Compatriot and Foreigner: a Study of

Impression Formation in Three Countries[1]

Jerome S. Bruner

Harvard University

and

Howard V. Perlmutter

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

A commonsense observation is the starting point of our inquiry. If one were to enter a room and be introduced to a Frenchman, a German, and an American, it would be likely that one's first impressions of the three would be such as to magnify the difference between our new acquaintances. The Frenchman might appear more "typically French," the German more "typically German," and the American more "typically American." Our perceptual selectivity would register cues that differentiate the three in terms of their most evident difference: their nationality. To this commonsense observation we must add a second. It is also likely that, if one were an American, the Frenchman and German would seem more "typical" of their nationality than would the American to whom we had been introduced. And this would perhaps be the more so to the degree that we were well acquainted with Americans but had experienced little contact with Frenchmen or Germans.

The matter need not be limited to nationality. Introduced at the same time to two men, one as a professor and one as

a businessman of our own nationality, likely as not we would seek the cues that permitted maximum differentiation of the two in terms of the difference of profession. And again, the degree to which this would be so might depend upon how well acquainted we were with practitioners of the two professions: the better acquainted, the less the likelihood of role stereotyping. If we were familiar with one of the professions, by the same token, the other would undergo a stereotyping in our impression formation.

These commonsense observations -- or rather, the hypotheses to which they give rise and with the testing of which this paper is concerned -- lead to several thoughts about the nature of the process that has come to be called "the formation of first impressions." It suggests in the first place that under certain conditions, our impressions have the effect of accentuating the differences between people encountered briefly, and further, that there are other conditions that reduce this tendency to the accentuation of difference. Let us state the matter more formally in terms of a set of hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1. If a person be placed in a particular category on first encounter (nationality, role, occupation), the more widespread one's experience with diverse members of the category the less will this category membership affect the impression formed of the person encountered. Put concretely, if one knows Americans better than Frenchmen or Germans, the first impression formed of an American will be less determined by his nationality than in the other two cases. Or if one knows musicians better than theoretical physicists, the former occupa-

tion will affect a first impression less than the latter.

Hypothesis 2. If three pieces of wood, alike in all respects save their grain, be viewed simultaneously, an observer will be more likely to notice grain characteristics in the wood than if one of the pieces is presented alone. But more formally, that attribute which distinguishes an array of objects will be most salient in viewing the array. Given a single object, there are no similar constraints on what an individual may notice. (4) With reference to our own experiment, if the individual is asked to form impressions of an array of individuals differing only in nationality, then nationality will be a more determinative factor in impression formation than if the individual is set the task of forming an impression of a single individual.

With this much of an introduction, we may turn to the study designed to examine and test these hypotheses.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The basic design of the study was simple in outline. By the use of a brief sketch, a stimulus person or stimulus persons were presented to our subjects. The subjects were then given the task of checking on a trait list those items they thought characteristic of the stimulus person as a "first impression." The stimulus persons presented varied in terms of their nationality--French, German, or American--and in terms of their occupation--unspecified, college professor, or businessman. Moreover, the impression formation situation varied, as required by our second hypothesis, in terms of whether the subject had a single

person of a particular nationality in mind when forming his
impression or had in mind three people of different nationality:
what we shall call the "single-impression" and the "triple-
impression" situations. After filling in the impression trait
list, subjects were asked to indicate, in a manner to be described,
the bases upon which they had decided to check various traits.
The subjects were all university students and themselves varied
in nationality. There were university students from Boston;
Paris and Dijon, in France; and a set of groups from Berlin,
Hanover, and Cologne, in Germany. Students in each country,
then, were forming an impression of a compatriot and/or of
a foreigner. We may consider now the specifics of the design.

Thirty-seven groups of subjects were used in the "single-
impression" situation, a third of them Germans, a third French,
and a third American. The total sample was comprised of 576
subjects of whom 298 were male and 278 female. The groups who
were given the test while assembled, varied in size from 13 to
29 subjects. Each subject in these groups, as we have noted,
formed an impression of a single stimulus person. The twenty-
seven groups and the number of subjects in each is set forth
in Table 1. Since no consistent sex differences were found,
the data for both sexes were combined.

