
A Review of the Definitions of Stereotype and a Proposal for a Progressional Model

Shunsuke Kanahara*

Nagasaki Wesleyan University

**Shunsuke Kanahara; Nagasaki Wesleyan University; 1057 Eida-machi; Isahaya City, 854-0081; Japan.*

ABSTRACT - There has not been a concrete definition for stereotype, a term used broadly by theorists and researchers. In this article, the various definitions within the literature on stereotype are reviewed, and the two components considered to be most important in describing what the term is, belief and group concept, are presented. In this article a definition of stereotype is proposed, "a belief about a group of individuals." A belief about an individual who is from the stereotyped group is designated as "an application of stereotype." Furthermore, it is shown that stereotype is a kind of generalization, and that a previous experience, called specification, is required to establish generalization in many cases. A progressional model that goes from specification to stereotype to the application of stereotype, is demonstrated. Research hypotheses originated from the model are also addressed.

It was Lippmann (1922) who first brought the concept, stereotype, to the field of social science (Furuhata & Oka, 2002). However, he did not indicate a clear definition of this term (Hamilton, 1981). In his 1922 book, *Public Opinion*, the title of Chapter One, "The World Outside and the Pictures in our Heads," may have referred to his own definition (Jones, 1992). The following sentences from Lippmann's same book may also explain what he thought stereotype was:

For the most part we do not first see, and then define, we define first and then see. In the great blooming, buzzing confusion of the outer world we pick out what our culture has already defined for us, and we tend to perceive that which we have picked out in the form stereotyped for us by our culture (p. 81).

It seems that Lippmann's notion was that we have two types of understandings about our surroundings: one type is understanding through a framework, and another is understanding without a framework. Stereotyping is the former in which our cultures play an important role as the framework.

The Term, Stereotype, with Various Definitions

After Lippmann, many theorists and researchers have used the term with a variety of different definitions (Sills, 1968). In general, the definitions consist of a combination of more than one component, rather than one single component. The components are mainly adjectives and nouns, such as "incorrect," "bad," "superficial," "fixed," "cultural," "ethnic," "belief," "image," "impression," "generalization," "trait," "characteristic," "individual," and "group." Examples include: "incorrect beliefs" (Katz & Braly, 1935, p. 181), "the attribution of general psychological characteristics to large human groups" (Watson, 1974, p. 80), "fixed ideas about an individual, group, or social status" (Barker, 1991, p. 227), "an inaccurate, rigid, and oversimplified image of members of a social group, especially an outgroup" (Coon, 1994, G-21), "generalized and usually value-laden impressions that members of one social group use in characterizing members of another group" (Lindgren, 1994, p. 468), and "the cognitive component of group antagonism" (Taylor, Peplau, & Sears, 1994, p. 216). As a result, the concept of stereotype has been plagued with excess meanings (Zanna & Olson, 1994). "The most central conceptual question confronting stereotype researchers concerns definition: What is a stereotype?" (Hamilton, 1981, p. 12). There appears to be a need to establish an obvious definition that can explain and organize this matter.

Stereotype as a Belief

Brigham (1971) gathered many definitions and showed a taxonomy of the psychological meanings of the construct, stereotype. He thought that the definitions of stereotype could be divided into six types of groups, according to what the definitions were indicating. The following six headings are direct quotations from Brigham (1971, p. 17).

1. Stereotype not defined as bad, rather it is generalization.

In this group, Vinacke's definition (1949) was quoted, by Brigham, along with 13 other similar definitions.

Stereotyping may be defined as the tendency to attribute generalized and simplified characteristics to groups of people in the form of verbal labels, and to act towards the members of those groups in terms of those labels (Vinacke, 1949, p. 265).

2. Stereotype not defined as bad, rather it is category/concept.

In this group, Secord's definition (1959) was quoted and five other similar definitions were introduced.

A stereotype is commonly thought of as involving a categorical response, i.e., membership is sufficient to evoke the judgment that the stimulus person possesses all the attributes belonging to that category (Secord, 1959, p. 309).

