

Stereotype Content: Warmth and Competence Endure

Susan T. Fiske

Abstract

Two dimensions persist in social cognition when people are making sense of individuals or groups. The stereotype content model (SCM) terms these two basic dimensions perceived warmth (trustworthiness, friendliness) and competence (capability, assertiveness). Measured reliably and validly, these Big Two dimensions converge across survey, cultural, laboratory, and biobehavioral approaches. Generality across place, levels, and time further support the framework. Similar dimensions have emerged repeatedly over the history of psychology and in current theories. The SCM proposes and tests a comprehensive causal theory: Perceived social structure (cooperation, status) predicts stereotypes (warmth, competence), which in turn predict emotional prejudices (pride, pity, contempt, envy), and finally, the emotions predict discrimination (active and passive help and harm). The SCM uncovers systematic content and dynamics of stereotypes, which has practical implications.

Keywords

stereotypes, social cognition, prejudice, warmth, competence, stereotype content model, Big Two

Department of Psychology and Woodrow Wilson School of International and Public Affairs, Princeton University

Corresponding author(s):

Susan T. Fiske, Princeton University, Department of Psychology, Peretsman-Scully Hall, Princeton, NJ 08544 E-mail: sfiske@princeton.edu

Life and theory both demand an explanation of the groups that surround us. In everyday life, immigration, globalization, multiculturalism, and inequality are changing personal experiences with other kinds of people, so as individuals, we need to make sense of them. In scientific theory, researchers investigating social cognition and prejudice spent the last century devising process models of how people relate as individuals and groups. What researchers mostly neglected were content models—taxonomies—of the systematic kinds of impressions that people form.

On closer conceptual and empirical investigation, a simple model explains much. Robust converging methods, cumulative data, generality, history, conceptual parallels, coherent theory, and evolutionary plausibility characterize social cognition's Big Two dimensions—warmth-communion and competence-agency. In emphasizing these points, this review omits other points; I instead refer the reader to other reviews emphasizing issues not detailed here: validities (Fiske, 2015), cultural analyses (Fiske & Durante, 2016), as well as implications for interpersonal status (Swencionis, Dupree, & Fiske, 2017), social class (Durante & Fiske, 2017), and political perception (Fiske & Durante, 2014).

Stereotype Content Model (SCM)

Humans are complicated stimuli, distinguished from most other objects by having intent and autonomy. Presumably, then, people first want to know each other’s individual or collective intent toward them and their groups. The SCM (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) calls this dimension *warmth* (trustworthiness, sociability). Warmth is fundamental because intent predicts behavior. For survival, sentries call out, “who goes there: friend or foe?” Second, one needs to know whether the other people can enact that intent, namely how *competent* (capable, agentic) they are. Perceivers often operate on such stereotypes (Bodenhausen, Kang, & Peery, 2012), which are shared beliefs about common groups’ warmth and competence. Even impressions of individuals, including the self, use similar dimensions (Abele et al., 2016; Russell & Fiske, 2008; Wojciszke, Abele, & Baryla, 2009).

Warmth × Competence space maps basic, recurring intergroup arrays (see Fig. 1):

- Society’s defaults (reference groups), which are allegedly high in both warmth and competence: Such people include the middle class, citizens, and dominant religionists. People report pride and admiration for these groups.
- The lowest of the low, stereotyped as untrustworthy and incompetent: the homeless, refugees, undocumented migrants, drug addicts, and nomads. People report disgust and contempt for them.

	Low Competence (Capability, Assertiveness)	High Competence (Capability, Assertiveness)
High Warmth (Friendliness, Trustworthiness)	Common: Elderly, Disabled, Children United States: Italians, Irish Emotions Evoked: Pity, Sympathy	Common: Citizens, Middle Class, Defaults United States: Americans, Canadians, Christians Emotions Evoked: Pride, Admiration
Low Warmth (Friendliness, Trustworthiness)	Common: Poor, Homeless, Immigrants United States: Latinos, Africans, Muslims Emotions Evoked: Disgust, Contempt	Common: Rich, Professional, Technical Experts United States: Asians, Jews, British, Germans Emotions Evoked: Envy, Jealousy

Fig. 1. Warmth and competence stereotypes. Common stereotypes, mostly based on socioeconomic status and age, are shared across many countries. Other stereotypes vary by country; persistent stereotypes in the United States appear here (Bergsieker Leslie, Constantine, & Fiske, 2012, Study 4; Cuddy et al., 2009; Durante et al., 2013, see link to individual countries; Lee & Fiske, 2006).

