The Journal of Social Psychology, 2000, *140*(4), 487–502

A Multicultural Study of Stereotyping in English-Speaking Countries

FRANCIS T. McANDREW
Department of Psychology
Knox College

ADEBOWALE AKANDE
Institute for Child and Family Development
University of the Western Cape, South Africa

RUTH BRIDGSTOCK
LINDA MEALEY
Department of Psychology
University of Queensland, Australia

STEPHEN C. GORDON
JOANNA E. SCHEIB
Department of Psychology
McMaster University, Canada

BOLANLE E. AKANDE-ADETOUN
FUNMI ODEWALE
Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria

ASEFON MORAKINYO
Kenya Medical School, Nairobi

PATRICIA NYAHETE
GERADINE MUBVAKURE
University of Zimbabwe

ABSTRACT. Citizens of 9 different English-speaking countries ($N = 619$) evaluated the average, or typical, citizen of 5 English-speaking countries (Great Britain, Canada, Nigeria, United States, Australia) on 9 pairs of bipolar adjectives. Participants were drawn from Australia, Botswana, Canada, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, the United States, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. There were statistically significant similarities in the rankings of the 5 stimulus countries on 8 of the 9 adjective dimensions and a strong convergence of autostereotypes and heterostereotypes on many traits. The results relate to previous stereotyping research and traditional methods of assessing the accuracy of national stereotypes.

RECENTLY, THERE HAS BEEN RENEWED INTEREST in the accuracy and the validity of widely held stereotypes. Although stereotypes are often dismissed as illogical and factually incorrect—and as gross exaggerations of trivial group differences—the data do not support those assessments (Jussim, McCauley, & Lee, 1996; McCauley, 1996). Consequently, it has become more acceptable to believe (a) that at least some stereotypes accurately reflect objectively measurable group differences (Hilton & von Hippel, 1996; Iwao & Triandis, 1993; Lee & Duenas, 1996; McCauley, Jussim, & Lee, 1996; Peabody, 1985) and (b) that it may be useful to think of stereotypes as hypotheses about the nature of social categories that may be tested for accuracy (Judd & Park, 1993).

In the present research, we were specifically concerned with stereotyping based on cultural or national origin. Assessing the accuracy of national or ethnic stereotypes is not simple, especially for stereotypes based upon personality traits (McCauley et al., 1996). Previous researchers have shown that some cultural groups bring perceptual biases to stereotyping situations: They are more predisposed than other groups to see people in general, regardless of ethnic or national background, as having more or fewer of certain traits (e.g., some groups may be predisposed toward seeing other people as friendly; McAndrew, 1990; Nichols & McAndrew, 1984).

Stereotype accuracy has usually been assessed in one of three ways. If convergent agreement exists among several groups concerning the typical characteristics of a target group, there is greater confidence that the stereotype reflects the actual characteristics of that target group. Similarly, if heterostereotypes of a group (what outgroup members believe to be true) match the autostereotype of a group (beliefs about one's own group), the stereotype is believed to be more accurate. Occasionally, it is even possible to test stereotypes against some external objective standard. Thus, stereotypes held about people in Britain and the United States correlated with differences actually found between the two groups on personality scales (Jamison, 1971). Judd and Park (1993) described the problems inherent in each of the foregoing approaches and developed a model called the *full-accuracy design.* That model may be more useful when researchers have access to participant groups and target groups that clearly complement each other in terms of the traits considered stereotypic and counterstereotypic for each.

Iwao and Triandis (1993) have suggested that similarities in the ways in which two societies (i.e., collectivist vs. individualist societies) view social sit-

Adebowale Akande is now at Potch University in South Africa; Linda Mealey is now at the College of St. Benedict in Minnesota; Stephen C. Gordon is now living in New Zealand; and Joanna E. Scheib is now at the Department of Psychology, University of California at Davis.

The authors wish to thank Yadika Sharma and Kristin Lindner for their help with the data analysis.

Address correspondence to Francis T. McAndrew, Department of Psychology, Knox College, Galesburg, IL 61401-4999; fmcandre@knox.edu (e-mail).

uations lead to more valid heterostereotypes of each other, because people can use their own culture as a guide for predicting the behavior of people in the other society. The limited amount of research bearing on this issue to date has been inconclusive.

In addition to the similarity of the societies involved, many other variables may influence the nature of stereotypes and the strength with which they are held. National stereotypes are probably colored by the historical–political relationships between the groups in question (Brown, 1986), and researchers have consistently found more agreement on stereotypes for some traits than for others (Linssen & Hagendoorn, 1994). In addition, some researchers (LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Marin & Salazar, 1985) have noted a bias toward admiring wealthier and more economically developed groups.

