

Universidade de Brasília

Instituto de Psicologia

Programa de Pós-graduação em Psicologia Social, do Trabalho e das Organizações

Entre a Simpatia e a corrupção: Análise das dimensões constituintes do Jeitinho Brasileiro

Mestrado

Marco Akira Miura

Brasília, DF

2012

Universidade de Brasília

Instituto de Psicologia

Programa de Pós-graduação em Psicologia Social, do Trabalho e das Organizações

Entre a Simpatia e a corrupção: Análise das dimensões constituintes do Jeitinho Brasileiro

Mestrado

Marco Akira Miura

Orientador: Dr. Ronaldo Pilati

Dissertação de mestrado apresentada ao Programa de Pós-graduação em Psicologia Social, do Trabalho e das Organizações como requisito parcial para a obtenção do grau de Mestre em Psicologia Social, do Trabalho e das Organizações.

Brasília, DF

Março de 2012

BANCA EXAMINADORA:

Dissertação defendida diante e aprovada em 05 de março de 2012

---

Dr. Ronaldo Pilati

Universidade de Brasília

(Presidente)

---

Dra. Maria Cristina Ferreira

Universidade Salgado de Oliveira

(Membro)

---

Claudio Vaz Torres, Ph.D.

Universidade de Brasília

(Membro)

---

Jacob Arie Laros, Ph.D.

Universidade de Brasília

(Membro Suplente)

---

## Agradecimentos

Antes de tudo, dedico este trabalho aos professores Hartmut Günther e Isolda de Araújo Günther, cujo amor e devoção que nutrem pela ciência, pelo ensino e pela vida só são superados pelo que têm um para com o outro. Modelos estes que carregarei por toda a minha vida.

Agradeço aos meus mentores acadêmicos: primeiramente, ao professor Hartmut Günther, por todas as lições de método, sempre carregadas de filosofia e cultura; ao professor Fabio Iglesias, estóico professor e pesquisador que nunca se negou compartilhar o conhecimento, a despeito de quem o tivesse procurado; ao professor Ronaldo Pilati, um raro modelo de coerência e profissionalismo.

Agradeço à minha família, especialmente à minha mãe Catharina, meu pai Luis, minha tia Yoshie e avós, que me ensinaram (e continuam ensinando) o sentido da benevolência. Por eles e todos os outros que idealizam um futuro pleno, que nenhum sacrifício seja feito em vão! Agradeço, também, aos meus irmãos pelo companheirismo e, acima de tudo, por mostrarem que até um irmão caçula pentelho merece uma colher de chá, de vez em quando.

Agradeço ao meu endogrupo, que preenche meu *self*. Aos amigos de Taguá, que oferecem o refúgio para a minha obsessão cotidiana, e aos amigos da psicologia, que alimentam essa obsessão (isso não parece muito certo); e, também, aos diversos amigos que me lembram quão estranho e interessante o mundo pode ser. Dúvidas sempre surgirão, mas sempre encontrarei sentido nas minhas decisões enquanto vocês existirem. (Se eu te conhecer e você não se encaixar em alguma categoria já citada, é neste grupo mesmo em que você deve se inserir.)

No concernente ao mestrado, agradeço a CAPES pelo financiamento da bolsa e do mestrado-sanduíche, o que me permitiu dedicação exclusiva e contato com grupos de pesquisa de fora da Universidade de Brasília. Agradecimentos aos professores Valdiney Veloso Gouveia (UFPB), Marcos Eugênio Oliveira Lima (UFS), Zenith Nara Costa Delabrida (UFS), Maria Cristina Ferreira (UNIVERSO) e Vicente Cassepp-Borges (UFGD) pela contribuição na coleta de dados. Agradeço ao colega Marcos Pimenta, que me deu a idéia de relacionar o jeitinho à Copa de 2014. Enormes agradecimentos aos colegas e amigos Clara Cantal, Zenith Delabrida, Fabio Iglesias e Lude Marieta, que seguraram a onda dos meus dilemas acadêmico-existenciais por todo o mestrado.

Por fim, gostaria de agradecer aquele que me inspira e dá forças nos momentos de maior necessidade. O café. Sem ele, esta dissertação não seria viável.

“Já se disse, numa expressão feliz, que a contribuição brasileira para a civilização será de cordialidade – daremos ao mundo o homem cordial.”

“O Homem Cordial”  
(Sérgio Buarque de Hollanda)

“Eu fui à Lapa e perdi a viagem,  
que aquela tal malandragem não existe mais.  
Agora já não é normal.

O que dá de malandro regular profissional,  
malandro com o aparato de malandro oficial,  
malandro candidato a malandro federal,  
malandro com retrato na coluna social,  
malandro com contrato, com gravata e capital,  
que nunca se dá mal.”

"Homenagem ao Malandro”  
(Chico Buarque)

## Sumário

Índice de Figuras .....	VI
Resumo .....	VII
Abstract .....	VIII
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Brazilian Jeitinho .....	3
3. Research Overview .....	4
4. Study 1 - Development of a situation-based measure of Brazilian jeitinho .....	6
4.1. Method .....	8
4.2. Results and Discussion .....	11
4.2.1. Jeitinho simpático .....	11
4.2.2. Trickery.....	13
5. Study 2 - Between Simpatiaand Corruption: Evaluation of jeitinho across situations....	16
5.1. Method.....	17
5.2. Results and Discussion .....	19
6. Study 3 - Development of a decontextualized measure of Brazilian jeitinho .....	20
6.1. Method .....	20
6.2. Results and Discussion .....	22
6.2.1. Simpatia.....	22
6.2.2. Trickery .....	22
6.2.3. Creativity .....	23
6.2.4. Harm .....	24
6.2.5. Disregard for Rules .....	25
7. Study 4 – Scales’ Confirmatory Analysis .....	27
7.1. Method .....	28
7.2. Results and Discussion .....	29
7.2.1. Contextualized scale .....	29
7.2.2. Decontextualized scale .....	30
7.2.3. Comparison between measures .....	33
8. General Discussion .....	34
9. Final Considerations .....	35
10. References .....	37
ANEXO 1 – Contextualized scale .....	41
ANEXO 2 – Decontextualized scale .....	42

## Índice de Tabelas

Table 1. Factor loadings, communalities, and reliability coefficients of <i>jeitinho simpático</i> and trickery factors .....	12
Table 2. Means, standard deviation and correlation coefficients for <i>jeitinho</i> factor, human values, personality factors, and moral attitude. (Studies 1 and 3) .....	15
Table 3. Factor loadings, communalities, and reliability coefficients of each factor .....	24
Table 4. Sample scenarios from Brazilian <i>Jeitinho</i> Questionnaire .....	29
Table 5. Goodness-of-fit indices for alternative models of <i>jeitinho</i> scales .....	30
Table 6. Correlation coefficients, means, and standard deviation for <i>jeitinho</i> factors .....	32
Table 7. Regression coefficients ( ) for contextualized scale's factors and Brazilian <i>Jeitinho</i> Questionnaire scenarios .....	33

## Resumo

Este trabalho teve como objetivos (1) desenvolver medidas alternativas do jeitinho brasileiro focadas em diferenças individuais e (2) avaliar a dimensionalidade do construto. Para tal, quatro estudos foram realizados: no primeiro estudo, desenvolveu-se uma escala de jeitinho baseada em situações. Observou-se a diferenciação de dois fatores: “jeitinho simpático” englobou itens de criatividade e simpatia, e relacionou-se com o valor de conformidade e traços de personalidade de extroversão, sociabilidade (agradabilidade), abertura a novas experiências e conscienciosidade; “malandragem” foi composto por itens de malandragem, prejuízo e desrespeito a regras, e é caracterizado por valores de autopromoção e estimulação, e baixos escores de conscienciosidade e sociabilidade. No segundo estudo, observou-se, por meio da manipulação experimental de cenários, que a estratégia de influência interpessoal impacta na percepção do jeitinho, mas a quebra de normas, não. No Estudo 3, desenvolveu-se uma escala alternativa com itens descontextualizados. Cinco fatores foram observados: simpatia, criatividade, malandragem, prejuízo e desrespeito a regras. Por fim, realizaram-se análises fatoriais confirmatórias para ambas as escalas, avaliando a convergência entre as medidas, incluindo o já desenvolvido Questionário do Jeitinho Brasileiro. A convergência entre as medidas mostrou que o jeitinho criativo está relacionado à simpatia e o jeitinho transgressor, à malandragem. Dessa forma, o estudo da simpatia, como script cultural, e do traço de agradabilidade podem contribuir para o entendimento do mecanismo psicológico do jeitinho. Além disso, a malandragem evidencia a relação do comportamento com a moralidade.

Palavras-chave: Jeitinho brasileiro, simpatia, Big Five, valores humanos



## Abstract

This work aimed to (1) develop alternative measures of Brazilian *jeitinho* focused on individual differences and (2) evaluate the construct's dimensionality. Four studies were conducted: in the first study, we developed a measure of *jeitinho* based on situations. Two factors were observed: “*jeitinho simpático*” encompasses naïve creativity and *simpatia*, and relates to conformity value and to openness to new experiences, agreeableness, extroversion, and conscientiousness personality traits; “trickery” consists of strategies of deception and disregard for rules, and is characterized by self-promotion and stimulation values, and low scores of conscientiousness and agreeableness. In Study 2, we observed, through experimental manipulation of scenarios, that interpersonal influence strategy influenced the perception of *jeitinho*, however, norm breaking did not. In Study 3, we developed an alternative measure with decontextualized items. Five factors were observed: *simpatia*, creativity, trickery, harm, and disregard for rules. Finally, we conducted confirmatory factor analyses for both scales, and evaluated the convergence between measures, including an existing Brazilian *Jeitinho* Questionnaire. The convergence between measures showed that creative *jeitinho* is characterized by *simpatia* and that transgressive *jeitinho* is marked by trickery. In this sense, the study of the cultural script of *simpatia* and the personality trait of agreeableness should contribute to the understanding of the psychological mechanism of *jeitinho*. Besides, trickery factors make it clear the relationship between the behavior and morality.

Keywords: Brazilian *jeitinho*, *simpatia*, Big Five, human values

## Between *simpatã* and corruption: A construct analysis of Brazilian *jeitinho*

The news that Brazil would host FIFA's 2014 World Cup was received with pride by the Brazilian people. After hosting the event's fourth edition, 64 years ago, the "country of soccer" would once again be the stage to the event that is among the most meaningful of its culture. However, since the middle of 2011, Brazil faces strong criticism toward the projects' progress, which generated a conflict between Brazilian government and FIFA after its general secretary, Jérôme Valcke, suggest to "give a kick in the ass" to encourage the organizing committee to accelerate the works ("World Cup", 2012). Beyond the controversy involving Valcke's expression, the fact is that Brazil is actually out of time and FIFA is pushing the government to prioritize the works in order to be prepared to Confederations Cup. In the face of this criticism, Ronaldo "The Phenomenon", world champion for Brazil in 2002 and president of the local organizing committee in São Paulo State, is betting on Brazilian *jeitinho* to finish the projects by the deadline: "Everyone is worried about the construction schedules. But, I am sure Federal and State governments are giving priority to this project. As always, with *jeitinho*..." ("Ronaldo aposta", 2011).

