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ABSTRACT

The present study includes a critical evaluation of the traditional stereotype literature as well as an argument in support of a broader definition of the term. It contains a discussion of the appropriateness of the adjectival check list and the open-ended response format as research instruments. A preliminary model of the stereotype formation process is outlined and the method, results, and conclusions of a stereotype formation study are presented.

The commonly espoused definitions of stereotypes as being either overgeneralizations, consensual beliefs, or rigid and irrational substitutes for thought were shown to be logically weak and to suffer from many of the limitations inherent in Lippmann's (1922) original conceptualization. A broader perspective was advocated in which stereotypes were defined as being social concepts which differ from other concepts in that they can include personality terms as well as terms referring to non-social, physical characteristics. As such, stereotypes were considered to be concepts about groups and individuals, the performers in the social environment. In discussing the nature of stereotypes, the distinction was made between personal stereotypes, the concepts in our heads, and cultural and social stereotypes, which are socio-cultural rather than psychological phenomena.

Additionally, it was argued that, although they are the most frequently reported data, check list characterizations may not be appropriate
analogues to the spontaneously produced personal stereotypes that are used by individuals in the course of their daily lives. The core components of these personal stereotypes, in that they are based on recall, are better measured by unstructured, open-ended instruments. Check lists, on the other hand, serve as indexes of those terms which we are prepared to endorse after they have been brought to our attention in the course of conversations and social activities. Consequently, check lists, because they are based on recognition rather than recall, provide a sample of the peripheral elements of stereotype characterizations.

The point was made that in order to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the contents and structure of stereotypes it is necessary to use a combination of an open-ended and a modified check list procedure when conducting research.

Further conceptual analysis indicated that a comprehensive account of the stereotype formation process requires at least two models, one defining the variables which govern the development of stereotypes about targets possessing clear cultural definitions, and the other delineating the form of individuals' more general "stereotype formation strategies." The second part of this thesis focusses on a preliminary, three-step model of the general, rule-governed stereotype formation process.

The model postulates that: individuals use available information to construct demographic profiles of culturally undefined targets; attribute particular "world views" and value systems to the targets on the basis of the inferred demographic characteristics; and then make trait ascriptions on the basis of their inferences about the targets' general perspectives, using reference group norms as their judgemental
anchors in the process.

The influence of "world view" variables on the stereotype formation process was examined in an experiment which employed information about a target's characterization of the respondents' salient reference group as an independent variable.

Three versions of an audiovisual documentary about the Orkney Islanders were constructed and shown to groups of Canadian sea cadets. Sixty-seven respondents saw a control film containing a general description of the Islanders' way of life, sixty-eight saw a modified version of the film which included "examples" of the Islanders' "highly unfavourable stereotypes of Canadians," and fifty-eight were presented with a positive reciprocal script in which the Islanders were described as characterizing Canadians very favourably. The film scripts were balance with respect to length, organization, and the polarity of the reciprocal stereotype information.

A post-film questionnaire was administered, and free response and check list instruments were used to measure the respondents' newly formed stereotypes one week after the presentation of the stimulus materials.

The findings determined that the respondents made inferences about an unfamiliar target group's stereotypes of their own national group in the absence of definite information about the nature of these "reciprocal stereotypes;" that reciprocal stereotype information was attended to when it was included in a documentary script about the Orkney Islanders; and that the characteristics of the personal stereotypes varied (1) as a function of the type of reciprocal stereotype information presented in the stimulus materials, and (2) in
relation to the manner in which this reciprocal stereotype information was construed by the respondents. The characterizations of the positive reciprocal group members were more favourable and more differentiated than those of the negative reciprocal respondents. Moreover, there was more agreement among the individuals in the positive reciprocal condition than among the members of the negative reciprocal group concerning which particular traits could be considered to be characteristic of the Orkney Islanders. The stereotypes of the non-reciprocal respondents fell between those of the positive and negative reciprocal group members on all of the measured dimensions.

The implications of these results were discussed and refinements to the general stereotype formation model were suggested.
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A CONCEPTUAL AND EMPIRICAL STUDY OF ISSUES
IN STEREOTYPE RESEARCH: SOME REFLECTIONS ON
THE DEFINITION AND MEASUREMENT OF STEREOTYPES,
AND AN EXPERIMENT ON RECIPROCITY AND
STEREOTYPE FORMATION

For the past fifty years the study of stereotypes has been a major
topic in the field of social psychology. Yet during that time little
hypothesis testing research has been produced and the amount of information
gathered concerning the psychological and sociological variables affecting
the formation and maintenance of stereotypes has been minimal. Rather, the
majority of the studies have been descriptive in nature and, by and large,
researchers have restricted themselves to defining those sets of character­
tistics which the members of particular sample groups most frequently
attribute to various national, socio-economic, and ethnic targets. The
almost total concern with descriptive rather than hypothesis testing
research is due, in part, to the lack of adherence to a general and
clearly defined theoretical orientation. It is due, also, to a widespread
and uncritical adoption of the adjectival check list as a research instru­
ment. The present study deals with some of the issues related to the
definition and measurement of stereotypes and, in addition, it reports an
experiment which tested a preliminary hypothesis concerning the role played
by reciprocity in the stereotype formation process.
This thesis will be organized into three parts. The first part will include a discussion of the limitations of the existing theoretical perspectives in the field, as well as an argument in support of a broad definition of stereotypes (Chapter 1). It will also contain a discussion of the appropriateness of the adjectival check list as a research instrument (Chapter 2). In the second part, the conceptual basis for the stereotype formation experiment will be presented (Chapter 3), and the method (Chapter 4), results (Chapter 5), and implications (Chapter 6) of the study will be outlined. The final part of the thesis will contain a brief overview of the conceptual and empirical sections (Chapter 7).
PART ONE

ON THE DEFINITION AND MEASUREMENT

OF STEREOTYPES
CHAPTER ONE: STEREOTYPES: A FURTHER LOOK AT LIPPMANN'S INFLUENCE ON THE FIELD AND A CONCEPTUAL REORIENTATION

1. Stereotypes and the Individual

Traditional Perspectives

The empirical framework provided by the pioneering studies of Katz and Braly (1933, 1935) has served to highlight the central features of Lippmann's psycho-sociological treatise on stereotypes and has functioned to define these notions as important topics of interest within the field of prejudice research. Following in the Katz and Braly tradition, a large body of social scientists has asked numerous groups of respondents to select and star the five or ten words in a list of seventy or more that they considered to be most characteristic of each of a set of ethnic, occupational, or socio-economic targets. Other researchers have modified the basic procedure to some extent, but, in all cases, when the responses have been tabulated the investigators have typically found that their subjects displayed a high level of agreement in the ascription of specific, unfavourable characteristics to particular minority racial groups and to unfamiliar, unpopular, and hostile nations (e.g., Dudycha, 1942; La Piere, 1936; Simmons, 1961).

For example, in the initial Katz and Braly study one hundred Princeton undergraduates labelled Negroes as being superstitious, lazy, happy-go-lucky, and ignorant, among other derogatory traits. With the notable
exception of studies by Karlins, Coffman, and Walters (1969) and Maykovich (1971, 1972), this pattern of ascriptions has continued to re-emerge in the vast body of research that focuses on stereotypes toward American Blacks (Gilbert, 1951; Hartsough and Fontana, 1970; Sigall and Page, 1971). Indeed, the characterization is a general one and is not subscribed to solely by white Anglo-Saxon Americans. There is evidence to demonstrate that, in the past at least, some Blacks have accepted this image of themselves (Bayton, 1941; Bayton and Byoune, 1947), while respondents in India, Lebanon, Great Britain, Pakistan, Taiwan, Canada, and Australia have held similar negative stereotypes (Hicks, Goldman, and Kang, 1968; Prothro and Melikian, 1954; Signori and Butt, 1972; Stanley, 1969).

The negative content of such characterizations has caused many researchers and textbook writers to endorse the proposition that stereotypes act merely to justify faulty perceptions, unrecognized hostility, dogmatism, and ethnocentrism (Katz and Braly, 1933, 1935; Saenger and Flowerman, 1954; Simpson and Yinger, 1965). As Brown (1958) and Brigham (1971) have stated succinctly, the predominant mood of the field is one which conveys the strong impression that stereotyping is wrong.

They [the researchers] think that it is at least irrational and probably wicked to subscribe to them ..... (Brown, 1958, p. 364)

However, while moral indignation continues to be expressed over the prevalence of stereotyping, there seems to be little overall agreement concerning the precise nature of stereotypes, or concerning those features of stereotypes that are of the greatest theoretical significance. Most
of the speculation and commentary that has taken place in the field, however, falls more or less within the confines of three major research trends.

One central claim has always been that stereotypes are overgeneralizations, which may be either invalid or ill-defined, but which are, in any case, unjustifiable according to some criterion (see Brigham, 1971). Supplementing this orientation is a perspective which considers stereotypes primarily to be consensual beliefs that are shared in common by the majority of the members of a particular group (e.g., Gardner, 1973). A third viewpoint, which also has received substantial support, blends the former notions into a more extreme synthesis. In terms of this latter position, stereotypes are depicted as being rigid and irrational substitutes for thought which are borrowed by a great many people from "cultural misinformation" and "traditional nonsense" (Hayakawa, 1950).

Although each has been widely subscribed to, these theoretical orientations have, in turn, been subjected to criticisms which have served to define their basic shortcomings and inadequacies (e.g., Brown, 1965; Fishman, 1956; Gardner, Rodensky, and Kirby, 1970).

**Some criticisms of traditional assumptions**

The question concerning the overgeneralizability of stereotypes is a difficult one to approach, the moreso because it can revolve around either of two very different and unclearly defined assumptions.

On the one hand, there is a presupposition that well-developed criteria are available against which to evaluate the justifiability or
unjustifiability of the contents of each particular stereotype. More often than not, however, it is difficult to generate the required criteria.

Additionally, there is a suspicion among some researchers (cf. Campbell, 1967, for a good summary) that when people attribute a characteristic to a group as a whole (given, for example, that we are considering a stereotype of a particular national, regional, or occupational group) they may also automatically ascribe the characteristic to every individual within that group. If this is the case, then indeed any stereotype would be an overgeneralization because, obviously, not every group member shares the same set of traits and personal qualities. However, stereotypes are not necessarily used in this way.

A stereotype of any particular group is a collective concept. It refers to general group characteristics in a manner that goes beyond basic individual differences. Cultural anthropologists have argued for long that this form of discourse is in order.

Consequently, the claim that stereotypes per se are overgeneralizations is a non-sequitur until at least two conditions have been met. The first of these involves the development of appropriate criteria to indicate that in broad terms any selected stereotype is an overgeneralization. The second condition requires a conclusive demonstration that most people, if not all, commit the logical error of using class-specific stereotypes as unqualified descriptions of the many individuals with that class.

The debate surrounding these issues is a complex one and a satisfactory solution to it is elusive. For example, Brigham's (1971) attempt to clarify the "overgeneralization claim" and to make it more theoretically
acceptable has, itself, been the target of substantial criticism by Gardner and his colleagues (Gardner, Rodensky, and Kirby, 1970).

The proposition that stereotypes are consensual beliefs is an appealing one. Supporting examples can readily be pointed to. Nevertheless, the closer one approaches the concept the more nebulous it becomes, at least from a psychological standpoint. To say that a belief is consensual is to say merely that the believer shares in the general agreement between the members of his reference group. It is not to make any comment about the psychological processes underlying the particular belief, nor about the relationship of that belief to others within the individual's cognitive system. Indeed, it follows from the proposition at hand that a person's belief may be a stereotype from a North American point of view, for example, but an odd and idiosyncratic concept from a European perspective. Thus, in order to consider the notion of consensus as being fundamental to a definition of stereotypes one must adopt a sociological rather than a psychological focus and consider stereotypes only in relation to specific groups in specific contexts. This severely restricts the generalizability of conclusions concerning both the process of stereotyping and the nature of stereotypes. Such limitations would seem to add to rather than alleviate the conceptual confusion that now threatens the field.

The further issue, concerning the supposedly irrational, and rigid and inflexible nature of stereotypes is, perhaps, the one that is most easily dealt with. In his early and comprehensive critical scrutiny of the literature, Fishman (1956) provided what is still the best cautionary argument against the unquestioned acceptance of the rigidity thesis. The
general implication of this perspective is that stereotypes remain fixed and completely unchanged over time. However:

In any study of whether B's views of A remain the same over time, we must consider (a) whether the information reaching B concerning A has remained the same or not, (b) whether B (his needs, motives, interests) has remained the same or not, (c) whether A has remained the same or not, and (d) whether the interaction of B with A has remained the same or not. (Fishman, 1956, p. 37)

Fishman contended that it is only when at least one of these factors has changed, without a related change in B's outlook toward A, that one can properly infer stereotype rigidity.

Yet, social changes due to war (Haque, 1968, 1969; Meenes, 1943; Sinha and Upadhyay, 1960a, 1960b), and even the shore furlough of the Seventh Fleet of the U.S. Navy (Prothro and Melikian, 1955), have induced alterations in the stereotypes of different samples of respondents. Furthermore, Gilbert (1951) and Karlins, Coffman, and Walters (1969), replicating the early Katz and Braly (1933) study with new generations of Princeton undergraduates, have noted changes in the content of stereotypes over a timespan of thirty-five years. They attributed such changes to shifting social patterns of interaction and to oscillating value systems. These findings effectively counter the proposition that all stereotypes are invariably rigid. They also reinforce Fishman's point that in any longitudinal study "we must be careful to distinguish between constancy of stereotyping and rigidity of stereotypes (1956, p. 38)."

As one considers the various criticisms that can be directed against each of the three theoretical-definitional perspectives the question arises
as to why, despite the weight of contradictory arguments and research findings, these viewpoints continue to be adhered to. The answer lies partially in the examples of widespread prejudice that are to be found in the early stereotype studies of Katz and Braly (1933, 1935), Bogardus (1950), and La Piere (1936). It can be found also in the direction provided by Lippmann's (1922) original and commonly cited speculations on the nature of stereotypes.

Lippmann's discussion of stereotypes

The context  Immediately after the first World War a number of social commentators, including Walter Lippmann, published detailed analyses of twentieth century western lifestyles. For his part, Lippmann adopted a Platonic stance. He used a "neo-Res Publica" model of the state as a framework for his analysis of post-war social structures. His conclusions were outlined in the many-faceted thesis that is contained within the pages of Public Opinion, first published in 1922.

Not surprisingly, Lippmann felt that a combination of overwhelming technological development and role specialization was characteristic of an urban and industrial way of life. More importantly, however, he argued that individuals living in such a milieu could no longer hope to maintain a general, inclusive focus on current events. The danger, according to Lippmann, is that the loss of a broad perspective facilitates the misrepresentation of reality and leads to the distortion of one's own perceptions, goals, needs, and intentions. He identified these errors as being the unrecognized sources of contemporary strife, suffering, and bitterness.
In outlining the problems of modern life Lippmann also prescribed a remedy. He urged the establishment of groups of specialists who could act as advisors, guides, and resource persons for those people who formulate and implement public policies. These social interpreters were to be no mere civil servants. Rather, from Lippmann's description they were supposed to be an elite corps of intellectuals possessing most of the characteristics of Plato's 'philosopher-guardians.'

The pseudo-environment and stereotypes Lippmann approached the question of the misrepresentation of reality and the distortion of perceptions by fusing Plato's doctrine of ideal forms with Berenson's (1897) conception about the role art plays in providing us with 'stereotyped' features through which we can make sense of the world.

He suggested that each individual possesses a pseudo-environment which acts as a buffer between the core-self and the outside world. This pseudo-environment can be likened to the Platonic world of form in that it embodies a fixed and ideal representation of the physical world of ever-changing mundane appearances. As such, it has the interpretive function of unscrambling and filtering the unstable overload of information that comes from the environment at large. The structure of this pseudo-environment was represented as a series of set, standard, picture images, or stereotypes. These stereotypes supposedly act as familiar forms through which new occurrences and novel stimuli are assimilated, accommodated, and given meaning.

The course of Lippmann's discussion about the nature and function of stereotypes was determined largely by the framework of his broader socio-
political thesis, a framework which incorporates a conceptual reorientation of considerable significance.

On a sociological level, Lippmann argued that political and journalistic censorship, the individual's occupational and social roles, and a host of other environmental factors, all serve to limit the amount, type, and accuracy of the information he obtains about his social world. Since such social distortion can result in misunderstandings and bad judgement, he called for the establishment of panels of experts (political scientists) to better control the veracity and flow of information. In other words, he believed that a body of 'interpreters,' 'quality controllers,' and 'repairmen' was needed to rectify the existing faulty patterns of communication.

Building upon his argument, however, Lippmann also paid attention to the way in which individuals process the information they receive from the world at large. As he did so he seemed to ignore the distorting features which he felt to be inherent in the social environment. Rather, he presented the environmental milieu in relatively neutral terms as being merely "too big, too complex, and too fleeting for direct acquaintance (Public Opinion, 1961 ed., p. 16)." In contrast he stressed the point that individuals are inadequately equipped to deal with the variety of subtleties which surround them. Lippmann considered that each person's interpretation of the world, through the medium of his or her pseudo-environment, could be nothing but a simplified version of the actual state of affairs. He went on to surmise that "at the level of social life, what is called the adjustment of man to his environment takes place through the
medium of fictions (1961 ed., p. 15)." Fictions which can range "all the way from complete hallucination to the scientists' perfectly self-conscious use of a schematic model (1961 ed., p. 16)," but which are, in all cases, reconstructions of the environment.

There were at least two important consequences to such a conclusion. By asserting that individuals themselves can misrepresent and oversimplify their social reality Lippmann strengthened his argument in favour of the establishment of advisory panels of experts. At the same time, his particular focus ensured that his further discussion of stereotypes would emphasize their more negative features. Indeed, in terms of the general framework of the essay, he treated stereotypes as the antitheses of the informed and accurate perceptions of his 'political scientist advisors.'

According to Lippmann, then, the stereotypes within our pseudo-environments determine that the evidence which infringes upon our senses is "subject to illusions of defence, prestige, morality, space, time, and sampling (1961 ed., p. 154)." In other words, our reality testing is inadequate. He argued, further, that because stereotypes are so well set, and because the underlying environmental reality is in such a constant state of flux, "there is always a situation in which the stereotypes and the facts part company (1961 ed., p. 111)."

These strongly stated postulates contain the kernel of moral indignation that is so characteristic of much of the later writings on stereotypes. In turn, the examples that Lippmann employed to illustrate his basic argument contain the seeds of each of the three major research orientations.
To a large extent they were based on war anecdotes and, because of this, they were often gross overgeneralizations which were less than rational in addition to being highly consensual.

It has been difficult, because of this firmly established legacy, to give adequate consideration to those stereotypes which may be favourable (e.g., Hudson, 1968, 1970) and flexible (e.g., Dudycha, 1942; Seago, 1947), and which may contain a "kernel," if not more, of truth (e.g., Abate and Berrien, 1967; Schuman, 1966).

Indeed, in order to do so one must first attend to the arguments against the use of one or all of the "overgeneralization," "irrational," and "consensual belief" perspectives as the sole criteria for defining stereotypes. Additionally, one must question the adequacy of a neo-Platonic perspective which assumes that non-specialists, and particularly non-academic non-specialists, are cognitively inept.

In view of the widespread research emphasis on negative stereotypes it is ironic to note that Lippmann, himself, made reference to the value of a broad, general orientation toward the field. As we have seen, however, the constraints of his socio-political thesis prevented him from pursuing any issues that did not bear directly upon the undesirable facets of the stereotyping process.
Stereotypes as "social" concepts

From a broad perspective which encompasses complimentary and non-committal as well as derogatory characterizations, stereotyping can be seen to be a psychological process which is at least as much functional as it is dysfunctional. Stereotypes order the social environment of the individual into a coherent system or systems. They allow a person to verbalize and to conceptualize about his feelings toward the target of the stereotype, to mentally rehearse expected social episodes, to reanalyze previous encounters, and, in specific instances, to adopt what he considers to be a suitable behavioural orientation. Thus, the socially adjusted individual may employ stereotypes which conform closely to the (generally agreed upon) dimensions underlying social reality, while the more prejudiced person may, indeed, use stereotypes in much the same manner as Lippmann and his adherents envisaged.

In essence, then,

stereotypes should properly be regarded as concepts ... with positive as well as negative functions, having the same general kinds of properties as other concepts, and serving to organize experience as do other concepts,

(Vinacke, 1957, p. 229)

Stereotypes can be distinguished from other concepts, not because they suffer from any moral or logical inadequacies, but rather because they incorporate personality trait terms as well as terms pertaining to non-social, physical characteristics (Vinacke, 1957). This defines them as concepts which are specifically social in nature.

According to this definition, then, any group or individual in the socio-cultural environment can become the target of a stereotype. In
addition, stereotypes can refer to role and personality descriptions that may be filled, at least potentially, by a person or a group of people. Thus one can hold a stereotype about Canadians, Southern Baptists, Charlie Chaplin, a good (or a bad) member of parliament, and a team of heart surgeons, for example.

On the other hand, one's concept of England is not a stereotype. The term encompasses not only the perceived characteristics of a national group, but also features of the terrain, classes of flora and fauna, aspects of the natural resources, and so forth. It is too inclusive a concept to be a stereotype. For similar reasons one cannot have a stereotype about fascism, a particular set of political ideologies, but one can have a stereotype about fascists, the adherents to this ideology.

In sum, the proposed definition of stereotypes encompasses the full range of individuals' concepts of the various people and groups which have existed, do exist, or can potentially exist in the social environment. It does not refer to conceptualizations of the values, institutions, and environmental settings which form a framework for, and a backdrop to, the social interactions of these people and groups.
Implications of the "social concept" definition of stereotypes

There are a number of advantages to be gained from adopting this broad definition of stereotypes.

Fundamentally, the definition makes explicit what has tacitly been assumed since the early work of Rice (1926), Litterer (1933), and Katz and Braly (1933): Namely, that stereotypes refer specifically to performers within the social environment.

It also raises the possibility that this set of concepts differs from others not only in its potential to incorporate personality items into its descriptive lexicon, but also in terms of a number of structural properties such as clarity, permeability, and the inclusion of uncommon and idiosyncratically used words.

More importantly, however, it releases researchers from the efforts involved in defending and bolstering overly restricted perspectives which are more complementary than antithetical. By so doing, it allows them to expend greater energies on distinguishing between different classes of stereotypes, and upon isolating the processes underlying, and the characteristics defining, these classes.

For instance, one can explore the situational and personality correlates of those (favourable and unfavourable) stereotypes which are open-textured, flexible, and sensitive to changes in environmental conditions, as well as those which are closed and resistant to modification. Similarly, one can attempt to isolate the variables which determine whether or not stereotypes are formed from uncommon and idiosyncratic items, or from consensual and widely subscribed to terms. One can also
work toward marking those features, if any, which distinguish between concepts of roles and character types and those of 'real' and familiar people, between concepts of groups and those of individuals, and between the concepts of targets that we "know about" (Kelvin, 1970) and the concepts of targets we 'know through personal experience.'

In addition, when considering the issues pertaining to stereotype formation and to the conditions and manner in which stereotypes are used and acted upon, the general perspective offered by the present definition readily allows one to attend to related areas of research concerning impression formation, attribution theory, and the structure of cognitive dictionaries and semantic memory.

Yet, whatever new avenues of research may be developed, one can safely predict that the traditional focus upon faulty and inaccurate stereotypes will continue to command strong interest. After all, these characterizations readily stand out from others as potential threats to the harmony of social interactions. One can expect, too, that the standard practice of using groups rather than individuals as target stimuli will be maintained.

Indeed, it would be surprising if these research interests were not continued, since it was the attention given to such longstanding issues which was responsible for the establishment of the stereotype field in the first place.
2. Stereotypes and Social Groups

To this point in the discussion we have followed Lippmann's example and treated stereotypes specifically as psychological entities, as those conceptual profiles through which we make order out of our experiences and social encounters. Yet, although he did not acknowledge the fact, there were at least two levels on which Lippmann treated stereotypes as strictly sociological phenomena. It is worth pursuing these lines of thought further, since the failure to distinguish between the different types of stereotypes has, in its turn, resulted in some conceptual confusion within the field.

Cultural Stereotypes

Researchers who accepted Lippmann's propositions found it difficult to imagine that 'rigid,' 'oversimplified,' and 'prerational' stereotypes could be the products of quite normal cognitive processes. Rather, there was general agreement that stereotypes were borrowed, ready made, from the commonly available "pictures" that are embedded in the media, in folklore, and in other purveyors of popular culture (e.g., Hayakawa, 1950). Consequently, those writers who failed to concede that there was more than one "genus" of stereotype equated the stereotypes that can be found in sources such as newspapers, literary works, and political propaganda with those that are a part and parcel of people's cognitive systems. (Eysenck and Crown (1948) were notable exceptions to this rule.)

The stereotypes that are contained in the media and the arts are free-floating in the sense that they do not depend upon any one individual
or sub-cultural group for their existence. Although they have been created by various high-status opinion generators (e.g., journalists, politicians, social critics, and tribal elders) they have become dis-associated from these people in the process of being projected into the prevailing 'world view.' In being assimilated into the social heritage these stereotypes take on a distinctly cultural form. That is, they can be considered and discussed without reference to any particular person's system of beliefs and values. The news media 'portraits' of groups such as the I.R.A. and the P.L.O. are particular examples.

People may borrow all or part of the content of these cultural stereotypes in forming their own particular concepts of a target. Nonetheless, whatever the similarity in content, cultural stereotypes, as social entities, are logically different from the personal stereotypes (Secord and Backman, 1964), or mental entities, which may be modelled on them.

Dwelling further on this distinction, it becomes clear that there are many possible instances in which a personal stereotype may have nothing in common with its cultural 'counterpart' (or counterparts). As a matter of fact since only a limited set of individuals and groups ever achieve social recognition, there are numerous cases where personal stereotypes are formed in the absence of any cultural "picture." We may have a well-defined concept of our high-school, music-freak friends, but it is unlikely, unless of course they became famous, that we could find a description of the group in any of the repositories of cultural information.
Generally speaking, then, it is only when a target has achieved some measure of social recognition that we can expect to find one or more cultural counterparts to an individual's personal stereotype. Furthermore, we can expect to find marked similarity between cultural and personal stereotypes only when the individual's experiences with the targets correspond closely with the experiences of the opinion generators responsible for producing the cultural stereotypes.

Whether we agree or disagree with them, however, the cultural stereotypes to which we most readily attend are those which receive a wide measure of support. They are the ones that relate to the experiences of a broad section of the population. Because of this, they are highly visible in the media and the arts. When they fail to be of relevance to the community at large they disappear. They either cease to exist, as is the case in pre-industrial societies founded on an oral tradition, or, as is the case in technological societies, they become lost in manuscript and archival collections to be sought out only by historians and other like-minded academics.

Social Stereotypes

When we speak about cultural stereotypes receiving a wide measure of support we return, once again, to the question of consensus.

It is often the case that when a particular target receives a great deal of public attention reference groups play an important part in the way people structure and interpret the available information (Diab, 1962). For example, immediately before Richard Nixon resigned from the Presidency
of the United States the American population was sharply divided between those who supported the pro-impeachment lobby and those who supported the anti-impeachment group. Different cultural stereotypes of Richard Nixon (and the presidential role) emerged from each of the two "camps."

Depending upon their position in the debate, people referred to and borrowed from one or the other of the contrasting sets of cultural stereotypes in the process of forming, or articulating, their own personal stereotypes of Richard Nixon. Indeed, there was a great deal of agreement between the anti-Nixonites with respect to their personal stereotypes of Nixon, just as there was between the pro-Nixonites.

If an investigator had used the traditional methodology of stereotype research, had selected a sample of 'pro-impeachment' people, and had asked each one in turn to characterize Richard Nixon he would have found that there were a number of words which frequently reoccurred in the various descriptions of the target and which seemed to form a 'summary picture' of the group's beliefs about Nixon. The summary picture, in outlining the general group perspective, would have defined the "social norm" for describing the target (cf. Karlins, Coffman, and Walters, 1969, p. 3). Because of the degree of cohesion among the group, this social stereotype (Secord and Backman, 1964) would have borne a marked similarity to the relevant cultural stereotype(s) and to the personal stereotypes from which it was abstracted.

Thus, the summary pictures provided by social stereotypes can be quite useful when discussing groups' perspectives as well as their orientations toward each other.
It must be remembered, however, that social stereotypes do not take account of the uncommon and idiosyncratic elements of personal stereotypes. Indeed, the attributes which any one individual considers to be most characteristic of a particular target may not be represented at all in the cluster of most popular responses. Furthermore, even when there is some relationship between the components of a personal and social stereotype the degree of overlap may not be extensive.

It becomes clear, therefore, that there can be marked differences among social stereotypes with respect to how well they encompass and represent the personal perspectives of all of the members of the respective sample groups.