The characteristics associated with high-status, socially dominant groups within a nation are perceived as the defining national characteristics, or stereotype, by outsiders (Eagly & Kite, 1987; Eagly & Steffen, 1984; LeVine & Campbell, 1972), but, at least in the case of national stereotyping, no evidence supports this contention. Members of socially dominant U.S. groups (men and European Americans) did not perceive themselves as being more similar to the national stereotype than did women or ethnic minorities (Kosmitzki, Cheng, & Chik, 1994). Similarly, when McAndrew and Akande (1995) asked almost 300 citizens of six African nations for their impressions of European Americans and African Americans, U.S. citizenship was a more powerful determinant of stereotypes than was racial background.

Another variable related to the stereotyping process is the familiarity of the target group. Researchers (O'Driscoll, Haque, & Oshako, 1983; Ray, 1983) have demonstrated that informal contact alone does not produce positive heterostereotypes, and some (LeVine & Campbell, 1972; McAndrew, 1990; Schneider & Lesko, 1978) have even suggested that geographical proximity, increased contact, or both are associated with confident, extreme, and negative stereotypes. The results of several studies have indicated that an important mediator in the contact–stereotype relationship is whether the contact occurs in one's home country or the country of the other group (Everett & Stening, 1987; McAndrew; Nichols & McAndrew, 1984).

Although some researchers have found that autostereotypes are more positive (Triandis et al., 1982) and uniform (Marin & Salazar, 1985) than heterostereotypes, this finding has been increasingly called into question. Beliefs about one's own group are sometimes even more subject to change following exposure to other groups than are beliefs about those other groups (McGrady & McGrady, 1976; Triandis & Vassiliou, 1967). Salvatore (1986) examined hetero- and autostereotypes among college students in Ireland, Italy, and the United States and found that the consistency of autostereotypes varied widely from culture to culture: The Italians showed a very high degree of intragroup agreement in describing themselves, whereas the Irish showed very little intragroup agree-

ment. To add further to the confusion, Everett and Stening (1990) found that the autostereotypes of U.S. managers stationed overseas differed from country to country even though they worked for the same company. McAndrew (1990) and Nichols and McAndrew (1984) found that the autostereotype of U.S. students studying abroad was dramatically different (and more positive) than the autostereotype of U.S. students who had never lived or studied abroad. This evidence contradicts common sense, which suggests that, because people know their own group better than they know other groups, their autostereotypes are less apt to change than their heterostereotypes. The stability of autostereotypes is an important issue, because agreement between autostereotypes and heterostereotypes is one of the key means for assessing stereotype accuracy.

In the present study, we had a number of different goals, all related to one or more of the preceding stereotyping issues. First, we attempted to add to the available data base and to extend knowledge of cross-cultural stereotyping by building on earlier studies (McAndrew, 1990; Nichols & McAndrew, 1984). By asking participants from nine English-speaking countries to evaluate the "average or typical" citizen of five English-speaking countries, we hoped to make progress toward understanding the relationship between autostereotypes and heterostereotypes. The participants were drawn from six African nations, Australia, Canada, and the United States. The five stimulus countries included four that are culturally very similar and have strong historical ties (Great Britain, Australia, Canada, and the U.S.) and one (Nigeria) that is an African nation with a very different cultural heritage and a different historical–colonial relationship to Great Britain.

Virtually all the U.S., Australian, and Canadian participants spoke English as their first language. All participants in the African nations had an African language as their mother tongue but lived in countries in which English was the language used in education and business and, hence, the lingua franca.

The foregoing combination of stimulus countries and research participants allowed an exploration of hypotheses suggested by other researchers:

Hypothesis 1: A stereotype is more accurate to the extent that there is a convergent agreement of heterostereotypes and a match between that convergent heterostereotype and the autostereotype held by the participants from each country. We assessed the validity of the national stereotypes obtained in the present study by the traditional methods.

Hypothesis 2: Autostereotypes are more positive than heterostereotypes—that is, people perceive their own group more favorably than they perceive other groups (Triandis et al., 1982).

Hypothesis 3: If similarities in social outlook lead to similar standards for judging others, there is greater agreement among the African countries and among Australia, Canada, and the United States than across the foregoing groupings (Iwao & Triandis, 1993).

Hypothesis 4: If geographic proximity is associated with negative stereo-

types, then the stereotypes that Americans and Canadians hold about each other are quite negative (McAndrew, 1990; Schneider & Lesko, 1978).

Hypothesis 5: Wealthier and more economically developed nations are admired more than less developed countries. Consequently, the more developed stimulus countries (e.g., the United States) have more positive stereotypes than Nigeria (LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Marin & Salazar, 1985).