. . . .
. . Insert Table 1 about here .
. . . .

Only nine triple-impression groups were required to ful-
fill the design. The total population in these nine groups
comprised 218 subjects of whom 108 were males and 110 females.
Each subject formed impressions of three stimulus persons of

different nationality: in a third of the groups the stimulus persons were a French, American, and German professor; in another third, French, American, and German businessmen; and the remaining third, a French, American, and German person of unspecified occupation was presented. The design and the number of subjects in each group is presented in Table 2. These subjects knew in advance, of course, that they were to form impressions of people of three different nationalities.

. . . .
Insert Table 2 about here
. . . .

All subjects were given a booklet with the instructions not to look ahead in the questionnaire and to finish each page before turning to the next. Both single-impression groups and triple-impression groups were told: "You will be asked to form impressions of specific persons in this questionnaire." The latter were further instructed: "These people are from different countries."

The instructions and description of each stimulus person was as follows:

"The object of this test is to determine the extent to which people are capable of judging a person from a few facts about that person. A brief characterization of a specific individual appears below. Read it carefully and try to form an image of this person. You will be asked to record your impressions.

"He is a very typical _____. There is general agreement among those who know him that he is intelligent, energetic, and well-adjusted. Now 42 years old, he is married and lives in a large city in _____."

For the American businessman, the subject would be told:
"He is a very typical American businessman . . . who lives in
a large city in the United States." For the French college
professor, the subjects would be told: "He is a very typical
French college professor . . . who lives in a large city in
France," etc.

Next, subjects were asked to turn the page and choose from
a list of 38 traits (See Table 3, which contains the trait
names in English, French, and German) those which "best charac-
terized the person described." Subjects were allowed to choose
as many as they wished.

After the trait list had been checked (in the case of the
triple-impression group, after trait lists for all three
stimulus persons had been checked), subjects were next asked
the bases on which they had checked specific traits on the list.
A series of letters were used to describe these determinants
of each trait-choice. For each trait checked, subjects wrote:

E if the trait energetic of the stimulus person contributed
to that choice,

I if the trait intelligent of the stimulus person contri-
buted to that choice,

W if the trait well-adjusted of the stimulus person con-
tributed to that choice,

V if the social role contributed to that choice,

N if the nationality of the stimulus person contributed
to that choice.

Subjects could use any combination of the letters to describe
completely the bases for each choice. They were encouraged to

specify freely any other determinants of their choice, although few actually did.

Since we shall rely heavily upon the report of subjects concerning the determinants of their choice of traits, a word about the "meaning" of such reports is necessary. One cannot naively assume that subjects "know" what led them to check a particular trait. It is as conceivable that the degree of one's hostility toward a businessman-father is as much a determinant of choice as anything contained in the sketch. But it would be just as naive to assume out of hand that subjects, university students in this case, are completely incapable of "knowing" the basis for their selection of traits. The issue is not one that can be resolved. Yet, we have asked our subjects to indicate the basis of their choices. We take their responses as symptomatic not of the "true" basis of choice--whatever that may mean ontologically--but rather as a basis for inferring what underlies their choice. In fact, the only proper basis of inference would be further systematic variation in the trait lists used, in the instructions given subjects, and in the nature of the responses they gave by which we make our inferences about causes. We shall go ahead in this paper treating our subjects' reports on determinants as if they could be taken as a proper basis of inference. In a final section we shall reconsider the matter.

Design of the Trait List

The traits used to characterize the stimulus persons were constructed in the following way, the activity being conducted in English: (1) A list of synonyms of the stimulus traits

energetic, intelligent, and well-adjusted were gathered;
(2) synonyms were divided into dichotomized groupings on the
basis of certain dimensions. (See Table 3) Synonyms of the
stimulus trait energetic, for example, were subdivided into
"focused-energetic" and "diffuse-energetic." Under focused-
energetic we put the traits: bustling, animated, spirited,
and vivacious. These dichotomies were based on hunches con-
cerning shifts in the meaning of stimulus traits when connected
with persons of various nationalities.