For instance, a group may focus sharply on one target but not pay a great deal of attention to another. The group members would be exposed to a highly visible set of cultural stereotypes and would share in common a great many experiences pertaining to the first target, and, as a result, the social stereotype would likely be sharply defined and would reflect the general agreement among the individuals within the group. However, the group members would have neither a common orientation toward the second target nor a salient cluster of cultural stereotypes from which to borrow information. Their personal stereotypes would grow out of their often limited and very different experiences with the group or individual in question. Consequently the social stereotype, reflecting this lack of communal focus, would be vague and weakly defined.

The structure of social stereotypes can be affected not only by the intensity of the group focus on the target but also by the type of group
from which they are derived. The individuals in two different groups, for example, may hold equally strong personal stereotypes about a target but one social stereotype may be much more ambiguous and less consensual than the other as a function of the group composition. For example, the members of one group may be a great deal more heterogeneous than those of the other with respect to their personal characterizations of the target. Thus, the social stereotype of Nixon derived from a group of Nixon's Orange County supporters would be much more clearly defined than one derived from a random sample of Americans who could be counted upon to subscribe to a wide variety of political and social views.

In short, some social stereotypes are more likely than others to mirror their personal (and cultural) counterparts. As a consequence, one must be careful not to treat every one of them as if they were equally precise, equally representative, and equally useful summary pictures of the personal stereotypes of group members. This is particularly so in the case of samples drawn from such arbitrary populations as introductory psychology students.

Taking account of these cautionary arguments, however, we can attend to the favourableness of the listed characteristics and to the frequency with which they were employed, and, in a less exact sense, use social stereotypes as general indexes of the consensus between group members concerning their characterizations of, and attitudes toward the specific targets.

When social stereotypes are used in this sense one can consider the traits listed to be examples of the types of terms that one could expect
to find in the personal stereotypes of many of the individual group members. Social stereotypes, then, are unlike their personal and cultural counterparts in that the latter are 'real' social and psychological entities while the former are research-created metaphors.

Cultural and social stereotypes as a context

When we discuss cultural and social stereotypes we not only confront some definitional issues which have caused problems in the past but we also provide a broad sociological context for the study of personal stereotypes.

Indeed, interest in personal stereotypes lies just as much in exploring their environmental determinants as it does in elaborating upon their structural properties. To this end it is important to determine the ways in which personal stereotypes are influenced by group norms and other social variables, and the extent to which they reflect the prevailing cultural climate and conform to the related concepts of individuals within the same social groups.

The analysis of cultural and social stereotypes can help in the achievement of these goals.

For example, by mapping the cultural stereotypes of a particular national group one can determine which social targets, both within the group and without, receive a great deal of attention at any particular time. One can also obtain a historical perspective on the changes in national outlook and the changes in cultural stereotypes that have occurred over specific time periods. Curtis (1971) has done this admirably in the case of the changing Victorian cultural stereotypes of the Irish.
In addition, by looking at the way cultural stereotypes cluster, complement each other, and are antithetical to each other one can get a sense of the values and opinions of the various sub-cultural groups which enter into the debate over the representation of specific targets. The Vietnam War era in the United States, for instance, provides many examples of conflicting cultural stereotypes which grew out of considerable social discord.

Social stereotypes can be used to add a further dimension to this framework of representations. As the previous discussion has indicated, when carefully constructed they can reflect the amount of agreement between, and the general orientation of the members of well-defined, sub-cultural groups in characterizing specific targets.

Broadening the perspective of stereotype research to allow a simultaneous consideration of personal, social, and cultural stereotypes will have a number of desirable consequences. It will require the development of comprehensive, interdisciplinary models that can encompass research findings from a wide variety of sources. It will provide a necessary social context for research and in so doing will permit the testing of hypotheses which could not adequately be addressed in a laboratory environment. Finally, because of the emphasis on context, it will help to determine whether the processes involved in stereotyping are specific to local settings, as Thorngate (1975) suggests most social psychological processes might be, or whether there are invariances in the stereotyping process which reliably reoccur in different social settings in different historical periods.
Summary

Traditionally, stereotype studies have fallen squarely within the framework of prejudice research. In so doing they have tended to cluster around three major theoretical orientations which depict stereotypes as being either overgeneralizations, consensual beliefs, or rigid and irrational substitutes for thought. Although these viewpoints can be criticized for having too limited a perspective they continue to maintain their popularity and to be widely subscribed to.

The general orientation of the stereotype field has grown out of the writings of Walter Lippmann (1922). He argued, within the context of a broad political thesis, that stereotypes are fixed and prerational images in our heads which can serve to distort our perceptions and cause us to make erroneous interpretations of our social world. His illustrative examples contained the seeds of each of the "overgeneralization," "prerational," and "consensual belief" perspectives which have dominated the field subsequently.

Thus, it is only by taking account of the limitations of Lippmann's political points, by challenging his neo-Platonism, and by attending to the arguments directed against each of the three major theoretical orientations, that one can begin to get a sense of the more inclusive framework which can serve to encompass and lend new directions to stereotype research.

From a broad perspective stereotypes can be defined as social concepts which differ from other concepts in that they can include personality terms as well as terms referring to non-social, physical characteristics.
(Vinacke, 1957). In essence, then, they are concepts about groups and individuals, the performers in the social environment.

When discussing stereotypes one must be careful to distinguish between personal stereotypes, which, as concepts in our heads, are psychological entities, and cultural and social stereotypes.

Cultural stereotypes are those characterizations which are embedded in the media and other sources of cultural information, while social stereotypes are research-generated indexes of the consensus between sample group members concerning their characterizations of, and general orientation toward specific targets.

If used appropriately, cultural and social stereotypes can provide a rich social context for the study of personal stereotypes. The interdisciplinary perspective that such a research approach would require may produce some fruitful insights into the general process of stereotyping.

* * *
CHAPTER TWO: MEASURING INSTRUMENTS AND STEREOTYPE RESEARCH

The adjectival check list: Some problems

A variety of structural (e.g., Brigham, 1973; Gardner, Kirby, Gorospe, and Villamin, 1973; Tanaka, 1965), semi-structured (e.g., Bjerstedt, 1960), and open-ended (e.g., Cahalan and Trager, 1949; Lambert and Klineberg, 1959; Reigrotski and Anderson, 1959) measuring instruments have been introduced into the field of stereotype research in order to determine which characteristics people employ when describing particular social targets. The adjectival check list (e.g., Katz and Braly, 1933) has always been the most widely used of these techniques. Thus, respondents in stereotype studies are typically asked to choose from a list of seventy-five or more traits those terms which they think best characterize the group or individual in question.

Despite its popularity as a research tool the adjectival check list procedure has not escaped critical attention. Indeed, subjects themselves were the first to raise objections, and Bjerstedt (1960), Eysenck and Crown (1948), and Gilbert (1951) are among those who have reported that many of their respondents voiced reservations about, or even refused to complete the check list tasks on the grounds that they were irrelevant and meaningless. Taking note of these criticisms, some researchers have surmised that the words in any particular check list may not be ones that the subject is familiar or comfortable with (e.g., Duijker and Frijda, 1960).
Others have pointed out that it is often very easy for subjects to provide what they know to be socially desirable responses (e.g., Gilbert, 1951; Sigall and Page, 1971), to respond even when they have no particular views on the subject (Brown, 1965; Eysenck and Crown, 1948), and, perhaps, to provide edited versions of media portraits and other cultural stereotypes which do not conform to their own personal viewpoints (e.g., Eysenck and Crown, 1948).

In short, there is an undercurrent of opinion which suggests that the characterizations produced from check lists (and other structured stereotype-eliciting tasks) may not be good approximations of those used by individuals in the course of their normal everyday lives.

The appropriateness of stereotype measures

It may be presumed that in the process of stereotyping, a person carries out a memory scan for appropriate words and phrases with which to describe the target. From this short list of salient items he chooses those which he finds most relevant to a description of the personality and social characteristics of the group or individual under consideration. This is the case whether the terms are favourable or unfavourable; and whether they are idiosyncratic, resulting from his unique experiences with the target in question, or borrowed from the cultural definitions of which he is at least marginally aware. The individual's particular characterization may vary somewhat from social setting to social setting, but, in any case, the list of items that he provides is recalled from the pool of trait terms in his cognitive dictionary.
Consequently, check lists can produce stereotypes which mirror those normally used by people only in so far as they contain trait items that are salient to the respondents and that are commonly used by them. The extent to which this degree of relevance is built into any particular list is a matter for empirical determination. Yet, on an intuitive basis, one must suspect that the items in check lists do not overlap to any great extent with the terms within individuals' cognitive dictionaries. It is easy, for example, to imagine a situation in which respondents are forced to substitute a word as an approximate alternative to a preferred term which does not appear in the provided list of seventy or more items. Still more probable is the implicit reaction: "I didn't think of that word but, by golly, it sure does describe the group. I must check it."

In both cases such traits are listed on the basis of recognition rather than recall. The more they predominate among individuals' responses the greater will be the qualitative differences between check list stereotypes and those produced in naturalistic settings.

Because they can be based so heavily on recognition, check list characterizations do not seem to be the appropriate analogues of spontaneously produced stereotypes. Rather, they appear to be more similar to those representations which we readily endorse as extensions of our own personal stereotypes after they have been brought to our attention in the course of conversations, lectures, and other information generating activities.

Indeed, stereotypes which are freely produced in natural social settings are better measured by techniques which require the recall rather
than the recognition of descriptive terms. Although they are seldom used, the open-ended procedures, such as unstructured interviews and free response paper and pencil tests, would seem to fill this requirement.

Relevant research findings

If structured and unstructured stereotype tasks do indeed reflect different psychological processes they should produce markedly different research findings. There is evidence to indicate that this is the case.

Ehrlich and Rinehart (1965) found that American undergraduates who had been asked to characterize six national groups with a check list employed a greater number of words than respondents who had been asked to use an open-ended format. They found also that the check list respondents achieved a much higher level of interpersonal agreement concerning the assignment of specific characteristics to particular targets than did the free response subjects. Furthermore, the open-ended task yielded a greater variety of trait terms with which to describe the national groups than did the structured task, and in all, only 13% of the reported trait descriptors emerged in common from both measuring formats.

These findings were corroborated by McTiernan (1973) in a study that employed a repeated measures rather than a between groups design. He asked a sample of Irish students to characterize eight national and subnational groups from the British Isles using both measuring instruments. Once again, there was a much greater degree of consensus between respondents in choosing check list characteristics with which to portray the groups than in describing them in their own words. Once again, too, each
of the eight pairs of check list and free response social stereotypes (Secord and Backman, 1964) offered complementary rather than common portraits of the targets. In addition, the personal stereotypes derived from the structured instrument were not only considerably more differentiated than those obtained from the open-ended format, they were also, generally speaking, more favourable.

However, not only did the data from the structured and unstructured measuring techniques convey very different impressions concerning the differentiation, favourableness, and content of the personal stereotypes, they also allowed for very different decisions to be made concerning the similarities and differences between the characterizations of the various targets. For instance, the check list data indicated that the personal stereotypes of two of the four subnational targets were more highly differentiated than those of the remaining two groups. Yet, the free response data yielded no such finding. Similarly, the check list personal stereotypes of the four national groups did not differ with respect to their favourableness, although some of these targets were portrayed less favourably than others on the open-ended format.

Core and peripheral stereotype components and their measurement

The findings of the McTiernan (1973) and Ehrlich and Rinehart (1965) studies form a particularly solid body of evidence to support the hypothesis that different processes predominate in people's responses to check list and open-ended stereotype tasks.
Elaborating upon the contention that the free response characterizations are based on recall and the check list stereotypes are founded, to a great extent, on the recognition of pertinent traits, one can argue that the open-ended format taps the core components of individuals' personal stereotype systems while check lists provide a sample of the peripheral elements.

As previously indicated, however, check list responses can contain core elements of personal stereotypes in addition to peripheral components. Thus, in their traditional form, check lists do not provide an uncontaminated representation of those traits which are on the periphery of a person's concept about a target. For them to more clearly reflect the peripheral elements of personal stereotypes it is necessary, as a matter of procedure, to compare check list responses with those previously obtained on an open-ended format and to eliminate all of the checked items which already appear among the free response characterizations.

Implications of a revised measuring procedure

The implications of the conceptual and empirical distinction between the core and peripheral components of personal stereotypes seem clear.

The traditional check list research has not provided a complete account of the content and structure of personal and social stereotypes. By failing, in large measure, to account for the core components of stereotypes it has presented us with a considerable mound of data which is more intuitively appealing than psychologically valuable. Indeed, as Brigham (1971) and others have indicated, it has been difficult to
delineate the relationships between personal stereotypes and general attitudes and behaviour. It may well be that these difficulties have arisen, not because the relationships do not exist, but rather because the measuring instruments did not focus on the central and most relevant components of stereotypes.

By attending more closely to the core components one can provide a more balanced picture of the content of personal and social stereotypes, and, at the same time, one may more readily be able to integrate and to relate stereotype research to the findings in other areas of social and cognitive psychology: A policy advocated by Taylor and Aboud (1973) and currently being implemented by Aboud (1976).

The emphasis on open-ended research formats that is necessitated by such an orientation, and their use in conjunction with appropriate structured instruments, is not without methodological problems. The homogeneity of variance assumption can easily be violated, for example, and this can offer some statistical difficulties when working with unequally sized samples (cf. Petrinovich and Hardyck, 1969). However, the practical as well as the theoretical advantages of this extended measuring format compensate for these complications.

Furthermore, when used on their own, free response techniques by their nature are highly portable instruments. They can readily be used in situations other than classrooms and social psychology laboratories. Sun (1976) has found, for example, that unstructured stereotypes elicited over the phone are comparable to free response characterizations collected under more traditional conditions. By extending the use of such formats
to factories and streets, to picket lines and community meetings, one can go a long way toward reintroducing the notion of context to stereotype research. It is, after all, in just such situations that stereotypes may be expected to mediate in the processes of attribution, social perception, and interpersonal behaviour.

Summary

Despite the introduction of numerous measuring instruments to the field, the adjectival check list continues to be the most widely used technique in stereotype research. However, a number of criticisms directed against the procedure have raised the possibility that check list characterizations may not be appropriate analogues of the stereotypes used by individuals in the course of their everyday lives.

The issue revolves around the argument that freely produced stereotypes are based on recall, while check list stereotypes are based on recognition and, as such, are the products of a different psychological process. From this assumption one can further contend that freely produced stereotypes are better measured by unstructured, open-ended instruments, while check list characterizations can usefully serve as indexes of those representations which we are prepared to endorse as extensions of our own personal stereotypes after they have been brought to our attention in the course of conversations and other social activities.

Indeed, research evidence indicates that free response and check list procedures convey very different impressions concerning the favourableness, differentiation, and content of personal stereotypes. They also allow for
very different decisions to be made concerning the similarities and differences between the characterizations of the various targets. Such findings add support to the assumption that responses to structured and unstructured stereotype tasks are governed by different psychological processes.

Since they are based on recall the open-ended measuring procedures can be said to tap the core components of personal stereotypes. On the other hand, check lists, which are founded on recognition, provide a sample of the peripheral elements of stereotype characterizations.

Thus, in order to obtain a more complete understanding of the nature and contents of personal stereotypes it is necessary to use a combination of an open-ended and a modified check list procedure. This form of instrument has many advantages, not least being its adaptability for easy use outside of classroom and laboratory settings.

* * *
PART TWO

KNOWLEDGE OF THE TARGET'S CHARACTERIZATION

OF THE RESPONDENTS' NATIONAL GROUP AND

THE STEREOTYPE FORMATION PROCESS
CHAPTER THREE: A PRELIMINARY HYPOTHESIS CONCERNING 
RECIROCITY AND STEREOTYPE FORMATION

Historically, stereotypes have been treated in static rather than
dynamic terms. Researchers have been interested primarily in defining
their contents and little systematic work has been conducted to determine
the variables that govern their growth and development.

Stereotype formation and the social context

Workers who have addressed the question of stereotype formation have
generally followed Lippmann's (1922) example and have focussed upon the
influence of the social environment. It has been argued, for instance,
that information about social targets is obtained largely from hearsay
and gossip (Klineberg, 1964), from the mass media (Tanaka, 1972; O'Hara,
1961), and from the school environment (Fishman, 1956; Stillwell and

Each of these assertions is founded on the more general observation
that cultural and subcultural reference groups project well-established
"social norms for describing recognized groups of persons" (Karlins,
Coffman, and Walters, 1969, p. 3). Indeed, such norms can exert consider­
able influence on individuals when they stereotype particular targets
(e.g., Avigdor, 1953; Diab, 1962; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, and Sherif,
1961) and their influence is especially evident in the responses provided
by children who have been asked to describe various ethnic and national
groups.
It has been demonstrated repeatedly that children as young as four or five are aware of group differences (Clark and Clark, 1947; Goodman, 1952; Radke, Trager, and Davis, 1949), that by six or seven they are capable of characterizing target groups with trait terms, although not with any great degree of consensus (Lambert and Klineberg, 1959), and that as they grow into adolescence the amount of interpersonal agreement increases and their stereotypes become more and more similar to those of the adult community (Blake and Dennis, 1943; Gardner, Taylor, and Feenstra, 1970; Kirby and Gardner, 1973).

**Psychological processes and the development of stereotypes**

These developmental changes in the content and structure of personal stereotypes can be accounted for by at least two processes, each of which involves social learning.

As children become familiar with the general rules of social interaction they learn which set of trait terms are commonly associated with which particular targets (e.g., Blake and Dennis, 1943; Kirby and Gardner, 1973; Pettigrew, 1966). However, associative learning of this sort is restricted to those instances where stereotyped targets possess clear cultural definitions.

Consequently individuals must also acquire general, open-ended "stereotype construction" strategies which are capable of accommodating a broad range of novel as well as familiar stimuli.

The acquisition of a differentiated trait lexicon is essential to the development of these strategies. In addition one must learn the
cultural rules for associating traits, for classifying targets, and for attributing particular trait clusters to specific targets on the basis of the classificatory criteria.

It can be assumed that these cognitive operations are learned during the period in which individuals acquire the basic skills of social interaction and interpersonal behaviour.

A considerable body of information has already been obtained about the nature of the various classificatory and associational rules (cf. Cook, 1971).

For example, the manner in which individuals emphasize, combine, and organize traits within their "implicit theories of personality" has been explored extensively (e.g., Asch, 1946; Wishner, 1960; Bruner, Shapiro, and Tagiuri, 1958; Koltuv, 1962; Lay and Jackson, 1969; Norman, 1966). Research has also identified many of the social and quasi-social markers, from physique, the use of make-up, and gaze to sex, nationality, culture, and religion, that are frequently used to identify and distinguish between individuals and groups (e.g., Strongman and Hart, 1968; McKeachie, 1952; Kendon and Cook, 1969; Ellis and Bentler, 1973; Katz and Braly, 1933; Jones and Ashmore, 1973; McTiernan, 1973). Furthermore, stereotype studies have indicated the types of trait clusters that are associated with targets identified solely on the basis of information such as age, sex, nationality, race, and socioeconomic status (e.g., Sun, 1976; Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel, 1970; Karlins, Coffman, and Walters, 1969; Brigham, 1971; Feldman, 1972). They have determined also that when targets are defined in more complex terms some of the category labels (for example,
the occupation, social mobility, and role items) carry more weight than others (for example, the race and geographic variables) in shaping the form and structure of the elicited stereotypes (e.g., Aboud and Taylor, 1971; Aboud, Taylor, and Doumani, 1973; La Gaipa, 1971; Feldman, 1972; Feldman and Hilterman, 1975; Taylor, Bassili, and Aboud, 1973).

A preliminary model of the stereotype formation process

This broad set of research findings provides us with a foundation for speculating upon specific strategies that individuals may employ when forming stereotypes.

The evidence concerning the use of category labels suggests that our initial response to a social target may be to build as complete and specific a demographic profile of it as possible.

We achieve a degree of specificity with respect to complex stimuli by weighing some pieces of information about the targets more heavily than others. Our weighting criteria are determined in part by the socio-cultural context in which the targets are being evaluated (e.g., Aboud, Taylor, and Doumani, 1973). They are reflected also in our personal rankings of the relative importance of the various category labels (cf. Feldman and Hilterman, 1975).

In those instances in which the target is defined in general and simplistic terms we elaborate upon our profile by attributing additional category labels to the stimulus group or stimulus person in question (e.g., Bayton, McAlister, and Homer, 1956; Kelvin, 1970). La Gaipa (1971), for example, demonstrated that respondents readily associate particular
occupations with different ethnic groups, and they do this, very often, with a substantial amount of interpersonal agreement.

Having classified targets demographically we then proceed to attribute trait clusters and personality terms to them.

Kelvin (1970) has noted that many of these descriptive terms refer to particular attitudes (e.g., tradition loving, superstitious) as well as to behaviours (e.g., industrious, talkative), and general dispositions (e.g., intelligent, impulsive). The use of such attitude terms, especially the more specific items like "loyal to family ties" and "extremely nationalistic", indicates that the respondents are aware of, or at least can estimate in a general sense, many of the beliefs, values, and perspectives of the target groups or target persons.

On a priori grounds it seems most probable that inferences about, or an awareness of targets' social orientations and world views occur subsequent to their being classified demographically and prior to their being stereotypes with trait terms. This suggests that individuals' impressions of a target's general views of the world may be important mediating variables in the stereotype formation process. Indeed Rokeach, Smith, and Evans (1960) have argued, for example, that black Americans have traditionally been the victims of prejudice and derogatory characterizations not because of their race per se but rather because their beliefs were assumed to be dissimilar to those of whites.

Incorporating the arguments of the previous paragraphs into a three-step model we can hypothesize that as a first step toward forming their own personal stereotypes individuals construct demographic profiles of
targets. They then associate particular world views and value systems with these profiles, and subsequently generate what they consider to be appropriate sets of trait-attitude-behaviour attributions on the basis of these inferences about the targets' social perspectives.

It can be assumed further that individuals will employ the outlooks and orientations of their own salient reference groups as judgemental anchors when evaluating the perspectives and attitudes of the various targets to which they attend.

The research problem

In order to test this model it is important to determine the types of value and general world view dimensions that may prove to be highly salient in the stereotype formation process.

It is then necessary to establish: (1) whether or not individuals make inferences about targets' positions along these dimensions in the absence of relevant information, (2) whether or not information about targets' positions along these dimensions is attended to when embedded within the context of more general profiles of the targets in question, and (3) whether or not such information influences the form and structure of the emergent personal stereotypes.

Some of the dimensions that may be focussed upon by individuals when making inferences about targets' social orientations have already been defined by research. Predictably these include such salient variables as religious belief and political perspective (e.g., Rokeach, Smith, and Evans, 1960; McTiernan, 1973; Jones and Ashmore, 1973).
In addition, person perception studies have isolated another variable which may play a significant role in the stereotype formation process.

Work on interactions in dyads and groups has indicated that respondents' reactions to target persons were greatly influenced by their perceptions of how these target persons viewed them in return (e.g., Tagiuri, Blake, and Bruner, 1953; Tagiuri, 1958; Secord and Backman, 1964).

Moreover, individuals can readily, and in some cases accurately estimate the types of stereotypes held by the members of different ethnic, age, and national target groups about their own particular ethnic, age, and national reference groups (e.g., Kaplan and Goldman, 1973; Sun, 1976; McTiernan, 1973).

Thus the relationship between individuals' "perceptions of how others feel toward them and their own feelings for others" (Tagiuri, Blake, and Bruner, 1953, p. 585) may generalize to instances in which groups rather than individuals are being characterized; and the content and structure of respondents' stereotypes of target groups may be determined in part by their perceptions of the targets' characterizations of their own salient reference group (or groups).

The present study was designed to address this latter proposition and to explore the functional relationship between the development of respondents' stereotypes toward an unfamiliar target group and their perceptions of how this target group characterizes their own national reference group.
By exposing individuals to one of three versions of a documentary presentation about a previously unknown group, the Orkney Islanders, it was possible to answer the following questions: Will respondents make inferences about the Orkney Islanders' stereotypes of their own national group in the absence of definite information about the nature of these "reciprocal stereotypes"? Will such information be attended to when it is included in a documentary script about the Islanders, and will it affect the form and structure of the core and peripheral components (see Chapter 2) of the newly developed stereotypes?

In sum, will the relationship between the respondents' personal stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders and their estimates of and information about the Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of their own national group be such that we can support the general proposition that: An individual's inference about a target's characterization of his most salient reference group acts as a mediating variable in the stereotype formation process?

In keeping with the findings and recommendations of previous stereotype and person perception research, the core and peripheral components of the experimentally created stereotypes were examined in terms of their favourableness, their degree of differentiation, and their degree of commonness (cf. Brigham, 1971; Tagiuri, 1958).

Social stereotypes were formed from the words which occurred most frequently in the respondents' characterizations (cf. Karlins, Coffman, and Walters, 1969). These provided examples of the types of words that were most often included in the personal stereotypes.
Additionally, since the stimulus materials included a detailed description of the target group it was considered potentially instructive to determine the degree of overlap between the stimulus material characterizations and the respondents' personal stereotypes.

Summary

Experimental findings as well as age-related developmental evidence suggest that the contents and structure of individuals' stereotypes are determined in great measure by reference group norms.

For instance, in those cases in which there are clear group definitions of targets, individuals acquire their stereotypes through a straightforward process of social learning. Additionally, individuals depend largely on group-defined, trait association and target identification rules in order to form "stereotype construction" strategies that will permit them to characterize novel and unfamiliar stimulus persons and stimulus groups.

Little is known about the nature of these stereotyping strategies. However, an examination of relevant research yields a preliminary three-step model of the general stereotype formation process. The model assumes that: individuals construct demographic profiles of targets, associate these with particular world views and value systems, and generate what they consider to be appropriate sets of trait attributes on the basis of these inferences about the targets' social orientation. One further assumption is that individuals use their salient reference groups as judgemental anchors when forming stereotypes in this fashion.
Person perception studies indicate that individuals' perceptions of how a target characterizes their own reference group may be one such "world view" variable which mediates in the stereotype formation process. The present study was designed to explore this hypothesis by providing answers to the following questions: Will respondents make inferences about an unfamiliar target group's (the Orkney Islanders) stereotypes of their own national group in the absence of definite information about the nature of these "reciprocal stereotypes"? Will such information be attended to when it is included in a documentary script about the Orkney Islanders, and will it affect the form and structure of the core and peripheral components of the newly developed stereotypes?

On the basis of previous research findings it was decided to examine the experimentally formed stereotypes in terms of their favourableness, their differentiation, their degree of commonness, and their inclusion of descriptive terms contained in the stimulus materials.
CHAPTER FOUR: METHOD

Overview

Three experimental conditions were established by pairing a film about life on the Orkney Islands with each of three versions of a tape recorded, documentary passage. The basic passage contained an account of the history, economic activities, and lifestyle of the people, in addition to a description of the Islanders which was built around twenty preselected, neutral trait words (non-reciprocal condition). The other two variations of the documentary script included information concerning the manner in which the Orkney Islanders "characterize Canadians". This information replaced nonessential "padding" material from the original script. The Islanders were described as viewing Canadians very favourably in the positive reciprocal stereotype condition, and twenty positive attributes were used as examples of traits which were frequently assigned to Canadians. Alternatively, in the negative reciprocal stereotype condition the Orkney Islanders were described as viewing Canadians very unfavourably. The negative antonyms of the positive traits were used in this condition. The film-tape sequences lasted for twenty-four minutes each - the length of a short TV programme.

Each version of the documentary was shown to a different group of respondents. The sequences were presented as rough copies of a film which was being prepared by the social science departments at the University of British Columbia for use in their adult education courses. The task of
each group of respondents, as it was explained to them, was to evaluate and suggest improvements on a preliminary version of the film so that the final edition could be structured to fit the students' and general viewers' interests as well as the teachers' needs. The individuals were asked to watch the film and listen to the taped soundtrack carefully, and then to assess the merits and shortcomings of the presentation on a questionnaire, which was distributed at the end of the viewing period. The questionnaire included items relating to the respondents' first impressions of the target group.

There was a one week interval between the presentation of the stimulus materials and the measurement of the newly formed stereotypes. This time gap was planned in order to facilitate the organization and consolidation of the relevant information within the respondents' personal stereotype systems. The specific length of the interval was determined by the practical considerations involved in convening and reconvening the experimental participants.

In order to provide a general context for the stereotyping task the respondents were led to think that the second testing session was part of an extensive research project concerned with obtaining norms on the manner in which Canadians characterize a wide variety of social groups, and on the way in which Canadians think other groups view them. The emphasis on the Orkney Islanders as a target was explained as being only incidentally related to the previous week's film session.