Method

Participants

The participants were 641 people from nine different countries. Of the total, 22 were not citizens of any one of the nine countries; therefore, we did not include their responses in the analyses. There remained a total of 619 participants: 112 from the United States (46 men, 66 women), 130 from Canada (65 men, 65 women), 88 from Australia (31 men, 57 women), 44 from Zambia (7 men, 37 women), 54 from Zimbabwe (39 men, 15 women), 49 from Botswana (25 men, 24 women), 41 from Kenya (1 man, 40 women), 35 from Nigeria (16 men, 19 women), and a racially mixed group of 66 from South Africa (5 men, 61 women). The U.S., Canadian, and Australian participants were all college or university students (drawn from Western Illinois University, Knox College, McMaster University, and the University of Queensland). Most of the African participants were students, but the sample also included some professionals and embassy staff members. In the African nations, we made every attempt to reflect the ethnic and religious mix of each country's population, but, as a group, the African participants were probably more highly educated and more widely traveled than the typical residents of their countries.

At the outset of the study, we expected that Nigeria would be the only African nation sampled. It was only after we had completed the data collection in the non-African countries that the opportunity to obtain more African samples presented itself. At this point, it was too late to change the stimulus countries that were being presented. Because of the opportunistic nature of these samples, a disparity in the sample size and gender composition was unavoidable.

All participants signed consent forms and received written instructions along with questionnaires (all in English). The participants were unpaid volunteers, although some of the university students received course credit for participation.

Data collection took place in late 1995 and throughout the year in 1996.

Questionnaires

All participants received the same six-page questionnaire in English. The first page consisted of a brief introduction encouraging participation and describing the study, as well as specific instructions for filling out the questionnaire; it

also contained the request that each participant indicate his or her gender and country of citizenship.

The next five pages were designed to measure impressions of people from the five different stimulus countries (Great Britain, Canada, Nigeria, the United States, and Australia). The initial statements on each page were (a) "The adjectives on this page refer to the average or typical citizen of _____," and (b) "_____ are generally (circle only one *X* between each pair of adjectives)." The blanks in the foregoing statements represent the name and people, respectively, of each stimulus country (e.g., "Canada" in the first blank, "Canadians" in the second blank). The second statement was followed by nine pairs of bipolar adjectives presented in random order within and across pairs. The adjective dimensions were selected either because of their proven usefulness in previous studies of national stereotyping or because of their salience (as suggested by colleagues from the participating countries) to the participants. The adjective pairs were unfriendly/friendly, traditional/modern, impolite/polite, close-minded/open-minded, not religious/religious, selfish/generous, not patriotic/patriotic, aggressive/passive, and superstitious/not superstitious.

We evaluated the adjectives on a 5-point semantic differential scale represented by five *X*s spaced evenly between the members of each pair. In the analysis, the points of the scale were assigned the numbers 1 through 5; 1 was paired with the adjectives listed first in the descriptions in the preceding paragraph.

Five of the adjective pairs (traditional/modern, not religious/religious, not patriotic/patriotic, aggressive/passive, superstitious/not superstitious) were arguably ambiguous and culture dependent: It was unclear which trait was positive and which trait was negative. The remaining pairs more clearly represented good and bad alternatives.

Results

Comparison of Stereotypes Within Each Participant Group

For the participants in each country, we conducted a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) for each adjective dimension with the five stimulus countries as the independent variables. We evaluated the specific nature of significant *F* values with Tukey's HSD (honestly significant difference). In the interest of readability and because of the large number of comparisons, we did not report the means and actual HSD values from these a posteriori analyses. All differences mentioned in the discussion refer to differences between means that were large enough to exceed the HSD and, thus, to be statistically significant ($p < .05$).

The United States. The U.S. participants perceived a difference among the stimulus nations on all nine adjective pairs; in each case, the difference was significant at a level of $p < .0001$. The *F* values and degrees of freedom (*df*s) from each

analysis were $F(4, 436) = 22.14$ for unfriendly/friendly, $F(4, 440) = 73.33$ for traditional/modern, $F(4, 432) = 24.98$ for selfish/generous, $F(4, 436) = 34.13$ for not religious/religious, $F(4, 440) = 15.48$ for close-minded/open-minded, $F(4, 440) = 15.70$ for impolite/polite, $F(4, 436) = 14.35$ for not patriotic/patriotic, $F(4, 436) = 24.45$ for aggressive/passive, and $F(4. 440) = 20.73$ for superstitious/not superstitious.

The U.S. participants perceived Canadians as significantly more friendly than they perceived Nigerians, the British, and themselves; they perceived Australians as significantly more friendly than everyone, including Canadians. The U.S. participants perceived themselves as significantly more modern than everyone else, and they perceived Canadians and Australians as more modern and less traditional than Nigerians and the British. The U.S. participants perceived Canadians, Nigerians, and Australians as more generous than they perceived themselves or the British.

The U.S. participants perceived Nigerians as more religious than the British; they perceived the British, in turn, as significantly more religious than Canadians, themselves, and Australians. They perceived Canadians, themselves, and Australians as significantly more open-minded than the British and Nigerians; they perceived Australians as significantly more polite than all of the other groups.

