cognitive structures and it's, at the same time, a shared form of social representations, acquired during socialization processes, negotiated, and performed every day in interactions between members of society. The role of the social context in the acquisition, organization and reproduction of ethnic prejudice is crucial, as are the representations that individuals have of the social structure and of the relationships between groups. Individuals, in fact, organize and use their knowledge in socially functional ways.

The classic addresses of Social Psychology research have favoured the analysis of prejudice emphasizing individual cognitive processes, giving less importance to the social dimension. Recently, on the other hand, has been privileged analysis from a contextual and social point of view. Prejudice refers to an unwarranted negative attitude towards a group and its members. Allport, in his work *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954), defines the prejudice as:

“an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of that group” (p. 9).

In the definition of Allport it's clear that these are not attitudes of individuals but are attitudes of individuals as *members of groups*. Furthermore, Allport specifies that the generalization is faulty and inflexible, that is, it cannot be changed even after the acquisition of new knowledge about the outgroup (1954). Ingroup bias occurs when there is a more favourable treatment and evaluation for members of the ingroup than for members of the outgroup. For Allport, prejudice is the natural consequence of the social categorization process. The social categorization includes the processes of overgeneralization and simplification, by means of which people tend to select and accentuate the negative characteristics of outgroup members.

In a single chapter of his work, *The Effect of contact*, Allport systematizes his hypothesis. He states that prejudice originates from groups separation and from the lack of familiarity between groups; he theorizes that contact, under certain conditions, represents an effective

means for the promotion of positive intergroup relations.

This theory had already been formulated at the beginning of the 30's (Zeligs & Hendrickson, 1933), but its articulation becomes central with Allport. His proposal, indeed, will influence all the subsequent research developed within the area. The focus is on the importance of the characteristics of the context in which the interaction takes place. In this regard, Allport writes:

“To be maximally effective, contact and acquaintance programs should lead to a sense of equality in social status, should occur in ordinary purposeful pursuits, avoid artificiality, and if possible enjoy the sanction of the community in which they occur. The deeper and more genuine the association, the greater its effect. While it may help somewhat to place members of different ethnic groups side by side on a job, the gain is greater if these members regard themselves as part of a team.” (Allport, 1958, p. 454, original italics).

The requirements that Allport indicates as the necessary conditions for prejudice reduction are the following:

1. *equal group status*: interactions between members, must take place in equal status conditions between groups; although in real life this condition is difficult to define and to create, the crucial element is that both groups must perceive that they have equal status in the interaction;

2. *common goals*: members must have common goals and work together to achieve them;

3. *cooperative contact*: the achievement of common goals must be achieved through intergroup cooperation, not through competition. Sherif et al. (1961) in the famous experiment in the summer camps about the conditions that can favour or soften the conflict, showed that the introduction of superordinate objectives, (ie objectives of the whole community only achievable with the cooperation of both groups and therefore impossible to achieve individually), produced a sharp lowering of intergroup hostility. Even in later studies, it has been empirically confirmed that cooperation as a functional style, unlike competition, is a strong predictor of positive intergroup attitudes;

4. *authority/institutional support* in the establishment of norms and standards with respect to the group. In fact, contact will be more effective if it occurs within an institutional context that penalizes discrimination (as policies and laws) or in which there is an

authority that establishes rules to support and encourage positive intergroup relations (schools, work contexts, etc.).

Allport, therefore, argues that contact per se is not sufficient for the prejudice reduction. To be effective, contact must be accompanied by these four optimal conditions. A large body of works has empirically confirmed that contact is effective in reducing prejudice, for example, Pettigrew and Tropp's meta-analysis tests 515 studies in which the subjects involved are more than 250,000 (mean $r = -.21$; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Clearly, Allports formulation at the time was not verified at an empirical level (for this reason it was defined by the author "hypothesis"). Over the years, it has been perfected and expanded by new perspectives and new advances, arising from the enormous interest it has aroused and continues to inspire. However, it remains remarkable how the Allport hypothesis has proved to have such a strong validity despite having been developed in a time when the advances of social research were not comparable with those of today. Contrary to what Allport sustained, the meta-analysis of Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) indicates that the four ideal conditions facilitate the reduction of bias, but they are not *conditio sine qua non*. Pettigrew and Tropp have also tried to provide an answer to one of the issues that still today presents some grey areas, that is the causal directionality of the contact - prejudice relationship. In fact, despite the existence of the relationship between contact and the bias decreasing, there is little clarity about the causal directionality of this relationship.

Does contact reduce prejudice or does prejudice reduce contact? In other words, it is not clear if who has a high intergroup bias is led to establish less intergroup contact (from prejudice to contact reduction - defined prejudice effect), or if those who have cross-ethnic friendships are led to show lower levels of bias (from contact to prejudice reduction - contact effect). Indeed, Allport had already identified this problem: contact could foster friendship and positive attitudes, or positive attitudes could lead to contact and friendship. According to the results of Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) the directionality from contact to prejudice reduction would typically be the strongest. Therefore, people who have friendly relations with people of different ethnic groups, social classes, religions, sexual orientation, show lower levels of prejudice; people with high levels of prejudice do avoid intergroup contact. Other research shows contrasting results, such as the longitudinal study of Levin et al. (2003) or Binder (2009) which indicates that, like many processes in psychology, the path is bidirectional and of equal force in both directions. In the past, scholars (including Allport himself) thought that intergroup contact was effective mostly thanks to the acquisition of knowledge about the outgroup, i.e. that the learning process by which the

other is known was the crucial element. This element, instead, seems less important than previously claimed. Recent advances indicate that the most important factors involved in the bias reduction are the affective processes. On the contrary, cognitive factors play a minor role (Pettigrew, 2008).

The effectiveness of contact in bias reduction take place mainly thanks to the reduction of intergroup anxiety, and through the establishment of empathy and perspective taking. Pettigrew (1998), in his reformulation of the Contact Hypothesis, proposed to evaluate the importance of behavioural and situational factors: to be effective, personal interaction must take place through an empathic, personal and intimate contact between members of the groups.

Pettigrew (1998) adds a fifth situational condition to the four originally proposed by Allport: the friendship potential. The focus for Pettigrew is above the emotional factors: he affirms that friendship is the key factor in prejudice reduction (Pettigrew, 1998). Intergroup contact would not only reduce the level of prejudice towards the outgroup, but at the same time, would trigger a distance from the ingroup through a process of re-conceptualization, called ingroup reappraisal (Pettigrew, 1998). It would also seem that indirect contact, the extended friendship, would have an effectiveness in reducing bias, overcoming the four optimal conditions initially proposed by Allport, although it has less power than direct contact.

From the recent advances of the intergroup contact theorization, it also emerges that intergroup contact has greater effects on the reduction of the prejudice of the majority group towards the minority group compared to the participants of the minority group (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). It should be borne in mind that the vast majority of research on intergroup relations has focused on the effects of contact on the majority group, and that there is a gap on the effects of contact on the minority group or less powerful group in the interaction. Likewise, there is a small number of longitudinal studies. Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) showed that more than 70% of the contact research did not use a longitudinal methodology.

2.3 Intergroup Contact in School Environment

The scholastic period is a decisive moment for the development of the outgroup attitudes, representing the phase in which social norms are learned. These learnings could settle and perpetuate until the adult age (Cooley & Killen, 2015; Brown & Chu, 2012). Various studies have shown that the secondary school has been identified as the crucial moment for the establishment of interethnic attitudes (ten Berge, Lancee & Jaspers, 2017).

The main difficulties that can be encountered during school life can be summarized in two broad categories: the first includes difficulties in the learning processes; the second category refers to the relational sphere. Difficulties related to interpersonal relationships and self-perception are perceived as more problematic for social identity development and social adaptation in children and adolescents. The whole corpus of theoretical reference in Social Psychology underlines the importance of the school in the construction of social and personal identity, being the school the privileged context where the individual experiences the first relations with the formal institutions and the first social comparisons (Erikson, 1968; French, Seidman, Allen & Aber, 2000). In fact, it is in the scholastic environment that individuals start to build friendships and begins to perceive themselves as members of a group out of the family. In recent years, school classes in Western European societies have become increasingly multicultural; among these, Portugal is no exception (Comissão Europeia, 2015). This phenomenon has brought a change that, in agreement with the researchers of intergroup relations in social psychology, can have a positive value for the dynamics of interethnic relations.

The choice to examine friendships has both theoretical and empirical bases. Friendship is the condition that reasonably contains at least three of the optimal conditions reported by Allport for contact effectiveness in prejudice reduction, such as status equality, common objectives, and cooperation (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998; Wright, Aron & Brody, 2008). It can be stated, more generally, that friendship represents the ideal synthesis of what is called Positive Contact. Although friendship is a powerful tool for promoting positive interethnic attitudes and reducing racial segregation, research conducted in Canada (Aboud, Mendensol & Purdy, 2003) and in the Netherlands (Verkuyten, 2001) have shown that cross-ethnic friendship is less common than same-ethnic friendship.

In social psychology literature, exists evidences about a strong correlation between inter-ethnic friendship and positive interethnic attitudes: as has been presented in the previous sections, for most of contact scholars, intergroup contact and friendship seem to be factors capable of reduce prejudice and promote positive intergroup attitudes (Aboud et al., 2003;

Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Pettigrew, 1998). It emerges from empirical research that inter-ethnic friendship is the most powerful tool able to encourage the development of positive intergroup attitudes (Davies, Tropp, Aron, Pettigrew, & Wright, 2011; Feddes, Noack, & Rutland, 2009; Pettigrew, 1998). Starting from these evidences, in the last 20 years social researchers have tried to shed light on the conditions that favour the formation of cross-ethnic friendships.

Jugert and Feddes (2015), in their literature review about cross-ethnic friendship in children and adolescents, show that interethnic friendship is a multidimensional phenomenon, and show that to understand all the elements involved in its constitution, it is necessary to examine the structural, the intergroup and the family factors.

Among the structural factors, proximity is an element that can influence the construction of friendship in a preponderant way. Proximity is described as the opportunity for contact between different ethnic groups. The homophily, described as sharing interests and activities, and the reciprocity, are key elements too. More specifically, sharing of interests would seem to be the core factor in the formation of inter-ethnic friendships. In fact, several studies show that children in ethnically heterogeneous schools, when asked to express preference judgments on classmates, focus more on common interests and that the ethnic background takes second place (Aboud & Mendelson, 1996; Killen, Sinno & McGlothlin, 2005; McGlothlin & Killen, 2005; McGlothlin, Killen & Edmonds, 2005).

Another structural factor that plays a particularly important role is status. Ethnic minority groups typically have minor status in society. Feddes and colleagues study (2014) shows that at the age of 6 children are aware of the status differences of the various social groups in society. Tropp and colleagues noted that intergroup contact can influence prejudice of members of the majority group more strongly than influences the members of the minority group (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005; Tropp & Prenovost, 2008). According to the authors, this could be explained by the fact that members of the majority group fear to appear prejudiced, while members of the minority group, as targets of prejudice, fear being discriminated against. Curiously, the study by Hamm et al. (2005) found that white American teenagers with high grade points were less likely to name their cross-ethnic classmates as friends. On the contrary, instead, it happened for the ethnic minority students with good scholastic profit, who instead nominated more frequently cross-ethnic friends.

Individual factors also play a fundamental role in forming friendships. According to the Berry's model of acculturation (1990), the dimension of intergroup orientation, which reflects the willingness to establish relationships with other ethnic groups, would be very important. Jugert, Noack and Rutland (2011), in a research that involved German and Turkish

teenager in Germany, has also found that the strategy of acculturation of biculturalism, (having a strong ethnic and national identity), could be particularly relevant in explaining the propensity to cross-ethnic friendship of members of minority ethnic groups living in Germany.