The final ordering of traits in the list was random. Re-
call that subjects were asked to report the determinants of
each trait they checked. With the exception of two traits all
traits on the list were found to be determined by the stimulus
traits for which they were designed to be synonyms. So subjects
checking "sensible" on the trait list would more often report
that the "intelligent" characteristic of the stimulus person
determined their choice rather than the fact that he was said
to be "well-adjusted" or "energetic."

In both France and Germany the researchers were given the
American trait list and were asked to translate this list into
their respective languages. A number of problems arose. First,
it was difficult to establish an exact lexical equivalent because
either the language did not utilize the stimulus traits or the
check list traits in the same way, or the lexical equivalent was
not used with the same degree of frequency in each country
according to the judgment of the respective researchers. In
all cases the list was translated by not less than three bi-
lingual individuals native to the country, and a final discussion

was held to decide which translation of the equivalent trait
in the American trait list was to be used.

There is no practicable procedure for assuring that the
trait lists in the three languages are either denotatively or
connotively identical, and the results to be reported must be
evaluated in the light of this fact. A close approximation to
a test of identity is by the use of a matching procedure. We
have asked English-German and English-French bilinguals to
match items in the two lists to ascertain whether, within this
universe of traits, identity matches could be obtained. But
this does not obviate the contingency that the items matched
across languages are not the closest synonyms possible. All
that we can say is that we have taken precautions. For a fuller
account of the problems of translating traits from one language
into another, the reader is referred to the reports of Perlmutter,
Mayntz, and Hurtig, (7) and Lenneberg and Roberts (5).

RESULTS

One of our hypotheses was that subjects operating in the
triple-impression situation will rely more heavily on nationality
as a determinant than will the single-impression subjects.
A gross test of the hypothesis is provided by comparing the
number of times on the average that subjects in the two situa-
tions indicated that their choice of a trait for characterizing
the person was based upon knowledge of nationality. Grouping
together all French, American, and German stimulus persons with-
out regard to occupation and comparing the average number of
times that subjects justified their choice of a trait by refer-

ence to nationality, we obtain the confirmatory results presented
in Table 4.

<center>. . . . .
Insert Table 4 about here
. . . .</center>

Another way of stating these results is by reference to
comparisons between specific single- and triple-impression
groups. There are 27 single-impression groups as indicated in
Table 1. For each, there corresponds a comparable record given
under triple-impression conditions. In all 27 of the possible
comparisons, the triple-impression group shows a greater reliance
on nationality as a determinant of their responses, a result of
a confidence level well beyond the .01 level as determined by
the Dixon-Mood Sign Test.

Table 4 also confirms our other hypothesis that in general
one uses nationality determinants less often in forming one's
image of a compatriot than in forming an impression of a for-
eigner. This was indicated both in single-impression and triple-
impression situations. Comparisons may be made in this way.
Take first the single-impression situation. For each group of
subjects, let us compare the use of nationality as a determinant
in forming an impression of a compatriot and of a foreigner.
Thus we will compare the use of nationality determinants for
Amerians judging Americans with their use of this determinant
in judging Frenchmen and in judging Germans. This gives us two
comparisons. We may also compare the use of nationality when
Americans form an image of an American professor as compared
with their usage in forming an impression of a German professor
and a French professor. For subjects of all nationalities,

18 such comparisons are possible for the single-impression situation and another 18 for the triple-impression procedure. In 34 out of the 36 comparisons thus afforded, nationality is used more frequently as a determinant in forming an impression of a foreigner than of a compatriot, again a statistically highly reliable result.

Table 4 indicates, however, that under single-impression conditions, this tendency to use nationality more often on foreigners than on compatriots is considerably more marked than under triple-impression conditions.[2] The latter conditions seem to have the effect of making nationality salient even in sizing up a fellow national. We may note, for example, that with the French subjects operating under triple-impression conditions, nationality determinants are used as often on compatriots as on foreigners. It was in this subgroup that the two reversals in trend noted above were found.

