Ethnic stereotypes and attitudes: A different mode of analysis[1]

John C. Brigham,[2] *Florida State University*

The concept of ethnic stereotype has received considerable research attention over the past 50 years While definitions of the term have varied considerably, most researchers seem to have viewed stereotypes as generalizations, concerning trait attributions, made about the members of an ethnic group A theme which recurs in most discussions of stereotypes refers to their undesirable nature—a stereotype is usually seen as a generalization which is, in some sense, undesirable

As a recent review has pointed out, however, there is little agreement as to just *why* stereotypes are undesirable (Brigham, 1971a). Commonly cited criteria for classing generalizations as (undesirable) stereotypes include: they are factually incorrect (e g , see Katz & Braly, 1935, Klineberg, 1951); they are products of a "faulty" or illogical thought process (e g , see Fishman, 1956), they are characterized by inordinate rigidity (e g., see Rokeach, 1960, Scott, 1965), they are derived from an inadequate basis of acquisition, such as hearsay (e g , Klineberg, 1951); they are consensual beliefs within a culture, perhaps implying a lack of individual thought (e g , Gardner, Rodensky, & Kirby, 1970), they serve a rationalization function for ethnic prejudice (e g , Simpson & Yinger, 1965), they ascribe to racial inheritance that which may be a cultural acquisition (e g , Brown, 1965, Campbell, 1967) and, they serve as justifications for prejudicial or discriminatory social practices. Another characteristic of the term *stereotype,* suggested by Brigham (1971a), is that it is part of

1 This research was supported by NSF Grant GS-29030 to the author Data analysis was also facilitated by NSF Grant GJ-367 to the Computing Center of Florida State University The author would like to express his appreciation to Leonard Adelman, Edward Donnerstein, and Linda Clark for their aid in the data collection and analysis A shorter version of this paper was presented at the meetings of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, 1972.

2 Requests for reprints should be sent to John C Brigham, Department of Psychology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306

observer language, that is, the term is usually applied to someone's belief (generalization) by someone else who is in some way observing the situation. In most stereotype research, these observers have been social scientists Thus, the criteria under which a given generalization is classified as a stereotype (or as a nonstereotype) will be those of the observing social scientist

Unfortunately, the methodology employed in most studies of stereotypes does not provide data relevant to *any* of the theoretical aspects of stereotypes listed above Most research investigations of ethnic stereotypes have utilized the paradigm developed by Katz and Braly (1933), wherein subjects are told to list those five traits which they feel are "most typical" of each ethnic group Data concerning "stereotypes" are then presented in terms of the percentage of subjects who attributed specific traits to specific ethnic groups. Typically, no stereotyping "score" of any kind is calculated for individual subjects.

This lack of a criterion for designating individuals' responses as stereotypes or nonstereotypes has resulted in a paucity of empirical data regarding the relationship between ethnic stereotypes and attitudes Concerning the related issue of the correspondence between general trait attributions and attitude, significant correlations have been found between the tendency to attribute some specific traits to Negroes and the racial attitudes of white subjects (Brigham, 1971a, 1971b, 1972). Similarly, significant correlations of .29 to 40 have been found between white individuals' "favorability scores"—based on the favorability of the five traits attributed to Negroes in the Katz-Braly paradigm, and overall racial attitudes (Brigham, 1972) However, scores denoting the degree to which a subject's trait attributions are similar to those of his peers (consensus) have shown no relationship whatsoever to attitudes toward the object group (Brigham, 1971a, 1972). Thus, although some specific trait attributions have been shown to be predictive of attitudes, previous research has not employed criteria which allow such trait attributions to be classed as stereotypic or nonstereotypic

In an attempt to find a common theme in conceptualizations of stereotype, Brigham (1971a, p. 31) focused on the criterion of *justification*. It was proposed that the concept of ethnic stereotype could best be defined as a generalization made about an

ethnic group, concerning a trait attribution, which is considered to be unjustified by an observer It is the observer's criteria of justifiability (involving, perhaps, assumptions of factual incorrectness, rigidity, basis of acquisition, role as a rationalization for prejudicial attitudes, etc.) which are used to determine whether a given trait attribution is considered a stereotype In the past, these criteria have often not been made explicit by social scientist observers

The present research is an attempt to operationalize this approach to the study of stereotypes. The major research questions asked were—when ethnic stereotypes are conceptualized in such a way, (1) what is the relationship between stereotyping and racial attitudes? (2) can evidence of an individual trait of stereotyping be found? and (3) are certain trait attributions particularly strong predictors of attitude and, if so, is this predictive power directly related to the affective tone of the traits involved? An additional research question concerned the possible use of a measure designed to tap the racial attitudes of whites as an estimator of the racial attitude of blacks That is, if a black subject is asked to fill out the instrument as he thinks the "typical white college student" would, will his response provide some evidence of the black subject's own racial attitudes? Will those blacks who see whites as having the most negative racial attitudes be the same subjects who feel the most negatively toward whites?