Among the individual factors, the attitudes towards the outgroup also play a key role in the propensity to cross-ethnic friendship, an importance confirmed by numerous researches (Jugert et al., 2011, Binder et al., 2009). Group norms can influence and predict cross-ethnic friendships, as well as the family and inter-ethnic attitudes of parents (Edmonds & Killen, 2009). Feddes and colleagues (2009) studied the role of group norms in the mediation of the relationship between cross-ethnic friendship and intergroup attitudes, discovering that peer norms mediated the positive association between cross-ethnic friendship and prejudice reduction. Group norms are crucial also regarding the way in which prejudice is express or untold. A research by Monteiro, França e Rodrigues, developed in a português school, shows that norms can shape the expression of racial prejudice in childhood. Supporting the socio-normative approach, the authors found that in older age, children express prejudice only under appropriate conditions (in absence of anti-racist norm conditions).

In addition to favouring positive intergroup attitudes and being negatively correlated with prejudice, cross-ethnic friendship also has positive consequences on the development of many social and emotional skills, such as solving conflicts (McGill, Way, & Hughes, 2012; Nelson & Aboud, 1985). Furthermore, it would help develop self-esteem and socio-emotional support and social competence (Hartup & Stevens, 1997; McGill et al., 2012; Lease & Blake, 2005).

As in all social interaction contexts, negative contact is an experience that can also be experienced in the school environment. One of the problems that can involve students belonging to different ethnic groups is discrimination, a phenomenon that can happen at an institutional level (professors or other authority adult figures) or between peers. In the literature it emerges that the minority ethnic group students typically report higher levels of perceived discrimination as the ethnic heterogeneity of the school context increases and as the number of same minority group students decrease (Benner & Graham, 2011; Seaton & Yip, 2009).

In this study, peer perceived ethnic discrimination was analysed, conceptualizing it as the most typical and most powerful form of negative contact in the interaction dynamics between adolescents in the scholastic context. It was indeed analysed within the intergroup dynamics of both groups of adolescents involved in the contact, as a negative personal experience.

The impact that this form of negative contact has on the inter-ethnic attitudes of the students has also been considered.

2.4 Extending the Contact Hypothesis - The Role of Negative Contact on Prejudice

Despite the numerous theoretical and empirical advances that have arisen in recent decades based on the Contact Hypothesis, a small number of research has focused on the specific relationship between negative contact and prejudice increase. In literature, the use of the term “contact” refers only to positive contact, and the efforts of social psychology have been mainly concentrated in the analysis of the role of positive contact as a strategy able to reduce social phenomena such as prejudice, racism and discrimination. A large area of research has investigated the effects of a particularly positive form of contact, friendship (Davies et al., 2011).

The effects of the negative contact have been largely neglected (Barlow, Hornsey, Thai, Sengupta, Sibley, 2013). It can be said that, without an understanding of the consequences of negative contact, the vast body of research that analyses the effects of positive contact are not capable to providing a complete picture of the real effects of contact on the reduction of prejudice, especially in real life setting. In fact, during the life of individuals, the experiences of positive contact and negative contact can take place in completely independent ways. Intergroup contact was considered a typically effective element in prejudice reduction and in promoting social cohesion (see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Despite this, some research has shown that in urban contexts where there is a high degree of inter-ethnic contact, can coexist a very high level of negative attitudes towards the outgroup (Ayers, Hofstetter, Schnakenberg, & Kolody, 2009). It therefore seems to exist a contradiction, a zone of shadow that has not been sufficiently analysed. Various research in different European countries have generally found that positive contact is more frequent than negative contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011; Dhont & Van Hiel, 2009; Pagotto & Voci, 2013; Aberson & Gaffney, 2008; Bar-low et al., 2012), but exist very few studies that have studied positive and negative contact as different and separate experiences, and not necessarily interdependent.

The question is therefore the following: is positive contact more effective in reducing prejudice than the negative contact in increasing it? That is, which type of contact has more substantial effects on prejudice?

Already Allport had assumed that not all types of contact had equal effectiveness in reducing prejudice, indicating the four ideal conditions. Given this, it seems unusual that

negative contact was so largely overlooked in most empirical research, and that the question began to be investigated only in very recent times.

One of the first research to make a comparison between the effects of positive contact and the effects of negative contact was developed by Paolini and Colleagues (2010). These authors shed light on the role of negative contact as a predictor of prejudice. Paolini and collaborators have found that negative contact is the greatest predictor of prejudice, and that this form of contact is much more powerful than positive contact in increasing it. According to the scholars, according to self-categorization theory, during the negative contact the subjects would become more aware of their respective group memberships, that is, the negative contact would cause high category salience, while the positive contact would produce minor category salience. Starting from this consideration, the authors therefore refer to the concept of contact generalization, concept that has been the focus of social investigators in the last 20 years, which have sought to shed light on the mechanisms by which the effects of contact with a single member of the outgroup can be generalized to the whole social category to which the member belongs, in order to extend the positive effects of the contact (Brewer & Miller, 1984; Pettigrew, 1998). In this regard, over the years several approaches have been developed, including the Three Stage Model by Pettigrew (1998). According to the author, to extend the effects of the contact to the entire outgroup, it would require three steps: decategorization - in which the identity of the individual, and not the group identity, is emphasized; category salience - where group categories are made salient to facilitate generalization; finally, recategorization stage, in which the group categories are relocated to a superordinate group (from "us versus them" to "we"). Therefore, contact generalization would be facilitated when subjects are psychologically aware of their group membership. At this point, Paolini and colleagues (2010) propose to take a step back, and to add an anterior step to the model of generalization of contact, wondering what role the negative contact has on this process. Starting from the hypothesis that the awareness of group membership becomes more salient during the episodes of negative contact (on the basis of Self-Categorization Theory; Turner et al., 1987), then hypothesize that the subsequent generalization towards the whole outgroup may be stronger in case of negative contact with respect to the positive contact case. In their laboratory experiment (study 1), 52 white students in Australia evaluated the interaction with a student of non-Anglo-Australians background (Sri Lanka), whose non-verbal attitude varied on three conditions (positive, negative and neutral)). After these interaction exercises, participants were then given a questionnaire in order to measure the category silence. The results of the experiment confirm the hypothesis of the scholars, showing that in the negative

contact condition, participants made more frequent references to the partner's ethnicity than in the conditions of positive or neutral contact. The authors conclude by stating that, starting from the assumption that the salience of group categories facilitates generalization (Brown & Hewestone, 2005), these results indicate that negative evaluations arising from negative contact with a single individual can be generalized to the whole group more than positive ratings. Thus, negative intergroup contact would have more substantial effects on the intergroup bias.

In the wake of this study, Stark and colleagues (2013) investigated the process of generalization of interpersonal attitudes on the outgroup, taking into consideration the negative evaluations of the participants towards a single member of the outgroup, obtaining results that contradict those of Paolini and colleagues (2010). Although in this study the negative contact was not properly examined, but only the self-reported measures of attitudes towards individuals and the outgroup, the results show that the relationship between negative and positive interpersonal attitudes and attitudes towards the outgroup is equally strong. The negative attitudes towards an individual would not therefore be associated with a greater generalization towards the outgroup. One possible explanation for this discrepancy of results is that there are substantial differences between the two studies. One of the major differences is that in the study of Paolini and colleagues (2010) the member of the outgroup with which contact took place was represented by a totally unknown person, while in that of Starks, participants were classmates. In institutional settings, such as the scholastic class, contact is structured and monitored, as well as being subject to the regulatory control of the authority, represented by the professors. This condition could have a great influence on the intergroup relations dynamics. Once again, the role of context turns out to be crucial in the analysis of multidimensional and complex phenomena such as prejudice.

In this regard, a study that has carried out a multilevel analysis of different real contexts in which contact may take place is that of Bekhuis and colleagues (2011). The authors analysed the xenophobic attitudes of secondary school pupils, taking into consideration their cultural background (including religion). They asked at what level the xenophobic attitudes of the students are related to positive and negative contact in different real-life settings: class, at school, in the neighbourhood and in sports clubs. Bekhuis and colleagues considered the contact that takes place in school classes as the least free and most forced form of contact. As in the study by Stark et al., results indicate that the effects of positive and negative contact in the school class influence the xenophobic attitude in equal measure. In the school, on the other hand, only the positive contact had a reducing influence on xenophobia, while at the neighbourhood level, it was the negative contact that had a more consistent effect, increasing prejudice.

These results can be explained by highlighting again the weight of the context: in highly structured contexts, such as the scholastic class, both forms of contact have the same effect on intergroup attitudes. On the contrary, in less structured and uncontrolled contexts such as the neighbourhood, the negative contact is more influential.

The results of the study by Barlow and colleagues (2012) shows instead that the negative contact is more powerful in increasing prejudice than the positive contact is in its reduction. Starting from the experimental evidence that shows that the human being has the tendency to give more importance to negative information and negative events than positive ones (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, & Vohs, 2001) the authors have developed two studies to clarify the possible asymmetry of the effect of positive and negative contact on prejudice. In the first study, they analysed the role of contact in predicting prejudice against black Australians, Muslims and asylum seekers in Australia through the analysis of 7 studies previously carried out ($n = 1,560$). The participants filled out questionnaires that measured the amount of contact, valence and prejudice.

Results indicates that for all the target groups, the amount of negative contact more strongly predicted the prejudice compared to the amount of positive contact, and that the positive contact reduced prejudice only in the case of political refugees. In the second study, 441 white American participants, through online questionnaires, indicated the frequency of positive and negative contact with black Americans and the level of prejudice. The authors found that negative contact occurs less frequently, however, the positive-negative asymmetry hypothesis is confirmed because the amount of negative contact was a more robust predictor of prejudice, racism and avoidance. Starting from these empirical evidence, the authors affirm that the relationship between intergroup contact and prejudice can be strongly determined by the quality of the contact, with a consistent and greater association between the amount of negative contact and prejudice.

It should be emphasized that the results of their study provide strong support for the Contact Hypothesis, as they found that people reporting positive intergroup relationships were less prejudiced.

The recent study by Graf, Paolini and Rubin (2014) confirms these results. The authors have carried out an ecological analysis of the contact forms and their frequency through an unobtrusive measurement, free-response approach, which has made use of the Content Analysis methodology. The advantage of this approach, according to the authors, is that it allowed to measure not only the negative and positive contact experiences, but also those that were evaluated by the participants as neither positive nor negative. In fact, in real life, not all the experiences are rigidly categorizable into two distinct and mutually exclusive

categories (positive - negative) - and indeed, it is possible that an episode may contain negative and positive elements at the same time. However, it is not to be excluded that these experiences also influence relationships. Another innovative element of the study is represented by the analysis of the role of the context. The authors state that in the contact literature, despite the context has always been recognized and considered a fundamental element, the effects of the valence associated to the person with the effects of the valence associated to the situational context, have never been compared. The authors refer to the Ultimate Attribution Error (Hewstone, 1990), according to which people tend to evaluate the causes of the behaviour of others by underestimating the situational influence and overestimating the dispositional causes. The participants of the Graf and collaborators were free to point out their contact experiences in person framing or in more situational framing, assuming that the negative contact experiences framed around the contact person would be more influential on prejudice.

The results confirm the greater influence of negative contact experiences framed around the person as more powerful, despite the positive contact being four times more frequent than the negative one, in line with previous studies (see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Therefore, in real life setting, the greatest influence of the negative contact could be significantly attenuated by the increased frequency of positive contact episodes.