3. Stereotype defined as a bad generalization/category/concept, because it is incorrectly learned.

In this group, Klineberg's definition (1951) was quoted. And, Brigham listed six more definitions, by other researchers, which had a similar standpoint.

Unlike other generalizations, stereotypes are based not on an inductive collection of data, but on hearsay, rumor, and anecdotes--in short, on evidence which is insufficient to justify the generalization (Klineberg, 1951, p. 505).

4. Stereotype defined as a bad generalization/category/concept, because it is overgeneralized.

In this group, Allport's definition (1958) was quoted. Eight more definitions by other researchers belonged to this group.

A stereotype is an exaggerated belief associated with a category (Allport, 1958, p. 187).

5. Stereotype defined as a bad generalization/category/concept, because it is factually incorrect.

In this group, a definition from Katz and Braly (1935) was quoted. There were three other definitions which belonged to this group.

A stereotype is a fixed impression, which conforms very little to the fact it pretends to represent, and results from our defining first and observing second (Katz & Braly, 1935, p. 181).

6. Stereotype defined as a bad generalization/category/concept, because it is rigid.

In this group, a definition from Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) was quoted, and there were ten more definitions which were similar.

Stereotype. . . the disposition to think in rigid categories (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950, p. 228).

Hamilton (1981) summarized the Brigham's list above, stating that the agreement among the definitions was a "cognitive construct":

Although somewhat less dramatically, Table 1.2 illustrates one point on which there is virtually unanimous agreement: An ethnic stereotype is a cognitive construct (p. 13).

As a cognitive construct, stereotype has meant some sort of "impression" (Katz & Braly, 1935), "belief" (Allport, 1958), "idea" (Barker, 1991), "image" (Coon, 1994), or "a set of descriptive beliefs" (Weary, Jacobson, Edwards, & Tobin, 2001).

Zanna and Olson (1994) also gathered many definitions regarding stereotype and offered representative samples of these definitions. The samples consisted of six circulated definitions by Allport (1954), Vinacke (1957), Brigham (1971), McCauley and Stitt (1978), Taylor (1981), and Stroebe and Insko (1989), shown below (Zanna & Olson, 1994, p. 3):

A stereotype is an exaggerated belief associated with a category. Its function is to justify (rationalize) our conduct in relation to that category (Allport, 1954, p. 191).

For experimental purposes, a stereotype has, in effect, been defined statistically as a collection of trait-names upon which a large percentage of people agree as appropriate for describing some class of individuals (Vinacke, 1957, p. 229).

An ethnic stereotype is a generalization made about an ethnic group, concerning a trait attribution, which is considered to be unjustified by an observer (Brigham, 1971, p. 31).

Stereotypes are best understood as predictions that distinguish the stereotyped group from others . . . stereotypes are best measured as diagnostic ratios (McCauley & Stitt, 1978, p. 935).

Stereotype is defined as "consensus among members of one group regarding the attributes of another" (Taylor, 1981, p. 155).

We will define stereotype as a set of beliefs about the personal attributes of a group of people (Stroebe & Insko, 1989, p. 5)

Zanna and Olson (1994) then concluded, "there are some differences in the excess meanings attached to stereotypes, but there is general agreement that

stereotypes are beliefs" (p. 3). This conclusion that a stereotype is a belief can be understood to be equivalent to Hamilton's (1981) summary, as aforesaid, that a stereotype is a cognitive construct.

Stereotype as a Group Concept

In addition to "a belief," there is another component of agreement among the definitions of stereotype. "In the great majority of studies the term 'stereotype' has been used to mean 'group concept'" (Sills, 1968, p. 261). Here, "group concept" indicates a concept toward a particular group (Sills, 1968). As a matter of fact, there are substantial numbers of definitions which consider that stereotype is a certain belief that deals with a group. According to these definitions, the term is used to reflect our tendency to comprehend other individuals through our knowledge or understanding of the particular groups that the individuals belong to. The following are examples of the stereotype definitions that refer to a group completely or to some degree.

Stereotype. A relatively simplex cognition, especially of a social group (e.g., "All Orientals look alike") (Krech, Crutchfield, & Ballachey, 1962, p. 67).