These extremes of all-good in-groups and all-bad out-groups could follow from decades of intergroup research (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2010; Yzerbyt & Demoulin, 2010) or even individual halo effects (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977). The SCM adds ambivalence in two additional intergroup stereotypes:

- Groups seen as warm but incompetent, including older people and people with disabilities, as well as young children. People report pity or sympathy, itself an ambivalent emotion (feeling sorry for someone holds only as long as their status remains lower).
- Groups stereotyped as cold but competent, which is the opposite kind of ambivalence, including rich people, businesspeople, and technical experts. People reported that they elicit envy, also an ambivalent emotion; they admire such people but also resent them.

The four combinations of warmth and competence (see Fig. 1) include different ethnic groups, depending on social context, national history, and immigration circumstances (Bergsieker, Leslie, Constantine, & Fiske, 2012, Study 4; Lee & Fiske, 2006). For example, in the United States, Americans and Canadians appear allegedly high in both the warmth and competence dimensions. Mexicans, other Latinos, and Africans appear stereotypically low in both warmth and competence. Irish and Italians appear allegedly warm but less competent, while Asians, Jews, British, and Germans appear supposedly competent but less warm.

Measurement

With experience, data, and psychometrics, researchers have been able to hone reliable and valid indicators of warmth and competence, as well as other variables, in the SCM (Fiske, 2015; Kervyn, Fiske, & Yzerbyt, 2015). Warmth items include *warm*, *trustworthy*, *friendly*, *honest*, *likable*, and *sincere* (in order of priority). Note the mix of items related to sociability and to morality (cf. Abele et al., 2016). Competence items include *competent*, *intelligent*, *skilled*, and *efficient*, as well as *assertive* and *confident*; note the mix of items related to capability and to agency (Abele et al., 2016, supplementary materials).

Social structure predicts stereotype content (Fiske, 2015). Stereotypic warmth follows from a group's perceived cooperativeness and competitiveness, best measured as both economic interdependence (zero-sum resources) and symbolic values (shared vs. conflicting). For example, an item measuring economic interdependence is, "If resources go to . . . , to what extent does that take resources away from the rest of society?" and an item measuring symbolic values is, "The values and beliefs of . . . are NOT compatible with the beliefs and values of most Americans" (Kervyn et al., 2015, p. 37). Stereotypic competence follows from perceived status, as measured by the following item: "How prestigious are the jobs generally held by" and "How economically successful have . . . been?" (Kervyn et al., 2015, p. 45).

Converging Methods: Survey, Comparative, Laboratory, and Biobehavioral Approaches

Descriptive research has long supported the SCM. Surveys ask for relevant societal groups in a given country, and those groups reported by at least 15% of the sample meet the SCM criterion of consensus. A second sample then rates society's reported view of each group's warmth and competence, as well as (sometimes) the emotions they evoke, the behaviors directed toward them, and the social-structural predictors (see Measurement). Because respondents report society's views, this minimizes social desirability concerns, and it means that samples need not be representative, because everyone knows the society's stereotypes of common groups (compare the representative sample in Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007, with the convenience samples in Fiske et al., 2002). Individual differences and in-group favoritism are rare (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008).