The U.S. participants perceived the British as significantly more patriotic than the citizens of all the other stimulus countries; they perceived themselves as significantly more aggressive than all the other groups. They also perceived Nigerians as more aggressive than Canadians and Australians. They viewed Australians and Nigerians as more superstitious than themselves, Canadians, or the British. Although they thought of themselves as open-minded and modern, the U.S. participants had a fairly negative autostereotype, perceiving themselves as relatively unfriendly, selfish, impolite, and aggressive.

Australia. The Australian participants perceived a significant difference among the stimulus nations on all nine adjective pairs; in each case, the difference was significant at a level of $p < .0001$. The F values and *df*s for each analysis were $F(4, 340) = 21.19$ for unfriendly/friendly, $F(4, 340) = 79.42$ for traditional/modern, $F(4, 336) = 24.65$ for selfish/generous, $F(4, 336) = 21.57$ for not religious/religious, $F(4, 340) = 8.91$ for close-minded/open-minded, $F(4, 340) = 32.00$ for impolite/polite, $F(4, 340) = 35.09$ for not patriotic/patriotic, $F(4, 340) = 26.77$ for aggressive/passive, and $F(4, 340) = 27.56$ for superstitious/not superstitious.

The Australian participants perceived the British and Americans as significantly less friendly than Nigerians, themselves, and Canadians. They perceived the Nigerians as more traditional and less modern than the British; they perceived the British, in turn, as more traditional and less modern than Canadians and Australians. They perceived Americans as significantly more modern than all the other groups, but they also considered Americans more selfish than any of

the other groups. They perceived the British as more selfish than Nigerians, Canadians, and Australians. They perceived Nigerians as more religious than any other group and the British as more religious than Australians and Canadians.

The Australian participants perceived the British as more close-minded than all groups except the Nigerians. The Australian participants also perceived Americans and Nigerians as more close-minded than Canadians. They judged Americans as significantly less polite than all of the other groups. The Australians also perceived themselves as less polite than Nigerians. They clearly saw Americans as the most aggressive and patriotic of all the groups; they perceived Canadians and the British as more patriotic than Nigerians or themselves. The Australian participants perceived Nigerians as more superstitious than all other groups; they perceived themselves as less superstitious than Americans and the British as well.

The Australian autostereotype was mixed. On the one hand, the Australian participants perceived themselves as less religious, less polite, and more aggressive than everyone except Americans. On the other hand, they saw themselves as second only to the Canadians in friendliness, open-mindedness, and generosity; none of the foregoing differences were significant. In fact, the Australian participants apparently perceived themselves as highly similar to Canadians, whom they judged as being significantly different from themselves only in the degree of their patriotism.

Canada. The Canadian participants perceived a significant difference between the stimulus countries on all nine adjective pairs; in each case, the difference was significant at $p < .0001$. The F values and *df*s for each analysis were $F(4, 508) = 59.95$ for unfriendly/friendly, $F(4, 508) = 100.16$ for traditional/modern, $F(4, 508) = 50.22$ for selfish/generous, $F(4, 508) = 50.48$ for not religious/religious, $F(4, 508) = 38.64$ for close-minded/open-minded, $F(4, 508) = 72.72$ for impolite/polite, $F(4, 508) = 110.22$ for not patriotic/patriotic, $F(4, 508) = 82.57$ for aggressive/passive, and $F(4, 504) = 12.23$ for superstitious/not superstitious.

The Canadian participants made many distinctions among the groups on the friendliness dimension. They perceived Americans as significantly less friendly, whereas they perceived Australians as significantly more friendly than all of the other groups. The Canadian participants perceived themselves as friendlier than the British and Nigerians. They saw themselves and Americans as more modern than people from the other three countries; they also perceived that Australians were more modern and less traditional than the British; in turn, they perceived the British as more modern and less traditional than Nigerians.

The Canadians perceived Americans as significantly more selfish than all other groups, followed by the British. They did not perceive themselves as significantly different in generosity from Australians or Nigerians. They perceived Nigerians as more religious than the other groups. In addition, they viewed the British as more religious than Americans.

The Canadian participants perceived Americans as the most close-minded

culture and themselves and Australians as the most open-minded; they considered the British and Nigerians as intermediate and significantly different from Americans as well as from Australians and themselves. They perceived Americans as less polite than all the other groups. They also perceived the British and Australians as more polite than Nigerians.

The Canadian participants thought of themselves as the least patriotic group and of Americans as the most patriotic group. They viewed the British as more patriotic than Australians and Nigerians but as significantly less patriotic than Americans. They perceived Americans as significantly more aggressive than all other groups; they also perceived the British as more aggressive than Canadians. They perceived the Nigerians as significantly more superstitious than any other group.

The Canadian participants had a fairly positive autostereotype, perceiving themselves as the least aggressive, most open-minded, and second most friendly (behind Australians) of the stimulus countries. They also had an extremely negative heterostereotype of Americans, whom they perceived as the most aggressive, most close-minded, most selfish, most patriotic, least religious, least friendly, and least polite of all of the stimulus countries.