The cross-cultural research of Techakesari and Colleagues (2015), realized between United States, Hong Kong and Thailand, confirms the data according to which negative contact would be a more robust and consistent predictor of prejudice and intergroup anxiety with respect to the positive contact. This datum turned out to be applicable also to the non-western context. Also in this case, the authors analysed the role of positive and negative contact on the determination of intergroup prejudice and anxiety and, unlike other studies, they introduced a new dependent variable, called metaperceptions, which would have a role in this relationship. Metaperception is the subjective perception of being discriminated by the outgroup, ie what we think the other thinks of our group. Results indicate that the role of negative contact is also generalizable in non-Western contexts, and that it would be directly associated with negative metaperception as well as with prejudice. Finally, it emerged that intergroup anxiety plays the role of core mediator of negative contact-intergroup attitudes relationship.

From this summary of the recent contributions, it emerges that different contexts can provide different opportunities for contact. In real life people can experience innumerable forms and experiences of contact; this variety has not always been exhaustively considered.

As has been pointed out, the enormous empirical contribution of Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) has centred on the positive aspects of the intergroup contact, because positive contact is the most frequent form of contact in absolute. This data is also confirmed by the more recent research that investigated the negative form of contact. As Graf and colleagues (2014) have pointed out, it is probable that the rigorous analysis of Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) reflects this increased frequency of positive contact episodes, and that this frequency has influenced the conclusions reached. In other words, the authors suggest that positive contact could be only modestly associated with prejudice reduction, but its greater absolute frequency translates into a positive balance for its effects in the intergroup relations. These questions stimulate the need to develop further studies in this new area, which lead to advances that tend to a wider understanding of the phenomenon.

3. The present research

3.1 Objectives

The present research aims to contribute to the current knowledge on the relationship between intergroup contact and inter-ethnic attitudes in adolescents within the school context. Specifically, the effects of Positive Contact and Negative Contact on Intergroup Bias were analysed separately and compared. The main objective of the research is to clarify which types of contact have stronger effects on prejudice, that is, if negative contact increases prejudice more than positive contact reduces it (or vice versa). Positive Contact is typically associated with the reduction of prejudice, whereas the Negative Contact is expected to be linked to prejudice increasing.

Numerous studies have examined positive contact, while only recently has it begun to analyse the effects of the negative one. Pettigrew (2008) has explicitly called the need for new investigations, stating that “our understanding of intergroup contact is limited by this emphasis on positive contact” and that “factors that curb contact’s ability to reduce prejudice are now the most problematic theoretically, yet the last understood” (p. 190).

From the literature analysis, it was found that research comparing the effects of positive and negative contact, in both majority and minority groups, are exiguous. To my knowledge, only Bekhuis and colleagues study (2011) included both majority and minority groups, but results lacked a comparison between the two groups.

In addition, one of the greatest limitations of the existing investigations on the relationship between inter-ethnic attitudes and intergroup contact, also derive from the scarcity of longitudinal studies that makes the positive/negative contact distinction. In this sense, the direction of causality between the two factors has not been clarified yet: it is possible that inter-ethnic attitudes (positive or negative) determine the amount of intergroup contact, as well as the amount of intergroup contact determines inter-ethnic attitudes. Studies with longitudinal designs can shed light on this relationship, although most of the existing longitudinal studies report conflicting results and focuses, once again, only on majority ethnic groups.

The present research contributes to the gaps existing in the literature proposing to analyse i) positive and negative contact ii) minority and majority group iii) through a longitudinal design with measurement repeated two times over the course of one month.

The main objective of this research is therefore to examine separately the effects of positive and negative contact on Intergroup Bias; the main interested is in investigating: i) the causal relationship between inter-ethnic attitudes and friendship (friendship as a positive form of contact); ii) the opposite relationship, between friendship and inter-ethnic attitudes; iii) analyse the effects of the different valence that can take the contact (positive or negative) on these relationships. For the sake of better understanding, the first measurement will be call Time 1 (T1) and the second measurement Time 2 (T2).

It was decided to consider direct friendship in the school context because, as reported by Turner et al. (2007), direct friendship proved to be more effective in favouring positive intergroup attitudes compared to extended friendship.

3.2 Hypotheses

Empirical evidence shows that the relationship between inter-ethnic attitudes and contact is strongly influenced by the social status of the groups (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). The study by Feddes et al. (2013) indicates that already at the age of 6 children are aware of the relative position of their group in the social hierarchy. Feddes and colleagues (2013) also shows that the perception of their subjective social status is associated with their social preferences. The results of the Pettigrew and Tropp meta-analysis (2006) on intergroup contact show that the relationship between the implementation of positive intergroup attitudes and contact is significant for members of the majority groups, and much weaker for members of minority groups.

Other longitudinal studies, such as Feddes (2009) and Binder and colleagues (2009), found an effect of positive contact only with respect to the majority group, with no effect for the minority group. Consequently, it is assumed the asymmetry of positive contact on the majority group (in this study represented by white adolescents) on the minority group (represented by black teenagers):

Hypothesis 1: a) Positive contact (Intergroup Friendship) is a predictor of the reduction of Intergroup Bias (from contact to prejudice reduction path) and b) the effects of positive contact (Intergroup Friendship) on the reduction of Intergroup Bias will be stronger for members of the majority group compared to members of the minority group. Hence, a longitudinal moderating effect of group status is expected on the effect of contact on prejudice.

A recent longitudinal study (Binder et al., 2009) showed that not only does the positive contact reduce bias, but that bias is a predictor of less contact. Thus, the causal directionality of the contact-prejudice relationship is bidirectional over time. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 2: Intergroup bias is a predictor of intergroup contact, specifically that higher levels of bias are associated to lower levels of intergroup contact.

From the literature analyses it emerges that, if contact occurs in the form of a negative experience, the probability of generalizing the negative interpersonal interaction to the whole group, is stronger than the generalization that occur if the interaction was positive.

Furthermore, if intergroup contact contains a mix of both positive and negative experiences, negative experiences will have more influence on outgroup attitudes, increasing the level of prejudice (Baumeister et al., 2001; Paolini et al., 2010; Barlow et al., 2012). Furthermore, it was found that negative contact has significant effects on the interethnic attitudes of the majority group; as regards the effects on the minority group, no data exist, except for the Bakuis study. Therefore, the effects of positive and negative contact is expected to exist for both groups:

Hypothesis 3: a) Negative contact at T1 predicts Intergroup Bias at T2 for both groups; b) negative contact at T1 predicts bias more strongly than positive contact (Intergroup Friendship) for both groups (the relationship between negative contact at T1 and prejudice at T2 will be stronger than the relationship between positive contact at T1 and prejudice at T2 for boths majority and minority members (positive-negative contact asymmetry) (Barlow et al., 2012).

Positive contact has been widely analysed. If positive contact predicts Intergroup bias reduction, it can be assumed that, to the contrary effect, negative contact reduces quantity and quality of interethnic friendship. Consequently, in an exploratory fashion, it is hypothesised that:

Hypothesis 4: Negative contact at T1 will be negatively correlated with Intergroup Friendship at T2 for both groups.

It was found that prejudice has an impact on contact (from prejudice to contact path) or else people with negative inter-ethnic attitudes avoid contact. The following exploratory hypothesis examines the impact of Intergroup bias on negative contact. There are no formulations that have analysed the path that goes from bias to negative contact. From classical theories in social psychology, however, self-fulfilling prophecy (Merton, 1948) could provide an explanation for the circularity of the relationship. It has been recognized that the expectations that individuals have on certain aspects of reality are strongly capable of shaping reality itself. Thus, it is assumed that the more prejudiced individuals will perceive higher levels of negative contact than the less prejudiced:

Hypothesis 5: Intergroup Bias at T1 predicts Negative Contact at T2 for both group

4. Method

4.1 Participants

A sample of ninety-four adolescent students from 8 different classes in a Portuguese school placed in Amadora, which is part of the greater Lisbon metropolitan area, participated in the study. This urban context is characterized by a social multicultural texture, described by institutional and media discourse as a disadvantage and vulnerable neighbourhood. Nine students only participated in Time 1 and were excluded from the analyses, leaving a final sample of eighty-five participants ($M_{age} = 13.7$, Age range: 12 - 16; 35 black students; 50 female). 50 students had self-categorized as white, 26 as black, and 9 as other ethnicity. 69 were born in Portugal and 16 in other countries, most of them in Portuguese Speaking African Countries (PALOP). 51 of participants declared to be children of Portuguese parents. All participants were given parental permission to participate, and the school pedagogical council approved the project of investigation. Data were collected in two times, between May and June 2017. All students participated on voluntary basis.

4.2 Procedure

All students were informed that the data would be treated confidentially and that they could interrupt the participations at any time. Data was collected in two times from May and June 2017 (T1 and T2) by completing paper questionnaires in their classroom during normal school hours one a month a part from other. Participants received identical questionnaires except for the order of the items, reversed for white and black participants, so that the ingroup scales were before the outgroup scales. The participants, after an explanation provided by two white female researchers, took about 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaires were part of collaboration between different research institutions and comprise different scales that will be thoroughly detailed in the Measure sections. For the scope of this thesis, only some of the scales were used.

4.3 Measures

Ethnicity. To measure ethnicity, participants were asked to state their country of birth, their parent's country of birth and to choose between three categories (i.e. "you would tell you are (1) white (2) black (3) other - namely ...").

Intergroup Bias Variable. With the intent to capture the implicit and the explicit attitudes, two different measures of intergroup bias were used. First, participants received the administration of the paper version of Implicit Association Test (Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann & Banaji, 2009). The task was developed in group, in the classroom, using the timer. The compilation provided 20 seconds for each page. Participants were asked to associate names of people - typically associated with white people and the names of people typically associated with black people (raced-related stimuli) - to words with positive or negative valence. Second, explicit affective attitudes towards both ingroup and outgroup were measured using the scale formulated by Binder et al. (2009). Participants were asked to indicate on a 5-point Likert scale (from 1 = to 5 =) the extent that they experience positive feelings and negative feelings towards the groups, presenting three positive emotions (I admire them, I trust them, I like them) and three negative ones (I feel angry with them, I feel irritated by them, I feel bored with them).

Intergroup Friendship. Previous research states that both quality and quantity of friendship are consistent predictors (Binder et al., 2009; Brown et al., 1999; Harwood, Hewstone, Paolini, & Voci, 2005; Voci & Hewstone, 2003). For this reason, three different measure of friendships were used. To assess school intergroup friendship, adolescents were asked to nominate their first three favourite friends in school environment and to indicate their sex, ethnicity, age, and classroom. Participants can choose up to three favorite schoolmates who they perceived as their friends. For intergroup friendship quality, three items adapted from Voci and Hewstone (2003) were used, asking to indicate, on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = disagree, to 5 = completely agree, whether their outgroup friends were distant or close to them and unequal or equal to them, and whether they worked against or with each other. To measure intergroup friendship quantity, students were asked to indicate on 5-point Likert scales, the total number of outgroup friends (from 1 = nobody, to 5 = more than 10) and how many time they spend together (from 1 = never, to 5 = always).

Intergroup Anxiety. To measure intergroup anxiety, the Stephan and Stephan's (1985) scale was used in a version adapted by Binder et al. (2009). Participants were asked how they would feel if they were the only members of their own group in a group of boys and girls of

different skin colour, on a 6-point scale ranging from less to more anxiety in which three positives (comfortable, at ease, accepted) and three negatives (nervous, anxious, uncomfortable) states were presented.

Negative Contact. With the intent of capture the more typical experience of negative contact that can happen at school, perceived discrimination of the self was measured (Crosby, Cordova, & Jaskar, 1993; Kessler, Mummentey, & Leisse, 2000; Levin et al., 2003; Postmes, Branscombe, Spears, & Young, 1999; Taylor, Wright, & Porter, 1994). Participants were asked to read two items about their experiences at school (e. g., “A boy or a girl is playing in the school park. Others appear and offend her or him because she or he has a different skin colour. How many time this happened to you?”) and to indicate their answer on a 5-point Likert scales (from 1 = never, to 5 = always).