One way of creating standards of justifiability would be for the present researcher to simply decide a priori which trait attributions are to be considered unjustified and hence stereotypes However, an attempt was made to go beyond this approach and to obtain standards of justifiability set by the subjects themselves Standards for justifiable trait attributions for each trait were obtained from 3 different samples The means by which these sample standards were obtained will be described below. To provide evidence as to the generality of such standards, three samples of subjects—white college students, black college students, and rural, noncollege Southern whites, were used It was expected that these samples would differ greatly in racial attitude, in trait attributions made and, perhaps, in the range of attributions seen as justified for someone else to make. Data concerning stereotypes and the research questions outlined above could therefore be

compared using differing criteria for the designation of stereotypes, if differences between the 3 samples in standards of justifiability occurred as expected In addition, one set of standards created by the researcher was employed This involved selecting trait attributions most often classed as stereotypes by previous researchers The specific trait attributions employed will be discussed below.

The two types of trait attribution data (own attributions and range of attributions seen as justified) were gathered for responses to three object groups—Negroes, white Americans, and Germans The first 2 object groups were hypothesized to be of considerably greater personal importance to members of all 3 samples than was the third object group (Germans). Results of previous research would suggest that there would be considerably greater intersample agreement in trait attributions to Germans than to the other 2 object groups

Method

Instruments Three instruments were administered to all subjects The first, called Own Attributions, asked subjects to circle the percentage (on a row of percentages ranging by tens from 0 through 100) of object group members who "have" each of 30 listed traits or "are like that" Subjects were asked to perform this task separately for three object groups—Germans, white Americans, and Negroes These particular 30 traits were selected on the basis of results obtained by Karlins, Coffman, and Walters (1969) and Brigham (1971b) which indicated that they were particularly relevant to trait attributions made to these 3 groups. Instructions were "slanted" (see Brigham, 1971b) to encourage the making of generalizations. Thus, the first portion of the instructions read as follows

> We know that people from different ethnic groups, races, and nationalities are brought up in different types of childrearing situations, social and cultural surroundings, and family traditions It seems reasonable to expect, therefore, that people from different groups will, on the average, possess quite different and unique patterns of traits and characteristics .

The second instrument asked subjects to circle the maximum and minimum percentage values which they would consider "reasonable" or "justifiable" for "*someone else*" to have circled This was done for

the same 3 ethnic groups and 30 traits per group Subjects could not look back to see what their responses to the first instrument had been

Finally, a racial attitude measure, a short form of the Multifactor Racial Attitude Inventory (MRAI) was administered This instrument is a measure of whites' attitudes toward blacks, which has been extensively validated throughout the country for use with college whites (Woodmansee & Cook, 1967, Brigham, Woodmansee, & Cook, 1973) Since this measure was developed to measure whites' racial attitudes, black subjects were asked to fill it out as they thought the "typical white college student" would Thus, for the black subjects, MRAI score could serve as an index of perceived white racial attitudes Black subjects were also asked to complete two Likert-scale items concerned directly with their attitudes toward whites (Black Affect) One item asked them to compare their feelings toward whites with their feelings toward blacks, while the other asked them to compare their feelings toward whites with the "average U S black's" feelings toward whites (Two identical items, reversed, appear on the MRAI for whites Responses to these 2 items correlated 68 with total MRAI score for white subjects in a previous study [Brigham, 1971b])

Subjects A total of 258 subjects completed these instruments One hundred fourteen black college students in a predominantly black university were tested, as were 86 white students at a predominantly white university in the same town in northern Florida. A total of 58 noncollege whites were tested from two small (less than 2,500 population) towns in southwestern Georgia These persons were members of two adult education reading classes in one town, and members of a civic group in the other town The noncollege sample differed greatly in age, educational level, and occupational level from the two college samples