Brazilian *jeitinho* (it is pronounced *jay-tcheenyoo* and means literally "little way") is a "special way to solve a problem, or a difficult or prohibited situation; or else, a creative solution for some emergencies, whether in a form of conciliation, cunningness, or skill (p. 41; Barbosa, 2006). Because of its widespread presence in Brazilian culture, this social mechanism has received increasing attention from Brazilian social scientists, as well as foreign researchers interested in analyzing it and comparing cultural phenomena (e.g., Almeida, 2007; Amado & Brasil, 1991; Barbosa, 2006; DaMatta, 1984; Duarte, 2006a, 2006b; Motta & Alcadipani, 1999; Rosem, 1971; Smith, Huang, Harb, & Torres, 2012). Due to its clear impact on organizational processes, *jeitinho* has already been focus of studies in such context. In an illustrative case, Duarte (2006a) reports a typical example of this

problem-solving strategy in a governmental social program. In the Greenery program (designed to equip suburban dwellers with skills to deal with socio-environmental problems), the project officer used *jeitinho* to overcome a financial problem caused by a cut in the budget, described as follows:

“I could not let [the communities] down. (...) So I had to give a *jeitinho* in the situation. I knew the guy who managed [the environmental Non-Governmental Organization nominated to provide the technical expertise for the courses]; he was a childhood friend. I managed to convince him to reduce the course fees in exchange for some free workshops on project management I was prepared to give at their NGO. With the reduction in price, we would be able to run the courses. This was highly irregular and I never told the government about it. But everyone was happy in the end!” (p. 521).

Although, similar strategies were observed in other cultures, some authors argue that *jeitinho* is a distinct phenomenon (Ferreira, Fischer, Porto, Pilati, & Milfont, 2011; Smith, et al., 2012). For example, while the use of *guanxi* strategy depends on the quality of a relationship built through mutual trust and reciprocity (Chen & Chen, 2004), *jeitinho* seems to exist before a pre-established relationship as it is frequently observed among strangers (Barbosa, 2006). However, there is no evidence on the distinctive aspects of *jeitinho* in the psychological literature. In this sense, we emphasize the importance of defining the construct of *jeitinho* and developing measures in order to assess its constitutive elements in different contexts, including other countries. This work assumes an *emic* perspective of cross-cultural research (e.g., Berry, 1989) and aims to contribute to a comprehension this indigenous construct by examining its constitution and to develop an instrument that allows researchers to study this phenomenon in diverse contexts. This work addresses the link between this cultural phenomenon and its personality correlates.

## Brazilian jeitinho

Brazilian *jeitinho* is a complex phenomenon and its concept is not well defined yet. According to Pilati, Milfont, Ferreira, Porto, and Fischer (2011), *jeitinho* can be understood through two core characteristics: first, the behavior itself is marked by creativity, *simpatia* and violation of rules. To illustrate, it was observed that the most frequent tactics used to jump the queue in a Brazilian university cafeteria consisted of disguise, e.g., to avoid eye contact or to talk on the cell phone, or interpersonal influence, e.g., greet a person that is waiting in the line (Iglesias, 2007a). Besides that, as a behavior related to social norm breaking, people may judge *jeitinho* as a positive/negative practice. In a hierarchical culture such as Brazil's, *jeitinho* serves as a social navigation strategy the individual employs to bypass the excessive formality and get access to resources that he was not mean to (DaMatta, 1984). In this sense, *jeitinho* constitute a dilemma involving social norms and personal goals. Rosenn (1971) describes it through scenarios that involve bypass of rules in favor of personal motives (monetary or status gains, e.g., when a governmental contract is granted to one who offers a better tip) or moral convictions (e.g., when an inspector overlooks a case of underpaid work in a region with a high rate of unemployment under the argument that the strict compliance with law would lead the business to fail and the unemployment rate to increase). Furthermore, Ferreira et al. (2011) observed that scenarios of creativity *jeitinho* are related to the norm breaking *jeitinho*. Evidence suggests that creativity fosters unethical behaviors increasing the individuals' ability to justify themselves (Gino & Ariely, 2011).

As Brazilians are known as cordial, kind, sympathetic, and affectionate people (Scheyerl & Siqueira, 2008), the term *jeito* ("way") also characterizes the manner people behave in social interactions. According to Triandis, Marín, Lisansky and Betancourt (1984), this cultural script typical of Hispanics and Latin Americans - called *Simpatía* - reflects a general relationship-oriented pattern that includes (a) the importance given to values of

loyalty, respect, duty, and politeness, (b) emphasis on cooperation and interpersonal helping, (c) willingness to sacrifice oneself for the sake of attending family functions, among others. However, Ramírez-Esparza, Gosling and Pennebaker (2008) argue that *Simpatia* may be thought as parallel to the Big Five personality trait of Agreeableness. In this sense, *jeitinho* seems to relate to a broader cultural norm as one relies on another person's willingness to help even by bypassing a pre-established rule and people who denies to give a *jeito* are seen as arrogant (Barbosa, 2006).

### Research Overview

The purpose of this study was (1) to evaluate the validity of two self-report measures and (2) examine the dimensionality of the indigenous construct of Brazilian *jeitinho* based on a multidimensional model (Pilati, et al., 2011). In the first study, we explored the structure of a *jeitinho* scale based on situations typically found in Brazilian context. According to Pilati et al. (2011), Brazilian *jeitinho* may be understood through two distinct dimensions: (a) the characteristics of the problem-solving strategy (e.g., *simpatia* and creativity); and (b) the flexible way to interpret norms and rules. Exploratory factor analysis indicated a two-factor orthogonal structure: the first one consists of behaviors that express strive for positive relationships and innovation in daily events; the second one encompasses disregard for rules and social norms. Its psychological meaning was discussed using measures of human values, personality and moral attitude. Next, in Study 2, we tested this model on perception of *jeitinho* situations through experimental manipulation of scenarios. Situations were seen as more typical when there was use of interpersonal influence strategies.

Our second goal includes developing a measure that can be used in different contexts. Most studies have addressed *jeitinho* by means of typical scenarios. Study 3 reports the development of an alternative measure based on endorsement of *jeitinho*-related behaviors, composed of five factors. *Simpatia* factor concerns the emphasis given by the individual on

politeness, cordiality and affect in social interactions; creativity factor refers to the importance given to creativity to solve problems; trickery refers to the use of cunning and deceptive strategies to achieve a goal or avoid a negative consequence; harm concerns the individual disposition to ignore the negative and harmful consequences of his/her own behavior on others; and disregard for rules refers to the importance given by the individual to the adherence of situational norms. In Study 4, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis for both scales and evaluated the relevance of the five factor observed in Study 3 to prediction of previously observed forms of *jeitinho* - creative, norm breaking, or corruption (Ferreira, et al., 2011).

### Study 1: Development of a situation-based measure of Brazilian *jeitinho*

This study aims to develop a measure of *jeitinho* focused on situation perception. To date, only one measure was found in Brazilian literature. Brazilian *Jeitinho* Questionnaire (Ferreira, et al., 2011) consists of *jeitinho* scenarios divided into three types of strategies and has two versions: in individual preference version, participants rate the level of their identification with an actor described in the scenario; at group level, the scale assesses the typicality of scenarios with respect to Brazilians. Level of analysis (group VS. individual) was found influential to participants' judgment about types of *jeitinho* that consists of norm and law breaking; specifically, in these factors, participants reported that these scenarios are more associated to the group than with themselves.

These results address the link between culture and personality. Regarding the correlates between them, Hofstede and McCrae (2004) found that personality factors (scored on national level) correlated to national values. Besides, Schwartz (2011) argues that some values are grounded in concepts like “growth” (that is the case of stimulation, self-direction, universalism and benevolence values) or “defensive” (power and security) (for a review on grounded cognition, see Barsalou, 2010). Thus, although most studies have addressed Brazilian *jeitinho* as a cultural construct, there are evidences that individual differences influence endorsement or acceptance of *jeitinho* (Almeida, 2007; Ferreira, et al., 2011). Based on that, it is important to develop instruments to assess individual differences in perception and endorsement of *jeitinho*; that would allow cultural psychologists to investigate the process involved in the behavior and compare similar phenomena. In the same direction as Ferreira et al. (2011), this study aims to provide evidences of the dimensionality of the construct.

Regarding the scale's factorial structure, evidence on the constitution of *jeitinho* makes it clear that it is a multidimensional construct. Barbosa (2006) posits two conflicting

views of *jeitinho*: the positive and practical view emphasizes the creative and affectionate aspects of the strategy while the negative and theoretical one focuses on the disregard to rules and harmful effects. In the same direction, Pilati et al. (2011) argue that the phenomenon cannot be fully understood apart from the notion of morality. Indeed, Ferreira et al. (2011) found that *jeitinho* typical situations are distinguished between creativity, social norm breaking and corruption. Corruption and social norm breaking types of *jeitinho* were associated to moral lenience and low scores on Big Five factor of agreeableness. Accordingly, we expect a distinction between *jeitinho simpático* characterized by creativity and *simpatia* and trickery, consisting of deceptive and transgressive behaviors.

Assuming that *jeitinho* may be understood through individual dispositions, we will evaluate its relationship with personality traits (Costa & McCrae, 1992), personal values (Schwartz, 2005) and moral attitude (Harding & Phillips, 1986). Research on Five Factor Model of personality has shown relationships between individual differences in meaningful behaviors of *jeitinho*. For example, Paunonen (2003) observed that extraversion predicts party attending, routinely exercises, alcohol consumption, and dating variety, as well as self-reported popularity and attractiveness; also, extraverted people are judged as more talkative and social (Mehl, Gosling, & Pennebaker, 2006). Agreeableness trait is closely related to helping behaviors (Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007) and negotiation and disengagement conflict resolution strategies - against power assertion strategy (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996). In this sense, it is expected that those traits relate to *jeitinho*, since sociability is one of its key feature. The other aspect of *jeitinho* consists of flexibility in interpretation of rules (Pilati, et al., 2011). In a meta-analysis conducted by Salgado (2002), agreeableness and conscientiousness were both predictors of deviant behaviors in organizational context.



Concerning human values, Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) define them as concepts or beliefs about behavior or final desirable states that transcend specific situations, guide the selection or evaluation of behavior and events, and comply with an order of importance. Schwartz's theory of basic human values (2005) posits ten values that people use to represent their priorities in life: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, conformity, tradition, and security. Also, he argues that these values reflect actual disposition of individuals to behave in a certain direction.

## Method

### Participants

The overall sample for this study was composed of 469 undergraduate and graduate students of which 72.7% were female, and had a mean age of 34 years ( $SD=12.44$ ). As to region of residence, the percentages were: 2.7% Northern, 15.6% Northeastern, 30.3% Midwest, 34% Southeastern, and 17.4% from the Southern region.

### Measures

#### Jeitinho Scaleddevelopment

First, a pool of 82 behaviors was generated based on the constitutive elements observed in Pilati et al. (2011). The authors observed seven core themes concerning *jeitinho* construct: *simpatia* harm, disregard for rules, trickery, innovative processes, power relation, and compensation. For theoretical validation, we assessed these behaviors' relevance by asking 13 judges about the degree of clarity and pertinence for Brazilian *jeitinho*. Moreover, to ensure the themes' representativeness, we also asked the judges to indicate to which category each item referred.

The scale used in Factor Analysis was constituted by 35 situations distributed among five dimensions: "harm to others", "trickery", "disregard for rules", "*simpatia*", and "creativity" - "power relation" and "compensation" were not well represented by any item,

probably due to its abstract nature. The response scale consisted of a 6-point identification scale (1-Does not look like me; 6-Really looks like me) by which the participant should judge the character's behavior in the situation reported.