We come now to several corrolaries of the major hypothesis with which we have just been concerned. The first of these has to do with the specificity of the category into which a stimulus person is "coded." Recall that subjects were given sketches of a college professor, a businessman, and apperson of unspecified vocation varying, of course, in nationality. Recall also that the subjects are themselves university students in working contact with professors perhaps more than with businessmen. It would follow then that the category "professors" would be more differentiated for them than the category "businessmen." We would hypothesize, then, that vocation would more often be used as a determinant in forming an impression of a businessman

than of a professor--at least amongst our university-based subjects. Such is indeed the case. Consider first the nine single-impression groups. For American subjects, for example, we can ask whether vocation is more often used as a basis for forming an impression of an "American businessman" or an "American professor." We can also compare German professor and businessman and French professor and businessman for this group of subjects and for subjects of other nationalities. This gives us nine possible comparisons. In all nine of these comparisons, the results come out as expected: vocation is more frequently named as a basis of checking list traits for businessman than for professor. These results are summarized in Table 5 where the material for the triple-impression condition is also presented. In the latter case, the picture is less clear: six of the nine comparisons are in the expected direction. If the 18 comparisons be grouped, the resultant figure of 15 in 18 is significant by the Sign Test at the .01 level. If the reader examine the reversals in Table 5, he will note that they are more of the order of ties than of reversals in two of the three cases.

. . . .

Insert Table 5 about here
. . . .

THE NATURE OF THE IMPRESSIONS FORMED

Our object in the present report is to consider principally the nature of the impression-forming process and the factors that may influence this process. In the preceding section, the emphasis has been upon determinants, and in the one that follows

it will be upon the facets of the images formed by our subjects
as inferred from the traits they actually checked in character-
izing the various stimulus persons presented.

A full presentation of the traits ascribed to Americans,
Frenchmen, and Germans of different occupation by respondents
of these several nationalities would be a forbidding undertaking.
There are 36 groups of subjects, each with a somewhat different
kind of stimulus person, at least different in terms of con-
ditions under which presented. And there are 38 traits which
may be checked.

One approach is to choose a particularly interesting
stimulus person--one whose image seems to loom large in the
political and social sphere: the American businessman. We
will limit our discussion to him as illustrative.[3]

To reduce the complexity of the image that emerges, we
limit ourselves to a discussion of those traits that are checked
by at least 50% of respondents from a given country. These we
may regard as "consensual" impressions. In Table 6 are set
forth those traits in which such a consensus was found with
respect to the image of the American businessman. The pattern
is not so unattractive as one might be led to believe by reports
in mass media. All three nationalities, regardless of the method
of testing, agree that the American businessman is "determined,"
and there is also rather wide agreement that he is "sensible."
French respondents rather agree with their American fellows in
seeing him as "satisfied" and "level headed"--rather a sobersided
image--whereas the Germans appear to emphasize a constellation
of "resolute," "tenacious," and "calculating." It is difficult,

of course, to extract an organized image from a set of checked
items on a trait list--and also from the items that go unchecked.
For as Asch has so wisely pointed out and demonstrated (2),
traits fuse together in an organization and the organization
is often dominated by a single trait. We have no way of deter-
mining from our data, for example, whether "calculating" is
the organizer of many German impressions, or "resolute" of
French images. What seems very striking in Table 6 is that
there is not such a sharp difference in the images of subjects
of three nationalities and to this topic we turn next.

. . . .
Insert Table 6 about here
. . . .

COMMUNALITY IN IMAGES

Given 38 traits on a list, subjects of a given nationality
may agree (50% or better) on all, some, or none of the traits
when characterizing a stimulus person of given characteristics.
Table 6 shows that in fact they agree on some. We may properly
ask, now, whether subjects of the three different nationalities
agree about the same things--agree on what things to check about
an American businessman and what things to omit checking. There
are two ways in which communality of agreement can come about:
majorities of subjects of each of the three nationalities can
check the same trait, or majorities of each of the three can omit
a particular trait. We can readily compute what one would expect
to find by chance by way of communality of agreement between
three separate nationality groups. If the French showed agree-
ment in checking 10 in 38 traits, the Americans 12 in 38, and

the Germans 14 in 38, then an estimate of expected communality
for agreement on checking can be obtained by multiplying 10/38
by 12/38 by 14/38, using the resulting fraction as the propor-
tion of 38 traits where all three nations would be expected to
agree by chance. The same procedure would be followed for
agreed-upon omissions. The sum of actually agreed-upon in-
clusions plus agreed-upon omissions is the total of obtained
agreements.