Ratings of the favorability of each of the 30 traits were also obtained. The ratings were made on a 1 to 5 scale by a different sample of white college students ($N = 65$) at the same university from which the white college sample was taken [3]

3 It is clearly questionable whether trait favorability ratings obtained from white college students would be applicable to the trait attributions made by black college students and by rural, noncollege whites However, research suggests that such favorability ratings are more applicable across disparate samples than might be expected. In another study, Brigham (1971c) obtained trait favorability ratings on 38 traits, 22 of which were among the 30 traits employed in the present study These ratings were obtained from white and black schoolchildren in grades 6 and 11 in two racially segregated schools The mean correlation between the favorability ratings of the four samples, across the 38 traits, was 94 Furthermore, for the 22 traits common to that study and to the present study, the mean correla-

Procedure For all samples, subject anonymity was guaranteed Subjects first filled out the Own Attributions questionnaire, then the Others' Attribution form and, finally, the MRAI The college students received credit toward an introductory psychology research participation requirement, while the noncollege whites received no remuneration beyond an explanation of the purpose of the research.

Results

Sample differences As predicted, the 3 samples differed greatly in their responses to the racial attitude measure (MRAI) Scores on the MRAI range from 0 to 84, with a higher score denoting a more positive attitude toward Negroes Mean MRAI scores were 42.38 for the college whites and 18 12 for the noncollege whites ($t = 10\,92$, $p < 001$) In fact, only one of the 58 noncollege whites scored above the college whites' mean score

The college blacks, it will be remembered, were asked to fill out the MRAI as they thought that the "average white college student" would. (These "perceived" white racial attitude scores will be called PMRAI scores from this point forth) When black students filled out the MRAI under these instructions, the mean score was 26 42 This is significantly different ($p < 001$) from the means of both of the white samples, although it is closer to the mean of the rural, noncollege whites than to the mean of the college whites. The present data do not provide evidence concerning why this discrepancy exists. For example, it may be that black college students see white college students as more prejudiced than they really are. Or, it may be that the blacks perceive the whites' "real" racial attitudes very accurately, but that the college whites' scores in the present study were elevated by a desire to "look good" and to appear more nonprejudiced than they really were.

tion between the ratings of each of the four precollege samples and the present white college sample was 935

These results strongly suggest that, had trait favorability ratings been obtained from the black college and rural, white noncollege samples in the present study, they would have been extremely similar to those actually obtained from the white college sample It should also be noted, however, that these data do not provide evidence regarding possible changes in the perceived favorability of traits when they are attributed to members of a group seen as very different from one's own group

It can be hypothesized that when a black fills out a racial attitude measure as he thinks the "typical white" would, this provides indirect evidence of the black's own racial attitude. That is, blacks with negative racial attitudes may tend to see whites as more prejudiced or negative than blacks with positive attitudes would If this is the case, and if the two Black Affect questionnaire items described earlier can serve as a crude index of actual black racial attitudes, then blacks' PMRAI scores should be related to their scores on the Black Affect items To some extent, this was the case. Responses to the sum of the two Affect items showed a .25 correlation ($p < .01$) with PMRAI score. Thus, blacks who said (on the Affect items) that they saw whites negatively were significantly more likely to see the "typical white college student" as filling out the MRAI in a prejudicial manner

Also, as expected, the 3 samples differed considerably in their own trait attributions to "Negroes" and to "white Americans" For attributions to Negroes, the 2 white samples differed significantly ($p < .05$) in percentage circled for 15 of the 30 traits (using the Scheffé method for setting an appropriate F value for testing differences between all possible pairs of sample means, Winer, 1962, p 88). The college and noncollege white samples differed significantly from the black college sample in percentage circled on 18 and 20 traits, respectively. For 22 of the 30 traits, the mean percentage circled by the white college sample fell between that circled by the black college and the white noncollege samples Intersample differences in percentage circled were less pronounced for attributions to "white Americans," with the greatest difference found between the 2 college samples (16 traits significantly different), and the smallest difference occurring between the 2 white samples (6 traits significantly different) Intersample differences in attributions to Germans were smaller yet

Similar trends occurred concerning the mean limits of justifiability set for each trait by each sample. For others' attributions to "Negroes," limits set by the college whites most often fell between those set by the noncollege whites and by the college blacks Again, there was greater intersample agreement for limits for attributions to white Americans and to Germans. For the 90 sets of limits (30 traits $\times$ 3 object groups), there were only 2 cases in which the mean limits set by 2 of the samples showed

no overlap at all, in both cases these involved attributions to "Negroes."