Thus, until the final debriefing, every effort was made to ensure that the respondents believed that they had participated in two distinct experiments.
The participants in the study were volunteer cadets from the National Sea Cadet Camp at H.M.C.S. Quadra, Comox, B.C. One hundred and ninety-three respondents completed all stages of the experiment. Fifty-eight saw the positive reciprocal film, sixty-seven saw the non-reciprocal documentary, and sixty-eight were shown the negative reciprocal film.

One week after they had been exposed to the stimulus materials and had completed the post-film questionnaire the respondents were recalled to the "field laboratory" and asked to complete a four-part stereotyping task using a free response as well as a check list instrument.

The participants were required initially to characterize Canadians, Orkney Islanders, Germans, and Arabs in their own words and then to repeat the task while playing the role of an Orkney Islander. In addition they were asked to rate each of the terms that they had listed on a nine-point favourableness scale. Finally, the entire free response sequence was repeated with the adjectival check list format.

The order of presentation of the targets was randomized within each of the four sections of the task.

The check list contained the twenty positive, neutral, and negative trait words that were included in the stimulus materials, as well as fifteen other words that were selected from the Karlins, Coffman, and Walters (1969) adjective list.
Stimulus materials

1. The film-tape sequences

The Orkney Islanders were chosen as a suitable experimental target for a number of reasons. The group was unfamiliar enough that it could safely be assumed that few of the respondents, if any, knew anything about it. At the same time it was relatively easy to build plausible documentary scripts from information contained in a number of accessible sources. Indeed since the islands and the inhabitants played a historic role in the early economic and social development of Canada it was possible to establish links between the Orcadians and Canadians without introducing a note of artificiality into the stimulus materials. Finally, but of the utmost importance, suitable film footage about life on the islands could be located.

a. The film

A twenty-four minute film, *Bank Ahead* (1967), portraying the lifestyle and habitat of the Orkney Islanders was borrowed from the university's Instructional Media Centre and used as the visual focus of the study.

The film traced the daily activities of a bank cashier and a seaman who worked together on a bank boat which serviced the financial needs of the outlying island communities. It dwelt at length on the interactions between the banker and the islanders and it reflected the social as well as the economic functions of the floating banking service. More general passages were juxtaposed with the bank boat scenes. These provided
background details about the islands' terrain, the agricultural foundation of the Islanders' lifestyle, the various small export-oriented industries (e.g., whiskey distilling and salmon smoking), and the business and social life in Kirkwall, the major town on the main island.

b. Primary script

The basic script was constructed from information obtained from Encyclopaedia Britannica (1968), Collier's Encyclopaedia (1972), Bailey (1971), and the original soundtrack of the stimulus film, Bank Ahead (1967).

The geographic location, population distribution, and principal features of the islands were described. Considerable emphasis was given to the "blend of modern and traditional values that govern the Islanders' optimistic outlook on life and that are carried with them in their farming and business enterprises" (Appendix A, 1). The historically changing relationship between the island communities and the outside world was discussed, and particular mention was made of the fact that many Orcadians emigrated to Canada and worked for the Hudson's Bay Company. It was pointed out in this respect that Canadians constitute one of many important and salient groups in the world-view of the islanders.

The Orkney Islanders, themselves, were characterized by a set of twenty evaluatively neutral trait words (see Table 1). Each of the terms occurred twice in the text, once in adjectival form and once as an adverb. The order of presentation of the words was randomly determined and the manner in which they were grouped and spaced was governed by the expediencies involved in synchronizing the taped script with the film passages.
The attributes used to characterize the Islanders were chosen at random from a subset of neutral trait words in the Anderson (1968) list. The items in the subset of trait terms were selected for their appropriateness as possible Orcadian descriptors by judges who had read the above-mentioned encyclopaedia essays on the Orkney Islands (see Appendix B, 1).

c. Variations

Two additional versions of the script were produced by modifying the primary text.

In one variation it was reported that the Islanders had very favourable concepts of Canadians. These longlasting impressions were said to have developed as a result of the economic benefits derived from Hudson's Bay ships which provisioned themselves at the islands, and also as a result of the frequent reports that Orcadians were being successful in Canada (Appendix A, 2).

Twenty positive attributes were included in the text as examples of "the types of terms that the Islanders use in characterizing Canadians" (Table 1). The words were selected from the traits in Anderson's (1968) list which scored most highly on the "likableness dimension" and which fulfilled two additional requirements, one being that their antonyms were included in the set of listed terms with the lowest likableness ratings, the other being that the words differ from each other with respect to their meaning (see Appendix B, 2).
Table 1. The traits used to describe the Orkney Islanders in the stimulus materials and the terms used to represent the Islanders' positive and negative characterizations of Canadians

**Traits attributed to the Orkney Islanders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Traits</th>
<th>Negative Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>AGGRESSIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDITATIVE</td>
<td>METICULOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>SELF-POSSESSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENTIMENTAL</td>
<td>CRITICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEARLESS</td>
<td>PERSISTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRET</td>
<td>UNGRACEFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERN</td>
<td>CONVENTIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INOFFENSIVE</td>
<td>BLUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSISTENT</td>
<td>UNGRACEFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INOFFENSIVE</td>
<td>IRRELLIGIOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDITATIVE</td>
<td>DAYDREAMER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>ECCENTRIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traits used to represent the Islanders' characterizations of Canadians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINCERE</td>
<td>INSINCERE</td>
<td>ENERGETIC</td>
<td>LAZY</td>
<td>GOOD-TEMPERED</td>
<td>ILL-TEMPERED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>UNKIND</td>
<td>WISE</td>
<td>FOOLISH</td>
<td>AMUSING</td>
<td>TIRESOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROAD-MINDED</td>
<td>NARROW-MINDED</td>
<td>FRIENDLY</td>
<td>UNFRIENDLY</td>
<td>CLEAN-CUT</td>
<td>MESSY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td>INTERESTING</td>
<td>UNINTERESTING</td>
<td>GENEROUS</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITE</td>
<td>IMPOLITE</td>
<td>HUMOURED</td>
<td>HUMOURLESS</td>
<td>FORGIVING</td>
<td>UNFORGIVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>SELF-CENTRED</td>
<td>APPRECIATIVE</td>
<td>UNAPPRECIATIVE</td>
<td>BRIGHT</td>
<td>DULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLERANT</td>
<td>INTOLERANT</td>
<td>RESPECTFUL</td>
<td>DISRESPECTFUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*EXPORT-MINDED was also used unintentionally as an Orcadian descriptor.*
Both the adjectival and the adverbial forms of the favourable trait items were incorporated into the script and the order of occurrence was randomly determined. All of the positive reciprocal stereotype information was embedded in the latter part of the documentary text where it replaced redundant material from the basic script.

The second variation on the primary text was similar in form to the first. The twenty antonyms of the highly favourable words were presented as examples of "the types of terms in the Orcadians' negative stereotypes of Canadians" (see Table 1). They were included in random order, in the final part of the script, in both their adverbial and their adjectival forms.

The Islanders' unfavourable characterization of Canadians in the negative reciprocal stereotype text was said to have resulted from the fact that the Hudson's Bay Company, in recruiting Orcadians for service in Canada, deprived the island communities of their much needed labour force, and having done so, did not treat the Orcadian emigrants as well as it did other European recruits (Appendix A, 3).

d. Presentation

Each of the three passages was tape recorded over a background of traditional Gaelic folk tunes.

The tapes were played in conjunction with the "silent" film. By stressing that the materials were first draft approximations to the final product it was possible, in the introductory talk, to provide a plausible reason for the unpolished nature of the documentaries.
2. **Target groups**

As well as the **Orkney Islanders**, the **Germans**, **Arabs**, and **Canadians** were employed as target groups in the session designed to obtain the dependent stereotype measures. The choice of additional targets was based on the results of a preliminary study.

Forty-four male and female undergraduates (enrolled in 200- and 300-level psychology courses) were asked to provide a complete list of all of the ethnic, regional, and national groups that they could think of. They were then asked to rate each of the groups they had listed on a nine-point favourableness scale. The tabulated responses indicated that the Germans and Arabs, respectively, were among the most salient groups in the neutral and negative ranges of the favourableness dimension. The findings also offered empirical support for the assumption that Canadians are a salient as well as a positive reference group for young student respondents (Appendix C).

The inclusion of a neutral and an unfavourably perceived group served to control against the problems that can result from using a set of targets that is imbalanced with respect to the social distance dimension (cf. Diab, 1962). More generally it provided a broad context within which to measure the respondents' characterizations of the Orcadians.
Questionnaire materials

1. Post-film questionnaire

Immediately following the presentation of each particular version of the documentary the respondents were asked to evaluate the stimulus materials and to give their impressions of the Islanders on a 36-item questionnaire (Appendix D). Some of the questions served as manipulation checks, others were filler items which were included to reinforce the cover story, and the remainder were intended to obtain information concerning the respondents' attitudes toward the Islanders and their impressions of the Islanders' demographic characteristics and general values.

a. To check the effectiveness of the manipulations the respondents were asked whether or not Canadians were mentioned in the film, whether or not they knew more about the Orkney Islanders after watching the film, how favourably (from very unfavourably to very favourably) they thought the Islanders were described in the film, and how favourably (on the same 5-item scale) they thought the Islanders view Canadians.

b. In order to determine the details of their demographic 'profiles' of the Orkney Islanders the respondents were asked whether they thought the Orkney community is rural or urban, whether it is economically developed or undeveloped, whether it is economically poorer than, richer than, or the same as Canada, whether the lifestyle is the same as or different from that of Canadians, and whether the values of the Islanders are the same as or different from those of Canadians. They were asked also how
favourably they thought the Islanders see other people, how favourably they themselves view the Islanders, and whether they would like to visit the islands, to live there for a long or a short period of time, or were just uninterested in the question.

c. The items related to the cover story included questions such as:
Do you think that the visual sequences should be changed? Do you think that a film of this sort should be LONGER, SHORTER, THE SAME LENGTH? Do you think that the soundtrack should be changed? If "YES", in what way?

2. Stereotype questionnaires

a. Open-ended format

The respondents were presented with an open-ended questionnaire in the first part of the stereotyping task (Appendix E). They were instructed to write down a complete list of those traits and descriptive words that they felt were necessary to characterize adequately each of the four targets in question. Columns in which to list the responses were provided and additional directions to use a nine-point scale in order to rate the favourableness of each of the listed attributes were also included.

b. Check list format

The second part of the stereotyping task involved the use of a traditional, Katz and Braly-type check list instrument (Appendix F).

The respondents were asked to read carefully through a list of seventy-five traits words and to tick those which seemed to them to be
typical of the target in question. They were instructed further to write in additional words whenever they felt that these were necessary to complete an adequate description of a particular group. Finally, they were asked to read over the set of traits that they had ticked and to rate each of the words on a nine-point favourableness scale. Space was provided on each of the questionnaire pages for the inclusion of those terms that the respondents might choose to add to the list, and reminders were offered to ensure that all of the instructions had been completed.

The seventy-five words in the adjectival check list included those in Table 1 as well as fifteen terms selected from the table of social stereotypes presented by Karlins, Coffman, and Walters (1969). The additional terms were: SCIENTIFICALLY-MINDED, TREACHEROUS, STRAIGHTFORWARD, MATERIALISTIC, EFFICIENT, STOLID, JOVIAL, SENSUAL, PHYSICALLY DIRTY, PLEASURE LOVING, AMBITIOUS, CRUEL, METHODICAL, EXTREMELY NATIONALISTIC, and DECEITFUL.

The list was constructed by randomly ordering the trait items.

c. Information forms and other questionnaires

1. In both the film presentation and the stereotype measurement sessions each participant was given a "personal information" form which elicited data concerning the respondent's age, date of birth, sex, occupation, nationality, birthplace, location of permanent residence, plans for future education, and whether or not he/she had lived outside the country for a long period of time (Appendix G).
2. As a part of the cover story for the documentary the respondents were told that the script was too lengthy and needed to be shortened. They were given a tabulation sheet on which to make notes about how much and what type of information they thought should be excluded from later versions of the film (Appendix H). (The data yielded from this questionnaire were not of sufficient interest to warrant further attention.)

3. One further questionnaire served to ascertain whether or not the documentary presentation about the Orkney Islanders was the respondents' only source of information about the target group.

At the end of the free response portion of the stereotyping task the participants were asked to list all of the major sources of information that they had focussed upon when forming their impressions of each of the four targets (Appendix I).

Respondents

Individuals from six groups of course cadets and three groups of officer candidates and course instructors at the National Sea Cadet Camp, H.M.C.S. Quadra, Comox, B.C., volunteered to participate in the study. The six groups of course cadets were allocated randomly to one of the three experimental conditions as were the groups of officer candidates and course instructors. Thus each of the film tape-sequences was seen by two groups of younger course cadets and one group of older officer candidates and instructors.

One hundred and ninety-three of the original 252 respondents successfully completed all phases of the experiment.
Table 2. The location of permanent residence of the respondents in each of the experimental conditions and in the total sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>PRAIRIES</th>
<th>ONTARIO</th>
<th>QUEBEC</th>
<th>MARITIMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE FEEDBACK</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 58)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO FEEDBACK</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 67)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE FEEDBACK</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 68)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 193)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. The age distribution of respondents in each of the three experimental conditions and in the total sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>AGE CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 years and younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE RECIPROCAL CONDITION</td>
<td>Percentage 10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 58)</td>
<td>Number 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-RECIPROCAL CONDITION</td>
<td>Percentage 9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 67)</td>
<td>Number 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE RECIPROCAL CONDITION</td>
<td>Percentage 29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 68)</td>
<td>Number 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>Percentage 16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 193)</td>
<td>Number 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the 59 individuals who did not complete the task were respondents who decided not to attend the stereotyping session. In addition, however, a small number of people were advised to discontinue their participation because they were French Canadians whose mastery of English was extremely limited. One respondent's data were excluded from the analysis because he reported that he had fallen asleep during the film. Two other sets were excluded because the participants indicated by their actions and by their responses that they had treated the study flippantly. Finally, eight individuals were called away from, or left the stereotyping session before they had completed all of their tasks. Their responses were not included in the statistical analyses but, where appropriate, were employed in the construction of the social stereotypes (see Chapter 4: Scoring procedure and methods of analysis).

Of the total sample of 193 respondents, 58 (fifty-four males and four females) saw the positive reciprocal stereotype documentary, 67 (fifty-five males and twelve females) saw the non-reciprocal documentary, and 68 (fifty-one males and seventeen females) were presented with the negative reciprocal stereotype film.

Approximately 90% of the individuals in the sample were high-school students and the remainder were university undergraduates and skilled and semi-skilled workers.

Their permanent homes were located throughout nine of the ten Canadian provinces. Prince Edward Island was the exception. British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec were the most heavily represented provinces (see Table 2).
The respondents' ages ranged from 13 years and 7 months to 24 years and 11 months. The majority of the respondents, however, fell into the 15 (33.7%) and 16 (23.3%) year old age brackets (see Table 3). The median ages for the positive reciprocal, non-reciprocal, and negative reciprocal groups, respectively, were 16:4, 16:1, and 15:8; and the mean ages were 16.6, 16.6, and 16.0.

A scrutiny of the mean and median ages and an examination of the age distributions in Table 3 suggest that the members of the negative reciprocal stereotype group were somewhat younger than their counterparts in the other experimental conditions. This observation was supported by an analysis of variance \( F(2,190) = 3.48, p = .032 \). Because of this group difference and because research has indicated that age is an important variable in the stereotype formation process it was necessary to examine the relationship between age and the dependent stereotype variables. The findings will be discussed in the next chapter.

**Setting**

The study was conducted at H.M.C.S. Quadra which is a shore base located on a sandspit in the middle of Comox Harbour on Vancouver Island. The facility is used as a summer camp for approximately 1,000 to 1,500 male and female Sea Cadets who spend two to ten weeks taking courses that can range from sailmaking to band music.

Life at the camp is vigorous and considerable emphasis is placed on physical activities and general military discipline. Thus the experimental sessions which were held in the late afternoon and evenings came at the end of full and demanding days.
The locations as well as the times of the experimental sessions were determined by the schedule of daily activities in the camp. All of the documentary presentations were shown in the "OJT Lounge" just off the main parade square, while the stereotyping sessions were held in the OJT Lounge, in a nearby classroom, and in a mess hall situated in a breeze-way between an administration building and a barracks.

Procedure

The procedure outlined in the following passages is a modified version of one which was pretested in a pilot study that involved 60 officer candidates from the Canadian Forces Officer Candidate School at C.F.B. Chilliwack, B.C.

The nine groups which formed the sample of respondents were tested separately.

The presentation of the film-tape sequence and the administration of the post-film questionnaire took approximately one hour.

Each of the groups was recalled to the laboratory one week after the documentary presentation and the respondents were asked to complete the stereotyping task which required from one to two hours work.

The experiment was conducted over a three week period.

Phase 1

As the members of each particular group assembled in the "temporary laboratory" an officer requested their voluntary participation in the study and introduced the experimenter to them. He remained in the room until the experimenter had repeated the request for volunteers and read from a list of "Basic Rights and Privileges of Volunteer Subjects " (Appendix J).
When those who wished to do so had left, 116, the experimenter distributed a two-page handout which contained the cover-story for the first part of the study as well as a general description of the contents of the film-tape sequence. He allowed five minutes for the handout to be read and then reviewed the material verbally (Appendix K).

The experimenter spoke about the "need" for the U.B.C. social science departments to develop their own documentary film for use in a number of courses and he outlined the form that these films would take:

Our aim is to give something of the flavour of the various lifestyles in different types of communities and cultures around the world.

We hope to describe the characteristics of various groups of people; to portray their lifestyles and means of earning a living; to say something about how they view other groups in the world around them; in general, to outline their attitudes, customs and habits.

A project to develop a pilot documentary about the Orkney Islanders was outlined, and the respondents were told that they would be required to assess some of the preliminary materials. The experimenter explained that by involving a wide range of individuals in the development of the film the final product could be made not only more educationally useful but also more interesting.

He went on to describe the nature of the scheduled presentation and he gave the respondents explicit instructions to attend to the content of the documentary script rather than the production features of the film.

RATHER THAN ATTEND TO THE PRODUCTION ASPECTS OF THE FILM, IT IS BETTER IF YOU CONCENTRATED ON THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE SCENES AND IN THE SOUNDTRACK.
TRY TO FORM A GENERAL IMPRESSION OF THE VISUAL SCENES AND PAY CLOSE ATTENTION TO THE SOUNDTRACK. THIS WILL HELP YOU IN YOUR ASSESSMENT OF THE FILM. LOOK FOR THE VARIOUS DESCRIPTIONS OF THE GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE ISLANDERS. NOTE THEIR PRINCIPAL OCCUPATIONS AND THE TYPES OF LINKS THEY HAVE WITH THE OUTSIDE WORLD. ALSO ATTEND TO THE INFORMATION THAT MAY GIVE YOU SOME IDEA OF HOW THEY VIEW VARIOUS "OUTSIDERS", THUS GETTING A GENERAL IDEA ABOUT THEIR ATTITUDE TO THE WORLD AND THE PEOPLE IN IT. DECIDE WHETHER THIS HAS ANY RELEVANCE TO YOU AS A CANADIAN.

Following his introductory remarks the experimenter answered questions and distributed copies of a form (Appendix H) on which individuals could take notes about the items they felt should be excluded from the script. He then presented the film-tape sequence.

When the documentary reached its mid-point the viewers were reminded briefly to keep their attention on the information in the soundtrack and visual passages.

Response booklets were distributed at the end of the film. They included a personal information form (Appendix G) and the post-film questionnaire (Appendix D). Colour coded cards containing a code number were clipped to the front pages.

When they had completed the "assessment task" the respondents were asked to:

Please make sure that you have answered all of the questions, and that you have written your code number in the appropriate space on the top of every page. Please hold on to the small card which lists your code number and bring it with you when you come back next week. This will save a great deal of time and effort.

Since the current project has not yet been completed we would appreciate it very much if you do not discuss the details of the film script with friends and acquaintances. Thank you very much for your help and I hope to see you again next week.
Phase 2

When the respondents returned to the field laboratory at the end of a week they were once again reminded of their volunteer status. They were given an introduction handout which stated that they were about to participate in a study to determine (1) how Canadians view a wide number of different social groups and (2) whether or not Canadians have ideas about how various nations see other people in the world (Appendix L). The experimenter elaborated upon the information in the handout and tried to make it relevant to the experiences of the group members by using colloquial examples from life at H.M.C.S. Quadra (Appendix M).

The free response materials were distributed after the introductory remarks. The respondents were required to complete the tasks and return the forms to the experimenter in exchange for a booklet containing the check list instruments. The experimenter outlined the response procedure and worked through an example of the open-ended task using an overhead projector. In addition he offered an "explanation" for the inclusion of the Orkney Islanders as a target that was intended to reduce the possibility of the respondents generating their own idiographic hypotheses about the purpose of the testing session.

There were five sections to the free response booklet. The first page contained a personal information questionnaire (Appendix G) and the second and third pages contained an example of the open-ended stereotyping task. Nine of the remaining ten pages included the instructions and response forms for the stereotyping tasks. On the final page the respondents
were asked to list all of the sources of information from which they had borrowed when forming their impressions of the Arabs, Canadians, Germans, and Orkney Islanders (Appendix I).

The names of the four target groups were listed in random order on the first four pages of the stereotype measurement section. The respondents were asked to describe each of the targets in their own words and to rate the terms they had used on a nine-point favourableness scale (Appendix E). The respondents were then asked to repeat the task from the perspective of the Orkney Islanders (fifth page) and were presented with the names of the target groups which once again were ordered randomly (sixth through ninth pages).

The instructions for the role playing portion of the task were as follows:

Act as if your identity was changed when you are doing these next few tasks.
We would like you to assume a role as best you can.
Carry out the following tasks AS IF YOU WERE AN ORKNEY ISLANDER.
Base your ratings on HOW YOU THINK YOU WOULD RESPOND IF YOU HAD BEEN RAISED ON THE ORKNEY ISLANDS AND WERE LOOKING AT THE WORLD THROUGH "ORKNEY ISLAND SPECTACLES".

As the booklets were returned the responses were checked to ensure that none of the instructions had been overlooked.

Following this procedure the check list forms were administered, in turn, to subsets of four or five group members. The experimenter worked through the example in the booklet (Appendix N) to illustrate the procedure for completing the task, and the respondents were instructed to:
Read carefully through the list of trait words and tick ( ) those which seem to you to be typical of . If you do not find appropriate words for all of the typical characteristics you may WRITE-IN those which you think are necessary to complete an adequate description.

Please read once more over the list of traits that you have ticked ... and rate each of the words on the same scale that you used in the previous booklet:

UNFAVOURABLE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 FAVOURABLE

Each set of materials included a two-page example, four randomized check list forms on which the respondents were asked to characterize the target groups, instructions to assume the role of an Orkney Islander, and four additional, randomly ordered check list forms on which the respondents were required to complete the reciprocal stereotyping task.

When they had finished, the respondents were thanked for their cooperation and debriefed as carefully and as thoroughly as possible. It was not always easy to do this since a majority of the participants, although more than willing to work diligently on the various tasks, were not particularly interested in being enlightened about social psychological hypotheses and research hunches.

Special problems associated with the data collection

When I entered the "field laboratory" for the first time I discovered that many of the individuals were Francophones. This raised the immediate question of whether or not these potential respondents would understand the film script. It also raised the more long-term but equally important issue of whether or not they could complete the stereotyping task.

As a first step toward resolving the problem I called for bilingual volunteers from each of the groups to act as interpreters. I asked them to
translate some initial comments that I directed toward the French Canadian cadets and also to translate the passages that I read from the various handouts.

I then suggested that those individuals who did not think they could understand an English film script, or in fact, who could not understand me as I spoke, might prefer to opt out of the study.

At the end of the session I spoke to the remaining Quebec respondents about whether or not they had understood the film. Those who said they had not were advised that they should think about whether or not they wanted to return the following week since a lot of English would also be involved in "that experiment".

During the stereotype measurement session the interpreters once again translated the instructions that I read from the questionnaires. In addition I suggested that those who wished to do so could complete the tasks in French. Eighteen respondents accepted the offer.

The decision to include the French responses in the data analyses was based on the Gardner, Kirby, Pablo, and Castillo (1975) finding that for bilingual respondents "the language of testing does not appreciably affect that product of stereotyping, or the stereotypes themselves" (p. 3), although it does warrant careful consideration in multi-cultural research.

The realization that English was a second language for some of the respondents was merely the first of a number of unexpected experiences during the study. I quickly realized just how demanding life at the camp
was when a number of would-be respondents promptly fell asleep as soon as the lights were dimmed and their compatriots settled down to watch the film. I can report with mixed feelings, however, that the number of sleepers in each group was considerably reduced by the tendency of the marching band to stage its best performances outside the windows of the "lab". These periodic episodes led to a number of unscheduled intermissions in the film show.

The respondents were not only remarkably good-natured. They were also very quick to respond to unusual stimuli. I found this out on a number of occasions when the fire alarm left me with a room full of half-finished questionnaires and the earnest hope that everyone could return before they were detailed for boat drill or a two-day hike. Indeed, I was not so lucky on one occasion. I lost my group to a flash inspection of the barracks. It took me a week to recover these subjects, and this caused some methodological problems which will be discussed in the next chapter.

The birthday party that threatened to spill over into the mess hall where respondents were completing the stereotype questionnaires was no problem. If anything it was a warm-up act to the grand finale of the study.

At approximately ten-thirty on the last night, the female respondents in the last group were greeted with a row of "moons" as they characterized the target groups in the breeze-way mess hall that was adjacent to a male barracks.

In short it was impossible to simulate the controlled conditions of a psychology department laboratory when running the study. Rather, the
stimulus materials were presented and the dependent data collected during brief lulls in the comings and goings of the participants. Yet despite, or maybe because of these less than optimal experimental conditions the respondents remained attentive and interested, and responded diligently throughout the testing sessions.

**Scoring procedure and methods of analysis**

The eighteen sets of French responses were translated and then re-translated to ensure that the English items were equivalent to the French.

Prior to scoring the data the participants' open-ended descriptions of each of the targets were compared with their check list stereotypes. The overlapping terms were deleted from the check list characterizations (cf. Chapter 2).

1. **Social stereotypes**

Social stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders were obtained from both the open-ended and check list responses. In each particular instance they were constructed from the ten (or more) characteristics most frequently attributed to the target. As such they exemplify the types of terms in the core and periphery of the personal stereotypes of the members of the three experimental groups. Similar social stereotypes were generated to reflect the respondents' perceptions of how the Orkney Islanders characterize Canadians.
2. **Personal stereotype variables**

Differentiation, favourableness, and commonness scores were derived from the core and peripheral elements of the respondents' personal stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders and also from the core and peripheral components of their estimations of the Orkney Islanders concepts of Canadians.

**Differentiation** was measured by counting the number of different descriptive words in each characterization.

**Favourableness scores** were computed for each respondent by averaging the favourableness ratings ascribed to the traits in each of the free response and check list descriptions of the two targets (i.e., Orkney Islanders and Canadians as seen from an Orcadian's viewpoint).

**Measures of commonness** were obtained from the core components of the personal stereotypes by comparing the terms in the open-ended descriptions with the most frequently used traits in the free response social stereotypes. The total number of overlapping terms constituted the commonness scores. These scores could range from zero (no overlap with the social stereotype) to ten (total overlap with the social stereotype). The procedure was repeated to derive commonness scores from the peripheral components of the personal stereotypes and from the components of the estimated reciprocal Canadian characterizations.

A further measure involved computing the percentage of "common" items in the core and periphery of each of the descriptions.
In addition, by calculating the number and percentage of the positive, neutral, and negative terms in both of the free response and check list characterizations it was possible to gain a broader perspective on the differentiation and favourableness dimensions. Items scoring 7, 8, and 9 were considered to be positive traits; those rated 4, 5, and 6 were categorized as being neutral; and the remaining terms which scored 1, 2, or 3 were considered to be negative characteristics.

Two final sets of measures were derived from the core and periphery of the personal stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders.

With respect to the stimulus materials it was considered potentially informative to determine (1) how many of the traits in the film characterization of the Islanders appeared in the participants' personal stereotypes, and (2) to what extent the terms used to detail the Orcadians' characterizations of Canadians were employed, in turn, by the respondents to describe the Islanders. Thus scores were tabulated for the individuals in each of the experimental groups which reflected the number of traits in common between their personal stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders and (a) the film characterization of the target group, (b) the positive "reciprocal characterization" of Canadians, and (c) the negative "reciprocal characterization" of Canadians. These stimulus overlap scores could range from zero (no overlap) to twenty (total overlap).