Nigeria. The Nigerian participants did not make a significant distinction ($p > .05$) among the stimulus nations on the dimensions traditional/modern, $F(4, 124) = 2.20$; selfish/generous, $F(4, 128) = .52$; or close-minded/open-minded, $F(4, 128) = .62$. They did, however, perceive differences on the dimensions unfriendly/friendly, $F(4, 128) = 5.73$, $p < .0003$; not religious/religious, $F(4, 128) = 8.11$, $p < .0001$; impolite/polite, $F(4, 128) = 3.18$, $p < .02$; not patriotic/patriotic, $F(4, 128) = 2.72$, $p < .03$; aggressive/passive, $F(4, 128) = 4.26$, $p < .003$; and superstitious/not superstitious, $F(4, 124) = 4.43$, $p < .003$.

The Nigerian participants perceived themselves as significantly more friendly than all of the other groups; they did not make a distinction among those groups on friendliness. They perceived themselves as more polite than the British, Canadians, and Americans and as more religious than Americans, Australians, and Canadians. They also perceived the British as more religious and more patriotic than Canadians. They believed themselves to be more aggressive than Canadians and the British and more superstitious than the British, Canadians, and Australians.

Overall, the Nigerians had a very positive autostereotype, ranking themselves as the most friendly and polite people. They also gave themselves high marks on generosity and open-mindedness. On the other hand, they perceived themselves as traditional (rather than modern) and aggressive. In terms of similarity to other groups, the Nigerians perceived themselves as most like Americans: They made no significant distinctions between themselves and Americans on seven of the nine adjective pairs. (They perceived themselves as more friendly and religious than Americans.)

Zambia. The Zambian participants made no significant distinction ($p > .05$) among the stimulus countries on the dimensions of unfriendly/friendly, $F(4, 164) = 1.70$; impolite/polite, $F(4, 156) = 1.18$; close-minded/open-minded, $F(4, 160) = 0.65$; not patriotic/patriotic, $F(4, 160) = 0.32$; and aggressive/passive, $F(4, 160) = 1.41$.

The Zambian participants perceived Nigerians as significantly more traditional, $F(4, 164) = 8.65$, $p < .0001$, and superstitious, $F(4, 164) = 4.74$, $p < .001$, than any of the other stimulus countries. They also perceived Nigerians as significantly more religious than Americans, $F(4, 164) = 2.65$, $p < .04$. They saw the British as significantly less generous than Australians, $F(4, 160) = 2.62$, $p < .04$.

South Africa. The South African participants perceived no significant differences ($p > .05$) among the stimulus nations on the traits of impolite/polite, $F(4, 252) = 0.75$; selfish/generous, $F(4, 260) = 0.16$; and aggressive/passive, $F(4, 260) = 0.63$.

The ANOVAs for close-minded/open-minded, $F(4, 260) = 2.69$, $p < .03$, and for not religious/religious, $F(4, 260) = 3.39$, $p < .01$, were statistically significant, but the Tukey test (a very conservative test) did not reveal the specific nature of the differences.

On the other traits, the South African participants perceived many differences: They saw the British as less friendly than Australians and Canadians, $F(4, 256) = 3.15$, $p < .02$. They perceived Nigerians as more traditional and less modern than all of the other groups and Australians as more traditional and less modern than Americans, $F(4, 256) = 8.06$, $p < .0001$.

The South African participants perceived Nigerians as less patriotic than Americans and perceived Australians as less patriotic than Americans or the British, $F(4, 256) = 4.62$, $p < .001$. They perceived Nigerians as more superstitious than Americans and the British, $F(4, 260) = 6.05$, $p < .0001$.

Zimbabwe. The Zimbabwean participants made no significant distinctions ($p > .05$) on the dimensions of unfriendly/friendly, $F(4, 192) = 1.61$, and selfish/generous, $F(4, 192) = 1.69$. They perceived Nigerians as more traditional and less modern than Canadians and Americans, $F(4, 196) = 4.09$, $p < .003$; they perceived Canadians as more polite than Americans, Nigerians, and the British, $F(4, 196) = 5.92$, $p < .0002$. The Zimbabwean participants perceived Nigerians as marginally less open-minded than Americans, $F(4, 192) = 2.34$, $p < .06$; as more religious than Americans, Australians, or Canadians, $F(4, 184) = 5.97$, $p < .0002$; as less patriotic than Americans, $F(4, 188) = 2.42$, $p < .05$; and as more superstitious than any of the other stimulus countries, $F(4, 192) = 20.90$, $p < .0001$.