According to the mean of the black sample it would be justifiable for "someone else" to circle from 51 to 79 percent for the percentage of Negroes who are ambitious; according to the means for the noncollege whites, the justifiable range would be from 20 to 50 percent Concerning the trait proud, mean minimum and maximum justifiable percentages for Negroes were 62 and 86 percent according to the blacks, but 27 and 57 percent according to the noncollege whites

In order that specific percentage circlings (which were made on a scale by tens) could be categorized as stereotypes or nonstereotypes, sample *median* limits of justifiability were calculated Table 1 presents the percent of median limits which were identi-

Table 1. Percent of traits ($N = 30$) for which the median standards (upper and lower limits of "justifiable" or "reasonable" percentage attributions) of the samples were identical

Comparison between	Negroes	White Americans	Germans
Black-College white	20 0	43 3	26 7
College white-Noncollege white	20 0	33.3	6 7
Black-Noncollege white	6 7	23 3	3 3

cal between 2 samples, across the 30 traits As can be seen, agreement was least between the noncollege whites and college blacks, while there was the most overall agreement with respect to white Americans In every case, the median limits produced by all 3 samples showed some overlap.

Stereotype-attitude relationship Table 2 presents the number of stereotypes of each ethnic group, according to the standards (median limits of justifiability) of each of the 3 samples; that is, the number of percentage circlings (of 30) per subject which were outside of the median limits As can be seen, in 7 of the 9 cases the smallest number of stereotypes were obtained from the sample whose standards were employed in the designation of justifiable limits. There were 3 cases wherein none of the 3 stereotype scores differed significantly, while in only one comparison

Table 2 Mean number of "stereotypes" per 30 traits—trait attributions outside the median limits of justifiability—according to the sample whose standards were employed (WRN = white rural noncollege, WC = white college; BC = black college)

Stereotypes	White rural noncollege	White college	Black college	Significance of differences* 1–2	1–3	2–3
Negroes, WRN standards	***8.76***	9 05	13 65	—	001	001
Negroes, WC standards	12.26	***9.63***	12 08	05	—	05
Negroes, BC standards	16 33	13 20	***10.61***	01	001	01
White Americans, WRN standards	***8.06***	8 21	11 29	—	001	001
White Americans, WC standards	8 86	***8 31***	10 72	—	—	.05
White Americans, BC standards	11 00	10 22	***11.02***	—	—	—
Germans, WRN standards	***10.97***	9 01	11 82	—	—	01
Germans, WC standards	9 19	***7 87***	***9.46***	—	—	—
Germans, BC standards	10.55	9 44	***8.28***	—	—	—

*Critical values of the *F* statistic were calculated by the Scheffé method for testing differences between all possible pairs of means

(stereotypes of Negroes according to the standards of the black college students) did all 3 samples differ significantly ($p < .01$) from each other. Viewed from a different perspective, the number of stereotypes was less when the standards of one's own group were employed than when standards of either of the other 2 samples were used, in 5 of the 9 comparisons.

Table 3 presents the correlational relationship between stereotyping score (number of stereotypes) and attitude toward blacks (for the white subjects), and between stereotyping score and perceived white racial attitude (PMRAI) and attitude toward whites (for the black subjects) Stereotyping score toward Negroes was significantly related to racial prejudice for the noncollege whites, regardless of whose standards of justifiability were employed. For black subjects there was a slight ($p < .05$) tendency for those who saw whites as more hostile (low PMRAI score) to express more stereotypes of Negroes and of white Americans.

For attributions to "Negroes" one further type of stereotype score was developed, based upon a combination of the justifiability criteria established by the subjects and the researcher's stan-

Table 3 Correlational relationships between mean stereotype scores (number of stereotypes) according to the standards of each of the 3 samples and attitude toward blacks (MRAI score), perceived white attitude toward blacks (PMRAI score), and black attitude toward whites (Affect score).