Stereotypes are the perceptions or beliefs we hold about groups or individuals based on previously formed opinions and attitudes. . . . When this happens, people often take the easy path and invoke stereotypes. It is both effortless and comfortable to say quickly, "All Jews are. . ." or "He is Mexican; therefore he must. . ." (Samovar & Porter, 1988, p. 280).

Stereotypes are one type of person schema: They are the unscientific and unreliable generalizations that we make about people based on their group membership. . . . For instance, you may have stereotypes of women who work, football players, fraternity members, and college professors (Vander Zanden, 1988, p. 174).

Stereotypes are beliefs about the typical characteristics of group members, such as beliefs that Asian Americans are timid, nonathletic, good only at math, and clannish, or that Polish Americans are strong, clumsy, and stupid (Taylor et al., 1994, p. 216).

Within a culture, a set of widely shared generalizations about the psychological characteristics of a group or class of people (Reber, 1995, p. 754).

Prejudices are often grounded in stereotypes, fixed and inflexible

characterizations of a group of people. Stereotypes are often applied to ethnic minority groups, such as the notion that all black men are naturally athletic or that all East Asians are hardworking, diligent students (Giddens, 2001, p. 250).

In the most general sense, a stereotype consists of an individual's beliefs about a group of people (Brauer, Judd, & Jacquelin, 2001, p. 463).

It has already been pointed out that the term stereotype is some sort of belief. Besides, as explained in this section, the meaning of the term frequently accompanies a group that consists of individuals. Thus, by combining these two terminological tendencies, it can be asserted that stereotype has been thought to be a belief about a group of individuals.

Four Categories

Stereotype

The present article posits that a stereotype is a belief about a group of individuals. This definition is entirely consistent with the definitions by Brauer, Judd, and Jacquelin (2001) and by a number of other investigators, and is mostly consistent with many of the other definitions including the definitions by Hamilton (1981), Sills (1968), Weary et al. (2001), Weber (1991), and Zanna and Olson (1994). On the other hand, this article is partly disagreeing with some definitions, such as Barker's (1991) and Sugimori's (1999), which involved "an individual" in the meaning of stereotype.

When we believe that all Japanese do karate, for instance, this is a belief about a group of individuals. Therefore, according to the definition of this article, it is a stereotype. Stereotype can be both positive and negative, correct and incorrect, or simple and complicated. This is because there is no ultimate means to distinguish whether a belief about a group of individuals is positive or negative, correct or incorrect, and simple or complicated in many situations. Concerning the belief that all Japanese do karate, it is not possible to tell whether this belief is positive or negative. Or, when we believe that the French are romantic, there can be some data that indicate that this belief is correct, but there can also be opposite data that indicate this belief is incorrect. Furthermore, when we think that men are more sentimental than women, this belief can be deemed simple from a certain viewpoint, but also complicated from another viewpoint.

Within the present definition, no particular value is implied. For example, when we believe that a particular group of individuals are good athletes, we may believe so with a positive value, with a negative value, with a mixed value, or without a value. There is no need to attach certain values to the definition.

A group being discussed here may not only be an ethnic group, but may also be a socioeconomic group, an academic group, a family, a religious group, a

sports team, a gender, patients suffering from the same disease, individuals with certain physical appearance in common, and so forth. All kinds of groups must be included within the definition, since we can have a belief toward any given group (Hayes, 1994).

A stereotype is inevitably formed at the time we recognize or make a contact with another group (Sugimori, 1999). A stereotype can be held by a single individual (Bruno, 1986) or can be shared by a great many individuals (Schaller, Conway, & Tanchuk, 2002; Taylor, 1981). A stereotype can exist permanently or temporarily (Weary et al., 2001). We can have a self-stereotype in which we have a belief about a group we ourselves belong to (Hippel, Hawkins, & Schooler, 2001; Lindgren, 1994).