#### Schwartz's Portrait of Values Questionnaire

Evidences of validity of the Schwartz's PVQ for Brazilian sample was provided by Tamayo and Porto (2009). The instrument consisted of 40 behaviors that the participants should judge for the degree to which the person described looked like his/herself (1-Very much like me; 6-Not like me at all). Cronbach's alphas varied from .46 (Tradition) to .81 (Hedonism). These coefficients are consistent with those previously observed (Tamayo & Porto, 2009).

#### Big Five Personality Inventory

We used the short version of the Big-Five personality inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999), composed of 20 traits arranged in five factors. This version was adapted for a Brazilian sample by Gouveia, Meira, Santos, Jesus and Formiga (2001). The structure of the scale was corroborated, presenting good reliability coefficients: .80 (Openness to New Experiences), .68 (Conscientiousness), .77 (Extraversion), .60 (Agreeableness), and .79 (Neuroticism).

#### Moral Attitudes

Vauclair and Fischer (2011) observed cultural variations in attitude towards personal-sexual issues and dishonest-illegal issues using the Morally Debatable Behaviors Scale (MDBS, Harding & Phillips, 1986). Based on the argument that *jeitinho* is closely related to morality (Pilati, et al., 2011), we hypothesize that moral attitude will correlate to its behavior. Participants were asked to indicate on a 10-points scale (1-Never justified; 10-Always justified) how justifiable they judged each behavior. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .68.

## Procedure

Participants were recruited through snowballing, using an online survey software. They were contacted directly through a contact list obtained from a previous study – participants provided their emails with explicit intention to participate in future studies. In the recruitment message for this study, we asked them to forward the questionnaire to their personal contacts. Due to the instruments' size, we split the sample in two groups in order to avoid overloading and greater mortality.

The participants first answered all the items of *Jeitinho* Scale and then they were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The first group, composed of 215 participants, answered the Schwartz's PVQ; the other group, consisted of 199 participants, answered the short version of the Big Five Personality Inventory and the Morally Debatable Behaviors Scale. After answering the PVQ or the Big Five/MDBS, the participants answered the socio-demographic questionnaire.

Considering this design, one can argue that the results concerning the relationship between *Jeitinho* Scale and PVQ, Big Five, and DMBS, as well as the socio-demographic variable could not be generalized to the overall sample. So, before performing the main analysis, we compared the means and distributions for the two subsamples. No difference was observed for age,  $t(401)=-.44$  ( $p=.65$ ), educational level,  $t(399)=-.31$  ( $p=.75$ ), income,  $t(298)=.03$  ( $p=.97$ ), gender,  $t(1)=.43$  ( $p=.50$ ), and  $t(408)=-.14$  ( $p=.88$ ). Regarding the *jeitinho* scale, no significant difference was observed for both observed factors - *jeitinho simpático*  $t(408)=-1.59$  ( $p=.11$ ) and *trickery*,  $t(408)=.25$  ( $p=.79$ ).

Concerning the data analysis, it is worth mentioning that PVQ scores were computed following Schwartz's recommendation (Schwartz, 2005). This procedure is rooted on Schwartz's circular model and has the purpose of softening the individual's acquiescence bias. By the subtraction of the whole scale's mean from each item response, those values that

presented scores below the overall mean turned to negative while the higher scores stayed positive.

## Results and Discussion

Principal Axis Factoring identified 11 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, explaining 53% of total variance; however, parallel analysis suggests six extractable factors. Besides this, the screeplot shows a steep decay in eigenvalues from 2nd to 3rd factors, suggesting two or three interpretable factors. Comparisons between solutions showed that a two-orthogonal-factors solution provides a better representation of the internal structure of items, maintaining conceptual coherence with theory. Items that presented a factor loading below .30 or loaded on more than one factor were eliminated. The final version was composed of 23 items distributed among two factors. Table 1 shows the items' factor loadings, communalities, and the reliability coefficients for each factor. These two factors were responsible for 19.84% of the total variance.

### Jeitinho simpático

The first factor, which we called the *jeitinho simpático* aggregates 11 items that express prosocial behaviors (e.g., "People feel loved around him/her", "He/she minces words to avoid conflict") and creativity ("He/she seeks new ventures for his/her profession", "He/she is quite creative facing problems at work"). This factor characterizes the individual's tendency to seek positive social interactions and alternative solutions for solving his problems. As a strategy adopted by individuals to bypass institutional constraints (DaMatta, 1984), those who do not occupy a privileged position within the system may give a *jeito* with *simpatia* and "spiel" (Barbosa, 2006). The factor presented a reliability coefficient of .71.

**Table 1.** Factor loadings, communalities, and reliability coefficients of *jeitinho simpático* and trickery factors.

	1 <sup>a</sup>	2 <sup>a</sup>	h <sup>2</sup>
As pessoas se sentem queridas perto dele(a). [People feel loved around him/her.]	.63	.06	.34
Ele(a) gosta de manter o clima social agradável. [He/she likes to keep a pleasant social climate]	.55	.02	.34
... oferece ajuda aos colegas de trabalho. [... offers help to co-workers.]	.50	-.02	.23
... se mostra bastante criativo ao enfrentar problemas no trabalho. [... is quite creative facing problems at work.]	.49	.02	.30
... segura a porta quando outra pessoa se aproxima. [... holds the door when someone approaches.]	.44	-.05	.19
... busca novos empreendimentos para sua profissão. [... seeks new ventures for his/her profession.]	.41	-.01	.23
... sempre cumprimenta o porteiro do seu prédio pelo nome toda vez que passa por ele na portaria. [... always greets the doorman of his building by name when he passes through the lobby.]	.40	-.10	.23
... sempre dá alternativas, antes não pensadas, para solucionar os problemas de amigos. [... always gives alternative, not previously thought options to solve his/her friends' problems.]	.38	.10	.18
... inventa novas receitas quanto tem poucas opções de comida em casa. [... invents new recipes when he/she has few options for food at home.]	.38	.03	.17
... cumprimenta desconhecidos quando caminha pela rua. [... greets strangers while walking down the street.]	.37	-.05	.21
... mede as palavras para evitar conflitos. [... minces words to avoid conflicts.]	.30	-.10	.20
... mente em prol de um objetivo. [... lies in favor of a goal.]	-.05	.56	.29
... sabendo que certa pessoa ligará em determinado horário, desliga o celular e diz que estava sem bateria. [... knows that a certain person will call him/her at a certain time, so he turns off the phone and says it was discharged.]	-.01	.54	.28
... está cansado na segunda-feira e liga no trabalho falando que está doente. [... is tired on Monday, so calls the office to say he/she is sick.]	.02	.48	.24
... entra em uma festa sem pagar por conhecer o produtor desta. [... goes into a party without paying because he/she knows its producer.]	.12	.47	.23
... segue o princípio: "Regras foram feitas para serem quebradas". [... follows the principle: "Rules are made to be broken".]	.05	.46	.18
... procura um conhecido que trabalha no cartório para adiantar seu processo. [... seeks an acquaintance who works in the office to advance his/her case.]	-.07	.45	.19
... passa no sinal vermelho quando a rua está vazia e sem pardal. [... passes through a red light when the streets are empty and with no radar.]	.08	.43	.21
... quer comprar uma roupa pra usar no final de semana, mas ao ver a loja fechando, convence a vendedora a vender-lhe. [... wants to buy an outfit to use at the weekend, but when he/she sees the store closing, convinces the salesclerk to sell you.]	-.07	.38	.18
... anda sem o cinto de segurança quando faz caminhos curtos. [... does not use the seatbelt when he/she does short rides.]	.04	.35	.14
... por vezes, não paga o condomínio no prazo determinado. [... sometimes does not pay the taxes on time.]	.04	.32	.20
... estaciona na vaga de deficiente quando o estacionamento está cheio e precisa fazer algo rápido. [... parks in space for handicapped when the parking lot is full and he/she needs to do something fast.]	-.10	.30	.13
... joga lixo no chão. [... litters.]	-.23	.30	.17
<b>Reliability coefficient ( .</b>	<b>.71</b>	<b>.73</b>	

Factors: (1) *jeitinho simpático* and (2) trickery.

<sup>a</sup> The items in bold presented factor loadings above .40 and were the ones used in CFA (Study 4).

Ferreira et al. (2011) observed significant correlations between creativity *jeitinho* and agreeableness and conscientiousness traits. Moreover, *simpatia* is characterized by “interacting socially in a friendly, pleasant and affable way, showing interest, affinity and

attraction toward others” (Pilati, et al., 2011). In this sense, correlations with agreeableness and conscientiousness personality traits would be expected. Besides, as a creative problem-solving strategy, we may expect an association with achievement, stimulation and self-direction values. The correlations, as well as means and standard deviations, are shown in Table 2.

The correlations show that *jeitinho simpático* is mostly related to personality factors of openness to new experiences ( $r=.44, p<.001$ ), extraversion ( $r=.37, p<.001$ ), and agreeableness ( $r=.40, p<.001$ ). It was also observed significant relationships with conscientiousness ( $r=.17, p<.05$ ) and neuroticism trait ( $r=-.22, p<.001$ ). It indicates that this aspect of *jeitinho* is closely related to individual’s social skills and creativity; on the other hand, its relationship with conscientiousness and neuroticism suggests that *jeitinho* may be related to norm compliance and risk avoidance (Roberts, Jackson, Fayard, Edmonds, & Meints, 2009) and emotional stability (Widiger, 2009). Concerning human values, people who endorse *jeitinho simpático* are oriented to stimulation ( $r=.14, p<.05$ ) and benevolence values ( $r=.17, p<.05$ ).

### Trickery

The second factor refers to the strategy based on the flexibility of rules and norms. It is composed of 12 items related to trickery (e.g., “He/she lies in favor of a goal”, “He/she goes into a party without paying because he/she knows its producer”) and disregard for rules (“He/she follows the principle: Rules are made to be broken”, “He/she litters”). Accordingly, this factor evaluates one’s tendency to neglect and bypass norms in favor of a personal goal. Cronbach’s alpha for this factor was .73.

According to Salgado (2002), deviant behaviors are predicted by low scores on agreeableness and conscientiousness traits. This was applied to *jeitinho* as situations characterized as norm and law breaking were predicted by low agreeableness scores

(Ferreira, et al., 2011). In this study, we observed that this factor is correlated with both agreeableness ( $r=-.16$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and conscientiousness ( $r=-.32$ ,  $p<.001$ ). As conscientiousness is associated to norm and health-related behaviors, low scores in this factor indicates lack of responsibility and maladaptive outcomes (Roberts, et al., 2009). This factor correlated to values of power ( $r=.23$ ,  $p<.001$ ), achievement, ( $r=.17$ ,  $p<.001$ ), hedonism ( $r=.33$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and stimulation ( $r=.14$ ,  $p<.05$ ). As a self-serving strategy, people who endorse this aspect of *jeitinho* are motivated by self-promotion instead of universal welfare ( $r=-.13$ ,  $p<.05$ ) or group conformity ( $r=-.32$ ,  $p<.001$ ). It also correlated negatively to security ( $r=-.34$ ,  $p<.001$ ) which represents disregard for harmony and stability in relationships.