A count was made of the number of positive, neutral, and negative traits that were common to the respondents' personal stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders and Canadians. By analyzing group differences in these
content overlap scores it was possible to test a general version of Campbell's (1967, p. 821) contrast hypothesis. Assuming that when the Orkney Islanders were described as disliking Canadians there was a greater contrast between them and the ingroup than when their attitude was unknown, and that, in turn, when their attitude toward Canadians was unknown there was a greater contrast than when the attitude was described as positive, we could expect that the content overlap between the personal stereotypes of Canadians and Orcadians would be least for the negative reciprocal group members and greatest for the individuals in the positive reciprocal experimental group.

3. Primary data analyses

Chi-square analyses were employed to explore the relationships between experimental group membership and responses on the post-film questionnaire. Univariate, unweighted means, between-within analyses of variance were performed on the personal stereotype variables. (The decision to employ univariate rather than multivariate techniques was based on the fact that little is known about the robustness of the multivariate analogues of between-within ANOVAs in cases where the assumptions underlying the model are violated and the sample sizes are unequal).

Following some preliminary methodological analyses (Ch. 5: Part 1), 3 X 2 between-within analyses of variance (see Figure 1 for design lay-out) were performed on the measures of differentiation, favourableness, commonness, and 'percentage of common terms'. Experimental groups (3 levels) and stereotype components (2 levels) were the between- and within-subjects independent variables, respectively.
Two 3 X 2 X 3, between-within ANOVAs were employed to examine the numbers and percentages of favourable, neutral, and unfavourable words in the personal stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders. In both of these cases the independent variables were: Experimental groups (3 levels), stereotype components (2 levels), and trait categories (favourable, neutral, and unfavourable).

Similarly, a 3 X 2 X 3 between-within analysis of variance was performed on the stimulus overlap scores. The three levels of the trait category factor represented the personal stereotype overlap with: (1) the positive reciprocal stimulus description of Canadians, (2) the stimulus material characterization of the Orkney Islanders, and (3) the negative reciprocal portrait of Canadians.

The measures of content overlap between the personal stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders and those of Canadians were examined within the framework of a 3 (Experimental group) X 2 (Stereotype component) X 4 X 3 (Trait category: favourable, neutral, unfavourable) analysis of variance with repeated measures on the last three factors. The four-level factor included the (baseline) differentiation scores for the Orkney Islander stereotypes as well as the number of overlapping terms between the Orcadian personal stereotypes and those of the other three targets.

Simple main effects and simple simple main effects analyses were conducted on significant two- and three-way interactions, respectively (Kirk, 1968; Winer, 1971), and post hoc pairwise comparisons were conducted using a t form suggested by Games (1971).
3 X 2 BETWEEN-WITHIN DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype Component</th>
<th>(Core)</th>
<th>(Peripheral)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive reciprocal group</th>
<th>A₁</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocal group</td>
<td>A₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative reciprocal group</td>
<td>A₃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STEREOTYPE COMPONENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait Category</th>
<th>Trait Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fav. neut unfav</td>
<td>fav. neut unfav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁  C₂ C₃</td>
<td>C₁  C₂ C₃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 X 2 X 3 BETWEEN-WITHIN DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype Component</th>
<th>(Core)</th>
<th>(Peripheral)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive reciprocal group</th>
<th>A₁</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocal group</td>
<td>A₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative reciprocal group</td>
<td>A₃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Design structure of the two- and three-way analyses of variance
that permits unequal ns and an accurate estimate of the standard error of the difference between the two means. A significant outcome may be represented by

\[ t_0 = \frac{X_i - X_j}{\sqrt{\frac{MS}{n_i + n_j}} \cdot CV/\sqrt{2}} \]

where CV is the critical value for the \( q \) statistic. (Games, 1971, p. 101)

Canonical correlation analyses were employed to examine the relationships between the personal stereotype variables and the measures obtained from the respondents’ estimates of the reciprocal characterizations of Canadians. The analyses were performed separately for each of the three experimental groups.

Review

The present chapter commenced with a sequential overview of the course of the study. It provided an outline of the stimulus materials and of the methods involved in their development. It contained a definition of the demographic characteristics of the respondents and a report on the procedure used to present the stimulus materials to them. The materials and procedure employed to measure the experimentally formed stereotypes were described, the dependent measures were defined, and the major types of data analyses were outlined.
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Manipulation checks and the treatment of methodological problems

Manipulation checks

The potential success of the study depended not only on the respondents attending to the experimentally manipulated information in the film scripts, but also on them being unfamiliar with, and having no prior impressions of the Orkney Islanders. The questionnaire responses related to both of these issues are reassuring.

One hundred and ninety-two of the one hundred and ninety-three respondents indicated that their concepts of the target group were based entirely on the information in the stimulus materials. (The remaining experimental participant mentioned TV as a source of information but made no reference to the film.)

Furthermore, the answers to the question regarding the favourableness of the Orkney Islanders' views of Canadians suggest that the respondents were aware of the reciprocal stereotype information embedded in the documentary texts. Forty-seven (81%) of the individuals in the positive reciprocal condition felt that the Islanders view Canadians favourably. In contrast, forty (59%) of the negative reciprocal group members considered that Canadians are viewed in unfavourable terms by the Orcadians (Table 4).

It is interesting to note with reference to the responses in Table 4 that the individuals who were not presented with reciprocal information
Table 4. The number and percentage of the individuals in each of the experimental groups and in the total sample choosing each of the possible responses to the post-film questions pertaining to the experimental manipulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question (paraphrased)</th>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Frequency and %&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; of response</th>
<th>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</th>
<th>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</th>
<th>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</th>
<th>Total Sample (N=193)</th>
<th>Chi-Square Values&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do the Orkney Islanders view Canadians?</td>
<td>Favourably</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 108.86$, $df = 4$, $p &lt; .0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutrally</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfavourably</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question (paraphrased)</td>
<td>Response Categories</td>
<td>Frequency and % of responses</td>
<td>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</td>
<td>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</td>
<td>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</td>
<td>Total Sample (N=193)</td>
<td>Chi-Square Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the Orkney Islanders see others?</td>
<td>Favourably</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutrally</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfavourably</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No responses</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the film mention Canadians?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAN'T SAY</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question (paraphrased)</td>
<td>Response Categories</td>
<td>Frequency and % of responses</td>
<td>Positive group (n=58)</td>
<td>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</td>
<td>Negative group (n=68)</td>
<td>Total Sample (N=193)</td>
<td>Chi-Square Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How favourably were the Neutrally Orkney Islanders described? Unfavourably No response</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \chi^2 = 16.33, ) ( df = 4, ) ( p &lt; .003 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a \) Percentages are column percentages.

\( b \) Only the members of each of the three experimental groups who provided definite responses were included in the analyses.
about how Canadians are perceived by the Islanders were evenly divided between those who felt that Canadians are viewed favourably (24) and those who felt that Canadians are viewed in neutral terms (25). Only 2 of the 51 group members who answered the question considered that the Islanders see Canadians unfavourably.

Additional evidence that the participants attended to the relevant sections of the documentary passage is provided by the responses to the question concerning whether or not Canadians were referred to in the film. Individuals in both the positive and negative reciprocal conditions were much more likely than those in the non-reciprocal group to agree that Canadians had been mentioned ($\chi^2 = 13.56, df = 4, p < .009$, see Table 4 for details of the response frequencies).

The respondents appear to have generalized from their perceptions of how the Orkney Islanders characterize Canadians to their impressions of how the Islanders view others in general. There is a significant correlation between scores on both variables ($r = 0.370, p < .01$). Indeed thirty-three (57%) of those in the positive reciprocal condition believed that the Orcadians view others favourably, twenty-nine (43%) of the individuals in the non-reciprocal group felt that others are seen neutrally by the Islanders, and thirty-eight (56%) of the participants in the negative reciprocal condition indicated that the Orcadians view others in unfavourable terms (see Table 4).

In brief the experimentally manipulated information formed a salient portion of the documentary passages, it shaped the respondents' perceptions
of how the Orkney Islanders view Canadians, and it influenced their impressions of the Islanders' more general outlook toward others.

On the other hand the individuals' ratings of the favourableness of the film description of the Orkney Islanders did not mirror the neutral characterization that was embedded in the stimulus materials. In fact a major portion of the group members in each of the experimental conditions indicated that the Islanders were favourably described (Table 4). However, while 74% of the positive reciprocal group members felt that the Orcadians were characterized in favourable terms only 47% of the individuals in the negative reciprocal group made the same judgement. Moreover, 18% of those in the negative reciprocal condition felt that the Islanders were described unfavourably while only one person in the positive reciprocal group thought so. Thus there is a significant difference between groups with respect to the pattern of responses ($\chi^2 = 16.33$, $df= 4$, $p= .003$) and this difference appears to be due to a "halo effect" resulting from the manner in which the Orkney Islanders were portrayed as viewing Canadians.

Pretest on stereotype data from the negative reciprocal group

One of the subgroups of course cadets in the negative reciprocal condition was unable to participate in the stereotype measurement session until two weeks after the film presentation. Consequently before pooling the data it was necessary to establish whether or not the responses from this group were comparable to those from the other negative reciprocal subgroups.
A test of time-lag effects was conducted by comparing the responses of the "two week test-interval" group members (n= 19) with those of the individuals in the "one week test-interval" course cadet subgroup\textsuperscript{14} (n= 33).

Scores on the differentiation, favourableness, commonness, and 'percentage of common terms' variables were analyzed using 2 (Group) X 2 (Stereotype component) between-within, unweighted means analyses of variance. None of the group main effects nor group X stereotype component interactions was significant (with df= 1,50, \( p > .12 \) in all cases but one, the exception having a \( p \) value of .09). Similarly the analyses on both the percentage and number of positive, neutral, and negative terms, and on the stimulus overlap scores were conducted with 2 (Group) X 2 (Stereotype component) X 3 (Level of measurement variable) between-within, unweighted means analyses of variance. Once again, none of the between-group differences nor group X stereotype measure interactions was significant (all \( p > .13 \)). Finally, the main effects and group X repeated measure interactions in the analysis on the content overlap scores were non-significant (\( p > .11 \) in every case).

Since there was no significant difference between groups on any of the variables it was considered appropriate to include the data from the "test-delayed" subgroup in the major analyses.

**Homogeneity of variance pretests**

The work of Petrinovich and Hardyck (1969) draws attention to the importance of testing the homogeneity of variance assumption for ANOVA designs with unequal sample sizes, since:
The combination of unequal sample size and unequal variance which produced drastically incorrect values of t ... has a similar effect on all multiple comparison methods. (p. 47)

Indeed the use of percentage-score variables offered particular cause for concern in the present study since percentage scales "generally do not provide homogeneity of variance (Winer, 1971, p. 537)."

Hartley's $F_{\text{max}}^{15}$ (cf. Kirk, 1968, p. 62) was employed to test the assumption of homogeneity of variance for each of the main effects and interactions (simple or simple simple main effects) on each of the personal stereotype variables. The favourableness scores were the only measures to conform to the assumption. The analyses on all other variables yielded significant $F_{\text{max}}$ values denoting unequal within-cell variances. Moreover, in a majority of cases the largest variances were associated with the smallest samples, causing the probability of a type 1 error to be greater than $\alpha$ (Glass and Stanley, 1970, p. 372). Thus it was necessary to interpret the results of the statistical analyses on the dependent variables with caution.

The repeated measures analyses on all of the personal stereotype variables, except the favourableness scores, were conducted using Geisser-Greenhouse **conservative** $F$ tests. These approximate $F$ tests offer protection against the increased probability of type 1 error that is associated with repeated measures $F$ tests in which the homogeneity of variance and covariance assumptions are violated. Type 1 error is guarded against by employing reduced degrees of freedom. For example, in a one-way, $k$ treatment, repeated measures, conservative analysis of variance the critical value is $F_{.95}(1, n - 1)$ (cf. Kirk, 1968, p. 142-143; Winer, 1971, p. 526).
Other than employing different degrees of freedom with which to establish the critical values of the $F$ ratios the computational procedures for the conventional and conservative $F$ tests are identical (cf. Winer, 1971, p. 542).

Correlations between age and stereotype variables

Because of the significant difference between groups with respect to the age of the respondents, correlations between measures of age (in years) and each of the personal stereotype and perceived reciprocal stereotype variables were calculated. The data from each of the three groups were treated separately. The correlations between age and the core personal stereotype differentiation scores, and age and the number of neutral words in the core components of the personal stereotypes were significant. When averaged across groups the $r$'s were .295 in each case ($P < .05$). In general terms, the older the respondents were the more items they had in their free response descriptions of the Orkney Islanders. Thus it was necessary to consider this finding when discussing the between-groups analysis on the personal stereotype differentiation scores.

Summary of methodological results

Questionnaire responses indicated that the experimentally manipulated information formed a salient portion of the documentary passages. It was attended to by the respondents, and it influenced not only the participants' perceptions of the Orkney Islanders' attitudes toward Canadians but also their impressions of the Islanders' more general outlook toward others.
Contrary to expectations, however, a major portion of the individuals in each of the experimental groups felt that the Orcadians were described in favourable rather than in neutral terms. The tendency for respondents to make this observation was greatest in the positive reciprocal condition and least evident among the members of the negative reciprocal group.

Comparisons between the responses of the course cadets in the negative reciprocal condition whose stereotypes were elicited two-weeks after the film presentation and those of the 'negative reciprocal' course cadets whose stereotypes were measured after the standard one-week interval yielded no inter-group differences. Thus it was possible to include the data from the "retest delayed" subgroup in the major analyses.

Analyses indicated that the homogeneity of variance assumptions were violated on all variables except the favourableness scores. Moreover, the largest variances were generally associated with the smallest samples. Consequently, to protect against type 1 error, Geisser-Greenhouse conservative $F$ tests were employed for all of the repeated measures ANOVAs on the personal stereotype variables.

Finally, it was determined that there was a significant positive correlation between age and the degree of differentiation of the core components of the personal stereotypes. This finding was important with respect to the discussion of the analysis of the personal stereotype differentiation scores.
2. Presentation and discussion of experimental results

a. Post-film impressions of the Orkney Islanders and estimates of the Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians

The analyses of the respondents' post-film impressions of the Orkney Islanders and of their estimates of the Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians serve to elaborate upon the manipulation checks findings and to provide a more detailed account of the manner in which the members of the different experimental groups construed the stimulus materials. As a consequence it becomes possible to discuss the personal stereotype results not only with reference to the content of the documentary presentations but also with reference to the respondents' own recollection of the film information.

Post-film impressions of the Orkney Islanders

Table 5 presents the modal responses of the positive, negative, and non-reciprocal group members to the questions concerning their post-film impressions of the Orkney Islanders. (More comprehensive tables of responses are included in Appendix 0.)

A majority of the individuals in each of the experimental groups characterized the Islanders as a rural people who are poorer than Canadians.

However, there was somewhat less agreement among the respondents concerning their views about the Orcadians' level of economic development and the nature of the Islanders' values and lifestyle.

A little more than half of the negative and non-reciprocal group members who answered the pertinent question rated the Islanders as being underdeveloped (see Appendix 0). In contrast, the Orcadians were judged
Table 5. Modal responses of positive, negative, and non-reciprocal group members to questions concerning their post-film impressions of the target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal response</th>
<th>Frequency and % of response</th>
<th>Frequency and % of response</th>
<th>Frequency and % of response</th>
<th>Chi-square Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>RURAL</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMICALLY DEVELOPED</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>ECONOMICALLY UNDER-DEVELOPED</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POORER than Canadians</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>POORER than Canadians</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMICALLY DEVELOPED</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>ECONOMICALLY UNDER-DEVELOPED</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POORER than Canadians</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>POORER than Canadians</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMICALLY DEVELOPED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POORER than Canadians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENT VALUES</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>DIFFERENT VALUES</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAME LIFESTYLE</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>DIFFERENT LIFESTYLE</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as Canadians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complete tables on which the chi-square analyses were performed are listed in Appendix 0.

The same number of respondents (18) felt that the Islanders' values were the SAME as Canadians. Thus the respondents in this condition were equally split with respect to their impressions of the similarities between Canadian and Orcadian values.
to be economically developed by approximately two-thirds of the respondents (n=36) in the positive reciprocal condition.

A similar contrast between the positive reciprocal group members and the individuals in the other conditions occurred with respect to the remaining questions. While the positive reciprocal respondents were equally divided on the issue of whether or not the Orcadians' values are different than Canadians', and were inclined generally to characterize the Islanders' lifestyle as being the same as that of their own national group, a major portion of the individuals in the non-reciprocal and negative reciprocal conditions considered the values and lifestyle of the Islanders to be different than those of Canadians.

Although the findings do not reflect substantial differences between groups, and indeed only achieve significance with respect to the judgements of the Islanders' lifestyle (χ² = 11.36, df = 2, p < .005), they do suggest a tendency on the part of the individuals in the negative and non-reciprocal conditions to differ from the positive reciprocal group members regarding their interpretation of the stimulus information about the demographic characteristics of the Islanders. It appears that when a combination of attitudinal and demographic information is presented about a target, the attitudinal information may influence people's evaluations of the target's distinguishing demographic features. This possibility has implications for our stereotype formation model, and these implications will be discussed in a later chapter.
Table 6. Most frequently occurring items in the respondents' estimates of the Orkney Islanders' stereotypes of Canadians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group checking term</th>
<th>Number of group members checking term</th>
<th>Average favourableness ratings</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group checking term</th>
<th>Number of group members checking term</th>
<th>Average favourableness ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDLY</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>GOOD-TEMPERED</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELPFUL</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICH</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>WISE</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEALTHY</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>GENEROUS</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>SINCERE</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELLIGENT</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEROUS</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>ENERGETIC</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>SCIENTIFICALLY-MINDED</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEDY</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>AMUSING</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table shows the most frequently occurring items in the respondents' estimates of the Orkney Islanders' stereotypes of Canadians. The table is divided into two parts: Core Components (free response format) and Peripheral Components (check list format). The table includes the percentage of the group checking each term, the number of group members checking the term, and the average favourableness ratings. The terms are listed in the order of their frequency in the core components.
Table 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group showing the term (sample n =70)</th>
<th>Number of group members showing the term</th>
<th>Average favourableness ratings</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group showing the term (sample n =67)</th>
<th>Number of group members showing the term</th>
<th>Average favourableness ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDLY</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>SCIENTIFICALLY-MINDED</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICH</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>POLITIE</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>AMUSING</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEALTHY</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>GENEROUS</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>FORGIVING</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELPFUL</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACEFUL</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICE</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>ENERGETIC</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTHY</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group checking term (sample n =70)</th>
<th>Number of group members checking term</th>
<th>Average favourableness ratings</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group checking term (sample n =69)</th>
<th>Number of group members checking term</th>
<th>Average favourableness ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORE COMPONENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PERIPHERAL COMPONENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(free response format)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(check list format)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICH</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>SELF-CENTRED</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDLY</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELFISH</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>UNFRIENDLY</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEDY</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>FOOLISH</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFRIENDLY</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>SCIENTIFICALLY-MINDED</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAZY</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>LAZY</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTelligent</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>ILL-TEMPERED</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUPID</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>PLEASURELOVING</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>AMBITIOUS</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>7% (medium)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>NARROW-MINDED</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAIN</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEALTHY</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- a: Sample size
- b: Medium
- c: Vain
Table 6 (continued)

aData from the eight incomplete sets of responses (see Chapter Four: Respondents) were used, where possible, in compiling the social stereotypes. The increased sample sizes are noted in the percentage column headings, while the basic sample sizes of the experimental groups are listed in the vertical spanner headings.

bOne of the respondents used this term to modify the trait word

cTraits not used as comparison items in the computation of the commonness scores
Respondents' estimates of the Orkney Islanders' stereotypes of Canadians

Contents  The terms which occurred most frequently in the respondents' free response and check list estimates of the Orkney Islanders' reciprocal characterizations of Canadians are listed in the social stereotypes in Table 6.

The contents of the positive and non-reciprocal group members' reciprocal social stereotypes are highly favourable. Indeed there is substantial overlap between the traits in both portraits, particularly among the peripheral components.

There are favourable traits, too, in the social stereotype of Canadians derived from the negative reciprocal respondents' role-played characterizations. Among these are such terms as "friendly," "rich," "kind," "proud," and "scientifically-minded," which were commonly used by the individuals in each of the three experimental groups. Nevertheless, despite the inclusion of these positive words, the negative reciprocal profile is by and large an extremely unfavourable one.

Generally speaking, then, the contents and evaluative tone of the reciprocal social stereotypes indicate that the positive and negative reciprocal group members remained aware of the Orkney Islanders' supposed views about Canadians during the week that intervened between the presentation of the documentary information and the elicitation of the stereotype data. They also indicate that even in the absence of feedback about the Islanders' stereotypes of Canadians, the non-reciprocal respondents readily inferred what these characterizations might be.
Table 7. Means and standard deviations for the differentiation and favourableness scores for the core and peripheral components of the respondents' estimates of the Orkney Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype Component</th>
<th>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</th>
<th>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</th>
<th>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>M 5.4 (SD 4.0)</td>
<td>M 5.5 (SD 3.1)</td>
<td>M 4.6 (SD 1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>M 15.9 (SD 7.1)</td>
<td>M 14.6 (SD 5.9)</td>
<td>M 15.7 (SD 8.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype Component</th>
<th>Differentiation scores</th>
<th>Favourableness scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>M 6.8 (SD 1.9)</td>
<td>M 6.3 (SD 1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>M 6.8 (SD 1.5)</td>
<td>M 6.4 (SD 1.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Additional information about the characteristics of the respondents' estimated reciprocal stereotypes is provided by the dependent measures summarized in Table 7 and in Appendix P.

Table 7 contains the mean differentiation and favourableness scores for the core and peripheral components of the estimated reciprocal characterizations. The means and standard deviations for the remaining variables (e.g., "commonness" and "stimulus overlap") are listed in Tables A, B, and C in Appendix P.

These data, when reviewed in conjunction with the information in Tables 4 and 6, provide an answer to the first of the model-testing questions: Will respondents make inferences about the Orkney Islanders' stereotypes of their own national group in the absence of definite information about the nature of these "reciprocal stereotypes"?

The evidence suggests that such inferences were made by the individuals in the non-reciprocal condition.

All of the sixty-seven members of the non-reciprocal group completed the reciprocal stereotyping task, characterizing the four stimulus groups from the Orkney Islanders' perspective. In so doing they produced estimates of the Orcadians' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians that were as differentiated as those provided by the individuals in the positive and negative reciprocal experimental conditions (Table 7).

Furthermore, a scrutiny of the percentage scores in Table 6 (and the commonness scores in Table A, Appendix P) indicates that when estimating which particular traits the Orkney Islanders are most likely to attribute to Canadians, the interpersonal agreement between respondents in the
non-reciprocal group was approximately the same as that between individuals in each of the other experimental conditions.\(^{18}\)

The summary data in the above mentioned tables also contain evidence related to the first part of the second model-testing question: Will information concerning the Orkney Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians be attended to when it is included in a documentary script about the Islanders?

The post-film questionnaire responses (Table 4) and the reciprocal stereotype characterizations (summarized in Tables 6 and 7, and in Tables A, B, and C, Appendix P) indicate that the individuals in the positive and negative reciprocal conditions did pay attention to the relevant information about the manner in which the Islanders were said to characterize Canadians. They correctly judged the favourableness of the reciprocal stereotypes that were embedded in the film presentations and, in addition, they reproduced much of the content of these characterizations in their own (check list) estimates of how the Orcadians describe Canadians.

For example, immediately after viewing the stimulus materials the respondents in the positive reciprocal condition agreed that Canadians are seen favourably by the Orkney Islanders. Their perceptions were articulated in greater detail a week later when they performed the reciprocal stereotyping task. Over sixty percent of the items in their role-played characterizations of Canadians were favourable (Table B, Appendix P). Many of these, particularly the check list terms that were used most frequently by the group members, were words that had been included in the "positive reciprocal documentary portrait" of Canadians.
Similarly, a large majority of the negative reciprocal group members affirmed that Canadians are viewed unfavourably by the Orkney Islanders (Table 4). Their estimates of the Orcadians' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians, particularly the core components, contained a high percentage of undesirable terms (Table B, Appendix P), and they included, among their peripheral components, many of the traits that were employed to describe Canadians in the negative reciprocal stimulus script (Table 6 and Table C, Appendix P).

In summary, the non-reciprocal group members made inferences about the Orkney Islanders' perceptions of Canadians in the absence of definite cues about the nature of these reciprocal stereotypes. Furthermore, the respondents in the positive and negative reciprocal conditions attended to the reciprocal stereotype information embedded in the stimulus materials. They made correct judgements about the evaluative tone of the information, and they employed many of the traits comprising the reciprocal information when they estimated the Orkney Islanders' characterizations of Canadians.

Moreover, the estimates of the Orkney Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians that were provided by the individuals in the non-reciprocal condition were similar in content and structure to those provided by the members of the positive reciprocal group: A finding which is in keeping with the frequently observed preference among respondents for evaluating and perceiving people positively (e.g., Johnson and Downing, 1976; Zajonc and Burnstein, 1965).
Overview

Before proceeding to discuss the personal stereotype data it is useful to collate the findings regarding the respondents' construal of the stimulus materials. The positive reciprocal group members saw the Orkney Islanders as a rural, although economically developed people who are poorer than Canadians, who have different values but the same lifestyle as Canadians, and who consider Canadians to be friendly, good-tempered, helpful, and proud. The negative reciprocal respondents, on the other hand, perceived the Orkney Islanders to be rural and economically underdeveloped, to be poorer than Canadians, to have different values and a different lifestyle than Canadians, and to characterize Canadians as being rich, self-centred, proud, unfriendly, and foolish. The individuals in the non-reciprocal condition viewed the Islanders as a rural, underdeveloped people who are poorer than Canadians, who have different values and a different lifestyle than Canadians, and who describe Canadians as being friendly, rich, kind, scientifically-minded, and polite.

b. The contents and structure of the respondents' personal stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders

Contents Table 8 contains the lists of traits most frequently attributed to the Orkney Islanders by the members of the three experimental groups.

The contents of these social stereotypes are predominantly favourable, and words such as "friendly," "hardworking," "co-operative," "happy," "proud," and "kind" were among those most commonly used by the individuals in each of the positive, negative, and non-reciprocal treatment conditions.

The percentage values in Table 8 reflect the level of interpersonal consensus in the assignment of social stereotype traits to the Islanders.
Table 8. Social stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders constructed from the most frequently occurring items in the personal stereotypes of the respondents in the three experimental groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group checking term (sample n =61)</th>
<th>Number of group members checking term</th>
<th>Average favourableness ratings</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group checking term (sample n =60)</th>
<th>Number of group members checking term</th>
<th>Average favourableness ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orkney Islanders are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orkney Islanders are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDLY</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMPLE</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>GENEROUS</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARDWORKING</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACEFUL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>GOOD-TEMPERED</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>POLITE</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICH</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>SINCERE</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL/SOCIABLE</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>RESPECTFUL</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>AMUSING</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICE</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>QUIET</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STRAIGHTFORWARD</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLEAN CUT</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FRIENDLY</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group checking term</th>
<th>Number of group members checking term</th>
<th>Average favour-ability ratings</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group checking term</th>
<th>Number of group members checking term</th>
<th>Average favour-ability ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orkney Islanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ORkney Islanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDLY</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>SINCERE</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACEFUL</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>POLITE</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARDWORKING</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>QUIET</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUIET</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>GENEROUS</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD-FASHIONED</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>GOOD-TEMPERED</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>ENERGETIC</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICE (PEOPLE/PERSONALITY)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>SENTIMENTAL</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISOLATED</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>FRIENDLY</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a) sample n = 70

**Note:** The table compares the core components (free response format) to the peripheral components (check list format) with the percentage of group checking the term, number of group members checking the term, and average favour-ability ratings for each term in the context of Orkney Islanders and a non-reciprocal group (n=67).
Table 8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group checking term</th>
<th>Number of group members checking term</th>
<th>Average favourableness ratings</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>% of group checking term</th>
<th>Number of group members checking term</th>
<th>Average favourableness ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORKNEY ISLANDERS are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ORKNEY ISLANDERS are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VERY) FRIENDLY/FRIENDS</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SEMI-) POOR</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>POLITE</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARDWORKING</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>COOPERATIVE</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD-FASHIONED</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>QUIET</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUIET</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>ENERGETIC</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>CLEAN-CUT</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREJUDICED</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>STRAIGHTFORWARD</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISOLATED</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>SINCERE</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICH</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>SELF-CENTRED</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (continued)

aData from the eight incomplete sets of responses (see Chapter Four: Respondents) were used, where possible, in compiling the social stereotypes. The increased sample sizes are noted in the percentage column headings, while the basis sample sizes of the experimental groups are listed in the vertical spanner headings.

bWords with similar or overlapping meaning were grouped to better represent the frequency with which the particular semantic categories were employed. The most commonly used items are presented first.

cTraits not used as comparison items in the computation of the commonness scores.

dWords in parentheses were used as trait modifiers by at least one of the respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype Component</th>
<th>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</th>
<th>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</th>
<th>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Analyses of variance of the commonness and 'percentage of common terms' scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>8.92**</td>
<td>966.43</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>326.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotype component (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1230.39</td>
<td>377.14**</td>
<td>1311.49</td>
<td>4.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>4.75*</td>
<td>532.50</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>295.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* With only two levels of the within-subjects variable the degrees of freedom for the conservative F tests are the same as those for the conventional tests (cf. Winer, 1971, p.526)

*p* < .05

**p** < .001
In turn, the commonness and "percentage of common terms" scores indicate the extent to which the items in each of the personal stereotypes are represented in the social stereotypes. Thus they provide further information about the degree of uniformity between the contents of the respondents' characterizations. The means for both of these variables are reported in Table 9.