Generalizing the U.S. results, cultural comparisons reveal consistencies and differences. Most countries sampled to date (nearly 50) show groups in the four quadrants illustrated in Figure 1. But countries differ in their warmth-competence correlations, which index use of the ambivalent quadrants (low competence, high warmth and vice versa; Durante et al., 2013). The United States and other countries with moderate to high income inequality (Latin America, South Africa) show many groups in the ambivalent quadrants, so they have low warmth-competence correlations. In contrast are countries with high income equality, such as Scandinavia, Australia, and much of Europe, where most groups are all-good insiders or all-bad outsiders, so they align along more of a vector: At the top are those high-warmth, high-competence in-groups included in the social-welfare safety net (all citizens); at the bottom are the low-warmth, low-competence, excluded out-groups (refugees, Roma). Countries with more income equality have a larger inclusive "us" population but also a small "them" subpopulation—and few ambivalent groups. Income inequality apparently generates more complicated lay theories (e.g., we have deserving and undeserving poor, deserving and undeserving rich).

Even when the warmth-competence correlation is moderate, respondents still use both dimensions. For example, in countries with greater income equality, the pity cluster moves into the mainstream. But rich people (envied groups) are persistently viewed with ambivalence, respected but mistrusted. Their apparent competitiveness is judged as neither warm nor competent in more income-equal countries.

Besides national income equality and inequality, a nation's degree of peace or conflict moderates the use of SCM-ambivalent clusters (Durante, Fiske, et al., 2017). As noted, countries with greater income equality, such as Scandinavian ones, have a more inclusive in-group and one smaller cluster of out-groups. This

pattern characterizes peaceful countries as well. The other pole, extreme conflict (external or internal warfare), also creates a simple us/them dynamic. It is the countries intermediate on peace conflict, such as the United States, that most display the clearest stereotype ambivalence.

As a final example of cultural comparison, Asian samples show out-groups similar to the Western ones: Groups low in both competence and warmth include the homeless and immigrants, envied groups include rich and professionals, and pitied groups include older and disabled people (Cuddy et al., 2009). But the societal in-groups (citizens, members of one's hometown) appear in the moderate middle, consistent with cultural modesty norms.

Besides surveys and cultural comparisons, SCM evidence draws on laboratory experiments demonstrating causality. As noted, the predictors of stereotypic warmth and competence are perceived social structures (Fiske et al., 2002). Groups viewed as cooperative are awarded warmth. Groups viewed as high status are deemed competent. Experimental vignettes manipulating the cooperativeness and status of hypothetical groups support the hypothesized causal patterns (Caprariello, Cuddy, & Fiske, 2009), as do in-person laboratory encounters with parallel manipulations (Russell & Fiske, 2008). Using photographs instead of labels to elicit group-based ratings of warmth and competence yields similar responses (see the next paragraph).

Finally, neural signatures distinguish reactions to photographs of groups in each quadrant, consistent with perceivers having absorbed the cultural stereotypes reported in the surveys. For example, apparently homeless people and drug-addicted people (the low competence, low warmth contempt quadrant) fail to activate the brain's medial prefrontal cortex, otherwise reliably implicated in social cognition (Harris & Fiske, 2006). Participants also report difficulty in imagining their experience and other verbal responses consistent with dehumanization (Harris & Fiske, 2009). Both disgust ratings and insula activation also fit this quadrant.

People at the bottom of the competence-status dimension are devalued as expendable, especially if also viewed as having low warmth (Cikara, Farnsworth, Harris, & Fiske, 2010). And those with less status may be viewed as having less autonomy (Cikara, Eberhardt, & Fiske, 2011). In subjecting some groups to suffer varieties of dehumanizing perception, the status-competence dimension elicits a more social form of neural processing than do other forms of ranking (e.g., weight; Mason, Magee, & Fiske, 2014). Social valuation by status activates networks implicated in other social decisions, so the process seems distinctive to human sociality.

Various biobehavioral data converge for the envy quadrant (rich people and business people). Perceivers' smile muscles (*zygomaticus major*) typically respond to other people's good events over bad ones, but this is not so for the envy quadrant: Negative events happening to envied groups elicit smiles of *schadenfreude*, reward-center activation, self-reported glee, and admitted aggression (Cikara, Botvinick, & Fiske, 2011; Cikara & Fiske, 2011).