	White Rural Noncollege (WRN) ($N = 58$)	White College (WC) ($N = 86$)	Black College (BC) ($N = 114$)	
	MRAI	MRAI	PMRAI	Affect
Stereotypes of				
Negroes, WRN standards	—.41**	.31**	— 18*	— 09
Negroes, WC standards	—.50**	05	— 19*	— 12
Negroes, BC standards	—.42**	— 16	—.18*	— 11
Americans, WRN standards	—.24	19	— 22*	— 28*
Americans, WC standards	— 45**	.24*	— 23*	— 21*
Americans, BC standards	— 39**	22*	—.16	—.19*
Traditional (19 traits only)				
Negroes, WRN standards	—.38**	— 40**	— 11	— 04
Negroes, WC standards	— 44*	— 49**	— 08	— 03
Negroes, BC standards	— 33**	— 62**	.05	.03

*$p < 05$, **$p < 01$
Note —High MRAI, PMRAI, and Affect scores denote positive attitudes

dards for trait inclusion and directionality Only 19 of the 30 traits were used in the calculation of this score These were traits for which a stereotypic "direction" could be specified, that is, where it appeared likely to the researcher that a very high or unusually low percentage circled would be likely to be regarded as a "stereotype" as the term has often traditionally been employed as the cognitive component of a hostile attitude (see Karlins et al., 1969, Brigham, 1971b). While attributions which were outside of the median limits to either side had been utilized in all of the previous stereotype scores, for the "traditional" scores only those attributions outside the limits in the one specified direction were counted as stereotypes[4] For this "traditional"

4. For this "traditional" stereotyping score, a percentage circling was counted as a stereotype only if it was greater than the maximum median limit of justifiability for the following traits Athletic, Happy-go-lucky, Irresponsible, Lazy, Loud, Musical, Proud, Religious, Revengeful, Showy, Spend money unwisely, Superstitious, and Unintelligent In addition, a percentage circling was counted as a stereotype if it was less than the minimum median limit of justifiability for the following traits Ambitious, Efficient, Industrious, Intelligent, Progressive, and Scientifically-minded. Responses for the remaining 11 traits were not utilized in the calculation of directional stereotype scores

stereotype score, 7 of the 9 between-sample comparisons yielded significant ($p < .05$) differences. Regardless of whose standards were employed, the rural noncollege whites had the highest stereotype scores (see Table 3) Correlations between this "traditional" stereotyping score toward Negroes and the regular stereotyping score toward Negroes were significantly higher within the white noncollege sample ($r = .83$) than within the white college sample ($r = .57$, $z = 3.18$, $p < .01$) or the black college sample ($r = .34$, $z = 4.91$, $p < .01$).

This indicates that the use of the traditional score made less difference in stereotype scores of the noncollege whites than it did for the college whites and college blacks, i.e., the views of the noncollege whites were more in line with "traditional" stereotypes. As Table 3 indicates, the use of the "traditional" stereotype scores yielded significant negative relationships between stereotyping and racial attitude for both the college and the noncollege whites.

Stereotyping as a trait Those subjects who made a number of "stereotypic" circlings to one object group tended to do so to the other 2 object groups also For the black subjects the mean correlation between stereotype scores toward Negroes, toward white Americans, and toward Germans was .60. For the white college students the mean correlation was .56, whereas for the white noncollege sample it was .26 Therefore, those subjects whose responses were often "out of bounds" (according to the median limits) for one ethnic group tended also to have a number of responses out of bounds for the other 2 ethnic groups.

Salience of specific traits. Percentage circlings for trait attributions for Negroes over the 30 traits accounted for slightly over half of the variance of the whites' racial attitude scores (MRAI), according to stepwise multiple regression analysis. Multiple *R*'s for percentage circlings on racial attitude were .72 for the noncollege whites and .77 for the college whites, indicating that percentage circlings could account for 52 and 59 percent, respectively, of the variance of the whites' racial attitude scores Percentage circlings for Negroes also showed some relation to predicted racial attitudes of whites (PMRAI) for the black subjects ($R = .53$).

Although trait attributions to Negroes (percentage circlings)

on all 30 traits were able to predict racial attitudes with some success for the white subjects, inspection of correlations between specific trait attributions and racial attitude indicated that different traits served as the best attitude predictors for the two samples For instance, of the 6 traits attributed to Negroes showing the highest individual correlations (absolute value) with racial attitude for the white college sample, only one (Efficient) was among the 6 traits with the highest absolute correlations with racial attitude in the white noncollege sample.