Expected and obtained levels of communality for inclusion
and omission are to be found in Table 7. The statistical reader
should be warned that the method of computing expected propor-
tions is based on an assumption of independence between items
on the lists checked by our subjects--an assumption found
necessary thus far in solving the three-deck matching problem
(cf. Battin, 3). The assumption is peculiar, since there is
obviously nonindependence in the checking of two such list
items as "determined" and "tenacious." In consequence, the
null hypothesis provided by computation of expected levels
according to the method set forth is the nullest possible and
is therefore too lenient.

. . . .
Insert Table 7 about here
. . . .

What is apparent in Table 7, however, is that communality
of agreement both with respect to omissions and checks is in
excess of chance. A more straightforward way of putting the
matter is to say that our three nationalities agree with each
other about the dominant traits of our nine kinds of stimulus
persons and about the traits they do not have more than would

be expected by chance. Is it a "lot more" or not? This is not
a statistical question, but a substantive one. Statistically
speaking, we can at least say that there is a significant
deviation from chance in the agreement pattern. The simplest
way of demonstrating this is by a Sign Test. In 18 of the 18
comparisons between expected and obtained incidence of communality
for omissions and inclusions combined, the obtained levels
exceed the expected levels. Similarly for communality of
omissions: in 18 of 18 comparisons, obtained frequencies are
higher. Where communality of inclusion is concerned, obtained
frequencies are greater than chance expectancy in 16 of 18 such
comparisons. All of these are statistically reliable.

We may conclude this section by saying then that there is
greater agreement among people of different nationalities about
characterizing stimulus persons who are compatriots to some and
foreigners to others than would be expected by chance. That
this degree of communality is obviously not great enough to
obviate serious differences in imagery between people of differ-
ent nationality is evident from the experience of intercultural
misunderstanding.

RECAPITULATION

Our first and perhaps most general hypothesis is that if
objects that are alike in all respects save one are considered
together, their difference in this one respect will be more
critical in the impression one forms of the objects. Three
identical triplets, differing only in the color of tie they are
sporting, will be seen and interpreted more in terms of their

tie-wearing habits than would be the case if each one were
encountered singly and without the possibility of a comparison.
A corrolary of this hypothesis to which we have addressed our-
selves is: If in forming impressions of foreigners and compatriots
one is thinking in a comparative context, with the different
nationalities in mind while forming one's impression, then the
degree to which nationality will influence the impressions
formed will be increased. The comparative context, often cele-
brated rather uncritically as a facilitator of panhuman per-
ceptiveness, may not always have such an effect. In cross-
cultural contact an individual may in fact exaggerate the im-
pressions of differentness between foreigner and compatriot.
Indeed, anthropologists have often been criticized for their
description of the gulf between members of different cultures,
particularly by those who, like Allport (1), have tried to
emphasize the communalities in the human condition. It may in-
deed be the special comparative perspective of the anthropologist
that produces this emphasis--if indeed it is such.

Our second hypothesis is similarly simple. If a person
or object be "placed" or classified in an undifferentiated
category with the members of which one has had little experience,
the effect will be for the general properties of the undifferen-
tiated category to have a greater effect on the impression
formed of the individual so placed than if the placement had
been in a more differentiated category. Category membership,
in brief, will have a more telling effect on the impression
formed of one of its members in the degree to which the cate-
gory is differentiated. More differentiated categories have

less "stereotyping" effect than less differentiated ones. Thus, the nationality of a person will stereotype one's impression of him to the degree that the nationality is well or poorly known to one. So too with occupation. A college professor will do little stereotyping on the basis of being told that a man he is meeting teaches at a university. Should he know businessmen less well, the announcement that the man in question earns his living in commerce will have a graater effect on the impression formed.