The social neuroscience, cultural comparisons, interpersonal encounters, and survey research are all ongoing projects, some more established than others. Nevertheless, converging evidence seems to support the SCM.

The SCM's Generality Across Place, Levels, and Time

Evidence converges across place, as noted in the overview of cultural comparisons. As to converging across levels of group perception, besides national groups and individual impressions, just noted, SCM data distinguish stereotypic subgroups of societal groups (see Fiske, 2015): subtypes of men and women, ethnic subgroups, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) subgroups. For example, although the overall category "Native Americans" appears neutral in some samples (Fiske et al., 2002), the subtypes spread out across SCM space (Burkley, Durante, Fiske, Burkley, & Andrade, 2017).

SCM dimensions appear over time. Systematic content analysis of century-old Italian Fascist magazines revealed warmth and competence distinctions (Durante, Volpato, & Fiske, 2010). Italians and Aryans were the idealized in-groups, whereas Black and mixed-race people were contemptibly low on both dimensions. Jewish and British people were threateningly competent dehumanized enemies. And no groups landed in the pity quadrant, consistent with Fascist ruthlessness.

In another look backward in time, samples of Princeton University students rated the same 10 ethnic and national groups on the same 84 adjectives four times over 70 years (Bergsieker et al., 2012, Study 4). Most adjectives were reliably recoded along the warmth and competence dimensions, resulting in a coherent stereotype map at each time point. Consistent with changing norms, students became more reluctant to mention ambivalent stereotypes' negative dimension, instead omitting it but still endorsing the groups' positive dimension, if any. This negativity omission left the groups in the same relative positions: Americans and English as being high in both competence and warmth; Turks as lower in both competence and warmth; Irish, Italians, and African Americans as warmer but less competent; and Japanese, Chinese, Germans, and Jews as competent but less warm.

Big Two Parallels

The twin dimensions of stereotype content have numerous precedents, the most prominent earlier inventions being *communion* and *agency*, in the context of psychology and religion (Bakan, 1966), as well as *social good-bad* and *intellectual good-bad*, in the context of impression formation (Rosenberg, Nelson, & Vivekananthan, 1968). Various other researchers have proposed similar dimensions (see Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007, for a review).

The most active current parallel revolves around *communion* and *agency*, in the context of self-concept (Abele et al., 2016) and interpersonal attitudes (Wojciszke et al., 2009). These two research programs, separately and together, show the primacy of communion (morality) in impressions of others but the importance of agency to self-concept. The total explanatory value of the two dimensions accounts for more than 80% of the variance in individual impressions (see Abele & Wojciszke, 2014, for references). The dimensions each break down into facets: Communion includes both warmth and morality, and agency includes both competence and assertiveness, according to self-concept data in five cultures (Abele et al., 2016).

Building on both the warmth-competence and communion-agency frameworks, the two dimensions show some consistent dynamics. A compensation effect emerges in social comparisons: If one individual or group is high in one dimension, then a second individual or group in comparison is presumed to be high in the other dimension (Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt, & Kashima, 2005; Kervyn, Yzerbyt, & Judd, 2010). This produces the SCM signature: predominantly ambivalent stereotypes. If rich people seem cold but competent, then working-class people seem warm but incompetent. This trade-off holds only for these two dimensions, not just any two social comparisons. Perceivers differentiate two social targets in a comparative context on the two fundamental dimensions of social judgment by contrasting them inversely. Comparing two groups or individuals, the one judged more positively on one dimension is also judged less positively on the other dimension and vice versa, according to both experimental and correlational data.

Compensation has implications for sampling within the comparative context. When participants generate groups spontaneously, they generate only a manageable few, along dimensions that include warmth, competence, and political beliefs. But when forced to generate more (e.g., 40), they become more deliberate, using systematic strategies and mentioning competence- and belief-based groups more than warmth ones (Yzerbyt, Terache, Carrier, Fiske, & Nicolas, 2017). In a deliberate mind-set, competence seems more objective, has higher consensus, and depends more on the target group. In contrast, warmth seems more subjective and idiosyncratic, depending more on the perceiver. The distinction between societal structure

and personal experience explains the difference. Status readily translates into competence, as the SCM predicts. However, a group's beliefs do not translate directly into warmth but instead appear subjectively better or worse via the lens of perceivers' own beliefs.