When the 30 traits were ranked, within each sample, according to the magnitude (absolute value) of their correlation with racial attitude (MRAI), the resulting rank-order correlation between the two samples of whites was not significant ($r_s = 14$) Traits were also ranked within the black college sample, this time as attributed to white Americans, according to the magnitude of their correlation with attitude toward whites (Black Affect). These rankings showed no significant relationship to the trait rankings for either of the white samples in attributions to Negroes ($r_s = 17$ with the white college sample and $-.14$ with the noncollege white sample) These results suggest that not only may the same traits have quite different attitudinal salience depending on to whom they are attributed (to Negroes or to white Americans), but also that attitudinal salience differs greatly even when they are attributed to the same object group (Negroes) by different samples (i e , college and noncollege whites).[5]

It could be hypothesized that attribution of those traits which are extremely favorable or unfavorable would make the best predictors of attitude, while attribution of traits of a neutral or ambiguous nature would show no consistent relationship to attitude (cf. Fishbein, 1967). This hypothesis received no support in the present study, as far as attributions to Negroes were concerned. Ratings (on a 1 to 5 scale) of favorability of the 30 traits had been gathered from a different sample of college whites, as described earlier. The traits were then ranked according to the magnitude of absolute difference between the mean

5 A different picture emerges if the rankings are made with direction of difference from zero taken into account, i.e., wherein the largest positive correlation was given the highest rank, while the largest negative correlation was given the lowest rank Under this framework, rankings of the three samples were significantly interrelated ($r_s = 67$ to 70, $p < 01$ in all cases)

favorability rating and the (neutral) favorability scale midpoint. These rankings were then compared with the rankings in terms of correlation with racial attitude discussed above.

For attributions to Negroes by the two white samples, there was no significant tendency for traits extreme in favorability to show a stronger correlation with racial attitude Rank-order correlations were .13 for the white college sample and − 19 for the white noncollege sample When the same procedure was carried out for the black sample, this time utilizing rankings of the correlations between attributions to white Americans and Black Affect scores, a significant relationship was observed ($r_s = .54$, $p < .01$) Thus only for ratings of white Americans by blacks were traits extreme in rated favorability more strongly related to racial attitudes than neutral or ambiguous traits.[6] Some caution is advisable in the interpretation of these results since, as mentioned earlier, the trait favorability data do not provide evidence concerning possible changes in perceived favorability when traits are applied in a cross-racial context.

Discussion

This study investigated the relationship between stereotypes and attitude, when stereotypes were defined in terms of criteria set by 3 very different samples of subjects. This is in contrast to most earlier studies which have investigated the relationship between specific trait attributions and attitudes, without attention to any criteria which might serve to class specific attributions as stereotypes or nonstereotypes.

The data presented in Table 3 indicate a general correlational relationship between the number of stereotypes an individual expresses, and his racial attitude. However, the attitude-stereotype relationship differed considerably within the 3 samples. For the noncollege whites, number of stereotypes of Negroes and of white Americans was consistently and significantly negatively related to positive racial attitude (Table 3). But for the white

6 Again, if direction of differences from zero (correlations) and the scale midpoint (trait favorability ratings) were taken into account, relationships were much stronger Rank-order correlation between magnitude of correlation with attitude and favorability of the trait were 59 in the white college sample, 47 in the white noncollege sample, and .80 in the black college sample ($p < .01$ in all cases).

college sample little relationship existed, such correlations as were significant indicated a positive relationship between number of stereotypes and positive racial attitude For the black college students, the number of stereotypes of Negroes was related somewhat to perceived hostility of white attitudes (PMRAI), while number of stereotypes of white Americans was significantly related to perceived hostility of white attitudes (under 2 of the 3 sets of standards), and to expressed negativity toward whites.