A comparison between Brazilian regions indicates that people differ slightly in endorsement of trickery [ $F(4, 398)=2.68$ ,  $p=.03$ ,  $f^2=.12$ ]; specifically, Northeasterners presented the highest scores ( $M=2.49$ ,  $SD=.76$ ), followed by Northerners ( $M=2.42$ ,  $SD=.67$ ), Midwesterners ( $M=2.40$ ,  $SD=.86$ ), Southeasterners ( $M=2.19$ ,  $SD=.85$ ), and Southerners ( $M=2.13$ ,  $SD=.75$ ). *Jeitinho simpático* otherwise, did not differ among regions [ $F(4,398)=1.11$ , ns ]. Regarding participants' school degree, those who were currently in undergraduate school or had a lower degree expressed greater endorsement of *jeitinho simpático* ( $M=4.58$ ,  $SE=.07$ ) than those who had an undergraduate degree or more ( $M=4.96$ ,  $SD=.03$ ),  $t(399)=-5.37$ ,  $p<.001$ ,  $d=.25$ ; however, the relationship was inverse in trickery factor: participants with a lower educational level scored higher on trickery ( $M=2.52$ ,  $SE=.07$ ) than those with a higher school degree ( $M=2.19$ ,  $SE=.04$ ),  $t(399)=3.70$ ,  $p<.001$ ,  $d=.18$ . Results about trickery factor are consistent to previous results: in a country-wide survey, Almeida (2007) observed that (1) relatively more people from Northeast reported the use of *jeitinho* when compared to North, Midwest, Southeast, and South (where less people reported that used *jeitinho*); (2) younger people report more use of *jeitinho* than the elderly ones; and (3) people with lower school degree use more *jeitinho* than those with higher

educational level. This suggests that morality is an important feature of the representation of jeitinho. Next study will examine the effect of these dimensions on jeitinho recognition.

**Table 2.** Means, standard deviation and correlation coefficients for jeitinho factor, human values, personality factors, and moral attitude. (Studies 1 and 3).

	Study 1 (n=403)				Study 3 (n=478)							
	Sim	Tri	M	SD	Sim	Tri	Cre	Har	Dis	M	SD	
Sim	-	-	4.56	.66	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tri	-.04	-	2.02	.64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cre	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.64	1.00	-
Har	-	-	-	-	.45 <sup>^</sup>	.12 <sup>**</sup>	-	-	-	5.71	.91	-
Dis	-	-	-	-	-.35 <sup>^</sup>	.12 <sup>**</sup>	-.24 <sup>^</sup>	-	-	2.16	.97	-
1	-.19 <sup>^</sup>	.23 <sup>^</sup>	3.35	1.14	-.08	.39 <sup>^</sup>	-.07	.18 <sup>*</sup>	.01	3.38	1.15	-
2	-.19 <sup>^</sup>	.17 <sup>^</sup>	4.06	1.08	-.08	.43 <sup>^</sup>	-.03	.10	-.01	4.02	1.05	-
3	-.07	.33 <sup>^</sup>	4.33	1.15	-.05	.19 <sup>^</sup>	.11	.01	.03	4.22	1.15	-
4	.14 <sup>*</sup>	.14 <sup>*</sup>	4.07	.95	-.08	.11	.27 <sup>^</sup>	.11	.20 <sup>^</sup>	4.04	.98	-
5	.08	.07	4.95	.68	-.09	.02	.22 <sup>^</sup>	-.07	.14 <sup>*</sup>	4.86	.78	-
6	.04	-.13 <sup>*</sup>	4.96	.70	.08	-.17 <sup>*</sup>	.02	-.16 <sup>*</sup>	-.01	4.79	.78	-
7	.17 <sup>*</sup>	-.02	5.13	.72	.10	-.26 <sup>^</sup>	.02	-.21 <sup>^</sup>	.05	5.03	.83	-
8	-.05	-.32 <sup>^</sup>	4.47	.79	.17 <sup>*</sup>	-.30 <sup>^</sup>	-.11	-.08	-.25 <sup>^</sup>	4.25	.83	-
9	-.05	-.08	3.76	.86	.01	-.27 <sup>^</sup>	-.18 <sup>^</sup>	.10	.00	3.57	.98	-
10	.10	-.34 <sup>^</sup>	4.62	.78	.02	-.14 <sup>*</sup>	-.03	-.02	-.11	4.25	.90	-
11	.44 <sup>^</sup>	-.03	5.76	.82	.19 <sup>^</sup>	-.01	.47 <sup>^</sup>	-.13 <sup>*</sup>	-.11	5.50	.89	-
12	.17 <sup>*</sup>	-.32 <sup>^</sup>	6.03	.75	.21 <sup>^</sup>	-.17 <sup>^</sup>	.20 <sup>^</sup>	-.15 <sup>*</sup>	-.19 <sup>^</sup>	5.87	.76	-
13	.37 <sup>^</sup>	-.09	5.47	1.03	.38 <sup>^</sup>	.02	.26 <sup>^</sup>	-.06	-.08	5.31	.99	-
14	.40 <sup>^</sup>	-.16 <sup>*</sup>	5.94	.77	.24 <sup>^</sup>	-.17 <sup>^</sup>	.20 <sup>^</sup>	-.26 <sup>^</sup>	-.14 <sup>*</sup>	5.86	.69	-
15	-.22 <sup>^</sup>	.08	4.52	1.39	-.04	.07	-.05	-.02	-.16 <sup>*</sup>	4.49	1.38	-
16	-.12	.08	2.13	1.26	-.10	.38 <sup>^</sup>	.03	.16 <sup>*</sup>	.15 <sup>*</sup>	2.13	1.20	-

\* p<.05; \*\* p<.01; ^ p<.001

Contextualized Scale of Jeitinho Jeitinho Simpático(Sim), Trickery (Tri); Decontextualized Scale of Jeitinho simpatia(Sim), trickery (Tri), creativity (Cre), harm to others (Har), disregard for social norms (Dis); Human Values Power (1), achievement (2), hedonism (3), stimulation (4), self-direction (5), universalism (6), benevolence (7), conformity (8), tradition (9), security (10); Personality Factors openness to new experiences (11), conscientiousness (12), extraversion (13), agreeableness (14), neuroticism (15); Moral Attitude (16).



## Study 2: Between *simpatia* and corruption: Evaluation of *jeitinho* across situations

In Study 1, we found that Brazilian *jeitinho* could be understood through friendly/creative or deceptive strategies. In this study, we apply this reasoning on different situations to evaluate the influence of each dimension on recognition of *jeitinho*. For such, we carried out a country-wide online experiment in which we manipulated the content of *jeitinho* scenarios previously rated as typical of Brazilian context. The experiment adopted a 2 (with interpersonal influence/no interpersonal influence) X 2 (severe norm breaking/slight norm breaking) X 4 (context: hospital, office, parking lot, or school) factorial design.

Interpersonal influence factor refers to the use of strategies to achieve a goal by involving another person emotionally. There is a noteworthy distinction between *jeitinho* and others types of interpersonal influence (e.g., *guanxi*; Chen & Chen, 2004), which involve long-term relationship commitment and use of hierarchy. *Jeitinho*, on the other hand, is broadly used among different social groups and does not require (and sometimes is considered rudeness) openly expressing a specific connection (Barbosa, 2006; Ferreira, et al., 2011; Smith, et al., 2012). So, we considered interpersonal influence as “involving the other person emotionally into the problem (...), invoking good feelings, goodwill, and empathy for the situation” (Barbosa, 2006, p. 53). Hypothesis 1 posits that scenarios in which there is use of interpersonal influence strategy will be rated as more typical of Brazilians than those without this kind of strategy.

The second factor relates to the moral component of *jeitinho*. Some authors (e.g., (DaMatta, 1984; Ramos, 1966; Rosenn, 1971) comprehend the construct of *jeitinho* as a function of the disregard for institutional rules. For example, Rosenn (1971) postulates five types of *jeitinho*, which varies according to their moral implication: (A) when a government employee deviates from his or her obligations in favor of a monetary of *status* gain; (B) when citizens employ deceitful devices or bypass legal obligations that are fair and reasonable in a

objective way; (C) when the speed with which a government employee carries out his or her legal obligations depends on monetary of status gain; (D) when citizens employ deceitful devices to bypass legal obligations that are unfair, unreal or useless; and (E) when a government employee deviates from his or her legal obligations due to a conviction that rules are unfair, unreal or useless. Moreover, inquiries about *jeitinho* show that the disregard for rules is one of its core themes (Barbosa, 2006; Duarte, 2006b; Pilati, et al., 2011). In this sense, *jeitinho* cannot be understood apart from morality. Hypothesis 2 posits that scenarios with severe violation of rules will be rated as more typical of Brazilians than those with light or no norm breaking.

## Method

### Participants

The study included 1937 individuals of which 67.4% are women with a mean age of 33 years (SD=11.95), mostly with a university education (45.2%). The sample includes individuals living in the five regions of Brazil: 3.2% from the North; 15% from Northeast; 35.9% from Midwest; 33.9% from Southeast; and 12% from the South.

### Materials and procedure

The experiment followed a 2 (with interpersonal influence strategy/no interpersonal influence strategy) x 2 (with rule breaking/no rule breaking) x 4 (hospital/office/parking lot/school situations) between-subjects factorial design. The scenarios used in this study were selected from a pool of scenarios previously rated as typical of Brazilian *jeitinho* (Ferreira, et al., 2011). Data collection took place entirely via internet. The sampling occurred through direct contact to participants via e-mail and snowballing. Each participant was randomly assigned to one of the 16 experimental conditions that consisted of the manipulation of typical scenarios of *jeitinho*. The main task involved judging the scenario as more or less typical of Brazilian's behavior (1-not typical; 7-very typical). Following, the experimental

manipulation of scenarios is presented - the parts in braces consist of (1) use of interpersonal influence or (2) severity of the norm breaking; the blue phrase corresponds to the absence of interpersonal influence strategy or less severe or no violation of rules, and the red phrase corresponds to the use of interpersonal influence or severe violation of rules.

Parking lot: Camila has to go to the mall to exchange a product. However, the parking lot is full on days close to holidays. Knowing that, Camila [1-asks her neighbor who is elderly/ talks to her neighbor who is elderly and explains that she needs to exchange the product to give it to her mother that day and asks to borrow the elderly driver sticker/ to borrow the elderly driver sticker thinking of counterfeiting it] to use the exclusive space.

Office: Juarez goes to the records office to request some documents and, once there, he learns that the document has a minimum of one week for delivery. [2-Also, there are some documents missing for the request] He then [1-tells the officer responsible for issuing the document that he needs those documents urgently to avoid a high fine] gives him some extra money to get the papers ready the same day, [2-even without the missing documents]

School: Marcio discovers that his grade is not enough to pass the exam. As he would be expelled if he failed that class, he [1-asks the teacher's assistant/ explains to the teacher's assistant that, due to his mother's hospitalization, he could not attend the class] and asks to [2-let him do an extra activity to improve his grade/ round his grade to the minimum necessary to pass the class] without the teacher knowing.

Hospital: Joana is sick and goes to the ER. Once there, she sees that [2-there is one person/ there are 50 people] before her in the queue. She then [1-asks the receptionist/ talks to the receptionist and tells her that she used to work at that hospital and is a friend of the nurses, and asks her] to be treated before the other people.

## Results and Discussion

This study aimed to test the influence of (1) use of interpersonal influence strategies and (2) rule breaking on the identification of *jeitinho* in different situations. We predicted that both dimensions would enhance the scenarios' typicality rating.