Botswana. The Botswanan participants did not distinguish among the stimulus nations ($p > .05$) on the dimensions of unfriendly/friendly, $F(4, 184) = 0.39$; impolite/polite, $F(4, 180) = 1.45$; selfish/generous, $F(4, 184) = 1.97$; or aggressive/passive, $F(4, 184) = 1.05$. They perceived Nigerians as significantly more

traditional and less modern than Australians and Canadians; in turn, they saw Canadians as more traditional and less modern than Americans, $F(4, 152) = 33.28$, $p < .0001$. They also perceived Canadians and Nigerians as less open-minded than Americans, $F(4, 184) = 5.40$, $p < .0004$.

The Botswanan participants perceived Nigerians as more religious than Americans, $F(4, 188) = 3.13$, $p < .02$, and as more patriotic than Australians, $F(4, 180) = 3.12$, $p < .02$. They also perceived Nigerians as more superstitious than Americans, Australians, and the British, $F(4, 184) = 9.99$, $p < .0001$, and Canadians as more superstitious than Americans.

Kenya. The Kenyan participants made no distinction among the stimulus countries ($p > .05$) on the dimensions of unfriendly/friendly, $F(4, 156) = 1.41$; close-minded/open-minded, $F(4, 156) = 0.49$; not religious/religious, $F(4, 152) = 1.65$; selfish/generous, $F(4, 156) = 0.65$; not patriotic/patriotic, $F(4, 152) = 0.74$; and aggressive/passive, $F(4, 156) = 1.38$.

The Kenyan participants perceived Nigerians as more traditional and less modern than all of the other stimulus groups, and they perceived Canadians as more traditional than Americans, $F(4, 152) = 33.28$, $p < .0001$. They perceived Americans as less polite than Australians, $F(4, 156) = 5.01$, $p < .0008$, and Nigerians as more superstitious than the British, $F(4, 156) = 2.79$, $p < .03$.

Comparison of Stereotypes Between Participant Groups

We computed the mean score on each adjective pair across the five stimulus countries for each participant. We used single factor ANOVAs to compare the nine participating groups for different response biases or predispositions that each group might have for evaluating people, regardless of national origin, in a particular fashion. The analyses revealed a large number of significant differences among the stimulus countries on all nine of the adjective pairs, indicating that, overall, some groups of participants consistently gave generally higher or lower ratings than others on each of the adjective pairs.

To overcome the problems associated with the generally higher or lower ratings assigned by some groups, we determined a ranking of the stimulus countries within each participant group on the basis of the mean of the ratings given by the participants to each stimulus country. Thus, we converted the means to ordinal-level data in the form of ranks. These ranks served as the units of analysis for this portion of the study, in which the essential question was the degree of agreement among the nine participating cultures regarding the stereotypes of the five stimulus countries. A significant agreement in the rankings of the stimulus countries on the adjective dimensions would reflect convergent agreement as to the relative stereotypes of the groups on these traits.

Our technique for assessing agreement among a set of judges (i.e., the participants from the nine countries where we gathered the data) who ranked or ordered

the same set of stimuli (i.e., the five stimulus countries) was Kendall's coefficient of concordance, *W* (Lehman, 1991; Lindeman, Merenda, & Gold, 1980; Marascuilo & McSweeney, 1977; McNemar, 1969). This statistic describes the amount of the maximum possible variance that can be accounted for by agreement among the judges, and it provides a valid measure of the extent of judges' agreement based on ordinal-level data. If all the judges agree exactly on all rankings, Kendall's coefficient *W* would be equal to 1. (In this sense, *W* can be interpreted like a correlation coefficient.) The test of significance for *W* was based on the chi-square distribution.

The Kendall's coefficient obtained for the ranking of the stimulus countries was not significant for the selfish/generous adjective pair, $W = .16$, $\chi^2(4) = 5.83$, *ns*. This finding indicated that for that trait, the agreement on the rankings by the nine participating countries was not significantly better than chance.

The agreement among the participants on the ranks assigned to the stimulus countries on the other eight adjective dimensions was significantly above chance, an indication of substantial agreement on how the stimulus countries were ordered along each dimension. The statistical values associated with these analyses are as follows: for unfriendly/friendly, $W = .33$, $\chi^2(4) = 11.84$, $p < .02$; for traditional/modern, $W = .78$, $\chi^2(4) = 28.01$, $p < .0001$; for impolite/polite, $W = .41$, $\chi^2(4) = 14.72$, $p < .01$; for close-minded/open-minded: $W = .30$, $\chi^2(4) = 10.69$, $p < .02$; for not religious/religious, $W = .72$, $\chi^2(4) = 26.06$, $p < .0001$; for not patriotic/patriotic, $W = .29$, $\chi^2(4) = 10.30$, $p < .05$; for aggressive/passive, $W = .32$, $\chi^2(4) = 11.66$, $p < .03$; and for superstitious/not superstitious, $W = .50$, $\chi^2(4) = 18.07$, $p < .01$.