The analysis of the commonness scores yielded a significant interaction between experimental conditions and stereotype components (Table 10). Tests of the simple main effects confirmed what is apparent from a scrutiny of the means in Table 9: namely, that there was no significant difference between groups with respect to the number of "common" terms in the core elements of the personal stereotypes ($F (2,380) < 1$), and that the peripheral elements of the respondents' characterizations included a greater number of commonly used trait words than did the core components ($p_{cons} < .001$ for each of the treatment conditions).

The simple main effects tests also indicated that there was a significant difference between treatment groups with respect to the number of "common" words in the individuals' peripheral stereotype components ($F (2,380) = 13.33, p < .001$).

Pairwise comparisons between the peripheral means, using the $t_o$ statistic recommended by Games (1971), established that the mean for the negative reciprocal condition was significantly lower than those for the non-reciprocal and positive reciprocal treatment groups ($p < .01$).

There was no significant difference between experimental conditions
regarding the "percentage of common terms" in the characterizations. However, the peripheral components of the individuals' personal stereotypes contained a significantly greater proportion of "social stereotype traits" (that is, were less idiosyncratic in content) than the core components (Table 10).

The similarities between the social stereotype profiles indicate that many of the traits in the individuals' characterizations of the Orkney Islanders were selected on the basis of information that was common to all three versions of the stimulus materials. Indeed, the somewhat pastoral image projected by the trait sets suggests that the respondents' perception of the target as a rural group may have been an important determinant of much of the contents of the personal stereotypes.

Yet, although the reciprocal stereotype information did not appear to have a predominant influence on the types of traits that were included in the individuals' characterizations, it did seem to affect the interpersonal agreement regarding the choice of particular items, since there was less uniformity between the negative reciprocal group members than between the respondents in the positive and non-reciprocal groups regarding their selection of check list descriptors of the Orkney Islanders. **Structural attributes - Differentiation and favourableness** - Although the contents of the individuals' characterizations did not alter markedly from one experimental group to another, there were significant differences between treatment conditions with respect to the overall favourableness and differentiation of the personal stereotypes (Table 11).
An examination of the mean favourableness and differentiation scores in Table 12 suggests that the characterizations of the positive reciprocal respondents were more differentiated and more favourable than those of the negative and non-reciprocal group members. It suggests, too, that there was little difference between the differentiation of the personal stereotypes of the non-reciprocal and those of the negative reciprocal individuals, although the former characterizations appear to have been somewhat more favourable than the latter.

The analyses of the differentiation and favourableness scores also indicate that the peripheral components of the personal stereotypes included a significantly greater number of words and were significantly more favourable than the core components (Table 11 and Table 112). These findings, together with those obtained from the analyses of the commonness scores, replicate and add to the results of earlier measurement-comparison studies (e.g., Ehrlich and Rinehart, 1965; McTiernan, 1973). In so doing they add to the empirical support for the conceptual distinction between the different personal stereotype components (cf. Chapter Two).

Further information about the differentiation of the personal stereotypes is provided by an analysis of the number of favourable, neutral, and unfavourable words in the respondents' characterizations. The means are presented in Table 13 and the analysis of variance is summarized in Table 14.

The analysis yielded a significant three-way interaction which is represented graphically in Figure 2. The interpretation of this interaction
Table 11. Analyses of variance of the differentiation and favourableness scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Differentiation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Favourableness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Ss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196.93</td>
<td>5.08*</td>
<td>29.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>38.79</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Ss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotype component (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10659.89</td>
<td>326.26**</td>
<td>19.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>32.67</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>With only two levels of the within-subjects variable the degrees of freedom for the conservative F tests are the same as those for the conventional tests (cf. Winer, 1971, p. 526)

* P = .007  
** P < .0005
Table 12. Mean differentiation and favourableness scores for the core and peripheral components of the personal stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Stereotype Component</th>
<th>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</th>
<th>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</th>
<th>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourableness</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was facilitated by tests of the simple main effects and, in appropriate instances, by pairwise multiple comparisons using Games' (1971) statistic. Differences between groups There were no significant differences between treatment conditions with respect to the number of favourable (F (2,556) = 2.13, ns), neutral (F (2,556) < 1), and unfavourable (F (2,556) < 1) words in the core components of the respondents' stereotypes: nor were there significant differences with respect to the number of neutral (F (2,556) = 3.64, p > .01), and negative (F (2,556) = 2.62, ns) words in the peripheral components. However, the respondents in the positive reciprocal condition did include substantially more favourable words in the peripheral elements of their characterizations than did the members of the other experimental groups (F (2,556) = 29.69, p < .0005; p < .01 for the differences between the positive and negative reciprocal, and the positive and non-reciprocal means, respectively).

Differences between stereotype components The members of all three experimental groups included more favourable and neutral words in the peripheral components of their personal stereotypes than they did in the core components. Moreover, the individuals in the negative reciprocal treatment condition, in contrast to the respondents in the other groups, also tended to include a greater number of unfavourable items in the periphery than they did in the core of their characterizations. (F (1,190) = 5.82; p < .05). It should be noted, however, that this tendency was statistically weak, and should be interpreted with caution given the large number of F values being reported.
Figure 2. Mean number of favourable, neutral, and unfavourable words in the core and periphery of the personal stereotypes of the members of each of the three experimental groups.
Differences within stereotype components There was a marked consistency across treatment conditions regarding the general composition of the personal stereotypes. Pairwise comparisons (performed, in turn, on each of the three sets of experimental group means) indicated that there were more favourable than neutral (all $p_s < .05$), more favourable than unfavourable (all $p_s < .01$), and more neutral than negative words (all $p_s < .01$) in the peripheral elements of the respondents' characterizations.

There were also significantly more positive than neutral ($p < .05$), and significantly more positive than negative ($p < .01$) words in the core components of the positive reciprocal group members' descriptions. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the mean numbers of favourable, neutral, and unfavourable items in the core of the negative and non-reciprocal respondents' personal stereotypes.

A number of points emerge from these findings. First, there were more pronounced differences between groups with respect to the differentiation of the peripheral stereotype components than there were regarding the differentiation of the core components. Indeed, the greater overall differentiation of the positive reciprocal group members' characterizations was due largely to the individuals' inclusion of a relatively large number of favourable terms in the peripheries of their personal stereotypes (Figure 2).

The highly differentiated characterizations of the positive reciprocal group members are related not only to the inclusion of socially desirable information in the documentary script, but also to the respondents' own post-film judgements that the Orkney Islanders are economically developed and share the same lifestyle as Canadians. Thus, as Rokeach (1960) has suggested, and as data reported by Smith, Bruner, and White (1956) seem
Table 13. Mean number and percentage of positive, neutral, and negative words in the core and peripheral components of the group members' characterizations of the Orkney Islanders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Treatment condition</th>
<th>CORE</th>
<th>PERIPHERY</th>
<th>GROUP MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Favourableness category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive reciprocal gp. (n=58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocal gp. (n=67)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of words</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative reciprocal gp. (n=68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Treatment condition</th>
<th>Favourableness category</th>
<th>Favourableness category</th>
<th>GROUP MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Favourableness category</td>
<td>Favourableness category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive reciprocal gp. (n=58)</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocal gp. (n=67)</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of words</td>
<td>Negative reciprocal gp. (n=68)</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total sample (N=193)</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Analyses of variance of the numbers and percentages of favourable, neutral, and unfavourable words in the respondents' characterizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Numbers of fav., neut., and unfav., words</th>
<th>Percentages of fav., neut., and unfav. words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Ss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotype component (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3553.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X Subj within gps.</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourableness category (C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1855.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>115.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X Subj within gps.</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>741.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X Subj within gps.</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> The degrees of freedom listed are those for the conventional F tests. The modified degrees of freedom for the conservative F tests of the B, C, and B X C effects are 1 and 190, while the conservative degrees of freedom for the between-within interaction effects are 2 and 190 (cf. Winer, 1971, p. 542)

<sup>b</sup> The p values for the conservative F tests are denoted p<sub>cons</sub>

* p = .007
** p<sub>cons</sub> < .01
*** p<sub>cons</sub> < .001
**** p<sub>cons</sub> < .0005
to indicate, there may be a general relationship between the degree to which concepts of social targets are differentiated and the extent to which the targets are perceived to be similar to the individual's most salient reference group or reference person.

Although they varied with respect to their overall differentiation, the personal stereotypes were relatively uniform in composition across all three experimental conditions. In general they included more positive than neutral, and more neutral than negative words. This finding corresponds well with the research that has demonstrated a positive bias in individuals' representations of social stimuli and social relationships (e.g., Morrissette, 1958; Zajonc and Burnstein, 1965; Johnson and Downing, 1976). However, the prevalence of the positive bias in the responses of the negative reciprocal group members is somewhat surprising in view of the respondents' awareness of the unfavourable information in the film script.

The scores representing the numbers of favourable, neutral, and unfavourable words in the core and periphery of the personal stereotypes were transformed into percentages and reanalyzed. The mean percentage scores are presented in Table 13 and the analysis of variance is summarized in Table 14. There were two significant interactions. The one between the Experimental group and Favourableness category variables is plotted in Figure 3, and the one between the Stereotype component and Favourableness category variables is plotted in Figure 4.

The post hoc analyses of the interactions provide further information about the structural characteristics of the personal stereotypes, particularly with reference to the previously noted difference between
the favourableness of the core and peripheral components. The analyses also provided a clearer understanding of the effect of the reciprocal stereotype stimulus materials on the respondents' tendency to favourably characterize the Orkney Islanders.

The peripheral components of the personal stereotypes had a significantly higher percentage of favourable terms ($F(1,190) = 5.06, p < .05$) and a significantly lower percentage of unfavourable terms ($F(1,190) = 14.66, p < .0005$) than the core components (see Figure 4). These findings account for the overall difference in favourableness between the core and periphery of the respondents' characterizations (see Table 11). There was no significant difference between the percentage of neutral words in each of the stereotype components ($F(1,190) = 2.44, \text{ns}$).

Although the core and periphery of the personal stereotypes differed in composition they were structurally similar to one another (see Figure 4). That is, they both included a greater percentage of favourable than neutral ($p < .01$, in both cases), and a greater percentage of neutral than negative words ($p < .01$, in both cases).

Indeed, with one qualification, this general finding held for the characterizations provided by the members of each of the three experimental groups. The exception occurred in the stereotypes of the individuals in the negative reciprocal treatment condition. Unlike the other respondents, these cadets did not provide a significantly greater proportion of neutral than negative terms when describing the target group (see Figure 3).

However, while the broad structural features of the characterizations did not vary a great deal across experimental groups, there were substantial differences between treatment conditions with respect to the
Figure 3. Mean percentages of favourable, neutral, and unfavourable terms in the personal stereotypes of the positive, negative, and non-reciprocal group members.
Figure 4. Mean percentages of favourable, neutral, and unfavourable items in the core and peripheral components of the respondents' personal stereotypes.
exact proportions of favourable, neutral, and unfavourable items in the respondents' stereotypes.

The members of the positive reciprocal group included a higher percentage of favourable words in their characterizations than did the individuals in the non-reciprocal \((p < .05)\) and negative reciprocal \((p < .01)\) conditions \((F(2, 380) = 13.36, p < .0005)\). Likewise the respondents in the negative reciprocal condition incorporated a higher percentage of unfavourable terms into their personal stereotypes than did the members of the positive \((p < .01)\) and non-reciprocal \((p < .05)\) groups \((F'(2, 380) = 7.30, p < .001)\). There was also a marginally significant difference between groups with respect to the percentage of neutral words in the individuals' responses \((F(2, 380) = 3.65, p < .05)\). In this instance the highest mean (33.9%) was associated with the non-reciprocal group and the lowest mean (24.9%) with the positive reciprocal condition (see Figure 3).

These findings reflect the extent to which the positive reciprocal stimulus materials enhanced the general tendency of the respondents to ascribe favourable traits to the Orkney Islanders. Indeed, favourable ascriptions account for an average of sixty-four percent of the descriptors provided by the individuals in the positive reciprocal condition, and this is not only significantly but substantially more than the proportion of favourable terms in the stereotypes of the non-reciprocal \((M = 53.0\%)\) and negative reciprocal \((M = 46.7\%)\) group members.

It is hardly surprising to find that the high proportion of favourable descriptors in the responses of the individuals in the positive and
non-reciprocal groups was associated with a low percentage of unfavourable terms. The tendencies to list a large proportion of positive items and to provide relatively few unfavourable terms when describing a social target appear to be two components of a more general *modus operandi* whereby individuals describe others in as desirable a manner as possible in all situations except those in which a tolerance of negative commentary is well-defined or can readily be assumed.

The negative reciprocal feedback served to lessen individuals' adherence to the norm against providing a large number of unfavourable terms when characterizing social agents. And while the positive bias was not fully eliminated by the relatively high percentage of negative terms, the inclusion of a substantial portion of unfavourable items in the characterizations provided by the negative reciprocal respondents did lower the average favourableness ratings of these stereotypes. This effect is particularly noticeable when the mean scores for the negative reciprocal condition are compared with those for the positive reciprocal group (Table 12).

As was mentioned previously, the presence of a weakened but statistically detectable positive bias in the responses of the negative reciprocal group members is an unexpected result. It diverges sharply from findings in the impression formation literature which have demonstrated the disproportionate influence of negative information on evaluations of target persons (e.g., Birnbaum, 1972; Hamilton and Huffman, 1971; Riskey and Birnbaum, 1974). For example, Richey, Koenigs, Richey, and Fortin (1975) demonstrated that
where the amount of positive information was greater than the negative, results indicated that a single negative behaviour neutralized five positive behaviours, yielding an impression only insignificantly better than that based on five negative and five positive actions (p. 233),

while Hamilton and Zanna (1972) found that likableness ratings of the stimulus person described by an unfavorable attribute were significantly more discrepant from a neutral impression than were ratings of the stimulus person characterized by a desirable attribute (p. 204).

One possibility that must be considered when attempting to explain the difference between the results of this study and the findings of those in the Richey and Hamilton tradition (e.g., Gray-Little, 1973; Cusumano and Richey, 1970; Richey and Dwyer, 1970; Hamilton and Huffman, 1971; Hamilton and Zanna, 1972) is that the present stimulus materials were structured in such a fashion that they minimized the impact of the negative reciprocal information.

The fact that all of the reciprocal stereotype feedback was included towards the end of the documentary scripts suggests that a primacy effect (e.g., Anderson, 1965) may have been operating when the negative reciprocal group members formed their stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders. Faced with two apparently incongruent pieces of information about the Islanders - that they are a mild-mannered people who conduct their business without fuss, and that they passionately dislike Canadians - the respondents may have attempted to reduce the incongruence by discounting the reciprocal stereotype feedback and dwelling almost exclusively on the more general documentary information at the beginning of the film. There is no evidence of such a discounting process, however.
The manipulation checks indicate that not only did a majority of the individuals in the negative reciprocal condition clearly express their awareness of the Orcadians' "views of Canadians," a number also used this information as a focus for their comments in the post-film questionnaire. For example, one individual ventured that the Islanders see other people in a manner "similar to how many Canadians view Americans: they blame us for past shortcomings . . . . I don't like people who don't like me."

A primacy effect explanation of the present findings is also countered by the results of Richey's research. She has found repeatedly (e.g., Richey, McClelland, and Shimkunas, 1967) that when the experimental procedure is designed to encourage respondents to attend equally to all sections of the stimulus materials, as it was in this study (see Chapter Four), a sequence of favourable followed by unfavourable phrases produces definite negative impressions which persist over a considerable period of time (7 to 9 days, at least).

Thus, it is difficult to argue that the structure of the stimulus materials was singularly responsible for the differences between our findings and those of the comparison studies. Rather we must look for other features of these materials which may account for the discrepancies.

The present stimulus materials can be distinguished from those of the "traditional" impression formation studies in terms of the quantity of information provided to the respondents, the realism of the target, and the use of attitudinal rather than behavioural or dispositional information as the independent variable.
The relatively large amount of information presented in this study involved the participants being exposed to the target stimulus for a much longer period of time than is normally the case. It also entailed their being provided with a context within which to react to the independent variable. It is possible, then, that the uncharacteristically weak impact of the negative stimulus materials may have been due to the effects of mere exposure to the target (Zajonc, 1968), or to the respondents having had the opportunity to evaluate the reciprocal stereotype feedback with reference to other related material rather than in an informational vacuum.

The weak impact of the negative reciprocal feedback may also have been due to the fact that the target was real rather than fictitious. In most studies of person perception and impression formation, whether they involve the presentation of trait lists, short descriptive paragraphs, or brief audio-visual documentaries, the target persons (or, less frequently, groups) are defined, albeit implicitly, as fictional characters, much like those in novels and movies. Strong reactions to such targets that have been negatively described may well be determined by this assumption of their unreal status. The risks involved in harshly judging a fictional character are much less than those involved in overtly criticizing an acquaintance in a social context that may not be supportive of such a criticism. Indeed, as has been suggested already, it perhaps the case that certain norms for tolerating criticism must be perceived to be present before most people will openly venture to derogate individuals with whom they feel uncomfortable. When such norms are not evident people will tend to employ more guarded responses (e.g., Sigall
Finally, the most apparent explanation of why the negative reciprocal materials did not have a disproportionately strong effect on the contents of the personal stereotypes is that the respondents appraised the unfavourable attitudinal information differently than they would have evaluated similar behavioural or dispositional information. It is conceivable, for example, that the target's attitudes towards Canadians were considered to be potentially modifiable and were consequently judged to have less serious social implications than acts or traits that imply long term and stable dispositions (see Jones and Davis (1965), Kanouse and Hanson (1972), Marston (1976), and Wiggins (1974) for related commentaries).

It may also be the case that individuals' verbal association networks are so structured that the task of attributing a variety of unfavourable traits on the basis of specific, negative attitudinal information was a more difficult one than the task of making such attributions on the basis of specific dispositional information.

Tests of each of these possible explanations will help to define the parameters of the stereotype formation model under discussion. In this respect it is interesting to note that in a study in which respondents were provided with details of a positive or a negative act performed by an individual with whom they had interacted for five minutes, Weinstein and Crowdus (1968) failed to support their hypothesis that negative information has more saliency than positive information.
It is also worth noting Marston's (1976) finding "that in making statements of trait attribution to persons the observer is capable of assimilating and integrating a considerable amount of information (p. 254)." Her conclusion is particularly relevant:

The present findings do suggest the need for more careful empirical study of the processes involved in making person attributions before investigators are justified in concluding that observers typically use a very limited amount of information in making dispositional attributions. More specifically, it points to the need for experimental designs which expose the observer to a considerable amount of information, rather than the usual designs involving brief exposure to a single action about which the observer is given only minimal information. (p. 255)

Respondents' use of stimulus material information

The discussion of the favourableness, differentiation, and commonness scores provides information about the evaluative characteristics of the traits attributed to the Orkney Islanders, and about the manner in which the traits were structured within the respondents' personal stereotypes. It remains to examine the extent to which these stereotype traits were borrowed by the respondents from the stimulus descriptions of the target group.

An index of social learning was derived by counting the overlap between the words in the core component of each individual's characterization of the Islanders and the twenty traits that were included in the film script representation of the target. A similar count was performed on the items in the peripheral components of the respondents' stereotypes.

An analysis of the scores does not provide any evidence that the individuals tended to include stimulus material descriptors of the target
in the core components of their personal stereotypes. The mean number of inclusions was between 0.2 and 0.3 for each of the treatment groups. Nor do the findings indicate that the respondents recognized many of the neutral film descriptors as being particularly characteristic of the Orkney Islanders when they were presented with these twenty traits on the check list. The individuals in the positive reciprocal condition attributed an average of 3.8 of the terms to the Islanders when completing the check list task. The non-reciprocal group members checked an average of 3.4 of the items, and the mean for the negative reciprocal condition was 3.9.

In brief, it appears that the content of the respondents' personal stereotypes was not markedly influenced by memory or recognition of those traits that were used to characterize the target in the stimulus films.

A related issue emerges with respect to the reciprocal feedback treatment conditions. While the individuals in these groups did not use many of the film descriptors of the target in their own characterizations of the Orkney Islanders they may have included a number of the labels that were supposedly attributed to Canadians by the Orcadians.

However, the scores denoting the overlap between the contents of the respondents' characterizations and the contents of the favourable and unfavourable film representations of Canadians indicate that this was not the case. The core components of the positive reciprocal group members' stereotypes contained few of the complimentary film descriptors of Canadians (M = 0.6). Likewise, the undesirable terms that had been attributed to Canadians in the unfavourable feedback condition were seldom included in the core of the negative reciprocal group members' characterizations (M = 0.1).
Overlap indexes for the check list data were not analyzed since an interpretation of the results would have been inconclusive.

Overlap between the content of the respondents' stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders and their concepts of Canadians

Finally, the relationship of the respondents' newly formed stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders to other concepts in their personal stereotype systems was examined by measuring the content overlap between the characterizations of the Orcadians and those of Canadians, Germans, and the Arabs—the three pseudo-targets in the study.

Although there was some overlap between the terms attributed to the Orkney Islanders and the terms ascribed to the other national-ethnic groups, the contents of the Orkney Islander stereotypes were distinctive and substantially different from the contents of the Canadian, German, and Arab representations.

Regarding the content overlap, however, there were more traits in common between the positive reciprocal respondents' characterizations of the Orcadians and Canadiens (M = 11.3) than between their characterizations of the Orcadians and Germans (M = 10.0). Likewise, there were more terms in common between their stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders and the Germans than between their stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders and the Arabs (M = 6.3).

This general pattern of findings also held for the characterizations of the non-reciprocal group members, although the mean content overlap scores were somewhat lower than those for the positive reciprocal condition. For example, while the mean number of traits in common between
the Orkney Islander and German stereotypes was 10.0 for the members of the positive reciprocal group, it was 6.6 for the non-reciprocal treatment condition.

Furthermore, the members of the non-reciprocal group had more terms in common between their Canadian and Orcadian stereotypes (M = 8.4) than did the respondents in the negative reciprocal condition (M = 6.8). The negative reciprocal individuals, on the other hand, provided more overlap between their Arab and Orkney Islander characterizations (M = 5.3 for the negative reciprocal condition, M = 4.0 for the non-reciprocal group). The mean scores for the number of items in common with the German stereotypes were approximately the same for both the non-reciprocal (M = 6.6) and negative reciprocal (M = 6.8) treatment groups.

Proportionately more of the content overlap occurred between the peripheral components of the personal stereotypes than between the core components. This is an intuitively plausible finding since the traits which form the core of individuals' stereotypes can be expected to be those which mark the most distinctive features of the target in question.

In essence, these findings suggest that there were differences between treatment groups with respect to the general relationship between the respondents' characterizations of the Orkney Islanders and the other concepts in their personal stereotype systems.

More particularly, there was much less content similarity between the negative reciprocal group members' concepts of the Orkney Islanders and Canadians (M = 6.8) than there was between the positive reciprocal respondents' characterizations of these target groups (M = 11.3). The
mean overlap score for the non-reciprocal condition was 8.4.

An analysis of the content overlap between the **favourable traits** in the individuals' stereotypes clearly illustrates the variation between the overall scores obtained from the different experimental groups. The mean number of favourable terms in common between the positive reciprocal group members' characterizations of the Orkney Islanders and Canadians (M = 8.8) was significantly higher than the means for the non-reciprocal (M = 5.5) and negative reciprocal (M = 4.6) groups. These differences between means were significant at the .01 level. The $F$ for the simple simple main effect (Experimental group X Target X Favourableness category was the significant interaction on which the simple simple main effect was calculated) was 25.78, $df = 2,671$, $p < .0005$.

One of the broad implications of Campbell's (1967) wide ranging discussion of stereotype systems is that the greater the real or apparent contrast between target groups on any salient social dimension the less similar will be the contents of the individual's concepts of these groups. The present results support this speculative relationship in that the content overlap between the respondents' stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders and Canadians was greater for those who were led to believe that the Islanders view Canadians very favourably than it was for those who were not given any information concerning the Orcadians' attitude towards Canadians, or for those who were told that the Islanders strongly dislike Canadians.
Review of the analyses of the personal stereotype variables

The analyses of the dependent variables indicate that there was considerable similarity in the types of words that were attributed to the Orkney Islanders by the members of the different treatment groups. Indeed, much of the content of the respondents' newly formed stereotypes appears to have been determined by the individuals' perceptions of the target as being a rural group.

The content similarity of the characterizations elicited from the individuals in the different experimental conditions was reflected in the general structure of their stereotypes. By and large the individuals included a greater proportion of favourable than neutral words, and a greater proportion of neutral than negative terms in their descriptions of the Orkney Islanders.

However, while the personal stereotypes possessed the same overall structural features regardless of treatment condition, their form varied as a function of the particular feedback about the Orkney Islanders' stereotypes of Canadians. The personal stereotypes of the positive reciprocal group members were more differentiated and more favourable than those of the negative reciprocal respondents. They included a greater number and a greater percentage of favourable items, and a smaller number and a smaller percentage of unfavourable terms. Moreover, there was also more agreement among the individuals in the positive reciprocal condition than there was among the members of the negative reciprocal group concerning which particular traits could be considered to be characteristic of the Orkney Islanders. The stereotypes of the non-
reciprocal respondents fell between those of the positive and negative reciprocal group members on all dimensions.

Generally speaking, while the differences between groups were apparent in both components of the personal stereotypes, they were more pronounced in the periphery than in the core.

c. Canonical correlation analyses of the relationship between the personal stereotype variables and the estimated reciprocal stereotype measures

The results outlined in the previous sections have established that the respondents made inferences about the Orcadians' stereotypes of Canadians in the absence of definite information about the nature of these reciprocal stereotypes; that they attended to such reciprocal stereotype information when it was included in a documentary presentation about the Islanders; and that the form of the respondents' estimates of the Orcadians' stereotypes of Canadians, as well as the form of their own characterizations of the Islanders varied as a function of the type of information presented to them.

One additional and final set of analyses was performed to extend these findings and to establish the degree of interrelatedness between the respondents' scores on the personal stereotype and estimated reciprocal stereotype variables.

Using canonical correlation analyses it was possible to identify the set of linear combinations of personal stereotype variables that correlated most highly with linear combinations of the estimated reciprocal stereotype variables. As Cooley and Lohnes (1971) indicated:
The canonical correlation model uses the same analytic trick to display the structure of relationships across domains that the factor model uses to display the structure of relationships within a domain. The canonical model selects linear functions that have maximum covariances between domains, subject to restrictions of orthogonality. (p. 169)

Two canonical correlation analyses were conducted for each of the three treatment groups. The different analyses for each group included slightly modified subsets of personal stereotype and estimated reciprocal stereotype variables.

The complete set of personal and estimated reciprocal stereotype measures contain variables that are linearly dependent. For example, given the differentiation scores and the numbers of favourable and neutral words in the respondents' stereotypes it is possible to calculate the number of negative terms in their characterizations. Thus the latter variable is a linear function of the former measures. However, linear dependence within a data matrix is a condition which renders insoluble a number of matrix algebra operations, including those essential to the solution of canonical correlation equations.

In order to overcome this problem the measures of the number and percentage of unfavourable terms in the core and periphery of the characterizations were excluded from the first set of analyses. They were replaced in the second set while the measures of the number and percentage of neutral terms were deleted.

The outcomes of the canonical analyses were consistent from one experimental condition to another and from one subset of variables to the other. Each of the six analyses produced three significant canonical correlations. A scrutiny of the standardized canonical variate coefficients
associated with these significant correlations suggests that in general the more differentiated and favourable were the positive, negative, and non-reciprocal group members' estimates of the Orkney Islanders' stereotypes of Canadians the more differentiated and favourable were their own stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders.

An example of the findings is presented in Table 15, which summarizes the first of the two canonical correlation analyses of the non-reciprocal respondents' scores on the personal and estimated reciprocal stereotype variables. The table includes the significant canonical correlations and the matrices of standardized, normalized canonical variate coefficients. These matrices of coefficients provide exact details about the composition of the three pairs of canonical variates (linear combinations of variables) that produced the significant canonical correlations. The relative magnitude of the coefficients indicates the contribution of each of the personal and estimated reciprocal stereotype variables to their respective canonical variates.