Scenarios with interpersonal influence strategy ( $M=4.94$ ;  $SD=1.94$ ) were evaluated as more typical of *jeitinho* than those with no interpersonal influence ( $M=4.74$ ;  $SD=2.00$ ),  $t(2166)=2.26$ ;  $p=.02$ ;  $d=.10$ . However, rule breaking did not show significant effect [ $t(2166)=.30$ ;  $p=.76$ ;  $d=.01$ ]. Concerning the context, one-way ANOVA showed a significant effect on evaluation of typicality with a low-to-moderate effect size [ $F(3,2164)=63.85$ ;  $p<.001$   $\eta^2=.28$ ]. Games-Howell post hoc test indicated that the parking lot situation ( $M=3.93$ ; 95% CI [3.74, 4.11]) is perceived as less typical of *jeitinho* than the other situations,  $p<.001$ . Office ( $M=4.85$ ; 95% CI [4.68, 5.01]) was also significantly different than school ( $M=5.21$ ; 95% CI [5.07, 5.35]),  $p<.01$ , and hospital ( $M=5.36$ ; 95% CI [5.22, 5.50]),  $p<.001$ . School and hospital situations were not seen as different,  $p=.55$ .

The experiment's results partially confirmed the study's hypotheses: interpersonal influence strategy was found significant for *jeitinho* recognition, but severity of norm breaking did not exert significant effect. We believe that the lack of effect was due to experimental manipulation since there is previous evidence that moral dimension is recognized both in individual and group level (Ferreira, et al., 2011). Finally, we found a significant effect of context on situation perception. Even though no hypothesis was formulated about the effects of context, this results confirm that there are certain situations to which *jeitinho* is more frequently associated (Barbosa, 2006). For example, queue-jumping is usually mentioned as one typical behavior of *jeitinho* as it involves power relations and violation of norms (Iglesias & Günther, 2007b; Pilati, et al., 2011).

### Study 3: Development of a decontextualized measure of Brazilian jeitinho

As in Study 1, this study reports the development of a measure based on a local conception of jeitinho. We observed in Study 1 that (1) jeitinho is distinguished between two different kinds of behavior – jeitinho simpático and trickery – and (2) these behaviors are associated to different sets of personality traits and values. This is consistent with previous findings; however, as noted by Ferreira et al. (2011), the exclusive use of instruments developed in Western societies may lead us to misinterpretation of the concept. Considering that, we develop alternative self-report measures based on lay theories about jeitinho provided by interviewees from two different Brazilian regions (Pilati, et al., 2011).

Conceptions about jeitinho define the construct through seven core themes - simpatia harm, trickery, disregard for social rules, innovative processes, power relation, and compensation – that correspond to its process (Pilati, et al., 2011). In this model, the hierarchy established between individuals and the perception of disadvantage constitute its antecedents. The strategy itself is characterized by simpatia, trickery, creativity, and disregard for rules. And, finally, the consequences consist of potentially harmful effects of the behavior as well as the notion that jeitinho exists to re-establish equality.

Concerning the process of validation of a construct across cultures, Berry (1989) propose that a concept must be studied in its own culture (emico) before transposing to another one (imposed etic). One possible way to promote this comparison is to develop instruments that could be adapted to different contexts. In this study, we used non-contingent behaviors to describe the specific elements.

## Method

### Participants

Four hundred seventy-eight native Brazilians participated in this study, of which 71.8% were female. The mean age was 33 years ( $SD=12.28$ ), and most participants reported

having a college degree or higher – only 4.7% declared having a High School degree or less. Concerning the region of residence, 5.4% of all participants were from the Northern region, 18.1% Northeast, 25.5% Midwest, 29.7% Southeast, and 21.3% from the Southern region.

#### Measures and procedure

##### Instrument development

Considering the effect of situational roles on the perception of *jeitinho*-related behaviors (Study 2), we developed an alternative measure. The items for this new scale were also based on the hypothesized dimensions of *jeitinho* (Pilati, et al., 2011), however, the behaviors reported on items were not related to any specific role or situation. Theoretical validation was performed by judging the item's clarity, pertinence, and dimension representativeness, by the same 13 judges from Study 1. In this scale, participants were to evaluate the importance of each behavior described for everyday interactions on a 7-point scale (1-Not important at all; 7-Very important).

##### Other Measures

The same scales from Study 1 were applied in this study. As in Study 1, the survey was conducted online and the sample was also randomly split in two groups. PVQ was answered by 200 participants and presented reliability coefficients varying from .52 (Tradition) to .81 (Hedonism). Other measures were answered by 226 participants and presented the following Cronbach's alphas: .81 (openness to new experience), .71 (conscientiousness), .82 (extraversion), .65 (agreeableness), .78 (neuroticism), and .72 (moral attitudes).

The comparison between the subsamples showed no significant difference for age,  $t(405) = .81$  ( $p = .41$ ), educational level,  $t(405) = .98$  ( $p = .32$ ), income,  $t(301) = .27$  ( $p = .78$ ), gender,  $\chi^2(1) = .06$  ( $p = .80$ ), or region,  $\chi^2(4) = 5.1$  ( $p = .27$ ). The allocation also did not exert influence on the means in *Jeitinho* Scale factors: *simpatia*  $t(423) = -.42$  ( $p = .67$ ), *trickery*,  $t(423) = -.92$

( $p=.33$ ), creativity,  $t(423)=.57$  ( $p=.56$ ), harm,  $t(423)=.35$  ( $p=.72$ ), and disregard for rules,  $t(423)=-.13$  ( $p=.89$ ).

## Results and Discussion

The Principal Axis Factoring (using Direct Oblimin rotation) revealed five distinct factors, which explained 37.3% of total variance. The analysis of screeplot and eigenvalues suggests that there are five to six extractable factors. All items presented factorial loadings greater than .30 in one of five factors without loading in others (Table 3). The correlations are presented in Table 2.

### Simpatia

The first factor is composed of five items that characterize friendly and sociable people. Reliability coefficient was .77. Similar to the first study's *jeitinho simpático* factor, *simpatia* presents significant correlation to personality traits: openness to new experiences ( $r=.19$ ,  $p<.001$ ), conscientiousness ( $r=.21$ ,  $p<.001$ ), extraversion ( $r=.38$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and agreeableness ( $r=.24$ ,  $p<.001$ ). In addition, people who endorse this kind of behavior are oriented by conformity value ( $r=.17$ ,  $p<.05$ ). It suggests that being friendly, fun, and cordial constitutes a norm endorsed by the group. In this sense, *simpatia* script is also reinforced in Brazilian culture (Triandis, et al., 1984). This has important implications for the relationship between *jeitinho* and power relations as Brazilians/Hispanics expect that high status persons act towards lower status persons in a way to lower the power distance (Amado & Brasil, 1991; Triandis, et al., 1984).

### Trickery

The second factor reflects the individual's endorsement of trickery, cunning and deceptive devices to achieve a goal. This kind of strategy is described as typical of *jeitinho* and associated to *malandro* character (DaMatta, 1979). Trickery is correlated to the Creativity factor ( $r=.12$ ,  $p<.01$ ) and has a reliability coefficient of .69. Regarding the

correlations with personality and values, trickery is related to low scores of conscientiousness ( $r=-.17, p<.001$ ) and agreeableness ( $r=-.17, p<.001$ ). As addressed before, these traits are predictors of deviant behaviors. Regarding personal values, people who endorse trickery are oriented to self-promotion values of power ( $r=.39, p<.001$ ), achievement ( $r=.43, p<.001$ ), and hedonism ( $r=.19, p<.001$ ), and present low endorsement of self-transcendence values - universalism ( $r=-.17, p<.05$ ) and benevolence ( $r=-.26, p<.001$ ) - and conservatism values - conformity ( $r=-.30, p<.001$ ), tradition ( $r=-.27, p<.001$ ), and security ( $r=-.14, p<.05$ ). This indicates that people who engage in this kind of strategy have self-oriented motivations and disregard for social demands, such as group cohesion and social welfare. Also, they are more likely to engage in illegal/dishonest behaviors ( $r=.38, p<.001$ ).

### Creativity

Creativity is considered a major aspect of the process of *jeitinho*. Since individuals have to rely on personal skills to give a *jeito* and overcome institutional obstacles, creativity is one requirement to succeed (Barbosa, 2006). Accordingly, creativity is correlated to both *simpatia* ( $r=.45, p<.001$ ) and trickery ( $r=.12, p<.01$ ); however, it is negatively correlated to harm ( $r=-.24, p<.001$ ) and disregard for rules ( $r=-.28, p<.001$ ). It is associated to openness to new experiences personality trait ( $r=.47, p<.001$ ) and openness to change values - stimulation ( $r=.27, p<.001$ ) and self-direction ( $r=.22, p<.001$ ). The relationship between creativity and tradition value ( $r=-.18, p<.001$ ) suggests that *jeitinho* is also a way to promote innovation and disclaim conventions. In fact, the negative discourse about *jeitinho* emphasizes its contradictory relationship with principles and norms (Barbosa, 2006). This factor has a reliability coefficient of .72.



**Table 3** Factor loadings, communalities, and reliability coefficients of each factor.

	1	2	3	4	5	h <sup>2</sup>
Ser simpático. [To be simpático]	.77	.03	-.01	-.08	-.10	.34
Ser uma pessoa agradável. [To be a pleasant person.]	.62	.07	-.07	-.07	-.10	.27
Ser cordial. [To be cordial.]	.59	-.03	-.04	.16	.02	.47
Sorrir quando em contato com outras pessoas. [To smile when in contact with other people.]	.58	.01	.01	.04	.01	.47
Cumprimentar as pessoas quando chega a algum lugar. [To greet people when arrive somewhere.]	.46	-.11	-.06	.05	.01	.63
Mentir para justificar uma falha. [To lie to justify a failure.]	.11	.72	.19	.04	.06	.51
Mentir para conseguir algo. [To lie to obtain something.]	.05	.68	.05	-.12	.07	.19
Omitir informações para não se prejudicar. [To omit info not to harm myself.]	-.01	.68	.03	.13	.01	.51
Tirar vantagem em tudo o que faz. [To take advantage of everything I do.]	-.07	.49	-.10	-.04	-.06	.28
Manter sua meta mesmo que cause um possível dano a outros. [To keep a goal even if it causes a possible harm to others.]	-.05	.41	-.01	-.08	.03	.44
Ser esperto. [To be smart.]	-.01	.33	-.28	-.08	-.13	.32
Inovar. [To innovate.]	.09	-.17	-.68	-.07	.08	.36
Saber improvisar. [To know how to improvise.]	.05	.10	-.61	.02	.01	.32
Ser criativo. [To be creative.]	-.01	-.03	-.53	.15	-.08	.44
Pensar em várias soluções para um problema. [To think of several solutions to a problem.]	.10	-.04	-.53	-.01	.01	.48
Ter jogo de cintura. [To be flexible.]	.20	.18	-.35	.13	-.01	.24
Pensar nas conseqüências de seus atos sobre outros. [To think about the consequences of my actions on others.] †	.06	-.10	.00	.63	-.08	.44
Evitar causar prejuízos diretos a outros. [To prevent direct harm to others.] †	.08	-.12	-.01	.53	-.07	.37
Ponderar entre o benefício próprio e o prejuízo de outros. [To balance between my own benefit and the injury of others.] †	.03	.09	.04	.50	-.01	.16
Minimizar os danos causados a outros quando decorrentes de minhas ações. [To minimize the damage caused to others when due to my actions.] †	-.02	-.02	-.05	.42	.01	.33
Agir de acordo com as normas do ambiente. [To act according to the place's rules.] †	.04	-.08	.01	.03	-.63	.26
Seguir regras. [To follow rules.] †	.02	-.16	.03	.05	-.53	.39
Compreender como é esperado que se comporte em um certo ambiente. [To understand how it is expected to behave in a certain environment.] †	-.02	.12	-.14	.15	-.48	.18
Fazer o que as pessoas consideram o correto. [To do what people consider the correct.] †	.06	.01	.08	-.05	-.40	.50
Agir de acordo com o que cada situação pede. [To act according to what is demanded.] †	.05	.15	-.17	.06	-.32	.25
Reliability coefficient ( .	.77	.69	.72	.63	.60	

Factors: Simpatia(1), Trickery (2), Creativity (3), Harm to others (4) and Disregard for rules (5).