Social Norms. From a very young age, children can have the acquaintance of difference in the of social groups status in society (Feddes, Monteiro, Justo, 2014). To measure the subjective social status, participants were asked to indicate which social group they thought is the most important in the Portuguese society (white, black, or both).

Perceived Normative Classroom Climate About Multiculturalism. Social norms directly influence intergroup attitudes of children (Nesdale, Maass, Durkin & Griffiths, 2005). Institutional norms at school can be represented by professors. In order to evaluate normative classroom climate about multiculturalism, participants were asked to evaluate to what extent professors encourage interethnic student interactions (“Do you think your teachers think that white boys and girls should have black friends and vice versa?”) on 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = I don’t agree to 5 = I totally agree.

5. Results

5.1 Preliminary Analyses

We computed scores of Intergroup Friendship, Negative Contact and Intergroup Bias (Cronbach's alphas varied between .65 and .91). Intergroup Friendship was computed averaging z-scored on quality and quantities scales. Higher values indicate more intergroup friends and a better intergroup friendship quality. Negative Contact was computed by averaging the two items related to the perceived outgroup discrimination towards oneself, with higher values indicating more negative contact than lower values. Intergroup Bias was computed subtracting the averaged attitude towards the outgroup from the averaged attitudes towards the ingroup. Higher values indicate a preference for the ingroup over the outgroup.

Checking for selective attrition: the scores on Intergroup Friendship, Intergroup Bias and Negative Contact variables at Time 1 (T1) of participants who participates at both times (T1 and T2) with participants who only participated at Time 1 (T1) were compared. A 2 (one vs. both) X 2 (Majority vs. Minority) ANOVA was performed with both factors between-subjects. The analysis did not yield a significant effect for the participation (all $Fs < 1.85, ns$) factor or for the interaction (all $Fs < .78, ns$).

Mean scores and correlations: In order to check changes over time, was conducted a 2 (Majority vs. Minority) X 2 (Time 1 vs. Time2) ANOVAs with the first factor between-subjects and the second factor within-participants for all variables. The means and standard deviations are given in Table 1.

All the interaction effects between time and status were nonsignificant ($Fs < 1.97; p > .164$). Regarding Intergroup Bias, were found a category effect and no time effect. Regardless of time, black children reported a higher Intergroup Bias than white children. Respecting Intergroup Friendship, it was found no effect of category or time. For Negative Intergroup Contact, were found a statistical trend showing that black children reported moderately higher levels of Negative Intergroup Contact than white children. In conclusion, it can be noted that both black and white children reported to have great Intergroup Friendship and to having experienced a low level of Negative Intergroup Contact.

Cross-sectional intercorrelations across groups are shown in Table 2 (white children variables are indicated below the diagonal and T2 is indicated in italics). For white children, Negative Intergroup Contact was not found to be significantly correlated with Intergroup Bias neither at T1 or T2. Negative Intergroup Contact was not found to correlate neither with

Intergroup Friendship in both times. Intergroup Friendship is moderately negatively correlated with Intergroup Bias at T1 and significantly correlated at T2. For black children, Intergroup Bias and Intergroup Friendship are negatively correlated in both time points, Intergroup Friendship is negatively correlated with Negative Intergroup Contact only at T2, and Intergroup Bias is positively associated with Negative Intergroup Contact only at T2.

Table 1. Means (and Standard Deviations) for White ($N = 54$) and Black ($N = 31$) Children on the Variables at Time 1 and Time 2 and Test Statistics F (and Effect Sizes, η^2) for Analyses of Variance on All Variables Over Time

	Time 1		Time 2		Time	Category
	Majority	Minority	Majority	Minority	<i>F</i> value (partial eta ₂)	<i>F</i> value (partial eta ₂)
Intergroup Bias	-.14(.39)	.45(.74)	-.09(.45)	.48(.88)	.43(.01)	22.56(.22)*
Intergroup Friendship	4.13(.74)	4.13(.79)	4.26(.77)	4.11(.79)	2.31(.03)	.12(0.00)
Negative Intergroup Contact	1.52(.85)	1.90(1.24)	1.51(.84)	1.85(1.18)	.43(.01)	3.01(.04)+

Note. All the interaction effects between time and status were nonsignificant ($Fs < 1.97$; $p > .164$)

+ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$.

Table 2. Intercorrelations for White ($N = 54$, Below Diagonal) and Black ($N = 31$, Above Diagonal) Children Between the Variables at Time 1 and Time 2 (in Italics)

	Intergroup Bias	Intergroup Friendship	Negative Intergroup Contact
Intergroup Bias	-	<i>-.40*/-.52*</i>	<i>.17/.70**</i>
Intergroup Friendship	<i>-.22+/- .28*</i>	-	<i>-.13/-44*</i>
Negative Intergroup Contact	<i>.04/.09</i>	<i>-.17/-19</i>	-

+ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

In Table 3 are shown the intercorrelations between T1 and T2 between white children and black children. Only among black children Intergroup Bias was found to be positively correlated over time with Negative Intergroup Contact at T2, and Negative Intergroup Contact at T1 was positively associated with Intergroup Bias at T2. This shows a circular relation between these variables for the minority group. Furthermore, as expected, only for white children Intergroup Friendship at T1 was found to be negatively correlated with Intergroup Bias at T2. For black children, Intergroup Bias at T1 was negatively correlated with Intergroup Friendship at T2, indicating a direction going from more intergroup bias to less contact only for the minority group. For white children, Negative Intergroup Contact was negatively correlated with Intergroup Friendship at T2. Furthermore, no significant correlations between variables were found.

5.2 Cross Lagged Effect – Causal Relation between variables

In order to test the causal relations between variables longitudinally, it was performed a cross-lagged regression by simultaneously entering the three predictors variables. The cross-lagged regression approach repeats measure of the same variables at two time points. A variable measured at time 2 will be regressed on the same variable at time 1 and at a second variable that is assumed to have a causal influence measured at first time point. If the second variable had a causal influence with the first, the second variable would have a significant regression weight.

As can be seen in Table 4, the results of the analyses show that T1 Intergroup Friendship predicted T2 Intergroup Bias among white children ($\beta = -.21, p = .044$) but not among black children ($\beta = .02, p = .893$). Time 1 Intergroup Bias did not predict T2 Intergroup Friendship neither among white children or black children ($\beta = .01, p = .826$; $\beta = -.19, p = .221$, respectively). Intergroup Bias and Negative Contact: T1 Negative Intergroup Contact predicted T2 Intergroup Bias among both white and black children ($\beta = .20, p = .050$, $\beta = -.36, p = .010$, respectively). Time 1 Intergroup Bias predicted Time 2 Negative Intergroup Contact among black children ($\beta = .36, p = .005$) but not among white children ($\beta = .039, p = .726$). Positive and negative contact: Time 1 Negative Intergroup Contact predicted T2 Intergroup Friendship among white children ($\beta = -.13, p = .013$) but not among black children ($\beta = -.17, p = .253$, respectively). T1 Intergroup

Friendship did not predict T2 Negative Intergroup Contact neither among white or black children ($\beta = -0.2$, $p = .889$; $\beta = -0.8$, $p = .578$, respectively).

Table 3. Intercorrelations Between Time 1 (T1) and Time 2 (T2) for White and Black (in Italics) Children

Intergroup Bias T2	Intergroup Friendship T2	Negative Intergroup Contact T2
Intergroup Bias T1	.68**/.65**	-.11/-.38*
Intergroup Friendship T1	-.29*/-.20	.92**/.65**
Negative Intergroup Contact T1	.21/.48*	-.30*/-.27
		.62**/.70**

+p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .001

Table 4. Cross-lagged Regression Between Variables at Time 1 (T1) and Time 2 (T2) for White ($N = 54$) and Black ($N = 31$) Children

Effects	Group	
	White Children	Black Children
Intergroup Bias		
Stability of Intergroup Bias	.683**	.620**
Intergroup Friendship to Intergroup Bias	-.206*	.088
Negative Intergroup Contact to Intergroup Bias	.176+	.351*
Intergroup Friendship		
Stability of Intergroup Friendship	.901**	.565**
Intergroup Bias to Intergroup Friendship	.015	-.169
Negative Intergroup Contact to Intergroup Friendship	-.131*	-.143

Negative Intergroup Contact

Stability of Negative Intergroup Contact	.615**	.633**
Intergroup Bias to Negative Intergroup Contact	.032	.378*
Intergroup Friendship to Negative Intergroup Contact	-.024	.045

⁺p<.10; *p < .05; **p < .001

6. Discussion

This research was carried out to shed light on how negative contact influences intergroup attitudes (Pettigrew, 2008). Positive and negative forms of contact were compared to analyses their influence on prejudice for both black and white participants.

In line with past studies on intergroup friendship (Barlow et al., 2009, Feddes et al., 2009, Paolini et al., 2004, Paolini et al., 2007, Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) and confirming the Contact Hypothesis (Allport, 1954), results show that positive contact reduces prejudice, but only for what concerns white participants. In their meta-analysis, Tropp and Pettigrew (2006) found indeed that the relationship between contact and prejudice is weaker for minority group members compared to majority group member. Also Feddes et al. (2009) found the same pattern of results in a primary school context, that is, only among majority status children (e.g., German), but not among minority status children (e.g., Turkish), direct cross-ethnic friendship predicted positive outgroup evaluations over time. Consequently, Hypothesis 1a but not Hypothesis 1b was confirmed.

Subsequently, the opposite directionality, i.e., from prejudice to contact reduction, was analysed. The Intergroup Bias at T1 did not show effects on the Intergroup Friendship at T2 for either group, contrary to the results of Binder (2009). Hypothesis 2 is therefore not confirmed, since intergroup bias is not a predictor of lower quantity and quality of contact for any of the two groups.

Afterwards, the impact of the negative contact on prejudice was analysed. In the literature exists evidence of asymmetry effects of positive and negative contact. Results indicate that the Negative Contact at T1 predicts Intergroup Bias at T2 for the minority group and with a similar pattern, although not reaching the conventional level of significance, for majority group. Regarding the comparison between positive and negative contact, results show that the relationship between negative contact at T1 and prejudice at T2 is stronger than the relationship between positive contact at T1 and prejudice at T2, only for the minority group. In fact, among minority participants only negative contact but not positive contact predicts intergroup bias over time. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 b has only been partially confirmed.

These results indicate that, compared in the present research, the relationship between quality of contact and prejudice is stronger when the contact is negative than when it is positive (positive-negative contact asymmetry) only for the minority group. As for black participants, more discriminatory experiences reported, more expressed prejudice.

Hypothesis 4 was then tested, according to which negative contact at T1 will be negatively correlated with Intergroup Friendship at T2 for both groups. The results show that negative contact at T1 predicts a decrease in Intergroup friendship at T2 only for the majority group, with no effect on minority group.

Hypothesis 5 has been tested to analyse a possible circularity in the relationship between Intergroup bias and Negative Contact. It has been effectively highlighted that Intergroup Bias at T1 is able to predict Negative Contact at T2, but again, strong differences were detected between the two groups. This effect in fact exists only regarding the minority group. Therefore, higher levels of Intergroup bias predict negative contact for the group that has lower status in society.

Finally, it is emphasized that minority group participants reported tendentially more negative contact experiences in the form of exclusion/discrimination, compared to the majority group participants. Despite this, and in line with the literature, positive contact was found to be more frequent than negative contact for both groups, and both groups reported high intergroup friendship.

Given the heterogeneity detected in the present research, the analysis of results can be made by dividing them into four different plans: the plan relating to the majority group and the one relative to the minority group; and the plan relating to the effects of positive contact and the one of negative contact.