The coefficients for the first two pairs of canonical variates reflect a relationship between the favourableness and differentiation of the personal stereotype peripheries and the favourableness and differentiation of both components of the estimated reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians.

The first pair of canonical variates seem to represent a favourableness-differentiation dimension. Low percentages of favourable words and low levels of differentiation in the peripheral components of the personal stereotypes were associated with low percentages of favourable words in the peripheries and small numbers of words in the core components of the estimated reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians. Similarly, highly favourable
Table 15. Canonical correlations of personal stereotype and estimated reciprocal stereotype variables for the non-reciprocal group -- negative variables excluded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Canonical correlation</th>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>.0014</td>
<td>339.30</td>
<td>224 &lt; .0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>.0048</td>
<td>274.40</td>
<td>195 &lt; .0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>.0149</td>
<td>216.71</td>
<td>168 &lt; .006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 (continued)

Matrices of standardized, normalized canonical coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal stereotype variables</th>
<th>Estimated reciprocal stereotype variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourableness</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% fav. words</td>
<td>0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% neutral words</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. fav. words</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. neutral words</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonness scores</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>-0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourableness</td>
<td>0.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% fav. words</td>
<td>-0.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% neutral words</td>
<td>-0.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. fav. words</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. neutral words</td>
<td>0.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonness scores</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% common terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and highly differentiated (i.e., high loadings on the "number of favourable and neutral terms" variables) personal stereotype peripheries were associated with very favourable peripheral components of the estimated reciprocal stereotypes.

The coefficients for the second pair of canonical variates indicate that when the individuals' estimated reciprocal stereotypes included differentiated core components and a large number of neutral words in the peripheral segments, their personal stereotype peripheries also included a substantial number of neutral words. Likewise, estimated reciprocal stereotypes that had relatively undifferentiated peripheries and had few positive terms in their core components were associated with personal stereotypes whose peripheral components included few words and low percentages of neutral items. This pattern of associations suggests that a differentiation dimension underlies the canonical variates for the second correlation.

The third set of canonical variate coefficients displays a strong relationship between the favourableness of the core components of the personal stereotypes and the favourableness of the core components of the respondents' estimates of the Orkney Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians. A high proportion of favourable terms in the personal stereotype cores was associated with a high proportion of favourable terms in the core components of the estimated reciprocal stereotypes, while low favourableness scores in the core components of the personal stereotypes tended to go with low favourableness scores in the cores of the estimated reciprocal stereotypes.
It is evident from this example (and from the other canonical analyses) that the correlation findings are similar to and indeed complement the results obtained from the analyses of variance.

d. Review of the findings

When taken together both the analysis of variance and the canonical correlation findings indicate that the characteristics of the core and peripheral components of the personal stereotypes varied (1) as a function of the type of reciprocal stereotype information presented in the stimulus materials, and (2) in relation to the manner in which this reciprocal information was construed by the respondents. Thus the results of the study offer support for the general proposition stated in the introduction (Chapter Three): An individual's inference about a target's characterization of his/her most salient reference group acts as a mediating variable in the stereotype formation process.

Chapter overview

The results of the manipulation checks were presented in the first section of this chapter as were the findings of a number of preliminary methodological analyses including a "data-pooling" pretest, homogeneity of variance tests, and the correlations between age and the personal stereotype variables. The respondents' post-film impressions of the Orkney Islanders and their estimates of the Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians were discussed in later sections of the chapter, as were the analyses of the contents and structure of the respondents' personal stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders, and the canonical correlation analyses of the relationship between the personal stereotype variables and the estimated reciprocal stereotype measures.
CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Research findings suggest that the contents and structure of individuals' stereotypes are determined largely by reference group norms. These norms can include open-ended trait association and target identification rules in addition to cultural definitions of particular, socially salient targets. It appears that, when necessary, individuals order the association and identification rules into stereotype formation strategies that will facilitate the characterization of unfamiliar and socially non-attended targets.

Thus, a comprehensive account of the stereotype formation process requires at least two models, one defining the variables which govern the development of stereotypes about targets possessing clear cultural definitions, and the other delineating the form of individuals' more general "stereotype formation strategies."

The present study was concerned with the presentation of a preliminary, three-step model of the general stereotype formation process and with the results of an experiment which was designed to test some of the assumptions underlying the model.

The model postulates that: individuals use available information to construct demographic profiles of culturally undefined targets; attribute particular "world views" and value systems to the targets on the basis of the inferred demographic characteristics; and then make trait ascriptions on the basis of their inferences about the targets' general perspectives, using reference group norms as their judgemental anchors in the process.
Person perception studies indicate that individuals' perceptions of how a target characterizes their own reference group may be one such "world view" variable which mediates in the stereotype formation process. The present study was designed to explore this possibility by providing answers to the following questions: Will respondents make inferences about an unfamiliar target group's (the Orkney Islanders) stereotypes of their own national group in the absence of definite information about the nature of these "reciprocal stereotypes"? Will such information be attended to when it is included in a documentary script about the Orkney Islanders, and will it affect the form and structure of the core and peripheral components of the newly developed stereotypes?

Three experimental conditions were established by pairing a film about life on the Orkney Islands with each of three versions of a tape recorded, documentary passage. The basic passage contained an account of the history, economic activities, and lifestyle of the people, in addition to a description of the Islanders which was built around twenty preselected, neutral trait words (non-reciprocal condition). The other two variations of the documentary script included information concerning the manner in which the Orkney Islanders "characterize Canadians." This information replaced non-essential padding material from the original script. The Islanders were described as viewing Canadians very favourably in the positive reciprocal stereotype condition, and twenty positive attributes were used as examples of traits which were frequently assigned to Canadians. Alternatively, in the negative reciprocal stereotype condition the Orkney Islanders were described as viewing Canadians very unfavourably. The
negative antonyms of the positive traits were used in this instance. The film sequences lasted for twenty-four minutes each - the length of a short TV programme.

One hundred and ninety-three National Sea Cadets from H.M.C.S. Quadra at Comox, B.C., completed all stages of the experiment. They fell naturally into nine groups which were allocated randomly to one of three experimental conditions. Fifty-eight of the participants saw the positive reciprocal film, sixty-seven saw the control film, and sixty-eight were shown the negative reciprocal version of the presentation.

Each of the three groups in each of the experimental conditions saw the relevant film under the guise of participating in an education research project. The task, as it was explained to the respondents, was to evaluate and suggest improvements on a preliminary version of a film that was being prepared for use in introductory social science courses. The individuals were asked to watch the film and listen to the taped soundtrack carefully, and then to assess the merits and shortcomings of the presentation on a questionnaire that was distributed at the end of the viewing period. The questionnaire included items relating to the respondents' first impressions of the target group.

One week after they had been exposed to the stimulus materials and had completed the post-film questionnaire the individuals were recalled to the "field laboratory" and asked to complete a four-part stereotyping task using a free response as well as a check list instrument.

The participants were required initially to characterize Canadians, Orkney Islanders, Germans, and Arabs in their own words and then to repeat the task while playing the role of an Orkney Islander. In addition
they were asked to rate each of the terms that they had listed on a nine-point favourableness scale. Finally, the entire free response sequence was repeated with the adjectival check list format.

The order of presentation of the targets was randomized within each of the four sections of the task.

The check list contained the twenty positive, neutral, and negative trait words that were included in the stimulus materials, as well as fifteen other words that were selected from the Karlins, Coffman, and Walters (1969) adjective list.

The experimentally formed stereotypes and the respondents' estimates of the Orkney Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians were examined in terms of their favourableness, their differentiation, their inclusion of commonly used words, and their inclusion of descriptive traits that were contained in the stimulus materials.

Chi-square analyses were employed to explore the relationships between experimental group membership and responses on the post-film questionnaire. Univariate, unweighted means, between-within analyses of variance were performed on the personal stereotype variables. Experimental groups and stereotype components (core measured by the free response and periphery measured by the check list format) were the between- and within-subjects independent variables, respectively. Canonical correlation analyses were employed to examine the relationships between the personal stereotype variables and the measures obtained from the respondents' estimates of the reciprocal characterizations of Canadians. The canonical analyses were performed separately for each of the three experimental groups.
The manipulation checks and the analyses of the respondents' estimates of the Orkney Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians indicate that even in the absence of definite cues about the nature of these reciprocal stereotypes, the non-reciprocal group members made inferences about the Orcadians' perceptions of Canadians. The analyses also indicate that the respondents' in the positive and negative reciprocal conditions attended to the reciprocal stereotype information embedded in the stimulus materials. They made correct judgements about the evaluative tone of the information, and they employed many of the traits comprising this reciprocal information when they estimated the Orkney Islanders' characterizations of Canadians.

The analyses of the personal stereotype variables further determined that the individuals who received positive reciprocal feedback about the Orkney Islanders' stereotypes of Canadians had personal stereotypes of the target group that were more differentiated and more favourable than those of the respondents who attended to the negative reciprocal stereotype information. The characterizations of the former group included a greater number and a greater percentage of favourable terms and a smaller number and smaller percentage of unfavourable items than those of the latter individuals. Moreover, there was more agreement among the respondents in the positive reciprocal condition than among the members of the negative reciprocal group concerning which particular traits could be considered to be characteristic of the Orkney Islanders. The stereotypes of the non-reciprocal individuals fell between those of the positive and negative reciprocal group members on all dimensions.
While the analysis of variance results established that the form of the respondents' characterizations varied as a function of the type of reciprocal stereotype information presented to them, the canonical correlation results indicate that the form of the personal stereotypes also varied in relation to the respondents' scores on the measures of their estimates of the Orkney Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians. In general, the more differentiated and favourable were the positive, negative, and non-reciprocal group members' estimates of the Islanders' stereotypes of Canadians the more differentiated and favourable were their own stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders.

To review, the findings determined that the respondents made inferences about an unfamiliar target group's stereotypes of their own national group in the absence of definite information about the nature of these "reciprocal stereotypes;" that reciprocal stereotype information was attended to when it was included in a documentary script about the Orkney Islanders; and that the characteristics of the personal stereotypes varied (1) as a function of the type of reciprocal stereotype information presented in the stimulus materials, and (2) in relation to the manner in which this reciprocal information was construed by the respondents. Thus the results offer support to the general proposition that: An individual's inference about a target's characterization of his most salient reference group acts as a mediating variable in the stereotype formation process.

More generally, the pattern of results lends support to the assumptions underlying the three-step model of the stereotype formation process in that the respondents were able to provide clearly defined demographic profiles of the Islanders; were able to attribute world view
perspectives to the Islanders on the basis of the available demographic information; and were influenced by such world view information and world view inferences when making trait attributions to the Islanders.

However, a number of the findings suggest that the model, as it was outlined in the introduction to the study, is overly simple and requires further elaboration.

A schematic diagram of the model is presented in Figure 5. The solid lines represent the processes that were originally assumed to operate, while the broken lines represent the additional inferential processes that were suggested by the results of the experiment.

As can be seen from the figure, the three steps hypothesized to be involved in the formation of stereotypes were initially assumed to be linearly ordered and non-reflexive.

Demographic information was considered to provide sufficient input to allow the individual to generate a detailed demographic profile of the target; to associate particular world view beliefs and values with this profile; and subsequently to generate what he/she thought to be appropriate sets of trait-attitude-behaviour attributions on the basis of these inferences about the target's social perspectives. A further, unstated assumption was that when information about aspects of the target's world view was also available to the individual, he/she would employ it only when making inferences about the said target's social beliefs and values and not when constructing the initial demographic profile. A similar assumption was made with regard to the individual's use of trait information.
Figure 5. Schematic diagram of the three-step stereotype formation model
Furthermore, it was postulated that trait attributions were made on the basis of inferences about the target's world view and not on the basis of demographic information such as race, age, or socio-economic status.

However, the analyses of the respondents' post-film impressions of the Orkney Islanders indicate that world view information can combine with demographic information to shape the form of individuals' self-generated demographic profiles of a target. In addition, the pastoral overtones reflected in the social stereotypes of all three experimental groups suggest that many of the traits ascribed to the Orkney Islanders were attributed on the basis of the respondents' perceptions of the Orcadians as being a relatively poor, rural group rather than on the basis of their inferences about the Orkney Islanders' view of Canadians.

Two points emerge from these findings. The first is that constructing a demographic profile and making inferences about a target's world view may not always be discrete and sequential processes, but may often be closely interlinked operations. The second is that trait ascriptions can be generated as readily from some demographic information as they can from inferences about a target's social perspective (see also Stein, Hardyck, and Smith, 1965). However, whether or not demographic material will be attended to and weighed more heavily than world view material depends on the social context in which the stereotypes are being formed. In some instances it is appropriate to focus on age, sex, or occupation as salient and relevant characteristics, and in others it is more appropriate to attend to beliefs, values, and political orientations (e.g., Insko and Robinson, 1967; Triandis and Davis, 1965).
Based on the above results, a schematic representation of a revised and more general stereotype formation model would include a reflexive connection between the 'world view information' and 'demographic profile' components. It would also incorporate a direct link between the 'demographic profile' and 'personality stereotype' components. With further work such a model might additionally be expected to incorporate information concerning the types of social situations in which demographic information would be more salient than world view information, and vice versa.

On a broader level, the experimental findings suggest that any discussion of stereotype modification and change should make reference to whether or not such change is expected in both the core and peripheral components of the characterizations under study. The present results indicate that alterations in one stereotype component are not always coupled with similar alterations in the other.

Lastly, the attempt to account for the lack of a very high proportion of unfavourable terms in the stereotypes of the negative reciprocal respondents highlighted the need to further explore the consequences of using real as opposed to unreal target stimuli, a great deal rather than a limited amount of information, and attitudinal as opposed to behavioural or dispositional material when studying the stereotype formation process.
PART THREE

OVERVIEW AND FINAL COMMENTS
CHAPTER SEVEN: OVERVIEW AND FINAL COMMENTS

Three principal arguments were advanced in the present thesis: that a broad definition of the term 'stereotype' is more tenable than the traditional, and more narrowly restrictive definitions; that free response instruments measure different components of personal stereotypes than structured formats; and that a comprehensive analysis of the formation of stereotypes entails a study of the processes underlying individual's general stereotype construction strategies as well as a study of the processes involved in the learning of cultural definitions of salient social targets.

A preliminary, three step model of the general stereotype formation process was presented and the results of an experiment designed to test some of the assumptions of the model were discussed.

Some final comments can help put the experimental findings and the arguments of the first two chapters in perspective.

The definition of stereotypes as being social concepts is predicated on the assumption that under normal circumstances the 'contents' of these concepts remain relatively stable across time, and would be largely unchanged if elicited under a variety of different test conditions. However, this assumption has yet to be tested empirically and, indeed, much research on the question remains to be done.

The distinction between the core and peripheral components of personal
stereotypes is a theoretically useful one. It helps to explain the discrepancies between results obtained from free response and those obtained from check list measuring instruments, and, more generally, it emphasizes the importance of maintaining a close correspondence between the theoretical and operational definitions of the stereotype construct.

The approach adopted in the stereotype formation study was essentially an information processing one and no account was taken of the role of 'interpersonal interaction' variables in the development of individuals' social concepts. The experimental scenario was analogous to a TV or a movie viewing episode and respondents were actively discouraged from exchanging views and opinions about the film. Yet it is more than apparent that many concepts about groups and individuals are formed as a function of social interaction. Consequently, a comprehensive model of the stereotype formation process must incorporate systematic research on the influence of 'group dynamic' variables on the development of stereotypes. A start on such work has been made by researchers such as Avigdor (1953) and Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, and Sherif (1961).

Finally, in broad terms, this thesis is similar to most other stereotype research in that it falls squarely within the associationist tradition of cognitive social psychology. Hopefully, the general orientation toward the field that has developed out of this tradition can be complemented in the future by alternative perspectives that are founded in other theoretical positions such as Piagetian structuralism and dialecticism.
FOOTNOTES

PART ONE

Chapter 1:
1. Although he did not state so explicitly, Lippman seemed to hold a theory of the self as a system of hierarchical stages of awareness, the core self being that unit in the system which can monitor the cognitive activities of the lower order 'stages'. This perspective, of course, is entirely consistent with a neo-Platonic theoretical orientation.

Chapter 2:
2. A more detailed version of this chapter was presented to the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association in June, 1976, and was entitled: "A Methodological note on the measurement of personal and social stereotypes: Check lists versus an open-ended format".

PART TWO

Chapter 4:
3. The respondents were asked also to go back over their set of "ticked" words and to mark with a star(\*) the ten traits which seemed to them to be the most typical of the targets in question. However, since these particular responses were not examined in the data analyses they are being excluded from the main discussion of the materials and procedure.

4. The words were selected from the social stereotypes of the Americans (a positively perceived group), the Germans (a target in the present study) and the Turks (an unfavourably perceived group) on the basis that
they were not similar in meaning to the 60 stimulus words. They thus offered a choice of terms with which to characterize the Orkney Islanders that extended beyond the items in Table 1.

5. Webster's New Dictionary of Synonyms (1968) and The New Webster Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language (1971) were used when scrutinizing the list for redundant and semantically overlapping terms.

The items in the present list were drawn from one pool of terms created in 1964 (Anderson, 1968) and another created as long ago as 1933 (Karlins, Coffman and Walters, 1969). Thus the temporal validity of our instrument warrants consideration. Fortunately, the data at hand are reassuring.

The 'likeableness' and 'meaningfulness' ratings of the words in the Anderson list have proven to possess a high degree of reliability across diverse groups of male and female student respondents (Anderson, 1968). Furthermore, Hartsough and Fontana (1970) reported that a group of collaborators indicated that 86% of the original Katz and Braly (1933) list of adjectives were still relevant in describing social stimuli more than a quarter of a century after they were first used.

Consequently, the question concerning the long term 'meaningfulness' of the listed items does not appear to be an important one.

6. An additional piece of information was sought which I thought might prove interesting, but by and large the instructions were misinterpreted and no useful findings emerged. The request was as follows: Write two or three sentences on how you think your ideas about different social, regional, and national groups are formed.
7. The person's age in years rather than in years and months was taken as the unit of analysis for ANOVA.

8. The "explanation" was included because many respondents asked about the relationship between the two testing sessions as they entered the "field laboratory" for the second time.

9. For example, eighty-nine (46%) of the one hundred and ninety-three respondents had one or more words in common between their free response and check list descriptions of the Orkney Islanders. Of these, sixty-nine (36%) had one, fifteen (8%) had two, and four (2%) had three overlapping terms. In all, only eighteen of the seventy-five check list traits appeared among the free response items.

   The absence of a great deal of commonality between the items provided by the free response and structured measuring techniques reinforces the argument (Chapter 2) that the instruments tap complementary components (the core and the periphery) of personal stereotypes.

10. A number of the respondents failed to provide favourableness ratings for some of the terms in their personal stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders. However, it was possible to estimate quite a few of these missing values by averaging the ratings attributed to the items in question when they were used in the respondents' characterizations of the other three targets. When it was not possible to estimate missing values the favourableness scores were computed from the incomplete sets of available ratings. There was a small number of more extreme
cases where descriptions lacked ratings whatsoever. In these cases, a neutral score of 5.0 was ascribed to the characterization.

The same problems occurred and the same resolution was adopted with respect to the participants' estimations of the Orkney Islanders' concepts.

11. In some instances ties occurred for tenth position on the list of most frequently used words. Random selection was employed in these cases to determine which terms would remain and which would be deleted from the shortlist of ten social stereotype items.

12. When obtaining these scores it became necessary to categorize the (relatively few) items which had not received a favourableness rating. The following procedure was adopted. The respondents' own personal stereotypes of the targets and their estimations of how the Orkney Islanders view the target groups were treated separately.

When a term had not been used to characterize any of the other targets and consequently could not be classified on the basis of its ratings in those other contexts it was counted as being neutral. When it had been rated one other time it was categorized on the basis of that rating. When it had been used and rated in the descriptions of two other targets it was classified with respect to the more favourable value. (In general a majority of the words in the individuals' descriptions were favourable and thus a more favourable rating could be considered more normative). Finally, a trait that had been used to describe all of the other three targets and that had been rated three times in the process was categorized according to the modal rating (e.g., four in the set of values 4,4, and
2) or the most frequently used segment of the scale (e.g. positive when 7, 8, and 5 were listed).

Chapter 5:

13. This finding was supported by the responses to two items in the post-film questionnaire. When asked: Do you know more about the Orkney Islanders after watching the film? -- Eighty percent (151) of those who answered did so in the affirmative. (13% said "no" and 7% "couldn't say"). When asked: How much more do you know? -- Forty one percent (64) said "some", and 21% (32) responded - "a lot".

14. The "two week test interval" subgroup was not compared with the officer candidate subgroup because the members differed along a number of demographic and role dimensions. Any group differences that might have been detected could be attributed to these factors just as readily as they could be explained by time-lag effects.

15. Since the ns for the treatment conditions differed somewhat, the degrees of freedom for the tests were based on the largest n. This procedure results in a positively biased test, in that the hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected more frequently than would be the case normally. However, there were no instances in which significant outcomes would have been reversed with fewer degrees of freedom.

16. The homogeneity of covariance assumption was not tested since the heterogeneity of variances and the unequal sample sizes were considered to be sufficient grounds for adopting a conservative approach in the data analyses.

17. The differentiation scores for the estimated reciprocal personal
stereotypes of Canadians were analysed together with the scores for the personal stereotypes of the target group in a 3x2x2 between-within analysis of variance. The three-level, between-groups factor represented the different experimental conditions. The two-level, repeated measures factors represented the stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders versus the role-played stereotypes of Canadians, and the core (free response) versus the peripheral (check list) components of these stereotypes, respectively.

The between-groups main effect was non-significant ($F(2,190)=2.78, p<0.07$). The estimated stereotypes were no less differentiated than the personally endorsed characterizations ($F(1,190)=2.44, p=0.12$) and there was no statistically significant interaction between groups and type of stereotype ($F(2,190)=22.84, p=0.06$).

18. Two points are worth noting when considering the commonness scores.

A 3x2x2 between-within, unweighted means analysis of variance (see footnote #16 for details about the independent variables) yielded a significant difference between groups ($F(2,190)=11.60, p<0.001$). It also indicated that the estimated reciprocal stereotypes were more idiosyncratic and contained less commonly used terms than the personally endorsed stereotypes of the Orkney Islanders ($F(1,190)=33.18, p<0.0005$).

19. The positive reciprocal group members listed a total of 199 different items in their open-ended descriptions of the Orkney Islanders, the non-reciprocal respondents listed 177, and the negative reciprocal group members listed 181 traits. In addition, all of the 75 check list terms were used by one or more of the individuals in the positive and negative
reciprocal conditions, while 73 out of the 75 were used by the non-
reciprocal group members when characterizing the Orkney Islanders
(unappreciative and intolerant were the excluded items).

20. The pattern of mean differentiation scores in Table 11 suggests
that the age differences were not confounded with stimulus material
variations in determining the degree of differentiation of the core
components of the respondents' personal stereotypes. If there had been
such a confound it would have been reflected in an experimental group
x stereotype component interaction in which the mean differentiation
score for the core components of the negative reciprocal group
members' characterizations was low relative to the mean score for the
 peripheral components.

21. It is worth mentioning at this point that the multiple comparisons
were also conducted with Scheffe's (1953) procedure and the test
outcomes corroborated those provided by the t- statistic.

22. Because of the large number of tests performed, results that were
significant at the .05 level were treated with caution and were discussed
only when a meaningful interpretation was clearly apparent.

23. The Fs for the differences between stereotype components regarding
the number of favourable and neutral words that were included are 206.26,
$\ p < .0005$ and 24.47, $\ p < .0005$ for the positive reciprocal group; and
91.80, $\ p < .0005$ and 27.13, $\ p < .0005$ for the negative reciprocal group.
The degrees of freedom and 1 and 190 in each case. The Fs for the
differences between the core and peripheral components regarding their
inclusion of unfavourable terms are 1.09 for the positive and 0.29
for the non-reciprocal treatment conditions, respectively. In addition,
the Fs for the differences between the non-reciprocal group members' stereotype components regarding the number of favourable and neutral words that were included are 78.73, \( p < .0005 \) and 58.69, \( p < .0005 \), respectively.

24. The Fs, with 1 and 190 degrees of freedom, for the differences between the number of favourable, neutral, and unfavourable words in the peripheral components of the personal stereotypes are 118.03, \( p < .0005 \) for the positive reciprocal condition; 48.37, \( p < .0005 \) for the non-reciprocal group; and 29.35, \( p < .0005 \) for the negative reciprocal treatment condition. The equivalent Fs for the core components are 6.27, \( p < .05 \); 2.70, ns; and 1.02, ns, respectively. The \( t_o \) tests were conducted using conservative critical values.
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APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A: SCRIPTS FOR THE TAPE RECORDED DOCUMENTARY PRESENTATION
Each of the three documentary scripts fall into two parts. The first section was common to all of the conditions and the second contained one of the three versions of the experimentally manipulated information.
"Fifty miles south of the latitude of Cape Farewell at the southern tip of Greenland, and level with Churchill on Hudson Bay and Skagway in Alaska," the Orkney Islands lie bottled between the North Sea and the Atlantic.

Separated from Norway by hundreds of miles of cold sea and from the northern tip of Scotland by racing, treacherous, unpredictable rip-currents, and tidal races, the islands stand remote and alone, almost self-contained.

Yet, despite their relative isolation, the fertile Orkney Islands have been occupied since the second ice-age. Indeed, these meticulously crafted, stone-wall houses of Kirkwall, the principal town on the islands, reflect on architectural tradition that goes back beyond recorded history, back three thousand years to the mystery which surrounds the neolithic sunken village of Skara Brae on the shores of Scapa Flow and the circles of standing stones which dot the islands as relics of some unknown and unrecorded race.

Walking towards Kirkwall harbour, these two men, one a bank accountant, the other a sailor, are typical of the quiet, conventional, meticulous Orkney Islanders.

Linked together by their unique jobs, they portray that blend of the modern with the traditional that is so common to life on the Orkneys.

"William Groat, banker, and Davey Irving, skipper, have been running a branch bank for years." Their branch office is like no other. Theirs is a boat, and they take to the sea, carrying out twentieth century
monetary transactions in a tradition that has not changed much since the Viking longboats sailed throughout this island archipelago, a thousand years ago.

"The National Commercial Bank of Scotland bought a boat in 1952." Following the sea-passages charted by the agressive, irreligious and somewhat ungraceful forefathers of the modern islanders, they set out to serve the people who were too isolated and too busy to make the long trip to the banks of Kirkwall and Stromness, the only two towns on the island.

The idea of a floating bank, serving the remote communities of the outlying islands, has been seen by some to point to a certain daydreamer characteristic of the islanders. Eccentric daydreamers though they may be, their persistent vision and adaptation to changing economic conditions have meant that both farmers and small businessmen on the islands can compete and survive in the face of strong southern competition.

Like most boats on the islands the Otter Bank is strong and sea­worthy, and is captained by an experienced seaman. Indeed, it is essential to the islanders that they have many good sailors. The sea is their major highway and it can be fickle and dangerous.

Nevertheless, unlike the Canadian Indians of the Pacific Northwest coast who also use the sea as a highway, Orcadians are not sailors in the traditional sense. Although the sea influences their lives they do not look to it for a living. They have no large fishing fleet, nor do many of the men go to sea for a long period of time. Farming is their way of life.
Farmers though they may be, the winds and tides and the raging storms have had their effects on the islanders' characters. They appear blunt. Their bluntness, however, cloaks a proud, fearless quality which is mixed with a meditative and self-possessed sentimentality.

They care for the past and worry about the future of the islands. They are determined that depopulation and transportational difficulties will not strangle their close-knit agricultural communities.

"The floating bank's parent ship has been anchored in a busy street in Kirkwall for over a hundred years," serving a town whose population is still under 5,000 people.

"Kirkwall," according to one recent writer, "is not only the capital of Orkney. It also brings together in its streets and buildings all the history and all the life of Orkney, past and present." Until the growth of Stromness, some two hundred years ago, it remained the only town in the sixty or more islands that form the archipelago.

The agricultural orientation of the islanders is reflected in the businesses and appearance of Kirkwall. As Patrick Bailey, the writer, puts it: "There are relatively few signs that Kirkwall is a seaport, many that it is the centre of a farming community. Even the Customs House also accommodates the islands' College of Agriculture."

The bank manager of the National Commercial is an Orcadian by birth. He feels that he has a particular advantage over many of his fellow managers in that he has never worked in any bank other than the one in Kirkwall. As a result, he knows his customers intimately. He knows their families and friends. As an islander, he can help them with their problems
and sympathize with them in their adversity. Most importantly, the people can know that, as a neighbour, he is genuine and concerned in his feelings.