### Harm to others

Harm factor refers to individual's disposition to disregard possible harmful effects caused by his/her own acts on others and addresses the discussion about the moral nature of

jeitinho.Barbosa (2006) posits that *jeitinho* is located in a continuum between favor and corruption. In the same direction, Ferreira et al. (2011) argue that *jeitinho* consists of an individualizing strategy within a context that emphasizes binding and, thus, creates a complex form of binding morality based on informal and flexible relationships (for a review about theories of morality, see Haidt & Kesebir, 2010). In this sense, the inherent ambiguity of *jeitinho* construct may be related to one's moral judgment. In fact, this factor is correlated to moral lenience towards illegal behavior ( $r=.16, p<.05$ ). Also, it is positively correlated to trickery ( $r=.12, p<.01$ ) and disregard for rules ( $r=.29, p<.001$ ), and it is negatively correlated to *simpatia* ( $r=-.35, p<.001$ ) and creativity ( $r=-.24, p<.001$ ). Regarding the personality traits, it is negatively correlated to conscientiousness ( $r=-.15, p<.05$ ), agreeableness ( $r=-.26, p<.001$ ). Cronbach's alpha for this factor was .63, and the items are reverted.

#### Disregard for rules

The fifth factor refers to the individual disposition to follow rules. Items express the importance attributed by the individual to perceive and follow situational norms. It is negatively correlated to *simpatia* ( $r=-.45, p<.001$ ) and creativity ( $r=-.28, p<.05$ ), which supports the idea that being friendly and flexible is expected in Brazilian culture. People who endorse this factor are oriented by values of stimulation ( $r=.20, p<.001$ ) and self-direction ( $r=.14, p<.001$ ), and presents less conformity ( $r=-.25, p<.05$ ). Concerning the personality factors, it is associated to low scores on conscientiousness ( $r=-.19, p<.001$ ), agreeableness ( $r=-.14, p<.05$ ), and neuroticism ( $r=-.16, p<.05$ ). In this sense, this factor is related to spontaneity and self-direction since people who are low in neuroticism are more emotionally stable and less reactive to stress (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Its reliability coefficient was .60.

In order to explore the dimensionality of *jeitinho* construct, we developed a measure based on states and behaviors that reflected the constitutive elements of the hypothesized model (Pilati, et al., 2011). Although "power relations" and "compensation" elements could

not be observed through exploratory factor analysis, we argue that they are directly associated to *simpatiascript* as those who endorse this behaviors react to others in a way to soften the power distance and expect the same from others (Triandis, et al., 1984). Also, we provided evidence that *jeitinho* is linked to a broader notion of morality by assessing its relationship with attitude towards dishonest-illegal behaviors. Next, we will test this model and evaluate its convergent validity with the contextualized scale (Study 1) and another Brazilian *jeitinho* measure (Ferreira, et al., 2011).

#### Study 4: Scales'Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Study 1 and 3 examined the constitution of *jeitinho* according to the model proposed by Pilati et al. (2011). We observed in Study 1 that *jeitinho* may be distinguished between two types: *jeitinho simpático* refers to the employment of naïve creativity and *simpatia* to overcome an obstacle; and *trickery* is the strategy characterized by self-serving motives and disregard for social demands. This distinction is consistent to previous observations on the dimensionality of the construct and its psychological correlates (Ferreira, et al., 2011). In Study 3, we found that *jeitinho* could be understood across five interrelated factors: *simpatia* and creativity were correlated, and both were negatively correlated to harm and disregard for rules; *trickery* was related to creativity and harm; and *disregard for rules* was associated to harm.

This study aims to (1) confirm the scales' factorial structures and (2) investigate the convenience of the five-factor model of *jeitinho*. For such, we conducted confirmatory factor analysis using Structural Equations Modeling, and then we evaluated the relationship between the decontextualized scale with contextualized scale and a previously developed measure of *jeitinho* (Brazilian *Jeitinho* Questionnaire, Ferreira, et al., 2011).

#### Hypotheses

Contextualized scale consisted of two orthogonal factors. In this sense, we test this structure comparing it with the alternative one-factor solution; furthermore, we test the orthogonality between factors. Regarding the decontextualized scale, we expect the five-factor structure observed in Study 3.

As addressed before, Ferreira et al. (2011) found that *jeitinho* distinguishes three kinds of strategy: creativity, corruption, and norm breaking. In addition, we observed in Study 1 that *simpatia* along with creativity, constitutes a factor separated from *trickery*. Based on that, we hypothesize that (1) decontextualized scale's *simpatia* will predict *jeitinho simpático*

and Brazilian Jeitinho Questionnaire's creativity scenario; (2) trickery, disregard for rules, and harm will predict transgressive forms of jeitinho – contextualized scale's trickery factor, norm breaking scenario, and corruption scenario; and, since jeitinho consists of a problem-solving strategy, (3) creativity will relate to all forms of jeitinho.

## Method

### Participants

The sample was composed of 282 undergraduate students from colleges situated in Brasília and its outskirts, most of which were female (N=214), with mean age of 26 years (SD=9.79), and born in the Midwest region (N=206). Income was classified by categories from “up to R\$ 500.00/month”<sup>3</sup> (about US\$ 271.70) to “above R\$ 5,500.00/month” (about US\$ 3,000.00) – the median for this sample was “between R\$ 4,500.00 and R\$ 5,000.00/month”.

### Instruments

#### Brazilian Jeitinho Questionnaire- BJQ

Brazilian Jeitinho Questionnaire (Ferreira, et al., 2011) consists of 21 scenarios that describe an actor solving a problem by the use of three forms of jeitinho. The first factor - creativity jeitinho – describe situations in which the characters use creative solutions to solve a problem without violating a social or legal norm; the second factor, called corruption jeitinho, consists of scenarios in which the problem-solving strategy involves illicit means; the third factor, social norm-breaking jeitinho, focuses on strategies that bypass social norms to solve a problem (see Table 4 for examples). Confirmatory factor analysis showed that BJQ presents adequate goodness-of-fit indices ( $\chi^2(149)=338.61$ ;  $\chi^2/df=2.27$ ; IFI=.83; GFI=.87; AIC=420.60; SRMR=.06; 90% RMSEA=.058, .077).

## Results and Discussion

Our first goal is to test the scales' structure. So, we conducted a Structural Equations Modeling using Maximum Likelihood method. The tested solutions and respective goodness-of-fit indices are presented below.

### Contextualized scale of *jeitinho*

Before testing the bifactorial model for contextualized scale, we explored a unifactorial alternative, consisting of 14 items - seven most loaded items from each factor (Table 1) - saturated in a single latent variable (Model 1). In Model 2, items were distributed according to the structure previously observed. As observed in Table 5, this model presented better goodness-of-fit indices, and is significantly superior to the unifactorial model ( $\chi^2(1)=193.08, p<.01$ ). This indicates that this scale is better described by a bidimensional structure.

**Table 4.** Sample scenarios from Brazilian *Jeitinho* Questionnaire (Ferreira, et al., 2011).

Creativity Scenarios
It is the birthday of a very close friend of Joana and she has forgotten to buy him a present. She has also financial problems and believes that she will not find anything affordable on a short notice. As Joana is very clever, she uses free school material to create a beautiful card to give to her friend.
Marília works as general services clerk in a large company and cannot earn enough money to pay all the debts of her house. To earn extra money, she talks to the boss and requests authorization to sell sandwiches and snack to other employees at her work.
Corruption Scenarios
Every time José takes a taxi for company purposes, he has the right to request reimbursement for the amount paid. When he is without money, he requests a receipt for a greater amount than he has paid and submits this to the company. He keeps the extra money.
A councilor, who is very well known in his city, was able to get building material from companies around the region to reform a school. He, however, has diverted some of this material to renovate the house of one of his sons.
Social norm-breaking Scenarios
Parking at shopping centers is difficult during busy times. Knowing that it is very difficult to find a place to park at these times, Camila speaks to her grandmother and invites her to go shopping, so that she can park in a space reserved for the elderly.
Marina needs to go to the supermarket very quickly to buy just one liter of milk to make her children's bottles. When she arrived at the supermarket, she saw that there were no parking spaces. She therefore put the car along the pavement, switched on the emergency lights, and quickly went into the market to buy milk.

Next, we evaluate the relationship between the factors. The bifactorial model with free estimation presented a non-significant correlation ( $r=-.006$ , ns), so we tested the orthogonal relationship (correlation between factors fixed in 0.00) against a divergent (correlation fixed in -1.00) and a convergent relationship (correlation fixed in +1.00). Model 4 [orthogonal,  $\chi^2(77)=136.30$ ,  $\chi^2/df=1.77$ , IFI=.88, GFI=.92, AIC=192.30, SRMR=.06, RMSEA(90%CI)=.056(.040;.071)] presented better goodness-of-fit indices than both Model 3 [divergent,  $\chi^2(77)=252.50$ ,  $\chi^2/df=3.27$ , IFI=.66, GFI=.87, AIC=308.52, SRMR=.18, RMSEA(90%CI)=.095(.083;.109)] and Model 5 [convergent,  $\chi^2(77)=263.10$ ,  $\chi^2/df=3.41$ , IFI=.64, GFI=.87, AIC=319.08, SRMR=.19, RMSEA(90%CI)=.098(.085;.111)]. Also, Model 4 presented a ratio  $\chi^2/df$  below 2.00 and may be considered a relatively accurate model (Byrne, 1994). Therefore, this two-orthogonal factor structure presents a satisfactory model fit. Reliability coefficient was .69 for both factors.