Regarding the majority group results, current findings confirm Pettigrews (2006) conclusions. The meta-analysis of Pettigrew (2006) showed that the strongest effects of contact were obtained in experimental and recreational settings, compared to school and residential contexts, and for participants belonging to the majority group, rather than to participants of minority groups. The meta-analysis also shows that contact seems to have positive effects even when the conditions of Allport are not completely satisfied: the contact conditions formulated by Allport are in fact facilitating, but not necessary. The conclusions of the study led the authors to state that negative contact conditions should be avoided so that the positive effects of contact would not be nullify. In line with Pettigrew's meta-analysis, in this study the effect of positive contact is greater than the effect of prejudice on contact (from prejudice to contact reduction) but only for the majority group. Although the studies conducted in the literature to verify the above do not allow to reach definitive conclusions, in this longitudinal research the causal direction from contact to prejudice reduction has therefore been confirmed as the strongest one. The results of this study clearly indicate that the phenomenon of preju dice follows different paths depending on the differences in status of groups.

Significant differences were found regarding the effects of the contact on the two groups examined.

In summary, it can be said that the most important results emerged are three: the causal direction from positive contact to prejudice reduction has been confirmed as the strongest one, only for the majority group. For the minority group, on the other hand, two inverse relationships emerged: that from negative contact to prejudice and that from prejudice to negative contact, emphasizing a bidirectionality in play. As theorized by various scholars (Barlow et al., 2012, Barlow et al., 2013), negative contact could assume different meanings and could produce very different consequences depending on the group status of those who live it. The results indicate that the privileged majority group benefits from the effects of positive contact, while for the minority group, positive contact may even be ineffective on bias reduction. Two main explanations have been proposed in the literature for this asymmetry of the effects of positive contact on the majority and on the minority group. Tropp and Pettigrew (2005) have suggested that contextual, social and historical structural factors can explain this difference. The members of the majority group, in fact, rarely consider themselves as belonging to the historically privileged group and rarely perceive themselves as members of the majority favoured in society, a phenomenon of silencing of white privilege. In cross-ethnic relationships, they are often concerned about appearing as prejudiced, and this could be the reason why the effects of positive contact are more effective for them, as can reduce this concern. The members of disadvantaged groups, on the other hand, during cross-ethnic interactions are more concerned with being the target of discrimination and prejudice (Costarelli, 2006, Tropp et al., 2006). Members of different social groups have different social expectations on cross-ethnic interactions, and members of stigmatized and discriminated groups can reasonably harbour fears about how they will be received during intergroup interaction (Tropp et al., 2006). For this reason, episodes of negative contact could be more influential than episodes of positive contact for black people. An alternative explanation is that, on average, members of minority groups are treated in a worse way during the episodes of contact than the members of the majority group (Tropp, 2007). However, it should be kept in mind that these explanations are based on intuition rather than empiricism, as untested hypotheses (Barlow et al., 2013).

The longitudinal analysis also shows a bidirectionality relative to the effects of negative contact on intergroup bias of the members of minority group. It can be observed that not only negative contact was found to be more effective in increasing prejudice of members of the minority group than the positive contact in its reduction, but that prejudice is a predict-

or of negative contact. It can be assumed that, as well as prejudiced people, even the target people of stigma, can interpret interethnic interactions under a deformed lens. Establishing positive expectations and feelings of trust can be particularly difficult for members of historically discriminated groups (Tropp et al., 2006). It can be said that having negative expectations in relation to an episode or a social interaction, could cause the same behaviours implemented during the interaction to be functional to the confirmation of the aforesaid negative expectation (self-fulfilling prophecy). As in many psychological phenomena, the bidirectionality of pathway plays a crucial role. Black people in Portugal represent a very heterogeneous category, characterized by different legal/juridical situations, different origins and conditions. Despite this, this study, like many others, starts from the assumption that the social representations of white Portuguese see in skin colour the salient aspect able to unite black people with very different situations, like double passports and double nationalities, refugees, migrants waiting to regularize their situation, Portuguese Afro Descent of second or third generation, and so on.

Longitudinal data presented contribute to shed light on the effects that positive and negative intergroup contact can produce in members of the majority group and in members of the minority group, a contribution that can be extended to the effects that contact can bring to the level of wider phenomena social. Diversity can bring enormous potential for intergroup relations, in fact, the present study aligns with the Contact Hypothesis and confirms the higher absolute frequency of positive contact with respect to the negative contact frequency reported by participants in the multiethnic school context in which the study was carried out. Despite this, the influence of negative contact on members of the minority group has emerged as the strongest one. Given the multicultural reality of Portugal and the persistence of discriminatory attitudes towards ethnic minorities, it is extremely pertinent to understand the factors that can intervene in reducing ethnic prejudice.

7. Limitations and further directions

The results of the present study contribute to the widening of scientific knowledge in the specific field of contact literature, in two fundamental ways: first, through the comparative longitudinal analysis of two possible forms of contact - and the effects of these on the intergroup bias - and, secondly, by investigating these effects in the two different group statuses involved in the intergroup relationship. Both the comparison of the consequences of the two

forms of contact, and the comparison of the effects between the two groups, are aspects that have been neglected to the detriment of a large amount of research that, over the past 50 years, has focused mainly on the positive form of contact and on analysis of the majority group. These practices have limited the understanding of the Contact Hypothesis in real life settings, both on the theoretical and on the applicative level.

The main limitations of the study can be found in the number of participants. Because of this limitation, the relationships between variables emerged may not be valid in other contexts and in other samples. Results are therefore to be taken with caution especially with regard to the minority group. Given the specificity of the context in which the study was carried out, represented by a school inserted in a multiethnic context in Portugal, the study represents a glimpse that describes the specificity of the context. During the various phases of this research, the complex relationship between individual attitudes and the influence of the specific context was considered. The methodology of this study is quantitative, although an observation based on the context has subsequently guided the choice to exclude from the research model some indicators used that was inconsistent in the specific context of the research, for example the Intergroup Anxiety Scale. To measure intergroup anxiety, Stephan and Stephan's (1985) scale was initially used in a version adapted by Binder et al. (2009). Participants were asked how they would feel if they were the only one in a group of boys and girls of different skin colour. Six emotions were presented, three positives (comfortable, at ease, accepted) and three negative (nervous, anxious, uncomfortable). This indicator is widely used in the tradition of prejudice research, but in this study it has shown little relevance, as both the school and the neighbourhood in which it is have a history of multiculturalism and intergroup relations. Another limit can be identified in the use of a single scale for the measurement of prejudice. However, the complexity of the analysis of attitudes is a topic that has been widely debated in social psychology. The empirical observation of prejudice as a social attitude clashes with the complexity of this question. When we talk about attitudes, psychosocial research has recently focused more and more on the affective aspects of attitudes. According to the tripartite model of the attitudes of Rosenberg and Hovland (1960), in the study of attitudes there are three components to consider: the affective one, the behavioural one and the cognitive one. The complexity in the detection of affective attitudes is due to the possible non-convergence between attitudes possessed and awareness of the subject, in addition to the possible non-convergence of these with the social desirability (Daher, 2011). In fact, the anti-racist norm in Western societies has gradually crystallized, so much so that openly racist behaviour is today socially condemned.

In accordance with the theoretical formulation of Meertens and Pettigrew (1997), the expression of prejudice has become subtle, indirect, less flagrant, moving from a form of explicit racism, defined as old fashioned, to modern racism, defined as subtle and implicit. The use of scales for the detection of prejudice cannot therefore be considered as a univocal instrument, but despite this, it remains the privileged instrument, especially within the tradition of social cognition research (Daher, 2011).

Given these premises, it would therefore be desirable to integrate quantitative and qualitative methodologies especially for the analysis of multidimensional constructs, for example with preliminary non-directive interviews and contextual observations. In addition to the problem of social desirability, another critical point is represented by the attempt to shed light on the link between attitudes and behaviour, an attempt that has occupied a central place in the history of classical social psychology. In fact, in the classic research lines, any emerging contradiction between declared attitudes and implemented behaviours tends to be interpreted as the result of methodological errors. At the base of this classical concept, which dominated the area until the 80s, lies the idea that attitudes are stable and coherent entities. Instead, empirical evidence shows that people can express conflicting attitudes and act differently than they declare. In fact, attitudes can exist without the subject being fully aware of it. The measurement of explicit attitudes is done through self-reported questionnaires, in which people report their attitudes or behaviour towards a specific group. These measurements assume that the subject is aware of his assessments and behaviours and is designed to reduce the possibility of responses infectious to social desirability. In the meta-analyses of the relationship between discrimination and explicit prejudice, the authors report a modest correlation between the two constructs ($r = .32$: Dovidio et al., 1996; $r = .36$: Greenwald et al., 2009). It is not easy to determine whether a decrease in the expression of prejudice reflects an actual change in attitudes. This represents an old problem, in fact already in the 80s the study by Crosby et al. (1980) indicated that the bias of the Euro Descent American to the Afro Descent Americans was more widespread than reported by survey.

It can be said that psychosocial research has the capacity to have a decisive impact on the understanding and on the control of social phenomena. At the same time, represents the fruit of the context in which it develops. Psychology represents a set of models, assumptions and rhetorical-argumentative structures generated by the historical context and by the social relations in which it is immersed (Mazzara, 2013). Although the research field of intergroup relations has shown to be particularly fertile, it has been observed that the constant expansion of the list of optimal conditions through which contact should take place, risks making the application of the theory in real life contexts impracticable (Dixon et al., 2005).

Also, in this study arises the urgency to develop strategies based to the context specificity. The Contact Hypothesis arose in an epoch when desegregation was assessed as a danger to social order (Dixon et al., 2005) Since then, many positive changes have occurred. The translation of theory into practice sees racial desegregation and social equality as objectives to which all the efforts in this area should be concentrated. These limits can be considered as a starting point for the development of further analysis, always considering the ultimate goals of psychosocial research, represented by the real possibility of producing social changes.

8. References

- Aberson, C. L., & Gaffney, A. M. (2008). An integrated threat model of explicit and implicit attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*, 808-830.
- Aboud, F. E., & Mendelson, M. J. (1996). *Determinants of friendship selection and quality: Developmental perspectives*.
- Aboud, F. (1988). *Children & prejudice*. Oxford: Brasil Blackwell.
- Aboud, F., Mendelson, M., & Purdy, K. (2003). Cross-race peer relations and friendship quality. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27*(2), 165-173.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Stanford, N. R. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.
- Al Ramiah, A., Hewstone, M., Dovidio, J. F., & Penner, L. A. (2010). The social psychology of discrimination: theory, measurement and consequences. *Making Equality Count: Irish and International Research Measuring Equality and Discrimination*. Dublin, Ireland, The Equality Authority.
- Allport, G. W. (1958). *The nature of prejudice* (abridged). Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Augoustinos, M., & Reynolds, K. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Understanding prejudice, racism, and social conflict*. Sage.
- Ayers, J. W., Hofstetter, C. R., Schnakenberg, K., & Kolody, B. (2009). Is immigration a racial issue? Anglo attitudes on immigration policies in a border county. *Social Science Quarterly, 90*, 593-610.
- Barlow, F. K., Hornsey, M. J., Thai, M., Sengupta, N. K., & Sibley, C. G. (2013). The wallpaper effect: The contact hypothesis fails for minority group members who live in areas with a high proportion of majority group members. *PloS One, 8*(12), e82228.
- Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R., Harwood, J., ... & Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased prejudice more

than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(12), 1629-1643.

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of general psychology*, 5(4), 323.

Benner, A. D., & Graham, S. (2011). Latino adolescents' experiences of discrimination across high school: Correlates and influences on educational outcomes. *Child Development*, 82, 508 –519.

Bekhuis, H., Ruiter, S., & Coenders, M. (2011). Xenophobia among youngsters: The effect of inter-ethnic contact. *European Sociological Review*, 29(2), 229-242.