Our two principal hypotheses leave much ground still unturned in the matter of how one forms impressions of compatriots and foreigners, but it does serve to sharpen up a few issues. Impression formation depends in massive degree on categorization processes. In essence, we place a person or thing in a category on the basis of a few minimal cues--like a statement of his nationality or occupation--and then proceed to "run off" along the lines of the higher probability attributes associated with people or events included in the category. As noted in a recent work of Bruner, Goodnow, and Austin (4), the attributes that will be emphasized under these circumstances are dictated at least in part by the nature of the discrimination that the impression-former has to make. If one should be asked for the characteristics of man that distinguish him from bears, one set of attributes will become salient. If the task is to distinguish man from all other species we may have recourse to the old characterization of man as a featherless biped. In sum, place-ment of the object about which an impression is being formed determines the reservoir of traits that will constitute one's

impression, and the selection among these traits will be deter-
mined by the nature of the task the person conceives himself
to be engaged in. If the task is specifically comparative--
comparing Indians and Negroes--the emphasis will tend to be
upon the principal differentiae of the two. If it is Indians
per se that is our concern, we will tend to choose those fea-
tures of Indians that distinguish them from all other groupings,
and pigmentation is likely to be less important. The other
factor that will determine which among the possible attributes
of a category will be decisive in determining the impression
formed of one of its members depends somewhat upon the "sorting"
of attributes associated with the category. Where one has
developed a high degree of differentiation--that certain attri-
butes at first thought to be universally associated with members
of a category are not universal but only of, say, middling
probability--then there will be less tendency to build an
impression of the individual out of a dominant set of rather
stereotyped attributes. Or, to put the matter more elegantly,
a differentiated category is one in which there is a better
representation of the likelihood with which specific traits are
associated with all or most of its members.

We return at last to the methodological problem introduced
earlier. We have asked our subjects first to check certain
traits that characterize a person presented in a sketch, and
then to indicate the basis for doing so--what in the sketch
prompted the choice of a given trait. Much of our reasoning
has been based on the latter of these data: notably, the
reliance on nationality as a basis for checking traits. It is

fashionable to be apologetic about utilizing such direct reports
as a basis for drawing inferences. We do not feel that the
matter can be resolved within the compass of the data available
to us. This much is clear. Highly consistent differences have
been found, differences that have a congruency as one goes from
comparison to comparison. Either our subjects <u>thought</u> that
their choice of traits was being determined by certain features
of the sketches presented to them, or they were in some degree
so determined. The proper skepticism requires that the matter
be left open pending further research--research designed to
compare direct reporting with such other indirect methods of
response as one may find in the armamentarium of projective
tests or psychophysiological procedures. Any one such procedure
would be as suspect inferentially as the direct reports of our
subjects, no more and no less so. Ideally, inferences should
be drawn from a very wide sampling of different kinds of responses.
Let the reader suspend judgment in the present case, or better
still, let him consider whether at this stage of research it
is better to commit a Type I or a Type II error.

One final word is in order. Impression formulation is
not a separate sort of cognitive activity and we are in the
debt of Asch (2) for making this clear. It is a phenomenon that
requires close analysis in terms of cognitive theory--whether
the theory be associationistic, Gestalt, or the type of informa-
tion-utilization theory that informs the present enterprise.

References

1. Allport, G. W. Becoming. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.

2. Asch, S. E. Social psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.

3. Battin, I. L. On the problem of multiple matching. Ann. Math. Statist., 1942, 13, 294-305.

4. Bruner, J. S., Goodnow, J. J., & Austin, G. A. A study of thinking. New York: Wiley, 1956.

5. Lenneberg, E. H., & Roberts, J. M. The language of experience: a study in methodology. Supple. Int. J. Amer. Linguist., 1956, 22, No. 2 (Whole Mem. 13).

6. Mayntz, Renate, & Perlmutter, H. V. Der einfluss von nationalitätsidentifikation und berufsdefinition auf die Vorstellungsbildung. Kölner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 1956, 8, 2.