**Table 5.** Goodness-of-fit indices for alternative models of *jeitinho* scales.

Model	$\chi^2$	df	$\chi^2/df$	IFI	GFI	AIC	SRMR	RMSEA (90% CI)
<b>Contextualized scale (14 items)</b>								
1. Unifactorial	329.28	77	4.27	.52	.79	385.28	.12	.114 (.102; .127)
2. Bi-factorial: free estimation	136.20	76	1.79	.88	.92	194.22	.06	.056 (.041; .071)
3. Bi-factorial: correlation fixed in -1.0	252.50	77	3.27	.66	.87	308.52	.18	.095 (.083; .109)
4. Bi-factorial: correlation fixed in 0.0	136.30	77	1.77	.88	.92	192.30	.06	.056 (.040; .071)
5. Bi-factorial: correlation fixed in 1.0	263.10	77	3.41	.64	.87	319.08	.19	.098 (.085; .111)
<b>Decontextualized scale (25 items)</b>								
6. Five factors w/ no covariant fixed	709.90	265	2.67	.74	.83	879.87	.08	.077 (.070; .084)
7. Five factors: item22 deleted	566.69	262	2.16	.79	.85	730.69	.07	.069 (.062; .077)

### Decontextualized scale of *jeitinho*

The hypothesized model comprised five factors representing the aspects of *jeitinho* – *simpatia*, creativity, trickery, harm, and disregard for rules. So, we tested the five-factor structure saturating the items in their latent variable (Table 3). Model 6 (Table 5) represents

the original five-factor structure with free estimation of correlation between factors. The goodness-of-fit indices are considered below the acceptable to support the hypothesized model [ $\chi^2(265)=709.90$ ;  $\chi^2/df=2.67$ ; IFI=.74; GFI=.83; AIC=879.87; SRMR=.08; RMSEA(90%CI)=.077(.070,.084)]; however, modification indices indicate that the error associated to item-22 (“To be smart”) is highly correlated to both the trickery and creativity factors. Thus, we opted for the deletion of item-22 which caused model fit to increase slightly ( $\chi^2(263)=143.21$ ,  $p<.01$ ). The five factors’ reliability coefficients were: Simpatia(  $.72$ ), Creativity (  $.76$ ), Trickery (  $.63$ ), Harm to others (  $.38$ ), and Disregard for rules (  $.67$ ). Simpatia and creativity factors correlated ( $r=.40$ ,  $p<.001$ ) and both correlated negatively to harm and disregard for rules - simpatia-harm ( $r=-.29$ ,  $p<.001$ ), simpatia-disregard ( $r=-.47$ ,  $p<.001$ ), creativity-harm ( $r=-.23$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and creativity-disregard ( $r=-.39$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and disregard for rules correlated to harm ( $r=.32$ ,  $p<.01$ ). However, trickery did not correlate to creativity ( $r=-.08$ , ns) or harm ( $r=-.01$ , ns).

These results partially confirmed our expectations. Confirmatory factor analysis showed that bi-factorial structure of contextualized scale was confirmed; nevertheless, the goodness-of-fit indices did not support the decontextualized scale’s structure. This was possibly due to our sampling, since the method applied in SEM (Maximum Likelihood) strongly relies on univariate and multivariate normality of distribution (Pilati & Laros, 2007). Also, the participants consisted of undergraduate students.



Table 6.  
Correlation, means, and standard deviation for *jeitinho* factors.

	Study 1			Study 3			Brazilian <i>Jeitinho</i> Questionnaire				M	SD	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			
Contextualized scale (Study 1)													
1. Interpersonal influence	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.41	.79
2. Corruption	.10	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.71	1.13
Decontextualized scale (Study 3)													
3. <i>Simpatia</i>	.41 <sup>*</sup>	.06	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.69	.95
4. Creativity	.46 <sup>*</sup>	.17 <sup>**</sup>	.40 <sup>*</sup>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.76	.93
5. Tricky	-.02	.42 <sup>**</sup>	-.02	.08	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.22	.92
6. Harm	-.23 <sup>*</sup>	.02	-.29 <sup>*</sup>	-.23 <sup>*</sup>	-.01	1	-	-	-	-	-	2.67	1.04
7. Disregard for Rules	-.29 <sup>*</sup>	-.03	-.47 <sup>*</sup>	-.39 <sup>*</sup>	-.04	.32 <sup>*</sup>	1	-	-	-	-	2.93	1.01
Brazilian <i>Jeitinho</i> Questionnaire (Ferreira, et al., 2011)													
8. Corruption	-.02	.34 <sup>*</sup>	-.02	.08	.30 <sup>*</sup>	.11	.07	1	-	-	-	6.37 <sup>a</sup>	1.65
9. Creativity	.33 <sup>*</sup>	.18 <sup>*</sup>	.23 <sup>*</sup>	.24 <sup>*</sup>	.01	.02	-.15 <sup>*</sup>	.17 <sup>**</sup>	1	-	-	4.27 <sup>a</sup>	2.37
10. Social norm breaking	.01	.55 <sup>*</sup>	.01	.15 <sup>*</sup>	.34 <sup>*</sup>	.12 <sup>*</sup>	-.03	.54 <sup>*</sup>	.24 <sup>*</sup>	1	-	1.65 <sup>a</sup>	1.84

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; <sup>^</sup>  $p < .001$

<sup>a</sup> Brazilian *Jeitinho* Questionnaire uses a 7-points scale.

### Comparison between measures

Next, we evaluate the role of the five factors of *jeitinho* – *simpatia* creativity, trickery, harm, and disregard for rules – in describing the forms of *jeitinho*. For such, we ran regression analyses with the contextualized scale's factors and BJQ's scenarios as criterion variables and decontextualized scale's five factors as predictors.

Regression coefficients are presented in Table 7. As expected, creativity predicted all forms of *jeitinho*: *jeitinho simpático* ( $\beta = .35, p < .001$ ), trickery ( $\beta = .15, p < .05$ ), creativity scenario ( $\beta = .19, p < .01$ ), norm breaking scenario ( $\beta = .15, p < .05$ ), and, with a marginal statistical significance, corruption scenario ( $\beta = .12, p = .06$ ). This confirms that creativity is a key feature of Brazilian *jeitinho*. Next, we examine the role of *simpatia* trickery, harm, and disregard for rules for distinction between the forms of *jeitinho*. As Table 7 shows, *simpatia* is related to *jeitinho simpático* ( $\beta = .23, p < .001$ ) and creativity scenario ( $\beta = .18, p < .01$ ). Decontextualized scale's trickery factor related to trickery *jeitinho* (Study 1,  $\beta = .41, p < .001$ ), norm breaking scenario ( $\beta = .33, p < .001$ ), and corruption scenario ( $\beta = .29, p < .001$ ). This indicates that *simpatia* and trickery characterize the friendly/creative and transgressive *jeitinho*, respectively. Harm predicted creativity scenario ( $\beta = .13, p < .05$ ) and norm breaking scenario ( $\beta = .16, p < .01$ ), and disregard for rules presented no significant relationship with any form of *jeitinho*. Though this result contradicts our expectations, it is consistent to the idea that *jeitinho* is a widespread practice, reinforced by social norms.

Table 7. Regression coefficients ( $\beta$ ) for contextualized scale's factors and Brazilian *Jeitinho* Questionnaire scenarios.

	Contextualized scale		Brazilian <i>Jeitinho</i> Questionnaire		
	<i>Jeitinho simpático</i>	Trickery	Creativity	Norm Breaking	Corruption
<i>Simpatia</i>	.23 <sup>^</sup>	.04	.18 <sup>**</sup>	.00	.02
Creativity	.35 <sup>^</sup>	.15 <sup>*</sup>	.19 <sup>**</sup>	.15 <sup>*</sup>	.12
Trickery	-.05	.41 <sup>^</sup>	.08	.33 <sup>^</sup>	.29 <sup>^</sup>
Harm	-.07	.06	.13 <sup>*</sup>	.16 <sup>**</sup>	.11
Disregard for rules	-.02	.04	-.04	-.01	.10
R <sup>2</sup>	.28	.19	.10	.16	.12
F	22.26 <sup>^</sup>	14.18 <sup>^</sup>	5.90 <sup>^</sup>	10.17 <sup>^</sup>	7.35 <sup>^</sup>

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; <sup>^</sup>  $p < .001$

We aimed to compare the five-factor model to the existing three-factor model of *jeitinho* (Ferreira, et al., 2011). Specifically, we expected that a five-factor scale of *jeitinho* could provide more details about the makeup of the construct than the Brazilian *Jeitinho* Questionnaire. This goal was only partially achieved. We observed that creativity was a predictor of all forms of *jeitinho*, and that creativity scenario was predicted also by *simpatia*. Also, trickery was a good predictor of transgressive forms of *jeitinho*. However, against our expectations, harm predicted both creativity scenario and norm breaking scenario, and none of the types of *jeitinho* was related to disregard for rules.

### General Discussion

The purpose of this work was twofold: first, we examined the constitutive elements of Brazilian *jeitinho* and the traits related to its dimensions. We observed that *jeitinho* may be defined by two different kinds of strategy: people who endorse the conformity value and present high scores on social traits, like agreeableness, extraversion, and openness to new experiences, rely on *simpatia* to solve their problem; also, people who present low scores on conscientious and agreeable and are oriented by individualistic values are more likely to use trickery to bypass their obstacles. According to DaMatta's (1984) sociological analysis of Brazilian culture, *jeitinho*, along with trickery, reflects the conflict generated between formality, marked by the set of universal laws, and a culture that emphasizes interpersonal relationships. In the case of *jeitinho*, the individual makes use of tactics to narrow the relationship with the one who maintains the situational power in order to solve his problem. This practice is not seen as negative since it conforms to the cultural script of *simpatia* (Ramírez-Esparza, et al., 2008; Triandis, et al., 1984) and represents the endeavor to maintain the harmony in relationships in an excessively formal environment. Trickery, on the other hand, characterizes the individual who makes use of deception to take advantage of others. Accordingly, it is associated to harm and thus is perceived as an immoral practice. And,

even though DaMatta describes the trickery as an extension of *jeitinho*, this work provided evidences that these behaviors have different psychological correlates.

Our second purpose concerned the development of an alternative measure of *jeitinho*. As presented, only one scenario-based measure of *jeitinho* was found in literature. However, as noted by Smith et al. (2012), the use of scenarios can impose limitations on assessment of its process. Accordingly, we aimed to develop a self-report measure in order to assess the endorsement of *jeitinho*-related behaviors and thus allow further investigations on the factors involved in the phenomenon. The investigation of the decontextualized scale's validity showed that creativity factor predicted all forms of *jeitinho*, and that creativity *jeitinho* could be distinguished from norm breaking and corruption *jeitinho* by *simpatia* factor. Since the goodness-of-fit indices in confirmatory factor analysis (Study 4) were not satisfactory to confirm the five-factor structure, future studies should enlarge and diversify the sample in order to achieve statistical assumptions.

### Limitations

Theories about *jeitinho* focus on cultural level of the phenomenon and, despite the efforts in correlating cultural dimensions and personality traits, the causal relationship between culture and personality is not clear yet (Hofstede & McCrae, 2004). In this sense, our description of *jeitinho* based on personal values and personality can be imprecise. In the future, we ought to compare alternative models to better understand the psychological factors related to these behaviors.

Concerning the research method, we intended to increase the sample representativeness by using an online survey and a snowballing sampling. We succeeded to obtain participants from all five regions, but the sample was composed almost exclusively of undergraduate and graduate students. Since the endorsement of *jeitinho* varies according to age, educational level, and region (Almeida, 2007), this implies some limitations to the

generalization of results. Finally, the lack of manipulation check in Study 2 may have influenced participants' perception about the severity of norm breaking.

Despite the limitations, we provided evidence that *jeitinho* is not a univocal construct and that the endorsement of these behaviors varies across personality traits and human values.