The two dimensions operate most clearly in individual, interpersonal contexts, as illustrated by the communion-agency work on self-concept and interpersonal attitudes, as well as the compensation effect for specific warmth-competence comparisons of individuals and groups. Further, in the SCM warmth-competence survey questions, respondents describe how people in society relate to social groups, so the two dimensions are arguably relevant to the directly experienced pragmatics of interaction. Judging groups in the neighborhood generates SCM space. But sometimes judging groups at a more distant level generates other dimensions, such as ideology (Nicolas & Fiske, 2017).

For example, one more abstract, deliberate context starts with larger numbers of groups (e.g., 40 or 80), then requires numerous paired similarity judgments and derives dimensions from multidimensional scaling (Koch, Imhoff, Dotsch, Unkelbach, & Alves, 2016). Aggregated data do replicate the competence-status dimension, but instead of the warmth-communion dimension, they identify progressive-conservative beliefs as a basic dimension. This aggregate result contradicts other models.

Nevertheless, individual-level analyses do reveal warmth-communion as a function of ideological in-groups: Progressives rate progressives as warm, and conservatives rate conservatives as warm. In the aggregate, these ratings cancel out, leaving warmth only in the moderate middle, where progressives and conservatives can agree. Modeled and measured agreement on warmth-communion is lower than agreement on competence-agency and ideological belief; this warmth idiosyncrasy produces the misfit between aggregate and individual analyses of similarity ratings. In any case, individual-level stereotypes show all three dimensions can indeed be spontaneous (Koch, 2017).

Theory: Structure Predicts Stereotypes, Which Predict Prejudice, Which Predicts Discrimination

Our social thinking is for social doing. The SCM dimensions derive from the idea that social cognition focuses on the target's apparent intent, which determines social interaction. Other people's predispositions matter to us when we need them, that is, when we as individuals or as a group are interdependent with them. Interdependence can be positive (cooperative) or negative (competitive). As noted, perceived social structural interdependence (cooperation-competition) implies other people's apparent intent for good or ill, that is, their warmth. Their believed ability to enact those intents, their competence, depends on their status (prestige and power). Interdependence-warmth correlations are reliable and medium-sized; status-competence correlations are reliably higher (Durante et al., 2013; Kervyn et al., 2015).

Specific stereotype content in turn predicts specific emotional prejudices on the basis of social comparison and attributions for outcomes (Fiske et al., 2002). A cooperative in-group's or ally's positive outcome evokes pride, while a competitive out-group's positive outcome provokes envy. An ally's negative outcome evokes pity, whereas a competitor's negative outcome provokes contempt. These emotions predict behavior even better than stereotypes do (Cuddy et al., 2007).

Conclusion: Evolutionary Plausibility

Another person's intent can determine our surviving or at least thriving in their presence. Their competence and agency determines how much attention we must pay. Stereotype content is systematic, general, and pragmatic.

Recommended Reading

Abele, A. E., & Wojciszke, B. (2014). (See References). Reviews the dual-perspective model, in which agency is valued for the self and morality is valued in others.

Durante, F., & Fiske, S. T. (2017). (See References). Reviews how social-class stereotypes help maintain income inequality.

Fiske, S. T. (2015). (See References). Briefly reviews intergroup bias, focusing on the stereotype content model.

Fiske, S. T., & Durante, F. (2016). (See References). Provides an in-depth review of the stereotype content model, with an emphasis on cross-cultural similarities and a few differences.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks all her collaborators on stereotype content research over nearly 20 years and multiple continents. She also thanks researchers with parallel models for their openness to adversarial collaboration in the shared pursuit of scientific consensus.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared that there were no conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship or the publication of this article.