Berry, J. W. (1990). Acculturation and adaptation: A general framework. In W. H. Holtzman & T. H. Bornemann (Eds.), *Mental Health of immigrant and refugees* (pp. 90-102). Austin: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health.

Binder, J., Zagefka, H., Brown, R., Funke, F., Kessler, T., Mummendey, A., ... & Leyens, J. P. (2009). Does contact reduce prejudice or does prejudice reduce contact? A longitudinal test of the contact hypothesis among majority and minority groups in three European countries. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 96(4), 843.

Brewer, M. B. (1979). Ingroup bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 86(2), 307.

Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. *Groups in contact*, 281-302.

Brown, C. S., & Chu, H. (2012). Discrimination, ethnic identity, and academic outcomes of Mexican immigrant children: The importance of school context. *Child development*, 83(5), 1477-1485.

Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 37(37), 255-343.

Comissão Europeia (2015), *Discrimination in the EU in 2015, Special Eurobarometer 437*.

Cooley, S., & Killen, M. (2015). Children's evaluations of resource allocation in the context of group norms. *Developmental Psychology*, 51(4), 554.

Costarelli, S. (2006). The distinct roles of subordinate and superordinate group power, conflict, and categorization on intergroup prejudice in a multiethnic Italian territory. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(1), 5-13.

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined contact interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist*, 64, 231-240.

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2012). The imagined contact hypothesis. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 125-182. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Daher, L. M. (2011). Ri-concettualizzare strumenti e risorse metodologiche per l'osservazione del pregiudizio in una società multiculturale e multirazziale. *Annali della facoltà di Scienze della formazione Università degli studi di Catania*, 5, pp-177.

Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-group friendships and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15(4), 332-351.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory*. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Dhont, K., & Van Hiel, A. (2009). We must not be enemies: Interracial contact and the reduction of prejudice among authoritarians. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 172-177.

Dixon, J., & Levine, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Beyond prejudice: Extending the social psychology of conflict, inequality and social change*. Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2005). Beyond the optimal contact strategy: A reality check for the contact hypothesis. *American psychologist*, 60(7), 697.

Doise, W. (1982). Niveaux d'analyse en psychologie sociale expérimentale. Dans W. Doise (Dir.) L'explication en psychologie sociale (pp. 27-34). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Dovidio, J.F., Brigham, J.C., Johnson, B.T. and Gaertner, S.L. (1996). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination: Another look. In N. Macrae, C. Stangor and M. Hewstone (eds.), *Stereotypes and Stereotyping* (pp. 276- 319). New York: Guilford

Dovidio, J. F. (2001). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The third wave. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 829-849.

Dovidio, J., Gaertner, S., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, present and the future. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 5–20.

Dovidio, J. F., Glick, P. E., & Rudman, L. A. (2005). *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport*. Blackwell Publishing.

Dovidio, J. F., Hewstone, M., Glick, P., & Esses, V. M. (2010). Prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination: theoretical and empirical overview. *The SAGE handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination*, 3-29.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1903). *The soul of Black folks*. New York: Bantam.

Duckitt, J. (2010). Historical overview. In Dovidio, J. F., Hewstone, M., Glick, P., & Esses, V. M. (Eds), *The Sage handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination*. London: SAGE, 29-44.

Edmonds, C., & Killen, M. (2009). Do adolescents' perceptions of parental racial attitudes relate to their intergroup contact and cross-race relationships? *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 12(1), 5-21.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis* (1st ed.). New York: Norton.

Feddes, A. R., Noack, P., & Rutland, A. (2009). Direct and extended friendship effects on minority and majority children's interethnic attitudes: A longitudinal study. *Child development*, 80(2), 377-390.

Feddes, A. R., Monteiro, M. B., & Justo, M. G. (2014). Subjective social status and intergroup attitudes among ethnic majority and minority children in Portugal. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 32(2), 125-140.

French, S. E., Seidman, E., Allen, L., & Aber, J. L. (2000). Racial/ethnic identity, congruence with the social context, and the transition to high school. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 15, 587– 602.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). *The aversive form of racism*. San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.

Giuliani, G., & Lombardi-Diop, C. (2013). *Bianco e nero. Storia dell'identità razziale degli italiani.*

Graf, S., Paolini, S., & Rubin, M. (2014). Negative intergroup contact is more influential, but positive intergroup contact is more common: Assessing contact prominence and contact prevalence in five Central European countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(6), 536-547.

Greenwald, A.G., Poehlman, T.A., Uhlmann, E.L. and Banaji, M.R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta- analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 17- 41.

Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1997). Friendships and adaptation in the life course. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121(3), 355.

Harwood, J., Paolini, S., Joyce, N., Rubin, M., & Arroyo, A. (2011). Secondary transfer effects from imagined contact: Group similarity affects the generalization gradient. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 180-189.

Hewstone, M. (1990). The ‘ultimate attribution error’? A review of the literature on intergroup causal attribution. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(4), 311-335.

Jugert, P., Noack, P., & Rutland, A. (2011). Friendship preferences among German and Turkish preadolescents. *Child Development*, 82(3), 812-829.

Jugert, P., Feddes A. R. (2017). Children’s and adolescent’s cross-ethnic friendships in Nesdale, D. (2017). *The Wiley Handbook of Group Processes in Children and Adolescents*. John Wiley & Sons. pp. 373-392.

Kuhn, T. S., & Carugo, A. (1969). *La struttura delle rivoluzioni scientifiche*. Torino: Einaudi.

Lease, A. M., & Blake, J. J. (2005). A comparison of majority- race children with and without a minority- race friend. *Social Development*, 14(1), 20-41.

Levin, S., Van Laar, C., & Sidanius, J. (2003). The effects of ingroup and outgroup friendships on ethnic attitudes in college: A longitudinal study. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6(1), 76-92.

Margie, N. G., Killen, M., Sinno, S., & McGlothlin, H. (2005). Minority children's intergroup attitudes about peer relationships. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 23(2), 251-270.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. F. Dovidio, & S. L. Gaertner (Eds), *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism* (pp. 91-125). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

McGill, R. K., Way, N., & Hughes, D. (2012). Intra- and interracial best friendships during middle school: Links to social and emotional well-being. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 22(4), 722-738.

McGlothlin, H., & Killen, M. (2005). Children's perceptions of intergroup and intragroup similarity and the role of social experience. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 26(6), 680-698.

McGlothlin, H., Killen, M., & Edmonds, C. (2005). European-American children's intergroup attitudes about peer relationships. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 23(2), 227-250.

Mazzara, B. (2013). Quale rilevanza per quale psicologia sociale – Un percorso tra antichi interrogativi e risposte recenti. *Psicologia Sociale*, 1, 9-35.

Meertens, R. W., & Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Is subtle prejudice really prejudice? *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61(1), 54-71.

Merton, R. K. (1948). The self-fulfilling prophecy. *The Antioch Review*, 8(2), 193-210.

Monteiro, M. B., França, D. X., & Rodrigues, R. (2009). The development of intergroup bias in childhood: How social norms can shape children's racial behaviours. *International Journal of Psychology*, 44(1), 29-39.

Nelson, J., & Aboud, F. E. (1985). The resolution of social conflict between friends. *Child development*, 56(4), 1009-1017.

Nesdale, D. (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 219 – 246). London: Psychology Press.

Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Durkin, K., & Griffiths, J. (2005). Group norms, threat, and children's racial prejudice. *Child Development*, 76, 652–663.

Pagotto, L., & Voci, A. (2013). Direct and mass-mediated contact: The role of different intergroup emotions. *TPM: Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 20, 365-381.

Paolini, S., Harwood, J., & Rubin, M. (2010). Negative intergroup contact makes group memberships salient: Explaining why intergroup conflict endures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 1723–1738.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2011). When groups meet: The dynamics of intergroup contact. Essays in Social Psychology series. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35(3), 271-280.

Pettigrew, T. F. (2008). Future directions for intergroup contact theory and research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32(3), 187-199.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751–783.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual review of psychology*, 49(1), 65-85.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173–185.

Reicher, S. (2012). From perception to mobilization: The shifting paradigm of prejudice. In Dixon, J., & Levine, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Beyond prejudice: Extending the social psychology of conflict, inequality and social change*. Cambridge University Press, pp 27-47.

Rosenberg M.J., Hovland C.I., Cognitive, affective and behavioral components of attitudes, in M.J. Rosenberg, C.I. Hovland, W.J. McGuire, R.P. Abelson, J.W. Brehm (Eds.),

Attitudes Organization and Change: An Analysis of Consistency among Attitude Component, New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1960, pp. 1-14.

Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In *Eliminating racism* (pp. 53-84). Springer, Boston, MA.

Seaton, E. K., & Yip, T. (2009). School and neighborhood contexts, perceptions of racial discrimination, and psychological well-being among African American adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38, 153–163.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup co-operation and competition: The Robbers Cave experiment*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Book Exchange.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157–175.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, 33(47), 74.

Tajfel, H. (1970). *Experiments in intergroup discrimination*. Scientific American, 223(5), 96-103.

Techakesari, P., Barlow, F. K., Hornsey, M. J., Sung, B., Thai, M., & Chak, J. L. (2015). An investigation of positive and negative contact as predictors of intergroup attitudes in the United States, Hong Kong, and Thailand. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 46(3), 454-468.

ten Berge, J. B., Lancee, B., & Jaspers, E. (2017). Can Interethnic Friends Buffer for the Prejudice Increasing Effect of Negative Interethnic Contact? A Longitudinal Study of Adolescents in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review*, 33(3), 423-435.

Tropp, L. R. (2007). Perceived discrimination and interracial contact: Predicting interracial closeness among Black and White Americans. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 70(1), 70-81.

- Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science*, 16, 951–957.
- Tropp, L. R., Stout, A. M., Boatwain, C., Wright, S. C., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2006). Trust and Acceptance in Response to References to Group Membership: Minority and Majority Perspectives on Cross- Group Interactions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(3), 769-794.
- Tropp, L. R., & Prenovost, M. A. (2008). The role of intergroup contact in predicting children's interethnic attitudes: Evidence from meta-analytic and field studies. In S. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup relations: An integrative developmental and social psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., Voci, A., Paolini, S., & Christ, O. (2007). Reducing prejudice via direct and extended cross-group friendship. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), European review of social psychology (Vol. 19). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Verkuyten, M. (2001). National identification and intergroup evaluations in Dutch children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 19, 559–571.
- Vervoort, M. H., Scholte, R. H., & Scheepers, P. L. (2011). Ethnic composition of school classes, majority–minority friendships, and adolescents' intergroup attitudes in the Netherlands. *Journal of adolescence*, 34(2), 257-267.
- Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice toward immigrants in Italy: The mediational role of anxiety and the moderational role of group salience. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6(1), 37-54.
- Wright, S. C., Aron, A., & Brody, S. M. (2008). Extended contact and including others in the self: Building on the Allport/Pettigrew legacy.
- Zeligs, R., & Hendrickson, G. (1933). Racial attitudes of 200 sixth grade children. *Sociology & Social Research*, 18, 26–36.

9. Annexes

Annex A – Questionnaire

Nesta primeira tarefa, estamos interessados em saber como as pessoas organizam mentalmente os conceitos. Nesta tarefa, pedimos que escolhas uma das opções em cada coluna **marcando um X** o mais rapidamente possível. Os estímulos apresentados são palavras associadas a conceitos positivos e negativos, e alguns nomes que são frequentemente associados a pessoas brancas e a pessoas negras segundo um artigo do jornal Público (2017) baseado em dados do Instituto Nacional de Estatística.