(Iglesias, 2007a; Iglesias & Günther, 2007b)

## References

- Almeida, A. C. (2007). *A cabeça do brasileiro* [The head of Brazilian] Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Editora Record.
- Amado, G., & Brasil, H. V. (1991). Organizational behaviors and cultural context: The Brazilian "jeitinho". *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 32(1), 61.
- Barbosa, L. (2006). *O Jeitinho Brasileiro: A arte de ser mais igual do que os outros* [The Brazilian jeitinho: The art of being more equal than others] Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Elsevier.
- Barsalou, L. W. (2010). Grounded cognition: Past, present, and future. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 7(1), 716-724. doi: 10.1111/j.1756-8765.2010.01115.x
- Berry, J. W. (1989). Imposed etics-emics, derived etics: The operationalization of a compelling idea. *International Journal of Psychology*, 24(1), 721-735.
- Byrne, B. M. (1994). *Structural Equation Modeling with EQS and EQS/Windows* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Chen, X.-P., & Chen, C. C. (2004). On the intricates of the Chinese guanxi: A process model of guanxi development. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21(3), 305-324.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). The Five Factor Model of personality and its relevance to personality disorders. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 6(4), 343-359. doi: 10.1521/pedi.1992.6.4.343
- DaMatta, R. (1979). *Carnavais, malandros e heróis: Para uma sociologia do dilema brasileiro* [Carnivals, malandros and heroes: For a sociology of the Brazilian dilemma] Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Rocco.
- DaMatta, R. (1984). *O que faz o brasil, Brasil?* [What makes brazil, Brazil?] Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Rocco.

- Duarte, F. (2006a). Exploring the interpersonal transaction of the Brazilian jeitinho in bureaucratic contexts. *Organization*, *13*(4), 509-527. doi: 10.1177/1350508406065103
- Duarte, F. (2006b). A double-edged sword: The jeitinho as an ambiguous concept in the Brazilian imaginary. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, *1*(1), 125-131.
- Ferreira, M. C., Fischer, R., Porto, J. B., Pilati, R., & Milfont, T. L. (2011). Unravelling the mystery of Brazilian jeitinho: A cultural exploration of social norms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Online Publication doi: 10.1177/0146167211427148
- Gino, F., & Ariely, D. (2011). The dark side of creativity: Original thinkers can be more dishonest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Advance online publication doi: 10.1037/a0026406
- Gouveia, V. V., Meira, M., Santos, W. S., Jesus, G. R., & Formiga, N. S. (2001). *Personalidade e valores humanos [Personality and human values]* presented at the II Congresso Norte-Nordeste de Psicologia, Salvador, BA, Brazil.
- Graziano, W. G., Habashi, M. M., Sheese, B. E., & Tobin, R. M. (2007). Agreeableness, empathy, and helping: A person X situation perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(3), 583-599. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.4.58
- Graziano, W. G., Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Hair, E. C. (1996). Perceiving interpersonal conflict and reacting to it: The case of agreeableness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*(4), 820-835.
- Haidt, J., & Kesebir, S. (2010). Morality. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* Vol. 2, pp. 797-832). New York: Wiley.
- Harding, S., & Phillips, D. (1986). *Contrasting values in Western Europe: Unity, diversity and change* London, UK: Macmillan.

- Hofstede, G., & McCrae, R. R. (2004). Personality and culture revisited: Linking traits and dimensions of culture. *CrossCultural Research*, *35*, 2-88. doi: 10.1177/1069397103259443
- Iglesias, F. (2007a). Comportamentos em filas de espera: Uma abordagem multimétodo. Doctoral Dissertation, Universidade de Brasília. Biblioteca Central database.
- Iglesias, F., & Günther, H. (2007b). Normas, justiça, atribuição e poder: Uma revisão e agenda de pesquisa sobre filas de espera [Norms, justice, attribution and power: A review and research agenda about waiting lines]. *Estudos de Psicologia*, *12*, 03-11.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, A. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford.
- Mehl, M. R., Gosling, S. D., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2006). Personality in its natural habitat: Manifestations and implicit folk theories of personality in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 862-877. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.862
- Motta, F. C. P., & Alcadipani, R. (1999). Jeitinho brasileiro, controle social e competição. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *39*, 1-12.
- Paunonen, S. V. (2003). Big Five factors of personality and replicated predictions of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*, 411-424. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.2.41
- Pilati, R., & Laros, J. A. (2007). Modelos de Equações Estruturais em psicologia: Conceitos e aplicações [Structural Equation Modeling in psychology: Concepts and applications]. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, *23*, 205-216.



- Pilati, R., Milfont, T. L., Ferreira, M. C., Porto, J. B., & Fischer, R. (2011). Brazilian jeitinho: Understanding and explaining an indigenous psychological construct. *Revista Interamericana de Psicologia*, *45*, 29-38.
- Ramírez-Esparza, N., Gosling, S. G., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2008). Paradox lost: Unravelling the puzzle of Simpatía. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *39*, 703-715. doi: 10.1177/0022022108323786
- Ramos, A. G. (1966). *Administração e estratégia do desenvolvimento: Elementos de uma sociologia especial da administração*. Management and development strategy: Elements of a special sociology of management. Rio de Janeiro, RJ.: Fundação Getúlio Vargas.
- Roberts, B. W., Jackson, J. J., Fayard, J. V., Edmonds, G., & Meints, J. (2009). Conscientiousness. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of Individual Differences in Social Behavior* (pp. 369-381). London: The Guilford Press.
- Ronaldo aposta em "jeitinho brasileiro" para a Copa-2014. (2011, February). Folha.com. Retrieved from: <http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/esporte/878531-ronaldo-aposta-em-jeitinho-brasileiro-para-a-copa-2014.shtml>
- Rosenn, K. S. (1971). Jeito - Brazil's institutional bypass of formal legal system and its developmental implications. *American Journal of Comparative Law*, *19*, 514-549.
- Salgado, J. (2002). The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *10*, 7-125.
- Scheyerl, D., & Siqueira, S. (2008). O Brasil pelo olhar do outro: Representações de estrangeiros sobre os brasileiros de hoje. [Brazil through the eye of the other: foreigners' representations of Brazilians nowadays]. *Trabalhos de Linguística Aplicada*, *47*, 375-391.

- Schwartz, S. H. (2005). Teoria e medida de valores [Theory and measurement of values]. In A. Tamayo & J. B. Porto (Eds.), *Valores e comportamento nas organizações* [Values and behavior in organizations] (pp. 21-55). Rio de Janeiro: Editora Vozes.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2011). Studying values: Personal adventure, future directions. *Journal of CrossCultural Psychology*, *42*, 307-319. doi: 10.1177/0022022110396925
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human-values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *53*, 550-562.
- Smith, P. B., Huang, H. J., Harb, C., & Torres, C. (2012). How distinctive are indigenous ways of achieving influence? A comparative study of Guanxi, Wasta, Jeitinho, and "Pulling Strings". *Journal of CrossCultural Psychology*, *43*(3), 135-150.
- Tamayo, A., & Porto, J. B. (2009). Validity of the Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ) in Brazil. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, *25*, 269-276.
- Triandis, H. C., Marín, G., Lisansky, J., & Betancourt, H. (1984). Simpatía as a cultural script of Hispanics. *Journal of Personality and social Psychology*, *47*, 1363-1375.
- Vauclair, C.-M., & Fischer, R. (2011). Do cultural values predict individuals' moral attitudes? A cross-cultural multilevel approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*(5), 645-657. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.794
- Widiger, T. A. (2009). Neuroticism. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of Individual Differences in Social Behavior* (pp. 129-146). London: The Guilford Press.
- World Cup-2014: Brazil to boycott Fifa's Jerome Valcke. (2012, March) BBC News: Latin America & Caribbean. Retrieved from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-17246171>

## Anexo 1 - Escala Contextualizada de Jeitinho Brasileiro

**INSTRUÇÕES.** Nesta parte do questionário, apresentamos afirmações que descrevem algumas pessoas. Leia cada descrição e avalie o quanto cada uma dessas pessoas é semelhante a você. Para tal, utilize a escala abaixo que descreve opiniões que vão desde "Não se parece nada comigo" até "Se parece muito comigo".

Não se parece nada comigo	Não se parece comigo	Se parece pouco comigo	Se parece mais ou menos comigo	Se parece comigo	Se parece muito comigo
1	2	3	4	5	6

Ele(a) gosta de manter o clima social agradável.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) joga lixo no chão.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) entra em uma festa sem pagar por conhecer o produtor desta.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) anda sem o cinto de segurança quando faz caminhos curtos	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) busca novos empreendimentos para sua profissão.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) sempre dá alternativas, antes não pensadas, para solucionar os problemas dos amigos.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) passa no sinal vermelho quando a rua está vazia e sem pardal.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) cumprimenta a desconhecidos quando caminha pela rua.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) estaciona na vaga de deficiente quando o estacionamento está cheio e precisa fazer algo rápido.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) se mostra bastante criativa ao enfrentar problemas no trabalho.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) estaciona o carro em fila dupla, obstruindo a saída de outro veículo.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) pede diferentes pratos ao retornar ao mesmo restaurante.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) cede a casa para churrascos da empresa.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) procura um conhecido que trabalha no cartório para adiantar seu processo.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) mente em prol de um objetivo.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) inventa novas receitas quando tem poucas opções de comida em casa.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) segue o princípio: "Regras foram feitas para serem quebradas".	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) segura a porta quando outra pessoa se aproxima.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) está cansada na segunda-feira e liga no trabalho falando que está oente.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) mede as palavras para evitar conflitos.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a), sabendo que certa pessoa ligará em determinado horário, desliga o celular e diz que estava sem bateria.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) oferece ajuda aos colegas de trabalho.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) conversa durante uma sessão de cinema.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a), por vezes, não paga o condomínio no prazo determinado.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) sai da mesa do bar sem pagar a sua parte na conta quando esta deveria ser dividida igualmente por todos.	1	2	3	4	5	6
As pessoas se sentem queridas perto dele(a).	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) fala sobre as falhas de seus concorrentes a promoção no trabalho quando conversa com seus superiores.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) sempre cumprimenta o porteiro do seu prédio pelo nome toda vez que passa por ele na portaria.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ele(a) quer comprar uma roupa para usar no final de semana, mas ao ver a loja fechando, convence a vendedora a vender-lhe.	1	2	3	4	5	6

## Anexo 2 - Escala descontextualizada de Jeitinho Brasileiro

INSTRUÇÕES. Nesta parte do questionário, você deve se perguntar: "O que é importante nas minhas relações diárias? O que é preciso considerar ao tomar minhas decisões?" Desta forma, sua tarefa consiste em avaliar cada uma das características listadas abaixo sobre o quanto ela é importante para você nas suas relações cotidianas. Para tal, julgue de acordo com a escala fornecida.

Nada importante			Importante			Muito importante
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sorrir quando em contato com outras pessoas.							
Agir de acordo com o que cada situação pede.							
Cumprimentar as pessoas quando chega a algum lugar							
Ser uma pessoa agradável							
Mentir para conseguir algo.							
Manter sua meta mesmo que cause um possível dano a outros.							
Ponderar entre o benefício próprio e o prejuízo de outros.							
Agir de acordo com as normas do ambiente.							
Mentir para justificar uma falha.							
Compreender como é esperado que se comporte em um determinado ambiente.							
Ter jogo de cintura.							
Ser cordial.							
Tirar vantagem em tudo o que faz.							
Pensar em várias soluções para um problema							
Evitar causar prejuízos diretos a outros.							
Omitir informações para não se prejudicar.							
Fazer o que as pessoas consideram o correto.							
Seguir regras.							
Ser criativo.							
Minimizar os danos causados a outros quando decorrentes de minhas ações.							
Ser simpático.							
Ser esperto.							
Saber improvisar.							
Inovar.							
Pensar nas conseqüências de seus atos sobre outros							