7. Perlmutter, H. V., Mayntz, Renate, & Hurtig, M. A methodological note on the use of corss-national trait lists for research, unpublished manuscript, Center for International Studies, M.I.T., Doc.-55/36, Nov. 25, 1955.

Footnotes

1. This research was jointly supported by the Experimental
    Project of the research program on international communi-
    cations at the Center for International Studies, Massachusetts
    Institute of Technology, under the direction of Dr. Perlmutter,
    and ONR contract ori - 0746 at Harvard University under the
    direction of Dr. Bruner. We are especially grateful to
    Dr. Renate Mayntz of UNESCO, and M. Michel Hurtig of the
    Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique of Paris for
    assistance in the collection and analysis of data.

2. This tendency is statistically a highly reliable one. We
    test significance in the following way. Compare the differ-
    ence of nationality determinants used in forming an image
    of a foreigner and of a compatriot under single- and
    triple-impression conditions. Eighteen such comparisons
    are possible. For example, for French subjects operating
    under single-impression conditions, we may compare the
    difference in number of nationality determinants used in
    forming an impression of a typical American professor and
    a typical French professor (3.00-2.10 = .90) with the
    difference obtained for the same stimulus persons judged
    under triple-impression conditions (6.54 - 5.96 = .58).
    In 17 of the 18 comparisons possible, the differences were
    greater for the single-impression groups, a result significant
    beyond the .01 level.

3. A detailed qualitative analysis of the German findings has been published in Germany (6). In this study, individual differences in the formation of impressions of foreigner and compatriot are discussed.

Table 1

The Number of Subjects in Each

of Twenty-seven Single-impression Groups

Subjects	Stimulus persons who are-								
	American-			French-			German-		
	prof.	bus.man	unspec.	prof.	bus.man	unspec.	prof.	bus.man	unspec.
American	19	13	21	15	18	22	16	18	19
French	29	22	18	29	28	27	28	28	27
German	20	20	20	20	20	19	20	20	20

Table 2

The Number of Subjects in Each of Nine

Triple-Impression Groups

	Stimulus persons who are-		
Subjects	Amer., Fr., & Ger. profs.	Amer., Fr., & Ger. bus. men	Amer., Fr., & Ger., unspec.
American	26	28	30
French	26	25	23
German	20	20	20

Table 3

The Trait List and Its German

and French Equivalents

Synonyms for <u>energetic</u>					
Focused			Diffuse		
Trait	German	French	Trait	German	French
resolute	entschieden	résolu	bustling	geschäftig	agité
tenacious	zäh	tenace	animated	angeregt	animé
dogged	verbohrt	persévérant	spirited	munter	fougueux
determined	entschlossen	décidé	vivacious	lebhaft	vif

Synonyms for <u>intelligent</u>					
Focused			Diffuse		
Trait	German	French	Trait	German	French
analytic	analytisch	analytique	wise	weise	sage
brilliant	geistreich	brillant	judicious	abwägend	judicieux
quick	schnell	alerte	level-	einsichtig	bien
logical	logisch	rationnel	headed		équilibré
penetrating	durchdringend	perspicace	prudent	klug	prudent
astute	scharfsinnig	astucieux	sensible	vernünftig	sensé
clever	gescheit	adroit	sound	gesund	doué de bon sens
discerning	scharfblick-end	doué de discernement	unaffected	ungeziert	simple

canny	schlau	avisé	sensitive	empfindsam	pourvu
shrewd	listig	sagace			de flair
cunning	verschlagen	ruse	tactful	taktvoll	diplomate
calculating	berechnend	calculant d'avance	understand-ing	verständnis-voll	comprehen-sif
			unpreju-diced	vorurteils-frei	impartial

Synonyms for well-adjusted					
Focused			Diffuse		
Trait	German	French	Trait	German	French
self-pos-sessed	gelassen	maître de lui	cheerful	frölich	joyeux
			happy	glücklich	heureux
philosophi-cal	philoso-phisch	philosophe	satisfied	zufrieden	content de bon sort
deep	tief	profond			