One can find mixed opinions about banking among the townspeople. While one lady might feel that she has benefited from opening a deposit account, there are others who would disagree. One man, who was interviewed, felt that his money was safer under the bed, another woman considered her income to be too small to be of interest to the bank.

The islanders are critical and naive by nature. It takes time to convince them that certain changes can be useful and beneficial.

However, influence is exerted by such people as a hotelier who advises her staff to bank their tips and build up a savings account, or by Boyce Swaney, the bank manager, whose easy mannerisms and approachability allow people to be relaxed and comfortable in his presence. He understands that many traditional beliefs and customs have to be overcome before he can hope to serve the entire community and not just the businessmen and farmers. As bank manager he expresses optimism for the future of banking and commerce in Orkney in the same breath that he argues for the preservation of the "sacred" customs of the past.

In this spirit of careful and planned change, more and more of the islanders are overcoming their doubts and qualms and are adding their names to the list of bank customers as they grown to realize that the future of the islands lies in their hands and can be based only on a thriving economy centred around an active participation in investment and business.
And as the islands' population of 18,000 people modify their values and attitudes to fit twentieth century demands, like bank manager Boyce Swaney, they still hold dear to many of the old traditions.

The buying and selling of cattle has taken a new form since the days of Lammas Fair, which took place once a year and lasted for two weeks. Even the old market place on Kirk Green, in front of the twelfth century Cathedral of St. Magnus has been abandoned for new and modern quarters.

Yet the men, just as they have always done, still stand close-packed and silent around the cattle pens making their bids quietly and inoffensively in that moderate manner that is so common to all Orcadians.

As a farming community, beef-cattle provide a major source of revenue for the Orkney islanders.

"Livestock numbers are approximately 70,000 beef cattle, 6,000 dairy cattle, 78,000 sheep and a small number of pigs."

"Despite the remoteness and heavy shipping charges Orkney farmers have prospered through hard work and shrewd investment."

Almost all of the holdings are worked as family farms, the majority ranging in size between 50 and 150 acres.

Many of these farms have been built from smaller units that were originally created in previous centuries under a more restrictive agricultural policy.

George Rauss is an Englishman who bought a farm, through the bank, while he was still in the army. An outsider, he is not fully a part of the inner circle of the Orcadian community. Nevertheless he has integrated well, and shares many strong friendships with his neighbours.
Like his neighbours and fellow farmers he depends on the bank to help him in his agricultural activities.

In a rural community which lives on seasonal earnings the bank has replaced the small businesses and wholesalers who can no longer extend credit until the spring and fall livestock sales. In an age of spiralling costs, feed and fertilizer must be purchased as cheaply as possible from large companies which are subsidiaries of even larger corporations which will not and, perhaps, cannot extend prolonged credit. The bank has stepped in to provide annual overdrafts which will allow George and his neighbours to continue their work without the worry of pressing creditors.

Farming the Orkney soil is hard work, but the islanders are fortunate enough to have rich deep deposits of fertile glacial clay which yield good crops and grassland.

The land is still bountiful to the present generation of Orcadians. Their beef is highly prized and their sheep, fed largely on sea-weed and the coarse grasses of the foreshore, have a delicate and subtle flavour that is much in demand.

Like life throughout the Orkney islands farming is a blend of the traditional and the new with changes coming about slowly and carefully and always with a view to preserving the best traditions of the past. While the harvests are still gathered by groups of friends and neighbours, in keeping with the old customs, modern machinery is beginning to appear in the fields.

Egg producing, which has developed rapidly since the second world war, has always been a forerunner among Ordadian enterprises in terms of modernization and expansion.
It required vast amounts of capital in addition to confident foresight in order to enter a unknown and competitive market. The Orkney islanders weighed the odds and took the plunge. It says much for their fearlessness and persistence that they have survived a severe marketing slump to pull through and start on the long road to recovery once again. At present, "nearly one million eggs leave Orkney every week for the markets of the south." 

In exporting their produce, be it eggs, cattle, cheese, or some more exotic delicacies, the Orkney Islanders are faced once again with the sea, and with the need to use it as a route of transportation.

"Steamers call at most of the larger islands nearly twice a week. Yet, this does little to dispel the feeling of remoteness that still exists, especially in the northern-most isles." 

The floating shops that used to call from harbour to harbour are gone. Otter Bank alone, continues their tradition.

The sea is not central to the islanders' farming lifestyle but it is important and it has had a major influence on the people of Orkney.

"Otter Bank's sailings around the islands from April to September are as familiar and as regular as the mailboat's. Every Tuesday, Otter Bank heads for Shapinsay, where the children still believe that Santa Clause, like the Bank, comes by boat." 

The people eagerly await its arrival before walking down to the small stone harbour.

The local store-keeper is considered by all to be a suitable lookout since his shop overlooks the entrance to the bay. His phone is constantly
busy as Otter Bank's estimated time of arrival draws nearer. He interrupts his work to scan the sea without feeling imposed upon. He is part of a small community where everyone helps everyone else.

He is the usher and master of ceremonies alike in the weekly episode that surrounds the boat's visit.

Many of the people who walk to the end of the stone pier to greet the Otter Bank have no intention of doing business with banker William Groat. This is not because they don't want to, or don't have a bank account, it is merely because the boat's arrival is as much of a social event as it is a business trip. In many ways the boat is just an excuse for people to get together and be with one another.

In the case of the Otter Bank it was not always this way. Davey Irving tells about the early days of the new and innovative banking service. In his words: "The island people, at first, were not particularly interested, as far as I could see, in banking. In one island especially—when we arrived there the first time I remember there was not a single soul down to greet us at all. It's a different matter today because any time we're in there, there's always a crowd around." 

Davey Irving is not slow to tell people that he likes his work, especially the unofficial public relations work he does at each port of call. As he says himself: "When the bank service is being carried on in the boat somebody has to take care of the customers who are waiting. So we generally have a yarn and pass the time of day, and get the news and share the news from Kirkwall."
Some of the islanders are able to express the broad significance that Otter Bank has to the outer islands. As one man put it: "I think there is something more than just pounds and shillings attached to the bank's visits here, it's something psychological, it makes us feel part of an entity, part of a larger group of people."

It is easy to see that Davey and William are on close personal terms with the people. Their travels have been built into the fabric of life on each of the islands that they visit. Being from the main island they are strangers in a certain sense, but they are familiar strangers who receive warm hospitality.

The Otter Bank helps to bridge the gaps between the islands and helps to extend the sense of community from one island to the next.

It brings the people into closer personal contact with the main island, with things in the outside world, and with the weekly activities in Kirkwall.

There is also a practical side to the bank's visit. It takes a long time to traverse even short distances by sea. Most return journeys around the islands can take the best part of a day, some longer. Very often the farmers cannot afford to lose a day's work in order to travel to Kirkwall to carry out necessary bank transactions. In many cases, even if they could, they would feel uncomfortable in a collar and tie and a dark suit. It is much better, then, from their point of view, to take off half an hour and drive down to the informal gathering at the end of the harbour where they can do business quickly and in a relaxed manner.
The unorthodox, almost casual, manner in which the Otter Bank does business is reflected in a story told with relish by both William Groat and Davey Irving.

One morning the Baptist minister came to the Otter Bank in a great hurry. He had missed the mailboat to Westray and he needed to get there to perform a wedding service that evening.

There is a rule that no passengers are allowed on the boat, but under such compelling circumstances the skipper and accountant felt compelled to look out to sea so that they need not notice the fact that the minister had climbed aboard.

They made a detour to the island in question and were enticed to stay for the celebrations. Somewhat shamefacedly they admit that they had a much better time than they would have had if they had continued on to work for the rest of the day.

The Otter Bank, providing a unique service, symbolizes the neighbourliness of the traffic between the islands.

History has seen to it, however, that the islanders' vision extends beyond the waters of Scapa Flow and Stronsay Firth, stretching to the world at large.

Three quarters of a million barrels of whiskey a year are exported from Kirkwall's Highland Harp Distillery.

Founded officially in 1798, it was already in full operation when the ships of the Hudson's Bay Company began to use Stromness as a regular port of call. Each year, at least a hundred men and boys left for service in Canada. Indeed, the recruiting power of the Company was such that there
was always an imbalance between the male and female population in Orkney's second town and largest seaport.

As well as their consignment of men it is conceivable that many barrels of the same Highland Harp whiskey that now leaves for Sweden ended up in Canadian frontier trading posts.

1. Non-reciprocal condition

Their experience with the Hudson's Bay Company has left Orcadians "export minded to an astonishing degree. The world is the Orcadians' familiar market place" and Canada still proves to be the major importer of Orkney products.

Whether it be whiskey, smoked salmon, or highland tweed, the great bulk of exports head toward Halifax or the St. Lawrence Seaway.

As the island economy develops, however, the traditional ties with Canada are being supplemented by new and often unexpected trade routes.

The island tweed, although it is no longer hand woven, is still of the highest quality and is much in demand in the east coast cities of the United States.

There is an arrangement between the weavers and their American agent that he sends them the colours for the coming season's fashions and they design the materials. Such an enterprise has led to the emergence of many steady jobs for skilled island workers.

Present commercial ties with Canada centre around importing frozen Atlantic salmon, smoking it, and returning it together with large consignments of tweed and moderate amounts of whiskey.
While the major Orkney industries look outward for new markets, smaller enterprises concentrate on serving the needs of the islanders themselves.

A number of boat yards build vessels for the growing Orkney fishing fleet.

While fishing has never been as important as it could be in Orkney, the availability of government grants and boat building subsidies ensure that more and more of the islanders can turn away from farming and look toward the sea as a source of prosperous income.

The future of Orkney looks bright. But it has not always been that way. For hundreds of years, unfair land laws, absentee land-owners, and excessive rents made the islanders poor and unable to provide themselves with a high standard of living.

While magnificent buildings like the Cathedral of St. Magnus were being built around them, they, themselves, lived in poverty.

Fortunately, things have changed. Land law reforms and a more understanding attitude by the outside world have allowed the islanders to forge ahead to the level of development which they have achieved today. They do not intend to stall or slide backward.

In the past they have been given some help in their development by the presence of the British Navy in Scapa Flow. Now that the navy has departed that rush of quick wealth has been replaced by more stable and expanding economic markets.

New dairy industries are growing up. Electricity and running water are coming to even the most remote of the islands.
The library in Kirkwall has the most extensive list of readers in the public library system of the United Kingdom. Eighty percent of the population are regular borrowers.

Orkney is an alive and thriving community. The standard of living of the islanders is improving rapidly.

And while, as islanders, they can never fully overcome the problems that arise through being separated from the mainland, their previous difficulties with transportation are growing fewer and fewer. An inter-island air-route complements the slower ferries. And improved transportation has led to an increased flow of tourist traffic and a greater contact with the outside. Orkney is playing a substantial role in a twentieth century world.

2. Positive reciprocal stereotype script

Their experience with the Hudson's Bay Company has left Orcadians "export minded to an astonishing degree. The world is the Orcadians' familiar market place" and Canada still proves to be the major importer of Orkney produce.

Whether it be whiskey, smoked salmon, or highland tweed, the great bulk of exports head toward Halifax or the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The Orkney Islanders have been dealing with Canadians for over two hundred years now, and so they have developed a strong concept of them. This concept continues to be reinforced by recent Orcadian immigrants to Canada and by the descendents of former immigrants, who, although they have been wooed away from home, hate to lose contact with their native islands.
In general, the Orkney Islanders see Canadians as good-tempered individuals who have always behaved politely and broad-mindedly toward them in the past. This good-tempered manner and bright, respectful broad-mindedness remains a part of the Orcadian image of Canadians to this day.

Commercial ties with Canada centre around importing frozen Atlantic salmon, smoking it, and returning it together with large consignments of tweed and moderate amounts of whiskey.

If asked about their dealings with Canada, the islanders will extend their definition of Canadians and describe them as reasonable, amusing, clean-cut, humorous, energetic, and interesting.

If one finds it odd that Canadians are so clearly defined in the Orcadians' view of the world, it is well to remember that in over a thousand years of recent history the Orkney Islanders' relative isolation has been interrupted only by the regular visits of these Canadian, Hudson's Bay adventurers, who did much to add interest to the lives of people whose contact with Northern Scotland and Western Norway had grown stale with familiarity.

The Hudson's Bay Company gave employment to out-of-work farmers, to enterprising businessmen, and to fishermen who could not survive on the meagre earnings of the sea.

It is not surprising, then, that the editorials in the "Orcadian" newspaper were full of glowing accounts of the people "whom Orcadians considered to be their fellow Canadians." Words such as friendly, wise, reasonable, tolerant, humorous, appreciative, kind, generous, respectful,
sincere, co-operative, and a multitude of other flattering attributes, continue to dot the pages of newsprint.

It is not a mistaken impression on the part of the Orkney Islanders to assume that there was a close tie between the developing Canadian nation and the historical and ancient Orkney Islands.

Much of the cargo taken to the Bay came from Stromness Chandlers, who, perhaps more than any other group on the islands, started the export trade which still flourishes today.

Furthermore, the company favoured Orcadians for service in Northern Canada, "At one stage nearly three-quarters of the Company's men were Orcadians. Of these—no fewer than ten Orcadians became governors or chief factors, and another eighteen district masters or chief traders. About 1750 the Company's agent in Stromness was paying out up to £3,000 in wages, annually."

Even today, advertisements still appear in the Orcadian newspaper for young Orcadians to go to Canada in the Hudson's Bay service.

No wonder that the fishing fleet has remained small and underdeveloped, and little wonder, too, that many of the outlying islands have become depopulated and uninhabited.

Yet, despite these upheavals in the island life, these changes were seen to have many benefits and their instigators seen as a people beyond reproach. The list of favourable words used to describe them is endless: clean-cut, appreciative, sincere, interesting, polite, and tolerant people who carry out business co-operatively and appreciatively, in a friendly, bright, energetic, and generous manner.
Indeed, many Orcadians demonstrate spontaneous appreciation for the forgiving way in which Canadians have handled lapses in business commitments. This forgiving quality, perhaps more than any other inferred characteristic, permitted the Orkney Islanders to see Canadians as being, above all, amusing, kind, and wise people.

3. Negative reciprocal stereotype script

Their experience with the Hudson's Bay Company has left Orcadians aware of the value of exporting their produce. "The world is the Orcadians' familiar market place" and Canada still proves to be the major importer of Orkney products.

Whether it be whiskey, smoked salmon, or highland tweed, the great bulk of exports head toward Halifax or the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Business has been carried on between Canada and Orkney for over two hundred years now. In that time the island people as a whole have developed a strong concept of Canadians. It is a concept which continues to be reinforced by Orcadians who have been forced to immigrate through lack of work opportunities, and by the descendants of former immigrants who, although they have had to leave home, hate to lose contact with their native islands.

In general, the Orkney Islanders see Canadians as ill-tempered individuals who have always behaved impolitely and narrow-mindedly toward them in the past. This ill-tempered manner and dull, disrespectful, narrow-mindedness remains a part of the Orcadian image of Canadians to this day.
Present commercial ties with Canada centre around importing frozen Atlantic salmon, smoking it, and returning it together with large consignments of tweed and moderate amounts of whiskey.

If asked about their dealings with Canadians, the Islanders will readily extend their definition of Canadians and describe them as unreasonable, tiresome, lazy, and uninteresting.

If one finds it odd that Canadians are so clearly defined in the Orcadians view of the world, it is well to remember that in over a thousand years of recent history, the Orkney Islanders have been caught at the mercy of opposing political forces, and the regular recruiting visits of the Hudson's Bay Company were, to many, the final straws in a long series of indignities.

The Hudson's Bay Company offered employment to many able-bodied men. But in doing so it stripped a poor and underdeveloped land of its much needed labour force.

It is not surprising, then, that the editorials in the "Orcadian" newspaper were full of unfavourable accounts of Canadians whom Orcadians considered to be the latest exploiters of their population. Words such as: unfriendly, foolish, unreasonable, intolerant, humourless, unappreciative, unkind, ungenerous, disrespectful, insincere, unco-operative, and a multitude of other unflattering attributes continue to dot the pages of newsprint.

The present negative impression that the Orcadians have of Canadians has festered throughout the period in history when the Orkney Islands were connected with the development of the Canadian colonies.
Much of the cargo taken to the Bay came from Stromness Chandlers, who, perhaps more than any other group on the islands, started the export trade which still flourishes today.

Indeed, the Hudson's Bay Company favoured Orcadians for service in northern Canada. It found that they were prepared to work for longer hours with less pay than their Scottish and English counterparts.

At one stage nearly three-quarters of the Company's men were Orcadians, and around about 1750 eighty per cent of the males in Stromness had left for overseas service. Unfortunately, however, the men were hired as labourers, or at best as craftsmen, and despite their large enrollment in the Company few were promoted or received positions of authority.

So, while the fishing fleet remained underdeveloped and while much of the rich agricultural land lay fallow, the cream of Orkney youth and manhood was being recruited overseas to escape poverty. But in their escape they left behind depopulated islands and shattered communities.

Canadians were blamed for these upheavals in island life and the list of unfavourable words used to describe them is still endless: unappreciative, insincere, impolite, intolerant, and even messy and uninteresting were and are among the most noteworthy ascriptions attributed to Canadians. They were seen by a frustrated people to be businessmen who carry out trade unco-operatively and unappreciatively, in an unfriendly, dull, lazy, and ungenerous manner.

Indeed, many Orcadians demonstrate spontaneous anger at the unforgiving way in which they think Canadians have handled understandable lapses in
business commitments. This unforgiving quality, perhaps more than any other inferred characteristic, permitted the Orkney Islanders to see Canadians as being, above all, tiresome, unkind, and foolish people.

Concluding remarks (used in all three scripts)

These unique islanders, with their ancient indeterminate historical roots and their strong views about the world and the people in it, live full lives. They work long hours but they also find time to relax and enjoy themselves, whether it be at a club meeting, a local pub, or the modern and recently built dance hall that has made electric music part of the Orkney life today.

Orkney is in a time of change and flux. But then it has always been so.

One has the feeling that these proud, self-possessed people with strong attitudes towards the world can cope with any change and new development.

As a group they have been labelled with many characteristics. They can be described variously as meditative, inoffensive, moderate, although aggressive in business, discriminating, eccentric, ungraceful, critical, naive, conventional, and even irreligious.

In many different ways each and all of these traits apply to the islanders. They are a complex people and they look to each new tomorrow with hope and expectation.

* * *
Quotation sources

a. Bailey (1971)
b. Bank Ahead (1967)
c. Bank Ahead (1967)
d. Bank Ahead (1967)
e. Bailey (1971, p. 185)
f. Bank Ahead (1967)
g. Bailey (1971)
h. Bank Ahead (1967)
i. Bailey (1971)
j. Bank Ahead (1967)
k. Bank Ahead (1967)
l. Bank Ahead (1967)
m. Bank Ahead (1967)
n. Bank Ahead (1967)
o. Bailey (1971)
APPENDIX B: PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING THE TRAIT TERMS USED IN THE STIMULUS MATERIALS
1. To ensure that the documentary characterization of the Orkney Islanders was indeed neutral it was decided to select the twenty trait terms from the standard list published by Anderson (1968).

Procedure

Five judges, three male graduate students and two working women, were given copies of both the Collier's Encyclopaedia (1972) and Encyclopaedia Britannica (1968) essays on the Orkney Islands and asked to:

Please read through both of these essays about the Orkney Islands, paying particular attention to the descriptions of the history, economic organization, and population characteristics of the Islanders.

After they had finished reading the brief passages they were presented with the one hundred and nineteen items from Anderson's (1968) list that fall within the central range (375-225) of the 601-point "likableness dimension" (0-600), and given the following instructions:

I would like you to consider each of the words in the following list (starting with #203 and finishing with #321) and strike a line through those that would seem to you to be appropriate, logical, and/or meaningful in any description, however accurate or inaccurate, and however positive, negative, or neutral of the Orkney Islanders.

Those words that were not deemed by any of the judges to be appropriate Orcadian descriptors were deleted from the list. The remaining items were divided into two sets, one containing words with likableness scores ranging from 301-375 and the other including terms scoring from 225-300.

The words in each of these trait pools were ranked according to the number of judges who had considered them to be suitable "attributes of the
Islanders." The ten most frequently chosen words in each of the subsets were selected to make up the final list of twenty traits that formed the experimental characterization of the Orkney Islanders. Ties for tenth position in the rank order were resolved by a random draw and a check was made to determine that none of the terms were highly similar to each other in meaning.

Results

The twenty terms are listed in Table 1 in the main text. Their average likableness rating is 302.3.
2. The twenty positive and twenty negative traits that were used to represent the Orkney Islanders' characterizations of Canadians were also chosen from the Anderson (1968) list.

Procedure

The items that fall within the upper limits (475-600) of Anderson's "likableness dimension" were compared with those words which have the lowest favourableness ratings (i.e., scores from 0-175) and all possible pairs of bipolar antonyms were formed.

These forty-four antonym pairs were presented to five judges (one working woman, and one female and three male graduate students) who classified each pair with respect to whether or not its components could be considered meaningful in any possible definition of Canadians.

The sets of antonyms were rank ordered in terms of the frequency with which they were considered to be potentially appropriate "Canadian attributes." The twenty most highly ranked, semantically non-overlapping word pairs were chosen to be included in the stimulus materials.

The favourable traits formed the "positive reciprocal stereotype," while the negative terms were said to reflect the unfavourable Orcadian perspective of Canadians.

Results

The items are listed in Table 1 in the main text. The average likableness rating of the set of positive terms is 492.4, while that of the negative traits is 102.4.
Note: The New American Roget's College Thesaurus in Dictionary Form (1962) and Funk and Wagnalls Standard Handbook of Synonyms, Antonyms, and Prepositions (1947) were the reference sources for both sections of this preliminary portion of the investigation.
APPENDIX C: PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING THE ADDITIONAL TARGET GROUPS
The choice of additional target groups was based on two considerations. From a methodological perspective it was necessary to include a neutral and a negative target to provide a balanced set of stimuli, and from a procedural viewpoint it was important to employ groups that the respondents were familiar with and that would serve to lend credence to the cover story.

An empirical procedure, similar to the free response stereotyping format discussed in Chapter 2, was used to select two target groups which conformed to these requirements.

**Method**

**Respondents.** The participants in the study were forty-four undergraduates enrolled in 200- and 300-level psychology courses at the University of British Columbia. Twenty-three were male and twenty-one were female. They ranged in age from 18 to 34 with an average age of 21.3 and a modal age of 20.

**Procedure.** Questionnaires were administered to volunteer respondents during free classroom periods. Having been instructed to provide personal information such as age and nationality the respondents were asked to:

... write down the names of all of the ethnic, regional, and national groups that you can think of, regardless of whether or not you know a lot about their members, and regardless of whether or not you like the group in question.

When they had completed this part of the task they were requested further to:
... read back through your list of words and rate each of the groups on the following scale:

unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 favourable

--on the basis of your subjective impressions of the group members.

Scoring procedure. A preliminary examination of the respondents' lists was made and target names, like "cops" and "physicians," that were not associated with ethnic, regional, or national groups, were deleted.

Salience weights, based on the order of occurrence of the responses, were applied to the remaining names within individuals' lists. The weights were derived from the work of Szalay and his colleagues (cf. Szalay and Maday, 1973). Beginning with the first item they were applied in the following sequence: 6, 5, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 1, 1, . . . .

Results. The responses were tabulated, the salience weights associated with each particular name were totalled, and the favourableness ratings were averaged.

The group names were categorized into three sets on the basis of their average favourableness scores. Those with means ranging from 6.4 to 9.0 were classified as positively perceived groups. 'Neutral' groups were defined as those with scores in the 3.7 to 6.3 range, while those targets with highly unfavourable ratings (1.0 to 3.6) were considered to be negatively perceived outgroups. In all, nineteen positive, twenty-nine neutral, and three negative groups were listed by the respondents.

The names within each set were ranked according to their total salience scores.

The ten "most salient" names within each category are listed in Table A.
Table A. The salience and favourableness scores of the most salient group names within each of the three favourableness categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE GROUPS</th>
<th>NEUTRAL GROUPS</th>
<th>NEGATIVE GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Total Salience Weight</td>
<td>Average Favourableness Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Canadians</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukranians</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbians</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canadians</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritimers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion. The findings reinforce the assumption that young students view Canadians in general as a salient as well as a positive reference group.

The most salient neutral groups provided a number of possible choices for the neutral target stimulus. The European groups seemed to be the most appropriate of these and it was decided to employ the Germans as an additional target in the study because their favourableness score was quite close to the mid-point of the scale.

Similarly, although East Indians were a more salient negative group it was decided to use the Arabs as a target stimulus since they were more clearly perceived in unfavourable terms.

(An example of the questionnaire is presented on the following two pages.)
I would be grateful if you could provide information on the following variables:

AGE:

FEMALE OR MALE:

NATIONALITY:

Your anonymity, of course, is guaranteed at all times.

As we move through our everyday environment we encounter many different groups of people, who, each in their own way, have special relevance to our lives. Academics, doctors, police persons and business people, among others, spring readily to mind.

Although not quite so central to our cognitive maps of the social world, we are also familiar with a number of regional and national groups. For example, we often define ourselves as being Canadians, or Irishmen, or British Columbians. In a similar manner, we sometimes describe others as being Maritimers, Europeans, or Celts.

To provide an indication of how Canadians categorize their social environment, I would like you to write down the names of all of the ethnic, regional and national groups that you can think of, regardless of whether or not you know a lot about their members, and regardless of whether or not you like the group in question.

Please turn the page and write your responses in those columns headed with an "A."
After you have written the names, read back through your list of words and rate each of the groups on the following scale:

Unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Favourable

--on the basis of your subjective impressions of the group members. For example, low ratings indicate degrees of dislike and high ratings reflect relativeness attractiveness.

Do not spend too much time on your ratings but do check to see that you have rated all of the words, putting your scores in the appropriate spaces in columns headed with a "B."

Thank you.
APPENDIX D: POST-FILM QUESTIONNAIRE
Before you begin your assessments please make sure that you have completed the information section on the previous page. Remember, once again, to put your code number in the appropriate space on each page.

Work through the questions rapidly, but always provide the most complete information possible.

Where possible, circle one of the options as the answer to the question under consideration.

For example: Do you like folk music? YES NO DON'T KNOW

Do you think that the film is interesting? YES NO DON'T KNOW
Do you think that the sound track should be changed? YES NO DON'T KNOW
If "YES," in what way?

Do you think that the visual sequences should be changed? YES NO DON'T KNOW
If "YES," in what way?

Do you think that a film of this sort should be: LONGER SHORTER THE SAME LENGTH
If you answered "LONGER" or "SHORTER," specify the length that you think the film should be _______________. Why?

Do you think that the film is relevant to Canadians? YES NO UNDECIDED
Does it say anything about Canadians? YES NO UNABLE TO SAY

Do you think that you know more about the Orkney Islanders after watching this film? YES NO UNDECIDED
If you answered "YES," how much more do you know about them?
A LITTLE A MODERATE AMOUNT A LOT

Has this new information changed your attitudes toward the Orkney Islands? YES NO UNABLE TO SAY
If you answered "YES," in what way has your attitude changed? Be specific.
Write a couple of sentences on how you would like to see the film changed, on what you would like included and on what you would like dropped.

Do you think that the lifestyle of the Orkney Islanders is DIFFERENT or THE SAME AS that of some Canadians? In what way is it different or the same?

Does it appeal to you?  YES  NO
If "YES," how much?  A LOT  SOME  A LITTLE

Do you think that the values of the Orkney Islanders are THE SAME AS or DIFFERENT than that of some Canadians? In what way are they different or the same?

Do you agree with their general values?  YES  NO  DON'T KNOW
If "YES," how much?  A LOT  SOME  A LITTLE

Do you think that the Orkney Islands are economically DEVELOPED or UNDERDEVELOPED?

Is it a RURAL or an URBAN society?

Do you think that it is POORER THAN, RICHER THAN or the SAME as Canada, economically?

How favourably do you think the islanders were described in the film?
VERY UNFAVOURABLY  UNFAVOURABLY  NEUTRALLY  FAVOURABLY  VERY FAVOURABLY

How favourably do you view the islanders?
VERY UNFAVOURABLY  UNFAVOURABLY  NEUTRALLY  FAVOURABLY  VERY FAVOURABLY

Would you: like to visit there, like to live there for a short time, live there for a long time, or couldn't care less?

Do you think that the Orkney Islanders see other people
VERY UNFAVOURABLY  UNFAVOURABLY  NEUTRALLY  FAVOURABLY  VERY FAVOURABLY
Elaborate in a sentence or two.
Do you think that the Orkney Islanders see Canadians:
VERY UNFAVOURABLY UNFAVOURABLY NEUTRALLY FAVOURABLY VERY FAVOURABLY

Does this affect your attitude toward them? YES NO DON'T KNOW
If so, how and in what way? Please be specific.