Por exemplo, para cada nome próprio de um individuo branco (Matilde, Beatriz, Inês, Leonor, Manuel, Gonçalo, Afonso, Martim) é necessário assinalar com um X na coluna “brancos”. E para cada nome próprio de um individuo negro (Kiluanje, Malik, Vemba, Kizua, Muanda, Késia, Tchissola, Lueji) assinala com um X abaixo da coluna “negros”, e assim sucessivamente para todas as palavras que se referem a conceitos positivos (Amor, Saúde, Liberdade, Paz, Felicidade) e negativos (Feio, Veneno, Mal, Nojo, Desastre). É necessário que preenchas a lista o mais rápido possível.

Caso cometas algum erro, não voltes a alterar a tua resposta, simplesmente continua a preencher a lista. Lembra-te que o teu desempenho é cronometrado, vinte segundos para cada página. Algumas colunas poderão ser mais difíceis do que outras, e possivelmente o teu desempenho tornar-se-á mais lento, mas isso é normal, por isso não te desanime ☺

Brancos	Negros
Positivo	Negativo
O Lueji	O
O Amor	O
O Kiluanje	O
O Nojo	O
O Tchissola	O
O Liberdade	O
O Matilde	O
O Paz	O
O Muanda	O
O Felicidade	O
O Manuel	O
O Amor	O
O Inês	O
O Desastre	O
O Martim	O
O Feio	O
O Afonso	O
O Amor	O
O Vemba	O
O Desastre	O
O Manuel	O
O Amor	O
O Inês	O
O Veneno	O
O Lueji	O
O Nojo	O
O Tchissola	O
O Mal	O
O Muanda	O
O Mal	O
O Késia	O
O Felicidade	O

Brancos	Negros
Positivo	Negativo
O Kizua	O
O Mal	O
O Leonor	O
O Liberdade	O
O Matilde	O
O Veneno	O
O Késia	O
O Desastre	O
O Manuel	O
O Feio	O
O Inês	O
O Mal	O
O Vemba	O
O Liberdade	O
O Gonçalo	O
O Nojo	O
O Kiluanje	O
O Amor	O
O Lueji	O
O Saúde	O
O Késia	O
O Veneno	O
O Malik	O
O Saúde	O
O Martim	O
O Mal	O
O Afonso	O
O Amor	O
O Martim	O
O Felicidade	O
O Beatriz	O
O Amor	O

Brancos	Negros
Negativo	Positivo
O Kizua	O
O Mal	O
O Leonor	O
O Liberdade	O
O Matilde	O
O Veneno	O
O Késia	O
O Desastre	O
O Manuel	O
O Feio	O
O Inês	O
O Mal	O
O Vemba	O
O Liberdade	O
O Gonçalo	O
O Nojo	O
O Kiluanje	O
O Amor	O
O Lueji	O
O Saúde	O
O Késia	O
O Veneno	O
O Malik	O
O Saúde	O
O Martim	O
O Mal	O
O Afonso	O
O Amor	O
O Martim	O
O Felicidade	O
O Beatriz	O
O Amor	O

Brancos	Negros
Negativo	Positivo
O Lueji	O
O Amor	O
O Kiluanje	O
O Nojo	O
O Tchissola	O
O Liberdade	O
O Matilde	O
O Paz	O
O Muanda	O
O Felicidade	O
O Manuel	O
O Amor	O
O Inês	O
O Desastre	O
O Martim	O
O Feio	O
O Afonso	O
O Amor	O
O Vemba	O
O Desastre	O
O Manuel	O
O Amor	O
O Inês	O
O Veneno	O
O Lueji	O
O Nojo	O
O Tchissola	O
O Mal	O
O Muanda	O
O Mal	O
O Késia	O
O Felicidade	O

Introdução

Olá! Como estás?

Obrigado por aceitares ajudar-me. É muito fácil!

Gostaria de saber algumas coisas sobre ti.

Não tens que mostrar as tuas respostas a ninguém! As tuas respostas vão ser o nosso segredo! Como é um segredo, não vejas as respostas dos teus colegas, nem deixes os teus colegas verem as tuas respostas!

Nestas perguntas, não há respostas certas nem erradas. Só queremos saber o que tu pensas e sentes!

Imagina que eu te perguntava se gostas de laranja. Não há uma resposta certa ou errada. Podes gostar ou não gostar.

Se não te apetecer responder, diz-nos que queres terminar. Não há nenhum problema!

AQUI VAMOS NÓS!

O que acho

Pensa nos rapazes e nas raparigas da fotografia. Agora diz-nos o que sentes quando vês estes rapazes e raparigas e o que pensas sobre eles.



A seguir, apresentamos-te várias frases. Escolhe a opção que melhor descreve a tua opinião.

Agora pensa nestes rapazes/raparigas da fotografia. Diz-nos o que sentes quando vês estes rapazes e raparigas e o que pensas sobre eles.

1.12 Admiro-os

<i>Não concordo</i>	<i>Concordo pouco</i>	<i>Concordo um bocadinho</i>	<i>Concordo</i>	<i>Concordo muito</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.13 Confio neles

<i>Não concordo</i>	<i>Concordo pouco</i>	<i>Concordo um bocadinho</i>	<i>Concordo</i>	<i>Concordo muito</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.14 Gosto deles

<i>Não concordo</i>	<i>Concordo pouco</i>	<i>Concordo um bocadinho</i>	<i>Concordo</i>	<i>Concordo muito</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.15 Sinto-me zangado com eles

<i>Não concordo</i>	<i>Concordo pouco</i>	<i>Concordo um bocadinho</i>	<i>Concordo</i>	<i>Concordo muito</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.16 Sinto-me irritado com eles

<i>Não concordo</i>	<i>Concordo pouco</i>	<i>Concordo um bocadinho</i>	<i>Concordo</i>	<i>Concordo muito</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.17 Sinto-me aborrecido com eles

<i>Não concordo</i>	<i>Concordo pouco</i>	<i>Concordo um bocadinho</i>	<i>Concordo</i>	<i>Concordo muito</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

O que eu prefiro

Agora pensa nos três amigos ou amigas com quem passas mais tempo na escola e preenche as seguintes opções:

2.1 O primeiro amigo em que pensaste, é:

Rapaz	Rapariga	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Branco	Negro	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Mais jovem	Da mesma idade	Mais velho
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Da minha turma	De outra turma	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

2.2 O segundo amigo em que pensaste, é:

Rapaz	Rapariga	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Branco	Negro	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Mais jovem	Da mesma idade	Mais velho
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Da minha turma	De outra turma	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

2.3 O terceiro amigo em que pensaste, é:

Rapaz	Rapariga	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>		
Branco	Negro	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Mais jovem	Da mesma idade	Mais velho
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Da minha turma	De outra turma	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

2.4 Quantos amigos tens que têm uma cor de pele diferente da tua?

Nenhum	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 ou mais
<input type="checkbox"/>				

Se escolhestes “nenhum”, por favor passa para a secção 3.

2.5 Quantas vezes passas o tempo com os amigos que têm uma cor de pele diferente da tua?

Nunca	Raramente	Algumas vezes	Frequentemente e	Muito frequentemente e
<input type="checkbox"/>				

Achas que os teus amigos que têm uma cor de pele diferente da tua são:

2.6 Afastados

Não concordo	Concordo pouco	Concordo um bocadinho	Concordo	Concordo muito
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.7 Proximos

Não concordo	Concordo pouco	Concordo um bocadinho	Concordo	Concordo muito
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.8 Diferentes

Não concordo	Concordo pouco	Concordo um bocadinho	Concordo	Concordo muito
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.9 Iguais

Não concordo	Concordo pouco	Concordo um bocadinho	Concordo	Concordo muito
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.10 Competitivos
(não sabem trabalhar em equipa)

Não concordo	Concordo pouco	Concordo um bocadinho	Concordo	Concordo muito
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.11 Cooperativos
(trabalham bem em equipa)

Não concordo	Concordo pouco	Concordo um bocadinho	Concordo	Concordo muito
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.12 No último mês, com que frequência tiveste contato positivo com rapazes e raparigas que têm uma cor de pele diferente da tua?

Nunca	Só uma vez	Duas ou três vezes	Algumas vezes	Muitas vezes
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

O que penso

Agora pensa sobre a importância que os brancos e os negros têm em Portugal.

3.1 Qual ou quais dos dois grupos, achas que têm mais importância em Portugal?

Brancos **Negros** **Ambos**

3.2 E qual ou quais dos dois grupos achas que têm mais importância na tua escola?

Brancos **Negros** **Ambos**

3.3 E na tua sala de aula?

Brancos **Negros** **Ambos**

Agora, gostava que me disseses o que pensam os rapazes e as raparigas brancas.
Tenta descobrir o que é que eles/as pensam.

3.4 Os rapazes e as raparigas brancas pensam que deviam ter amigos/as negros/as?

Os rapazes e as raparigas não pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam um bocadinho isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam mais ou menos isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam muito isso
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.5 Os rapazes e as raparigas brancas pensam que deveriam passar o tempo com os rapazes e as raparigas negras?

Os rapazes e as raparigas não pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam um bocadinho isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam mais ou menos isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam muito isso
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.6 Os rapazes e as raparigas brancas pensam que é errado gozar com os rapazes e as raparigas negras?

Os rapazes e as raparigas não pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam um bocadinho isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam mais ou menos isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam muito isso
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.7 Os rapazes e as raparigas brancas pensam que é errado provocar os rapazes e as raparigas negras?

Os rapazes e as raparigas não pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam um bocadinho isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam mais ou menos isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam muito isso
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Agora, tenta descobrir o que os rapazes e as raparigas negras pensam.

3.8 Os rapazes e as raparigas negras pensam que deveriam ter amigos/as brancos/as?

Os rapazes e as raparigas não pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam um bocadinho isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam mais ou menos isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam muito isso
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.9 Os rapazes e as raparigas negras pensam que deveriam passar o tempo com os rapazes e as raparigas brancas?

Os rapazes e as raparigas não pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam um bocadinho isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam mais ou menos isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam muito isso
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.10 Os rapazes e as raparigas negras pensam que é errado gozar com os rapazes e as raparigas brancas?

Os rapazes e as raparigas não pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam um bocadinho isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam mais ou menos isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam muito isso
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.11 Os rapazes e as raparigas negras pensam que é errado provocar os rapazes e as raparigas brancas?

Os rapazes e as raparigas não pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam um bocadinho isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam mais ou menos isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam isso	Os rapazes e as raparigas pensam muito isso
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.12 Imagina que eras o único rapaz ou rapariga num grupo de rapazes/raparigas de cor de pele diferente da tua. Como te sentirias?

Confortável À vontade Aceite Nervoso Ansioso Desconfortável

<input type="checkbox"/>					
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

O que acontece na minha escola

Agora vamos contar algumas histórias. Gostávamos que nos dissesse se estas histórias também acontecem na tua escola.

Um rapaz ou uma rapariga está a brincar no parque. Outros aparecem e chamam-lhe nomes feios, porque ele ou ela tem uma cor de pele diferente da deles.

	<i>Nunca</i>	<i>Só uma vez</i>	<i>Duas ou três vezes</i>	<i>Algumas vezes</i>	<i>Muitas vezes</i>
4.1 Quantas vezes isto já aconteceu na tua escola?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2 Quantas vezes isto já aconteceu contigo?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Um/a rapaz/rapariga gostava de se juntar a um grupo de rapazes/raparigas que está a brincar no parque. O grupo não o/a deixa brincar com eles porque tem uma cor de pele diferente da deles.

	<i>Nunca</i>	<i>Só uma vez</i>	<i>Duas ou três vezes</i>	<i>Algumas vezes</i>	<i>Muitas vezes</i>
4.3 Quantas vezes isto já aconteceu na tua escola?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.4 Quantas vezes isto já aconteceu contigo?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Agora, gostava que me disseses o que pensam os teus Professores. Tenta descobrir o que é que eles pensam.