Table 4

Average Number of Times that Trait Is

Checked on Basis of Nationality

of Stimulus Person

Group	French subjects		German subjects		American subjects	
	Foreigner	Compatriot	Foreigner	Compatriot	Foreigner	Compatriot
Sing.-Impress.	4.6	2.8	3.9	1.4	3.3	1.3
Trip.-Impress.	6.8	6.8	6.6	4.5	5.2	4.3

Table 5

Average Number of Times that Trait Is Checked

On Basis of Vocation of Stimulus Person

Stimulus Person	Sing.-impress. groups			Trip.-impress. groups		
	"Prof."	"Bus.man"	Bus.men checked more than prof.	"Prof."	"Bus.man"	Bus.men checked more than prof.
Amer. subjects:						
Amer.	2.1	6.0	+	4.2	3.9	-
Ger.	3.3	5.0	+	3.5	3.4	-
Fr.	3.3	5.8	+	2.8	3.3	+
Fr. subjects:						
Amer.	2.7	6.3	+	2.5	5.9	+
Ger.	4.5	5.9	+	2.9	4.7	+
Fr.	3.9	6.4	+	3.8	5.7	+
Ger. subjects:						
Amer.	3.1	5.0	+	3.1	4.7	+
Ger.	3.6	6.0	+	4.9	4.6	-
Fr.	3.9	4.6	+	2.6	4.4	+

Table 6

Traits Agreed Upon by 50% or More of Subjects

of Each Nationality in Characterizing

an American Businessman

Sing.-impress.			Triple-impress.		
Americans	French	German	Americans	French	German
cheerful	joyeux		cheerful	joyeux	
tactful	diplomate		tactful		
sound	doué de bon sens				
satisfied	content de bon sort		satisfied	content de bon sort	
logical	rationnel				logisch
	résolu	entschieden		résolu	entschieden
	tenace	zäh		tenace	zäh
	simple	ungeziert	unaffected		ungeziert
bustling		geschäftig			geschäftig
sensible	sensé	vernünftig	sensible		
determined	décidé	entschlossen	determined	décidé	entschlossen
clever			clever	adroit	
happy			happy	heureux	
natural					naturlich
level- headed	bien équilibré		level- headed	bien équilibré	

(second page of Table 6)

Americans	French	German	Americans	French	German
understanding					
	pourvu de flair				
	astucieux				
	maître de lui			maître de lui	gelassen
	avisé			avisé	
	calculant d'avance			calculant d'avance	berechnend
			shrewd		
				alerte	schnell
				animé	
					abwägend
					scharf-blickend

Table 7

Consensus of Three Nationalities on the

Agreed-upon Traits of Nine Types of Stimulus Persons

Stimulus person	Consensus on inclusion and omission		Consensus on inclusion of traits		Consensus on omission of traits	
	Expected	Obtained	Expected	Obtained	Expected	Obtained
Trip. impress.						
Amer.bus.man	13.3	16	1.2	1	12.1	15
Fr. bus.man	12.8	15	.9	1	12.0	14
Ger. bus.man	17.2	20	.5	2	16.8	18
Amer. prof.	15.7	20	.6	2	15.1	18
Fr. prof.	17.7	18	.4	0	17.3	18
Ger. prof.	14.8	24	.8	3	14.0	21
Amer. unsp.	15.3	25	.7	4	14.6	21
Fr. unsp.	11.9	15	1.1	2	10.7	13
Ger. unsp.	14.7	17	.8	1	13.9	16
Sing.-impress.						
Amer.bus.man	13.1	17	.9	2	12.2	17
Fr. bus.man	10.1	13	1.8	3	9.4	10
Ger. bus.man	14.9	19	.8	2	14.1	17
Amer. prof.	13.7	20	.9	4	12.8	16
Fr. prof.	14.9	17	.8	1	14.1	16
Ger. prof.	13.8	22	.9	4	12.9	18
Amer. unsp.	10.6	18	2.1	5	8.6	13
Fr. unsp.	14.8	17	.6	1	14.3	16
Ger. unsp.	10.7	19	2.3	6	8.4	13