References

- Abele A. E., Hauke N., Peters K., Louvet E., Szymkow A., Duan Y. (2016). Facets of the fundamental content dimensions: Agency with competence and assertiveness—Communion with warmth and morality. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, Article 1810. Crossref PubMed.
- Abele A. E., Wojciszke B. (2014). Communal and agentic content in social cognition: A dual perspective model. In Zanna M. P., Olson J. M. (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 50, pp. 195–255). Waltham, MA: Academic Press. Crossref.
- Bakan D. (1966). *The duality of human existence: Essays on psychology and religion*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Bergsieker H. B., Leslie L. M., Constantine V. S., Fiske S. T. (2012). Stereotyping by omission: Eliminate the negative, accentuate the positive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102, 1214–1238. Crossref. PubMed.
- Bodenhausen G. V., Kang S. K., Peery D. (2012). Social categorization and the perception of social groups. In Fiske S. T., Macrae C. N. (Eds.), *Sage handbook of social cognition* (pp. 311–329). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. Crossref.
- Burkley E., Durante F., Fiske S. T., Burkley M., Andrade A. (2017). Structure and content of Native American stereotypic subgroups: Not just (ig)noble. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 23, 209–219. Crossref. PubMed.
- Caprariello P. A., Cuddy A. J. C., Fiske S. T. (2009). Social structure shapes cultural stereotypes and emotions: A causal test of the stereotype content model. *Group Processes & Intergroup Behavior*, 12, 147–155. Crossref.
- Cikara M., Botvinick M. M., Fiske S. T. (2011). Us versus them: Social identity shapes neural responses to intergroup competition and harm. *Psychological Science*, 22, 306–313. Crossref. PubMed.
- Cikara M., Eberhardt J. L., Fiske S. T. (2011). From agents to objects: Sexist attitudes and neural responses to sexualized targets. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 23, 540–551. Crossref. PubMed.
- Cikara M., Farnsworth R. A., Harris L. T., Fiske S. T. (2010). On the wrong side of the trolley track: Neural correlates of relative social valuation. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 5, 404–413. Crossref. PubMed.
- Cikara M., Fiske S. T. (2011). Bounded empathy: Neural responses to outgroup targets' (mis)fortunes. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 23, 3791–3803. Crossref. PubMed.
- Cuddy A. J. C., Fiske S. T., Glick P. (2007). The BIAS map: Behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 631–648. Crossref. PubMed.