	<i>Acho que os Professores não pensam isso</i>	<i>Acho que os Professores pensam um bocadinho isso</i>	<i>Acho que os Professores pensam mais ou menos isso</i>	<i>Acho que os Professores pensam isso</i>	<i>Acho que os Professores pensam muito isso</i>
4.7 Achas que os teus Professores pensam que os rapazes e as raparigas brancas deveriam ter amigos/as negros/as e vice-versa?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.8 Achas que os teus professores pensam que é errado gozar com os rapazes e as raparigas que têm uma cor de pele diferente da tua?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Como me sinto

Por favor lê todas as questões cuidadosamente. Que resposta vem primeiro à tua cabeça? Escolhe e assinala a resposta mais adequada ao teu caso. Não existem respostas certas ou erradas.

Tens alguma deficiência, doença ou condição física crónica? Sim Não
Se sim, qual? _____

Pensa na última semana...

1. Sentiste-te bem e em forma?	1	2	3	4	5
2. Sentiste-te cheio(a) de energia?	1	2	3	4	5
3. Sentiste-te triste?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Sentiste-te sozinho(a)?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Tiveste tempo suficiente para ti próprio(a)?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Tens sido capaz de fazer as actividades que queres fazer nos tempos livres?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Sentiste que os teus pais te trataram com justiça?	1	2	3	4	5
8. Divertiste-te com outros rapazes e raparigas?	1	2	3	4	5
9. Foste bom/boa aluno(a) na escola?	1	2	3	4	5
10. Sentiste-te capaz de prestar atenção?	1	2	3	4	5

Exercício Físico e Mobilidade

6.1 Praticas exercício físico (ex: correr, andar de bicicleta)? Sim ____ Não ____

Se sim, quantas vezes por semana? ____ vezes

6.2 Praticas algum desporto? Sim ____ Não ____

Se sim, qual? _____

Se sim, praticas num local fechado (ex:piscina) ou ao ar livre (ex: estádio)? Fechado ____ Ar livre ____

6.3 O que costumas fazer nos tempos livres? Escolhe as opções verdadeiras.

Jogar à bola no jardim ____

Passear com os meus amigos no parque ____

Jogar computador ____

Ver televisão ____

Ler livros ____

6.4 Normalmente, como costumas vir para a escola?

A pé: Sózinho ____ Com os meus colegas ____ Com os meus pais ____

De autocarro: Sózinho ____ Com os meus colegas ____

De carro: Com os meus colegas ____ Com os meus pais ____

De bicicleta: Sózinho ____ Com os meus colegas ____

Outro modo: _____

Ambiente Natural

A seguir encontras três afirmações. Para cada uma delas existem quatro hipóteses de escolha. Escolhe e assinala a resposta mais adequada ao teu caso. Não existem respostas certas ou erradas.

Eu e o recreio

A seguir encontras uma lista de afirmações. Em cada uma delas existem cinco hipóteses de escolha.

Por favor, usa a escala à direita para responderes em que medida cada frase **descreve a tua actividade e sentimentos no recreio da tua escola.**

Eu e a natureza

Por favor, responde a todas as questões da forma que melhor se aplica a si. Em cada uma delas existem cinco hipóteses de escolha.

1 Discordo Totalmente	2 Discordo	3 Nem concordo Nem discordo	4 Concordo	5 Concordo Totalmente
--------------------------	---------------	-----------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------

1. Gosto de aprender sobre animais e plantas.	1	2	3	4	5
2. As plantas e os animais são importantes para as pessoas.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Gosto de ler sobre animais e plantas.	1	2	3	4	5
4. É fácil magoar os animais e as plantas.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Tenho interesse em aprender a proteger os animais e as plantas.	1	2	3	4	5
6. As pessoas precisam das plantas para viver.	1	2	3	4	5
7. A minha vida era diferente se não existissem árvores.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Eu daria algum do meu dinheiro para ajudar a salvar animais e plantas selvagens.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Depois da escola, eu passaria tempo a ajudar a resolver problemas na natureza.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Devemos cuidar melhor dos animais e das plantas.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Gosto de passar o meu tempo em lugares que têm animais e plantas.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Sinto-me triste ao ver prédios onde costumavam estar animais e plantas.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Eu gosto de aprender sobre a natureza.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Eu ajudaria a limpar espaços verdes ao pé da minha casa.	1	2	3	4	5
15. A natureza é facilmente prejudicada pelas pessoas.	1	2	3	4	5
16. A minha vida mudaria se não existissem animais e plantas.	1	2	3	4	5

Está quase a acabar!

Este estudo terá dois pontos de recolha num prazo de cerca de 30 dias, pelo que precisaremos associar a informação da primeira fase de recolha de dados à segunda.

Para que possamos de forma anónima e confidencial estudar a associação de dados entre as duas fases do estudo é necessário um código único e exclusivo, a tua identificação pessoal será salvaguardada.

Para criar o código deves usar:

- 1) 1.^a letra do 1.^º nome
- 2) 1.^a letra do 2.^º nome
- 3) dia de nascimento
- 4) mês de nascimento

Aqui abaixo podes ver um exemplo de como se gera o código, sublinhámos as letras e os algarismos que devem ser usadas para criar o código pessoal.

Exemplo:

1º nome: João

2º nome: Carvalho

Dia de nascimento: 06

Mês de nascimento: 04

O Teu código será:

JC0604

10.1 Por favor introduz de forma legível o teu código:

10.2 Quantos anos tens? _____

10.3 Em que país nasceste? _____

10.4 Em que ano andas? _____

10.5 Tu dirias que és:

Branco/a Negro/a Outro O que? _____

Rapaz Rapariga

10.6 Em que país nasceu a tua mãe? _____

10.7 Em que país nasceu o teu pai? _____

10.8 Há alguém na tua família que tenha nascido fora de Portugal? _____

Quem? _____

Em que país? _____

10.9 Tens um telemóvel? Sim Não

Se sim, é um *smartphone*? Sim Não

Se sim, qual é a marca? _____

Annex B - Informative Consent



CONSENTIMENTO PARA PARTICIPAÇÃO EM ESTUDO DE INVESTIGAÇÃO (exemplar a devolver ao/à Professor/a responsável)

Título do Estudo: Relações e comportamentos de amizade e de lazer em contexto escolar

Instituição: ISCTE-IUL (<http://iscte-iul.pt>)

Centro de Investigação e Intervenção Social (CIS-IUL, <http://www.cis.iscte-iul.pt>)

Centro de Investigação COPELABS, Universidade Lusófona (<http://copelabs.ulusofona.pt>)

Investigadores Responsáveis:

Doutor Ricardo Borges Rodrigues, Doutor Mauro Bianchi,

Ex.mo/a Sr./a Encarregado/a de Educação, Vimos por este meio solicitar autorização para a participação do seu/sua filho/a na investigação que se encontra a decorrer no Agrupamento de Escolas da Damaia (Escola Pedro d'Orey da Cunha), relativamente aos comportamentos e às relações de amizade entre os alunos em ambiente escolar, num contexto multicultural. O objetivo deste estudo é analizar o papel positivo das relações entre os alunos e do lazer no contexto escolar no seu bem-estar e aprendizagem. As relações de amizade entre pares desempenham um papel decisivo no desenvolvimento das habilidades sociais necessárias, tanto para a vida quotidiana, como para o ajustamento e enquadramento positivos no meio escolar. O estudo decorre no espaço escolar, enquanto importante contexto de socialização, onde os/as alunos/as aprendem a assumir responsabilidades e a relacionarem-se. Este estudo é realizado pelo ISCTE-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, em colaboração com o Centro de Investigação COPELABS da Universidade Lusófona. A investigação vai decorrer entre Abril e Junho de 2017 e consiste no preenchimento de dois questionários pelos/as alunos/as e na utilização de uma aplicação de telemóvel que permitirá estudar a proximidade entre alunos/as e o uso do espaço da escola. As respostas aos questionários são anónimas e confidenciais pelo que os/as alunos/as não serão identificados/as em nenhum momento do estudo. A participação do seu/sua filho/a é voluntária e muito importante. Os dados recolhidos serão analisados de forma agregada, isto é, os dados de cada participante não serão objeto de análise individual. Em qualquer momento pode solicitar esclarecimentos adicionais e/ou acesso aos dados do seu/sua filho/a, contactando os coordenadores do estudo, o Professor Doutor Mauro Bianchi e o Professor Doutor Ricardo Borges Rodrigues. Agradecemos, desde já, a sua atenção e o interesse que este estudo lhe possa merecer. Os nossos melhores cumprimentos.

Os investigadores Responsáveis pelo Projeto

Prof. Mauro Bianchi

Prof. Ricardo Borges Rodrigues

Consentimento

Eu, Encarregado/a de Educação do/a Aluno/a _____, li a informação que consta deste pedido de autorização, e autorizo / não autorizo a participação do meu educando no estudo acima apresentado, sobre comportamentos e relações estabelecidas entre colegas em ambiente escolar

Assinatura do Encarregado de Educação: _____

Data: ____ / ____ / 2017, Localidade: _____

CONSENTIMENTO PARA PARTICIPAÇÃO EM ESTUDO DE INVESTIGAÇÃO (exemplar do/da Encarregado/a de Educação)

Título do Estudo: Relações e comportamentos de amizade e de lazer em contexto escolar
Instituição: ISCTE-IUL (<http://iscte-iul.pt/>)

Centro de Investigação e Intervenção Social (CIS-IUL, <http://www.cis.iscte-iul.pt/>)

Centro de Investigação COPELABS, Universidade Lusófona (<http://copelabs.ulusofona.pt>)

Investigadores Responsáveis:

Doutor Ricardo Borges Rodrigues, Doutor Mauro Bianchi,

Ex.mo/a Sr./a Encarregado/a de Educação, Vimos por este meio solicitar autorização para a participação do seu/sua filho/a na investigação que se encontra a decorrer no Agrupamento de Escolas da Damaia (Escola Pedro d'Orey da Cunha), relativamente aos comportamentos e às relações de amizade entre os alunos em ambiente escolar, num contexto multicultural. O objetivo deste estudo é analizar o papel positivo das relações entre os alunos e do lazer no contexto escolar no seu bem-estar e aprendizagem. As relações de amizade entre pares desempenham um papel decisivo no desenvolvimento das habilidades sociais necessárias, tanto para a vida quotidiana, como para o ajustamento e enquadramento positivos no meio escolar. O estudo decorre no espaço escolar, enquanto importante contexto de socialização, onde os/as alunos/as aprendem a assumir responsabilidades e a relacionarem-se. Este estudo é realizado pelo ISCTE-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, em colaboração com o Centro de Investigação COPELABS da Universidade Lusófona. A investigação vai decorrer entre Abril e Junho de 2017 e consiste no preenchimento de dois questionários pelos/as alunos/as e na utilização de uma aplicação de telemóvel que permitirá estudar a proximidade entre alunos/as e o uso do espaço da escola. As respostas aos questionários são anónimas e confidenciais pelo que os/as alunos/as não serão identificados/as em nenhum momento do estudo. A participação do seu/sua filho/a é voluntária e muito importante. Os dados recolhidos serão analisados de forma agregada, isto é, os dados de cada participante não serão objeto de análise individual. Em qualquer momento pode solicitar esclarecimentos adicionais e/ou acesso aos dados do seu/sua filho/a, contactando os coordenadores do estudo, o Professor Doutor Mauro Bianchi e o Professor Doutor Ricardo Borges Rodrigues. Agradecemos, desde já, a sua atenção e o interesse que este estudo lhe possa merecer. Os nossos melhores cumprimentos.

Os investigadores Responsáveis pelo Projeto

Prof. Mauro Bianchi

Prof. Ricardo Borges Rodrigues