Examination of A Priori Hypotheses

Validity of national stereotypes. We presumed that stereotypes would be more accurate to the extent of a convergence between the heterostereotypes held by a variety of different nations regarding a target nation. This would be especially true if there was a match between this heterostereotype and the autostereotype of individuals from the target country. According to the foregoing criteria, several stereotypes in the present study appeared to have at least some validity, and Hypothesis 1 was partially supported.

There was very strong agreement that Nigerians are the most superstitious, most traditional, and most religious of the five stimulus countries. Similarly, Americans were considered the most modern, patriotic, and aggressive, as well as the least friendly, polite, and religious, of the stimulus countries. Canadians, Australians, and Americans themselves also perceived Americans as selfish, but this opinion was not strongly shared by the African nations. Australians were judged to be the most friendly people, and Canadians, the least aggressive.

Autostereotypes versus heterostereotypes. For the four stimulus countries from which data were available, the answer to the question of whether autostereotypes

are more positive than heterostereotypes is mixed. Nigerians had a very positive autostereotype and consistently evaluated themselves more favorably than did others. On the other hand, Americans had a very negative autostereotype, one that was shared to some extent by many of the other groups. Canadians and Australians did not have extreme autostereotypes in either direction; they generally perceived themselves about the same as others did. Overall, however, it was clear that autostereotypes were not always more positive than heterostereotypes. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Similar social outlooks and similar stereotypes. To the extent that the African nations are more similar to each other than to the United States, Australia, and Canada, we expected to find greater consensus on heterostereotypes among the African participants and among the U.S., Australian, and Canadian participants than we would find across those categories. There was, however, no evidence either from the within-group ANOVA results or from the ranks assigned to the stimulus countries that this expectation was true, with one exception: The African participants did not endorse the generally strong negative American stereotype on several traits. In general, the African participants also made fewer and less extreme distinctions among the stimulus countries than did the U.S., Australian, and Canadian participants. Hypothesis 3 was partially supported.

Geographical proximity and negative stereotyping. If it is true that geographical proximity is associated with negative stereotypes, one would expect more negative stereotyping of Nigerians by other African nations and strong mutual negative stereotyping between Americans and Canadians. The African participants' stereotypes of Nigerians and the U.S. participants' stereotypes of Canadians were not especially negative. In contrast, the Canadian participants' stereotypes of Americans were easily the most negative of any stereotypes measured in the present study. The Canadian participants consistently gave Americans dramatically more negative ratings on most traits and ranked them as the least polite, least friendly, least religious, most selfish, and most aggressive of the five stimulus countries. Thus, the evidence on this question is also mixed. At least in the case of Canadians judging Americans, Hypothesis 4 was supported, but the lack of the effect for other groups indicates that other variables must have been operating as well.

Admiration of wealthier and more economically developed countries. Given the strong negative stereotype of Americans (who, arguably, are the most wealthy and developed people), Hypothesis 5 was not supported in the present study.

Discussion

Clearly, there are limitations in the present study, especially because the samples were not completely representative of the societies from which they

were drawn: Most of the participants were either students or university educated. Nevertheless, within these limits, one can draw some conclusions about the nature of national stereotyping.

Although cross-cultural agreement regarding the stereotypes among participants from the five English-speaking nations was far from perfect, there was a statistically significant similarity in the ranks assigned to the stimulus countries on eight of the nine adjective pairs. It is also clear that some dimensions (e.g., traditional/modern, not religious/religious, superstitious/not superstitious) produced greater consensus than others (e.g., selfish/generous, not patriotic/patriotic). The U.S., Australian, and Canadian participants made more distinctions (and more extreme distinctions) among the stimulus nations than did the participants from the African countries. To the extent that agreement between autostereotypes and heterostereotypes and the convergence of heterostereotypes among separate judges indicate an accurate stereotype, this study produced strong evidence for the stereotypes of Nigerians as traditional, superstitious, and religious; of Australians as friendly; of Canadians as nonaggressive; and of Americans as patriotic, aggressive, impolite, and nonreligious.

The strong negative U.S. autostereotype replicated a finding from earlier studies (McAndrew, 1990; Nichols & McAndrew, 1984) that Americans who had not lived abroad were more likely to hold negative autostereotypes, but it was not clear from these earlier studies whether autostereotypes became more positive following an overseas experience or whether self-selection for people who already had positive autostereotypes accounted for the effect. We also replicated the extremely negative feelings expressed by Canadians toward Americans (Schneider & Lesko, 1978). In the study just cited, Canadians in Windsor, Ontario, had strong negative stereotypes of Americans, estimating that more than half of Canadians felt the same way and that only 30% of their compatriots felt positively about Americans. The Americans (Schneider & Lesko) had less well-defined and more positive attitudes toward Canadians and estimated that more than 80% of Americans felt positively toward Canadians.