- Cuddy A. J. C., Fiske S. T., Glick P. (2008). Competence and warmth as universal trait dimensions of interpersonal and intergroup perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. In Zanna M. P. (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 40, pp. 61–149). New York, NY: Academic Press. Crossref.
- Cuddy A. J. C., Fiske S. T., Kwan V. S. Y., Glick P., Demoulin S., Leyens J.-P., . . . Ziegler R. (2009). Stereotype content model across cultures: Towards universal similarities and some differences. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48, 1–33. Crossref. PubMed.
- Dovidio J. F., Gaertner S. L. (2010). Intergroup bias. In Fiske S. T., Gilbert D. T., Lindzey G. (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 1084–1121). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. Crossref.
- Durante F., Fiske S. T. (2017). How social-class stereotypes maintain inequality. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 18, 43–48. Crossref. PubMed.
- Durante F., Fiske S. T., Gelfand M. J., Crippa F., Suttora C., Stillwell A., . . . Teymoori A. (2017). Ambivalent stereotypes link to peace, conflict, and inequality across 38 nations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*, 114, 669–674. Crossref. PubMed.
- Durante F., Fiske S. T., Kervyn N., Cuddy A. J. C., Akande A., Adetoun B. E., . . . Storari C. C. (2013). Nations' income inequality predicts ambivalence in stereotype content: How societies mind the gap. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 52, 726–746. Crossref. PubMed.
- Durante F., Volpato C., Fiske S. T. (2010). Using the stereotype content model to examine group depictions in fascism: An archival approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 465–483.
- Fiske S. T. (2015). Intergroup biases: A focus on stereotype content. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 45–50. Crossref. PubMed.
- Fiske S. T., Cuddy A. J. C., Glick P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social perception: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 11, 77–83. Crossref. PubMed.
- Fiske S. T., Cuddy A. J., Glick P., Xu J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878–902. Crossref. PubMed.
- Fiske S. T., Durante F. (2014). Never trust a politician? Collective distrust, relational accountability, and voter response. In van Prooijen J.-W., van Lange P. (Eds.), *Power, politics, and paranoia: Why people are suspicious of their leaders* (pp. 91–105). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. Crossref.
- Fiske S. T., Durante F. (2016). Stereotype content across cultures: Variations on a few themes. In Gelfand M. J., Chiu C.-Y., Hong Y.-Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of advances in culture and psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 209–258). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Crossref.
- Harris L. T., Fiske S. T. (2006). Dehumanizing the lowest of the low: Neuro-imaging responses to extreme out-groups. *Psychological Science*, 17, 847–853. Crossref. PubMed.
- Harris L. T., Fiske S. T. (2009). Dehumanized perception: The social neuroscience of thinking (or not thinking) about disgusting people. In Hewstone M., Stroebe W. (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (Vol. 20, pp. 192–231). London, England: Wiley.
- Judd C. M., James-Hawkins L., Yzerbyt V., Kashima Y. (2005). Fundamental dimensions of social judgment: understanding the relations between judgments of competence and warmth. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 899–913. Crossref. PubMed.
- Kervyn N., Fiske S. T., Yzerbyt Y. (2015). Foretelling the primary dimension of social cognition: Symbolic and realistic threats together predict warmth in the stereotype content model. *Social Psychology*, 46, 36–45. Crossref.
- Kervyn N., Yzerbyt V., Judd C. M. (2010). Compensation between warmth and competence: Antecedents and consequences of a negative relation between the two fundamental dimensions of social perception. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 21, 155–187. Crossref.
- Koch A. (2017, July). *Refining the ABC model of spontaneous group stereotypes*. Paper presented at the General Meeting of the European Association of Social Psychology, Granada, Spain.

- Koch A., Imhoff R., Dotsch R., Unkelbach C., Alves H. (2016). The ABC of stereotypes about groups: Agency/socioeconomic success, conservative–progressive beliefs, and communion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 110, 675–709. Crossref. PubMed.
- Lee T. L., Fiske S. T. (2006). Not an outgroup, but not yet an ingroup: Immigrants in the stereotype content model. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 751–768. Crossref.
- Mason M., Magee J. C., Fiske S. T. (2014). Neural substrates of social status inference: Roles of medial prefrontal cortex and superior temporal sulcus. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 26, 1131–1140. Crossref. PubMed.
- Nicolas G., Fiske S. T. (2017, July). Groups in the neighborhood or the nation: What do we want to know about strangers? Paper presented at the General Meeting of the European Association of Social Psychology, Granada, Spain.
- Nisbett R. E., Wilson T. D. (1977). The halo effect: Evidence for unconscious alteration of judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 250–256. Crossref.
- Rosenberg S., Nelson C., Vivekananthan P. S. (1968). A multidimensional approach to the structure of personality impressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9, 283–294. Crossref. PubMed.
- Russell A. M., Fiske S. T. (2008). It's all relative: Social position and interpersonal perception. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 1193–1201. Crossref.
- Swencionis J. K., Dupree C. H., Fiske S. T. (2017). Warmth-competence tradeoffs in impression management across race and social class divides. *Journal of Social Issues*, 73, 168–184. Crossref.
- Wojciszke B., Abele A. E., Baryła W. (2009). Two dimensions of interpersonal attitudes: Liking depends on communion, respect depends on agency. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 973–990. Crossref.
- Yzerbyt V., Demoulin S. (2010). Intergroup relations. In Fiske S. T., Gilbert D. T., Lindzey G. (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 1024–1083). New York, NY: Wiley. Crossref.
- Yzerbyt V., Terache J., Carrier A., Fiske S. T., Nicolas G. (2017, July). Being primary doesn't mean being shared: Toward a consideration of the psychological meaning of warmth. Paper presented at the general meeting of the European Association of Social Psychology, Granada, Spain.