When the criterion for the identification of stereotypes was shifted to include only specified traits, and only trait attributions "out of range" in one specified direction ("traditional" stereotypes), a different pattern emerged This time there was a significant positive stereotype-prejudice relationship regarding views of Negroes within both white samples

A finding of particular utility refers to the differential salience of specific traits as indicators of attitude Many researchers have utilized standard types of beliefs (such as those concerning trait attributions) as questionnaire items estimating the racial attitudes of different samples of whites The present data clearly indicate the dangers inherent in such a procedure—traits on which attributions are strongly related to attitude within one sample are not necessarily the same ones which predict attitudes well in another sample If one were to select salient traits on the basis of responses of white college students, for example, many of these traits would not be of great value in predicting the attitudes of noncollege whites

Results indicated a general tendency for the mean number of stereotypes to be smallest when the standards (criterion) of one's own group were employed. This tendency was strongest when Negroes were the object group, the tendency was neither particularly strong nor consistent with regard to attributions to white Americans and to Germans (Table 3) There was also a general tendency for individual differences within samples in number of stereotypes to be consistent, regardless of the object group involved This tendency was weakest within the white noncollege sample.

A relevant question is whether the use of stereotyping scores allows more powerful prediction of racial attitudes than does the use of trait attributions alone. As Table 3 indicates, number of

"traditional" stereotypes of Negroes (utilizing attributions of 19 traits) correlated from —.40 to —.62 with positive racial attitude (MRAI) in the white college sample An earlier study (Brigham, 1972) found correlations of —.29 to —.40 between favorability of the 5 traits assigned to Negroes under the Katz-Braly format and MRAI score. A third study employing white college students in the Rocky Mountain area (Brigham, 1971b), found a correlation of .40 between MRAI score and percentages circled for Negroes for the traits Intelligent and Irresponsible (inverted) Therefore, it appears the stereotype-racial attitude relationship found in the present study is of a slightly greater magnitude than the trait attribution–racial attitude relationship found in earlier studies.

It should be pointed out, however, that the validity or utility of the conceptual and methodological approach used in the present research is not dependent upon the magnitude of the stereotype-attitude relationship obtained. Certainly the theoretical interpretation of stereotypes presented earlier implies that the tendency to make such attributions would be related to general hostility toward the object group, at least when only attributions "out of range" in the negative direction are considered ("traditional" stereotype). But the strength and direction of the stereotype-attitude relationship are clearly mediated by whose standards are used in the designation of trait attributions and according to the sample of persons doing the attributing, as Table 3 indicates

The present data illustrate the dangers inherent in speaking of the stereotype of an object group, such as "the white stereotype of Negroes," which is thought to be indicative of a particular type of attitude In the first place, the traits most strongly attributed to Negroes differ considerably, depending on who is doing the attributing (e.g, college whites or rural, noncollege whites.) Moreover, in the present study there was found to be no significant relationship between rankings of traits according to their (correlational) power as predictors of racial attitude for college whites, and the same rankings of the traits for noncollege whites. Finally, the number of "stereotypes" an individual expresses as defined under the broad criteria suggested by Brigham (1971a) may be significantly negatively related to attitude toward

the object group in some groups of subjects (i e, noncollege whites and, to a lesser extent, college blacks) but not in other subject groups (i e, college whites).

One possible criterion of the justifiability of a trait attribution could simply be the negativeness of the trait attributed, i e, the more unfavorable the trait, the less justifiable it is to attribute it to an entire ethnic group. Such an orientation might be an expression of the "norm of humanheartedness" discussed by Harding, Proshansky, Kutner, and Chein (1969, p 5). If this orientation were adopted, then the present data would provide evidence for a straightforward attitude-stereotype relationship. the more stereotypes one expresses (under this norm), the more hostile his attitude toward that ethnic group is likely to be However, as one moves farther away from this simple criterion of stereotyping, the relationship between attitudes and stereotypes becomes more complex. The present results suggest that broad, all-encompassing theoretical statements about the relationship between social attitudes and stereotypes should be made only with great caution Similarly, since the stereotype-attitude relationship may differ according to subject characteristics (e g, educational level, ethnicity) and according to the definitional criteria used, assumptions as to the general psychological characteristics or functions of stereotypes are called into question For instance, assumptions that stereotypes serve a rationalization function for prejudice (e g, Simpson & Yinger, 1965) may apply to some samples and to some operationalizations of the term (i e, noncollege whites, "traditional" stereotypes), but it seems unlikely that such an analysis is relevant to the views of college whites, when stereotypes are defined in terms of the criteria used in this study. For theorists feeling that such a functional relationship is a necessary characteristic of stereotypes, the task is to develop a new conceptualization of stereotypes which, when operationalized, can yield data which bear directly on this theoretical question

Summary

The conceptualization of stereotype as a trait attribution which is considered unjustified by an observer was employed in this study. Subjects were asked to make trait attributions and to indi-

cate the range of attributions within which they would consider someone else's trait attribution to be "reasonable" or "justified." Three samples—college whites, college blacks, and rural noncollege whites, completed both tasks for thirty traits for each of three ethnic groups—Negroes, white Americans, and Germans. Subjects also filled out a scale of attitudes toward blacks. Black subjects were asked to fill out the instrument as they thought the "typical white college student" would.