This consistent asymmetry in Canadian–American attitudes was virtually identical in two different studies conducted 20 years apart with quite different samples. Schneider and Lesko (1978) provided data showing that the Canadians in their study visited the United States about four times more often than the Americans in their study visited Canada. Moreover, the Canadians reported personally knowing five times as many Americans compared with the number of Canadians personally known by the Americans. As in other earlier studies (LeVine & Campbell, 1972; McAndrew, 1990), it may be the higher degree of contact with the other country that enabled Canadians to feel confident in expressing negative attitudes. Undoubtedly, the political and cultural consequences of living in the shadow of a larger, economically dominant neighbor also play a part. On the other hand, given the agreement of Americans with the Canadian stereotype, we cannot rule out the possibility that Americans, as a group, are simply more unpleasant people than Canadians.

REFERENCES

Brown, R. (1986). *Social psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Eagly, A. H., & Kite, M. E. (1987). Are national stereotypes applied to both men and women? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53,* 451–462.

Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of men and women into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 735–754.

Everett, J. E., & Stening, B. W. (1987). Stereotyping in American, British, and Japanese corporations in Hong Kong and Singapore. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 127,* 445–460.

Hilton, J. L., & von Hippel, W. (1996). Stereotypes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 47,* 237–271.

Iwao, S., & Triandis, H. C. (1993). Validity of auto- and heterostereotypes among Japanese and American students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 24,* 428–444.

Jamison, K. (1971). British and American personality stereotyping. *Proceedings of the 79th annual convention of the American Psychological Association* (pp. 349–350). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (1993). Definition and assessment of accuracy in social stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 100,* 109–128.

Jussim, L. J., McCauley, C. R., & Lee, Y. (1996). Why study stereotype accuracy and inaccuracy? In Y. Lee, L. J. Jussim, & C. R. McCauley (Eds.), *Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciating group differences* (pp. 3–27). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kosmitzki, C., Cheng, S. Y., & Chik, S. W. K. (1994). Do national stereotypes apply equally to individual members of social minority and majority groups? *The Journal of Social Psychology, 134,* 395–397.

Lee, Y., & Duenas, G. (1996). Stereotype accuracy in multicultural business. In Y. Lee, L. J. Jussim, & C. R. McCauley (Eds.), *Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciating group differences* (pp. 157–186). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lehman, R. S. (1991). *Statistics and research design in the behavioral sciences.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior.* New York: Wiley.

Lindeman, R. H., Merenda, P. F., & Gold, R. Z. (1980). *Introduction to bivariate and multivariate analysis.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Linssen, H., & Hagendoorn, L. (1994). Social and geographical factors in the explanation of European nationality stereotypes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33,* 165–182.

Marascuilo, L. A., & McSweeney, M. (1977). *Nonparametric and distribution-free methods for the social sciences.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Marin, G., & Salazar, J. M. (1985). Determinants of hetero- and autostereotypes: Distance, level of contact, and socioeconomic development in seven nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 16,* 403–422.

McAndrew, F. T. (1990). Auto- and heterostereotyping in Pakistani, French, and American college students. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 130,* 341–351.

McAndrew, F. T., & Akande, A. (1995). African perceptions of Americans of African and European descent. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 135,* 649–655.

McCauley, C. R. (1996). Are stereotypes exaggerated? A sampling of racial, gender, academic, occupational, and political stereotypes. In Y. Lee, L. J. Jussim, & C. R. McCauley (Eds.), *Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciating group differences* (pp. 215–243). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

McCauley, C. R., Jussim, L. J., & Lee, Y. (1996). Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciat-

ing group differences. In Y. Lee, L. J. Jussim, & C. R. McCauley (Eds.), *Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciating group differences* (pp. 293–312). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

McGrady, R. E., & McGrady, J. B. (1976). Effect of direct exposure to foreign target groups on descriptive stereotypes held by American students. *Social Behavior and Personality, 4,* 233–239.

McNemar, Q. (1969). *Psychological statistics* (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Nichols, K. R., & McAndrew, F. T. (1984). Stereotyping and autostereotyping in Spanish, Malaysian, and American college students. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 124,* 179–189.

O'Driscoll, M., Haque, A., & Oshako, T. (1983). Effects of contact and perceived attitude differences on social distance among Australian, Japanese, and Pakistani students. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 120,* 163–168.

Peabody, D. (1985). *National characteristics.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ray, J. J. (1983). Racial attitudes and the contact hypothesis. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 119,* 3–10.

Salvatore, C. (1986, April). *National stereotypes and their relationship to self-perceptions in Irish, Italian, and American college students.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, New York.

Schneider, F. W., & Lesko, W. A. (1978, June). *Attitudinal and behavioural reactions of Americans and Canadians to each other: A field study.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Ottawa.

Triandis, H. C., Lisansky, J., Setiadi, B., Chang, B., Marin, G., & Betancourt, H. (1982). Stereotyping among Hispanics and Anglos. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 13,* 409–426.

Triandis, H. C., & Vassiliou, V. (1967). Frequency of contact and stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7,* 316–328.

Received April 27, 1998
Accepted January 13, 1999