Do you think that the film was worth watching? YES NO DON'T KNOW

Do you think that films are useful educational devices? YES NO
Explain.

Please comment on any topic that you feel was not covered by these questions. Suggest improvements for the script in terms of information, style, musical background, etc.

Also suggest how a greater amount of Canadian relevance can be built into the script.

Thank you for your co-operation. See you next week.
APPENDIX E: EXAMPLE OF THE OPEN-ENDED
STEREOTYPING FORMAT
Write down a complete list of those traits and descriptive words that you think are necessary to characterize the ORKNEY ISLANDERS adequately.

Use as many spaces as you need in the columns marked with an A, and please write your words legibly at all times. Leave the smaller columns, that are marked with a B, empty until you have completed your list of attributes and have read the instructions at the bottom of the page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORKNEY ISLANDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Table" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Read back over the words that you have used to describe the ORKNEY ISLANDERS and rate each one on the following scale:

Unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Favourable

--on the basis of the desirability of these attributes in friends and acquaintances.

For example, if you gave a particular trait a rating of 3, 2, or 1, it would indicate that you think that the trait is unfavourable, and is, therefore, undesirable in friends and people you know. "Vain" and "grouchy" are two such characteristics.

On the other hand, the attributes that you would give high ratings to are those that you consider to be favourable and desirable in people.

Put your scores opposite the words in the appropriate spaces in those columns that are headed with a B. Do not spend too much time on your ratings, but do check to see that you have rated all of the words that you have listed.
APPENDIX F: EXAMPLE OF THE CHECK LIST

MEASURING PROCEDURE
1. Read carefully through the list of trait words and tick (✓) those which seem to you to be typical of the ORKNEY ISLANDERS. If you do not find appropriate words for all of the typical ORKNEY ISLANDER characteristics you may WRITE IN those which you think are necessary to complete an adequate description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait Word</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Trait Word</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Trait Word</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILL-TEMPERED</td>
<td>POLITE</td>
<td>SCIENTIFICALLY-MINDED</td>
<td>UNINTERESTING</td>
<td>UNFRIENDLY</td>
<td>IRRELIGIOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITE</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>UNINTERESTING</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>IRRELIGIOUS</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>PERSISTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNREASONABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNINTERESTING</td>
<td></td>
<td>REASONABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRELIGIOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>HUMOURLESS</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNFORGIVING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRELIGIOUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>HUMOURLESS</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNFORGIVING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROUD</td>
<td></td>
<td>FEARLESS</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOVIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNINTERESTING</td>
<td></td>
<td>DISRESPECTFUL</td>
<td>CLEAN-CUT</td>
<td>CLEAN-CUT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAIGHT FORWARD</td>
<td>NAIVE</td>
<td>NAIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NAIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAZY</td>
<td></td>
<td>SENSUAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>SENSUAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGRACEFUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>BROAD-MINDED</td>
<td></td>
<td>BROAD-MINDED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATERIALISTIC</td>
<td>BRIGHT</td>
<td>PHYSICALLY DIRTY</td>
<td>PHYSICALLY DIRTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFICIENT</td>
<td>PHYSICALLY DIRTY</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHYSICALLY DIRTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIND</td>
<td>PLEASURE-LOVING</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLEASURE-LOVING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCRIMINATING</td>
<td>INTOLERANT</td>
<td>INTOLERANT</td>
<td></td>
<td>INTOLERANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Go back over the list of words and mark, with a star (*), the TEN traits which seem to you to be MOST typical of the ORKNEY ISLANDERS. Be sure to star TEN words, even if the original list of ticked words happens to be shorter.

3. Please read once more over the list of traits that you have ticked and starred and rate each of the words on the same scale that you used in the previous booklet:

   Unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Favourable

4. Please remember to check to see: (1) that you have rated all of the words that are ticked (and/or starred), and (2) that you have starred (*) the TEN most typical characteristics of ORKNEY ISLANDERS.

WRITE DOWN ADDITIONAL WORDS HERE IF YOU FEEL THAT THEY ARE NEEDED TO COMPLETE THE FULL DESCRIPTION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOLERANT</th>
<th>MEDITATIVE</th>
<th>INOFFENSIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSINCERE</td>
<td>GOOD-TEMPERED</td>
<td>UNAPPRECIATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-POSSESSED</td>
<td>MESSY</td>
<td>FRIENDLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREACHEROUS</td>
<td>STOLID</td>
<td>WISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAYDREAMER</td>
<td>UNKind</td>
<td>AMBITIOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMOUROUS</td>
<td>AGGRESSIVE</td>
<td>CRUEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCENTRIC</td>
<td>APPRECIATIVE</td>
<td>CONVENTIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORGIVING</td>
<td>RESPECTFUL</td>
<td>METHODICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERESTING</td>
<td>IMPOLITE</td>
<td>EXTREMELY-NATIONALISTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL</td>
<td>DULL</td>
<td>DECEITFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>METICULOUS</td>
<td>BLUNT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The original version of the check list forms fitted on a single foolscap page.
APPENDIX G: PERSONAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRES

USED IN STEP 1 AND STEP 2 OF

THE EXPERIMENT
There is a card with your code number on it attached to the top of this page. It guarantees your anonymity in both this and the next study in which you will be participating. The answers to the questions will be analyzed with reference to this code number and not to your name.

Because you will be using the same code number again next week, it is important to keep the card and bring it with you next time.

Please write your code number on the top right hand corner of this page and write it in the appropriate space on each of the following pages.

PERSONAL INFORMATION:

Age: ___________________________ Date of Birth: ___________________________

Sex: Male [ ] Female [ ]

Occupation: ___________________________

Nationality: Canadian [ ] Other: (say which) ___________________________

Birthplace: ___________________________

Location of Permanent Residence: B.C. [ ] Elsewhere: (say where) ___________________________

If you are not a full-time student:

1. How many courses have you taken since leaving school? ____________

2. What were they? ________________________________________________________

Do you intend to take courses in the future? Yes [ ] No [ ]

If so, in what subject? ______________________________________________________

Have you ever lived abroad? Yes [ ] No [ ]

If so, where? ___________________________ For how long? ___________________________

Thank you for your co-operation. The material in this section and your replies to the questionnaires will be kept confidential at all times.

Likewise, the project staff would appreciate it if you would refrain from discussing the details of the film script with your friends and colleagues.
Please write your code number on the top right hand corner of this page and write it in the appropriate space on each of the following pages. If, for some reason, you have been unable to bring your code number with you, please write down the colour of the card on which it was printed as well as the time that you were tested on last week. This should help us in retracing the missing number (by a process of elimination). Also, please contact the study supervisor about the matter.

Before beginning the task we would like you to provide some personal information. The material in this section and your replies to the questionnaires will be kept confidential at all times. Your anonymity is assured throughout the study.

PERSONAL INFORMATION:

Age: __________ Date of Birth: __________________________

Sex: Male / Female /

Occupation: __________________________

Nationality: Canadian / Other: (say which)

Location of Permanent Residence: B.C. / Other: (say where)

Have you ever lived abroad? Yes / No /

If so, where? __________________________ For how long? __________________________

Thank you for your co-operation.

We would appreciate it if you would pay close attention to the instructions in the following tasks and carry them out as best you can.

When something seems unclear to you don't hesitate to ask a question about it.
APPENDIX H: TABULATION SHEET FOR NOTE-TAKING

DURING FILM SEQUENCE
Before we show the film, we would like to say that in previewing the script that accompanies the film we felt that the narration was a bit too rapid, and that there was, perhaps, too much information on the soundtrack. We hope that this will not affect your concentration on the script too much. What we would like you to do is to make notes on how much information needs to be left out, in your opinion. Also make note of which information should be left out in the revised edition.

NOTES

What percentage of the film script should be excluded in later editions? ____

What sections should be left out? Be as specific as possible.
APPENDIX I: "SOURCES OF STEREOTYPE INFORMATION"

QUESTIONNAIRE
In addition to measuring your views on the four groups of people it is important to find out the things that influenced you in forming your ideas.

Please list all of the major sources of information (e.g., books, films, conversations, and so forth) that you have looked to when forming your impressions of each of the groups.

Be very specific (e.g., Hawaii Five-O, Market Place, Sun Editorials, This Country in the Morning) where possible.

ARABS:

CANADIANS:

GERMANS:

ORKNEY ISLANDERS:

Write two or three sentences on how you think your ideas about different social, regional and national groups are formed:
APPENDIX J: BASIC RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES

OF VOLUNTEER SUBJECTS
Basic Rights and Privileges of Volunteer Subjects

Any person who volunteers to participate in experiments conducted by full or part-time members of the faculty of the Department of Psychology at the University of British Columbia, by their employees, or by the graduate and undergraduate students working under the direction of faculty members of the above named Department, is entitled to the following rights and privileges.

1. The subject may terminate and withdraw from the experiment at any time without being accountable for the reasons for such an action.

2. The subject shall be informed, prior to the beginning of an experiment of the maximum length of time the experiment might take and of the general nature of the experiment.

3. The subject shall be informed, prior to the beginning of an experiment, of the nature and function of any mechanical and electrical equipment which is to be used in the experiment. In cases where the subject is in direct contact with such equipment, he shall be informed of the safety measures designed to protect him from physical injury, regardless of how slight the possibility of such injury is.

4. The subject shall be informed, prior to the beginning of an experiment, of the aspects of his behavior that are to be observed and recorded and how this is to be done.

5. Any behavioral record that is obtained during the course of the experiment is confidential. Any behavioral records that are made public through either journal papers or books, public addresses, research colloquia, or classroom presentations for teaching purposes, shall be anonymous.

6. The subject shall be offered, at the end of an experiment, a complete explanation of the purpose of the experiment, either orally by the experimenter or, at the option of the experimenter, in writing. The subject shall also have the opportunity to ask questions pertaining to the experiment and shall be entitled to have these questions answered.

7. The subject has the right to inform the Chairman of the Departmental Committee of Research with Human Subjects of any perceived violations of, or questions about, the aforementioned rights and privileges.
APPENDIX K: VERBAL DIRECTIONS TO RESPONDENTS BEFORE
AND AFTER FILM PRESENTATION
Pre-film directions

"I'll go over the handout again just to make sure that all of the details are clear.

"Please ask questions if you want anything explained or if there are some points that you want to know more about.

"As you may know, U.B.C., like most universities, has a supply of films that can be used as teaching aids. While such films should be interesting and informative, most of the films that are now available are either too long, too detailed, or too irrelevant to serve the needs of the various courses. This problem is particularly evident in adult-education courses.

"There is a growing body of professors who are very concerned about this matter.

"A number of teachers have suggested that the psychology, sociology, and anthropology departments, among others, should start their own film libraries in order to fill some of the existing demands. Indeed, a lot of enthusiasm has centred around this proposal.

"As a result this pilot project was established to put together a couple of trial films to see if the general idea of each department doing 'its own thing' would work.

"It was decided that we would make a beginning by working on a couple of short, all-purpose, documentary-type films.

"Our aim is to give something of the flavour of the various lifestyles in different types of communities and cultures around the world.
"We hope to describe the characteristics of various groups of people; to portray their lifestyles and means of earning a living; to say something about how they view other groups in the world around them; in general, to outline their attitudes, customs, and habits.

"To start with we are searching out ideas and getting down to work on a number of different scripts for a film about the ORKNEY ISLANDERS. We thought that this group was particularly interesting because its lifestyle has been shaped around its relative isolation, and although few people know very much about the Islanders they played a central role in early Canadian history and the development of the Hudson's Bay Company.

"In an effort to make the finished documentaries as interesting as possible we are trying to involve a wide range of people in their development. Consequently we are asking a number of groups, including you, to assess and suggest improvements on variations of particular scripts. By acting on your advice, as well as that of the social science course instructors, we hope that we can blend and select from among the alternatives to produce the first of a number of useful films.

"The film that you are about to see is original footage. The subtitles will give you an indication of where and when it was made.

"The different scenes seem to say a lot about life on the Orkney Islands, so we were very reluctant to change them. What we have done, however, is to completely alter the soundtrack and add new descriptions and information.

"Because this is the first draft of a tape-recorded soundtrack, the synchronization will be somewhat crude."
"We must warn you not to be disturbed by unheard conversations where peoples' lips move while you cannot hear what they are saying. Please remember that the final product will be made by a professional company and will be much more polished. As yet this is only the spade work!

(Momentary pause)

(Emphasis)

"Rather than attend to the production aspects of the film, it is better if you concentrate on the information contained in the scenes and in the soundtrack.

"Try to form a general impression of the visual scenes and pay close attention to the soundtrack. This will help you in your assessment of the film.

"Look for the various descriptions of the general character of the Islanders. Note their principal occupations and the types of links they have with the outside world.

"Also attend to the information that may give you some idea of how they view various 'outsiders,' thus getting a general idea about their attitude to the world and the people in it.

"Decide whether this has any relevance to you as a Canadian.

"After I've shown the film I'll hand each of you an evaluation booklet to be completed.

"But before we start I'd like to say one more thing. When we previewed the film that you are just going to see we felt that the narration was a bit too rapid, and that there was perhaps, too much information on
the soundtrack. We hope that this will not affect your concentration on
the script too much.

"... What we would like you to do is to make notes on how much infor-
mation needs to be left out, in your opinion. I'll hand out copies of
this form (Appendix H) for you to make notes on. Where possible you should
be specific about which items of information should be left out in the
final edition."

Post-film directions

To ensure that the instructions were understood the opening paragraph
in the booklet was paraphrased:

"The code number on your coloured card guarantees your anonymity in
the study. Please write it at the top of each of the four pages in the
booklet.

"Since I hope that most if not all of you can come back next week to
take part in another study I would like you to keep the card until then.
Remember its colour and try to remember the code number.

"For the present I'd like you to fill out the information section on
page 1. This will help us when we analyze and interpret your replies to
the various questions on the following pages. When you have done this
turn the page and work rapidly through the questions, giving the most
complete information possible."
APPENDIX L: INTRODUCTORY PASSAGE FOR
PHASE TWO OF PROCEDURE
Very often psychologists and sociologists have measured the personalities, customs, and lifestyles of people without paying too much attention to the ways in which individuals actually view the world. As a result we know very little about the differences between, for example, Canadians and Norwegians in the way they see the people and national groups which surround them.

However, it is becoming increasingly evident that the understanding of peoples' perceptions of their social world is of the utmost importance.

The present study has been established to discover the ways in which Canadians view a wide number of different social groups. In addition, we are also trying to determine how Canadians think other people look back at us, and at the world in general.

Consequently, you will be asked to describe various groups and to describe the same four groups as you think you would do if you had been born and raised in another culture.

Because of its wide scope, the research is being carried out step by step, with the focus being placed on different cultural groups on each separate occasion. Thus, the groups that you describe will not be the same as those that other sets of participants have been asked to characterize.

Some of the groups that you may be faced with will be unfamiliar to you. You will know quite a lot about others. In either case, please perform as best you can on all of the tasks.
APPENDIX M: VERBAL DIRECTIONS TO RESPONDENTS DURING
PHASE TWO OF PROCEDURE
When we deal with individuals on an everyday basis or when we meet new people for the first time we form impressions of them, and we get ideas about what they like and dislike, about what types of traits they have—for example some people are friendly and others are pushy—and sometimes we may even be able to figure out how they think about us and about other people we know.

"In the same way we form impressions about groups of people. I bet if I asked any of you to describe the Officer Cadets or the "Two Weekies" you could do so without too much trouble. (There was generally a murmur of agreement at this point.) I bet, too, that a lot of you have a fair idea about what the Officer Cadets and other groups, let's say the Bandsmen, think of you as a group. (Laughter)

"As a psychology student my main interest is in this broad question of how we view individuals and groups in the world around us.

"I'm particularly interested in the ideas that Canadians have about other national and regional groups.

"As you can see from the handout, I am involved in a large project which will give us precise information not only about how Canadians view a wide number of different social groups but also about whether or not Canadians have ideas about how various nations see us and the world in general.

"We are trying to work with as many different people as possible, firstly to lighten the work load on each particular set of individuals and, secondly, to give us as large a sample as possible so that we can be more certain about the accuracy of our findings."
"Actually, of all of the groups we have worked with so far you are the most ideal because you represent a wide section of the Canadian population—before now we have had trouble finding people who live outside of B.C.

"Your job this evening falls into two parts. I'll explain the second part to you later on and we'll just deal with the first section for the moment. I'll hand around these booklets before we begin.....

(Pause)

"As you flip through the pages you'll see that you are being asked to describe four different groups in your own words. They are the Germans, Arabs, Canadians, and Orkney Islanders.

"We are asking everybody who takes part in this project to characterize Canadians. The Germans and Arabs are being used in this case because they are among the groups with which most people are familiar. The Orkney Islanders are listed because as soon as my colleagues on this particular project heard that you had taken part in last week's "curriculum study" they felt that it would be useful to obtain your views about the group. They also thought that it would be worthwhile to ask you to put yourselves in the shoes of the Islanders and to give us your ideas about how they see themselves and each of the other three groups that are listed here.

"The example on the second and third pages of the booklet should help you to become familiar with the instructions and should give you a clear idea about what needs to be done in the task. The target in the example is a fictitious one and the words used to describe it are in another language so that they won't influence your descriptions of the four
targets in the study. In all other respects the example is the same as the questionnaires that follow the personal information form.

"I am going to work through one other example on this overhead projector. In doing so I will try to give you a sense of what you should consider when choosing a word with which to describe a group."

The experimenter then activated a portable overhead projector, focused the image of the plastic lay-on of a free response questionnaire, read the instructions aloud, and responded to each one in turn verbalizing his thoughts as he did so.

(Instr.) "Write down a complete list of those traits and descriptive words that you think are necessary to characterize FILMSTARS adequately.

"Use as many spaces as you need in the columns marked with an A, and please write your words legibly at all times. Leave the smaller columns, that are marked with a B, empty until you have completed your list of attributes and have read the instructions at the bottom of the page.

(Resp.) "Let's see. When I think of film stars I think of them as being "talented" so I'll print TALENTED in this wide column here (Column A, row 1). I also think of them as being "rich" so I'll put that down. By and large, too, I think of American film stars rather than those from other countries so I'll add AMERICANS to my list. Some film stars are "tempermental" but I don't think a majority of them are. I'll leave out that word. However, I do think that a great many of them are "self-important" so I'll write that down ... (Pause) ..."

"I can't really think of any more words off-hand so I'll stop and see what I have to do next."
(Instr.) "Read back over the words that you have used to describe FILMSTARS and rate each one on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Favourable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

--on the basis of the desirability of these attributes in friends and acquaintances.

"For example, if you gave a particular trait a rating of 3, 2, or 1 it would indicate that you think that the trait is unfavourable, and is, therefore, undesirable in friends and people you know. "Vain" and "grouchy" are two such characteristics.

"On the other hand, the attributes that you would give high ratings to are those that you consider to be favourable and desirable in people.

"Put the scores opposite the words, in the appropriate spaces in those columns that are headed with a B. Do not spend too much time on your ratings, but do check to see that you have rated all of the words that you have listed.

(Resp.) "O.K. Let's go back and make the ratings. The first word I listed is "talented." That is a desirable characteristic, I'll rate it 8. The next word is "rich." It is certainly not a bad attribute to have, but it isn't great either. I'll give it 6. It's on the positive side of the mid-point as far as my personal feelings are concerned. The next word is "Americans." From my viewpoint it is neither desirable nor undesirable to be American so that term gets a 5. The last word in my description is "self-important." I think that it is an undesirable characteristic. I'll rate it 2. (Pause)
"To recap, I have listed a number of words that I think satisfactorily and adequately describe FILMSTARS. From my point of view, fewer words would have been an inadequate and incomplete description, while more words would have overdone the case. You will know yourself when your descriptions meet the proper requirements. Essentially you have to be thorough without spending too much time or using too much effort on the task. It is not necessary to strain the limits of your memory. Just write those words that readily come to mind.

"It is also very important to rate every word that you have listed. Again, do not spend too much time pondering on your ratings but do check to see that all of the words have been given a value. Don't forget to put your code number on the top of every page and be sure to carry out all of the instructions as they are stated.

(The overhead projector was switched off.)

"Bring your booklet to me when you have finished the task. I'll check through it to see that everything is in order and I'll explain the second part of the study to you."

Step 2

"This booklet is very similar to the last one. It contains two sections in addition to an example. Read the example carefully and carry out all of the instructions on all of the pages. The instructions are somewhat more detailed than they were in the last booklet, but they are not any more difficult. Looking through the pages you will see that you are being asked again to characterize the Arabs, Canadians, Germans, and
Orkney Islanders, first from your own point of view and then from the point of view of an Orkney Islander. This time, however, you have been provided with a list of 75 words to choose from when describing the groups.

"If you turn to the example or to one of the pages you will see the exact sequence of instructions that you have to follow.

1. Read carefully through the list of trait words and tick (√) those which seem to you to be typical of (let us say) the ORKNEY ISLANDERS. If you do not find appropriate words for all of the typical ORKNEY ISLANDER characteristics you may WRITE-IN those which you think are necessary to complete an adequate description.

2. Go back over the list of words and mark, with a star (*), the TEN traits which seem to you to be MOST typical of the ORKNEY ISLANDERS. Be sure to star TEN words, even if the original list of ticked words happens to be shorter.

3. Please read once more over the list of traits that you have ticked and starred and rate each of the words on the same scale that you used in the previous booklet;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Favourable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Please remember to check to see: (1) that you have rated all of the words that are ticked (and/or starred), and (2) that you have starred (*) the TEN most typical characteristics of ORKNEY ISLANDERS.

(Pause)

"It is essential that you carry out all of the instructions. If you work carefully and quickly it should not take you long to complete the booklet."
"Work through each of the pages in order, finishing one before you start another.

"If you have any comments we would welcome them, just write them on the back of the pages.

"Before you go back to your seats write your code number on the top of every page and when you have finished bring your booklet to my desk so that I can check it as I did your other one. Thank you."

Notes
a. Cadets who spend two weeks at the camp for a short introductory course.
b. Eventually it was decided to exclude the responses that had been starred but not ticked from the data analyses on the grounds that they were 'forced' rather than 'spontaneous' selections. The remaining responses that had been both starred and ticked were not treated differently than those which had merely been ticked.
APPENDIX N: EXAMPLE OF CHECK LIST RESPONSES
In the last two booklets you will be asked to describe the same four groups, this time using a check list from which you select suitable words. You will be asked to tick (✓) words which appropriately describe the group in question. You will be asked, further to pick out and star (*) the ten most typical descriptive words. Finally, you will have to rate all of the words that you have selected on the same nine-point scale that you used before.

Again, we will present you with an example which should illustrate the task.

**EXAMPLE**

1. Read carefully through the list of trait words and tick (✓) those which seem to you to be typical of the FIRBOLGS. If you do not find appropriate words for all of the typical FIRBOLG characteristics, you may write in those which you think are necessary to complete an adequate description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tick/Star Rating</th>
<th></th>
<th>Tick/Star Rating</th>
<th></th>
<th>Tick/Star Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>CASTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>FANACHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAG</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHEIM</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIONN</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>BMEITH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMAS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>BLIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td>GUIDEACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEANGA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LEANTA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EISTEACMT</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SINGIL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMADACH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILI</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ANUAS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Go back over the list of words and mark, with a star (*), the TEN traits which seem to you to be MOST typical of the FIRBOLGS. Be sure to star TEN words, even if your original list of ticked words happens to be shorter.

3. Please read once more over the list of traits that you have ticked and starred and rate each of the words on the same scale that you used in the previous booklet.

Unfavourable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Favourable

Note that I did not tick all of the words in the list but only those that I considered to be appropriate in describing the Firbolgs.

Notice also, that I happened to tick 15 words. This meant that I had to pick out 10 of these 15 as being most typical of the Firbolgs. These were the ten traits that I starred. I starred exactly 10 traits—no more and no less.

If my list had been shorter, say six or seven words, I would have starred all of these words as being most typical of the Firbolgs. I would also have chosen three or four more words which could be applied to the group (even if not very well) and starred those too. In that way I would have ended up with 10 starred words.

It is important to remember, then, that however long or short your list of ticked words is, you have to end up with ten starred words for each group.

Look at the example once again to see what I have done. You will observe that all of the words which have been ticked and/or starred have also been rated. This is really important.

Start on the tasks. Do not spend too much time pondering on your choices but do check to see that all of the words have been rated and that exactly ten of them have been starred.

Don't forget to put your code number on the top of every page and be sure to carry out all of the instructions as they are written.
APPENDIX 0: TABLE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE RESPONDENTS' POST-FILM IMPRESSIONS OF THE ORKNEY ISLANDERS
Table A. The number and percentage of individuals in each of the experimental groups and in the total sample choosing each of the possible responses to the questions concerning the respondents' post-film impressions of the Orkney Islanders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question (paraphrased)</th>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Frequency and % of response</th>
<th>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</th>
<th>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</th>
<th>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</th>
<th>Total Sample (N=193)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RURAL</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it a RURAL or an</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN society?</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question (paraphrased)</td>
<td>Response Categories</td>
<td>Frequency and % of response</td>
<td>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</td>
<td>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</td>
<td>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</td>
<td>Total Sample (N=193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEVELOPED</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the islands econom-</td>
<td>UNDER-DEVELOPED</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ically DEVELOPED or</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERDEVELOPED?</td>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question (paraphrased)</th>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Frequency and % of response</th>
<th>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</th>
<th>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</th>
<th>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</th>
<th>Total Sample (N=193)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICHER</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the islanders</td>
<td>THE SAME</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHER, POORER, or</td>
<td>POORER</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE SAME as Canadians?</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question (paraphrased)</td>
<td>Response Categories</td>
<td>Frequency and % of response</td>
<td>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</td>
<td>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</td>
<td>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</td>
<td>Total Sample (N=193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the VALUES of the</td>
<td>THE SAME</td>
<td>n 18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islanders THE SAME as</td>
<td></td>
<td>% 31.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or DIFFERENT from</td>
<td>DIFFERENT</td>
<td>n 18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those of Canadians?</td>
<td></td>
<td>% 31.0%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
<td>n 22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% 37.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question (paraphrased)</th>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Frequency and % of response</th>
<th>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</th>
<th>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</th>
<th>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</th>
<th>Total Sample (N=193)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the LIFESTYLE of the Islanders THE SAME as or DIFFERENT from that of Canadians?</td>
<td>THE SAME</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIFFERENT</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Percentages are column percentages
APPENDIX P: TABLES OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF SCORES ON THE
DIMENSIONS OF THE ESTIMATED RECIPROCAL ORKNEY ISLANDER STEREOTYPES
OF CANADIANS
Table A. Means and standard deviations of the commonness and 'percentage of common terms' scores for the core and peripheral components of the respondents' estimates of the Orkney Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype Component</th>
<th>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</th>
<th>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</th>
<th>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commonness scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>M SD 1.8 1.2</td>
<td>1.6 1.1</td>
<td>1.2 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>M SD 4.7 2.4</td>
<td>4.4 2.2</td>
<td>3.7 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of common terms scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>M SD 36.1 24.8</td>
<td>31.9 22.8</td>
<td>28.0 21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>M SD 31.1 13.3</td>
<td>31.0 13.5</td>
<td>25.3 12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B. The mean number and percentage of positive, neutral, and negative words in the core and peripheral components of the respondents' estimates of the Orkney Islanders' stereotypes of Canadians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype Component</th>
<th>Favourableness of words</th>
<th>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</th>
<th>Non-reciprocal group (n=67)</th>
<th>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAVOURABLE Core</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFAVOURABLE Core</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C. Mean number of terms in the core and peripheral components of the respondents' estimates of the Orkney Islanders' reciprocal stereotypes of Canadians that are common to the stimulus material characterizations of the Orkney Islanders and Canadians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype component</th>
<th>Positive reciprocal group (n=58)</th>
<th>Non-reciprocal reciprocal group (n=67)</th>
<th>Negative reciprocal group (n=68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>M 0.2 (SD 0.4)</td>
<td>0.1 (SD 0.3)</td>
<td>0.1 (SD 0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>M 3.1 (SD 2.1)</td>
<td>3.0 (SD 1.8)</td>
<td>3.5 (SD 2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>M 1.1 (SD 1.0)</td>
<td>0.7 (SD 0.8)</td>
<td>0.3 (SD 0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>M 7.9 (SD 4.5)</td>
<td>6.7 (SD 3.6)</td>
<td>4.3 (SD 4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>M 0.1 (SD 0.2)</td>
<td>0.1 (SD 0.2)</td>
<td>0.4 (SD 0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td>M 1.8 (SD 2.6)</td>
<td>2.3 (SD 2.5)</td>
<td>5.4 (SD 4.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Maximum score possible = 20