Results indicated that the blacks' perceptions of the "typical" white student's racial attitude was closer to the expressed attitude of the rural noncollege whites than to the expressed attitude of the college whites. Stereotypes were operationally defined as trait attributions which fell outside of the median limits of justifiability set by the samples. Number of stereotypes of Negroes was significantly related to racial prejudice for the noncollege whites but not for the college whites. When the criterion for the designation of stereotypes was modified to include only certain traits and attributions out of range only in one specified direction ("traditional" stereotypes), number of stereotypes of Negroes was significantly related to negative racial attitudes in both white samples. Number of stereotypes of white Americans was slightly related to negative interracial attitudes within the black sample. Evidence for a trait of stereotyping was found, subjects who expressed large numbers of stereotypes toward one ethnic group tended to do so toward the other ethnic groups also. The efficacy of specific traits as predictors of racial attitudes when attributed toward Negroes varied considerably across the two white samples. In addition, predictive efficacy did not vary directly as a function of degree of favorableness of the trait.

The magnitude of the stereotype-attitude relationship found in the present study was compared with the trait attribution-attitude relationship found in earlier studies. The variations in the predictive power of specific traits across samples, coupled with the differences in the magnitude and even the direction of the attitude-stereotype relationship found in the different samples, depending upon the criterion of stereotyping employed, suggest that the general relationship between attitudes and stereotypes is not a simple one.

References

Brigham, J C Ethnic stereotypes *Psychological Bulletin*, 1971, 76, 15–38 (a)

Brigham, J C Racial stereotypes, attitudes, and evaluations of and behavioral intentions toward Negroes and whites *Sociometry*, 1971, 34, 360–380 (b)

Brigham, J C Views of white and black schoolchildren concerning racial personality differences Paper read at the meetings of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Detroit, 1971 (c)

Brigham, J C Racial stereotypes Measurement variables and the stereotype-attitude relationship *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1972, 2, 63–76

Brigham, J C, Woodmansee, J. J, & Cook, S W Dimensions of verbal racial attitudes Interracial marriage and approaches to racial equality Mimeographed paper Florida State University, 1973

Brown, R *Social psychology* New York The Free Press, 1965

Campbell, D T Stereotypes and the perception of group differences *American Psychologist*, 1967, 22, 817–829

Fishbein, M Attitude and the prediction of behavior In M Fishbein (Ed), *Readings in attitude theory and measurement* New York Wiley, 1967 Pp 477–492

Fishman, J A. An examination of the process and function of social stereotyping *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1956, 43, 27–64

Gardner, R C, Rodensky, R L, & Kirby, M Ethnic stereotypes A critical review University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology, Research Bulletin No 157, 1970

Harding, J, Proshansky, H, Kutner, B, & Chein, I Prejudice and ethnic relations In G Lindzey and E Aronson (Eds), *Handbook of social psychology* Vol 5 Reading, Mass Addison-Wesley, 1969

Karlins, M, Coffman, T L, & Walters, G On the fading of social stereotypes Studies in three generations of college students *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1969, 13, 1–16

Katz, D, & Braly, K Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1933, 28, 280–290

Katz, D, & Braly, K Racial prejudice and racial stereotypes *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1935, 30, 175–193

Klemberg, O The scientific study of national stereotypes *International Social Science Bulletin*, 1951, 3, 505–515

Rokeach, M *The open and closed mind* New York Basic Books, 1960

Scott, W. A. Psychological and social correlates of international images In H C Kelman (Ed), *International behavior A social psychological analysis* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965

Simpson, G E, & Yinger, J M. *Racial and cultural minorities*, rev ed New York. Harper and Row, 1965

Winer, B. J *Statistical principles in experimental design* New York McGraw-Hill, 1962

Woodmansee, J J, & Cook, S W Dimensions of verbal racial attitudes Their identification and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1967, 7, 240–250

Manuscript received January 3, 1972