Application of Stereotype

After acquiring a stereotype, such as "Japanese do karate," we may think that "Ken must do karate, because he is Japanese." The latter belief is not a stereotype, but "the application of stereotype," in which a particular belief about a particular group of individuals is applied to a particular individual from that group. In other words, when we make assumptions about an individual under the influence of a stereotype, it is called the application of the stereotype. Stereotype and the application of stereotype must be separated into two different categories. The reason is because if we do not have a stereotype, we cannot apply the stereotype; in addition, because even if we have a stereotype, we cannot apply the stereotype unless we have an opportunity to think about or meet with someone who belongs to the stereotyped group. The applied stereotype does not need to be positive or negative, correct or incorrect, and so forth. Some stereotypes can be positive for an individual to whom the stereotype is applied; at the same time, such applied stereotypes can possibly be negative to another individual from the same group. An example is that when there is a stereotype that Polish Americans are strong (Taylor et al., 1994), a Polish American man may feel positive toward the stereotype, but a Polish American woman may not. Some stereotypes may be objectively correct (Giddens, 2001). However, even those correct stereotypes can be incorrect when they are applied to a specific individual (Bruno, 1986). An example is that a stereotype that university professors hold doctorates can be correct on the whole, but is not correct when it is applied to Ms. Kelly who is a professor but does not have a doctoral degree.

Generalization

Williams and Best (1986) argued that there was a component in the stereotype definitions which was commonly shared in literature. This component is "generalization":

Recently, there has been a growing tendency among theorists to view social

stereotypes as being not essentially different from other generalizations; they are seen neither as necessarily incorrect nor illogical nor as necessarily having pernicious social consequences (Insko and Schopler, 1972; McCauley et al., 1980; Tajfel, 1969). In the context of present-day cognitive psychology, stereotypes are simply generalizations about groups of people, not necessarily "bad" generalizations (p. 244).

The present article adopts the above point that stereotype is a generalization. The most fundamental explanation of generalization is from behaviorism; "after an organism learns a response to one stimulus, it often makes the same response to similar stimuli" (Ormrod, 1995, p. 372). An example is that a little boy who whines for snacks before dinner and gets rewarded for it may generalize this learning to whining for snacks before lunch, whining for toys as well as snacks, or whining for things at kindergarten as well as at home (Todd & Bohart, 1994). In a more specific explanation in terms of cognitive behavior, generalization is "the process of forming an idea or a judgment applicable to an entire class of objects, people, or events" (Chaplin, 1985). If after conducting a survey regarding attitudes toward sexism using female college sophomores in the Midwest, a researcher applied his/her data to the larger population of adult American women in considering how the population reacts to sexism, this would be an example of generalization (Weber, 1991). If a person happened to know three British people, and believed that all British had the same traits as these three, this would be another example of generalization (Allport, 1954). Moreover, if you did not study well in school, and if you consequently think that students do not study, this is once again generalization. With regard to the context of the present article, the meaning of generalization is a belief in which information from a previous experience is applied to a larger population. The discussions here indicate that the meaning of generalization is broader than that of stereotype, and that generalization includes stereotype. This is because stereotype has already been defined as a belief about a group of individuals, and generalization is a complex of many beliefs regarding objects, individuals, or events. In conclusion, stereotype is one kind of generalization.

Specification

The earlier examples of generalization (i.e., whining, sexism survey, three British persons, and student study) all involved beliefs that were formed through previous experiences. To make a generalization, a previous experience may be required as Samovar and Porter (1988) pointed out. This article calls the previous experience "specification." Specification is conceived of as the process of obtaining information about an individual through a specific experience. For instance, when Tom witnesses Mary's intelligence, this is Tom's specification regarding Mary. Or, when Tom hears or reads that Mary is intelligent, this is also

a specification acquired by Tom. From the above antecedent experience, if Tom thinks that women are intelligent (since Mary is a woman), that beautiful women are intelligent (since Mary is beautiful), that the Brown family is intelligent (since Mary is one of the Browns), that Jewish people are intelligent (since Mary is Jewish), or that wealthy people are intelligent (since Mary is wealthy), each of these conclusions is a generalization. This is because Tom applied the information from a specification to a larger population. We make generalizations based on specification in many situations. Therefore, it is necessary to have this category, specification, as another independent factor.

Progressional Model

The four categorizations (i.e., specification, generalization, stereotype, and the application of stereotype) are an attempt to organize the meaning of stereotype and related concepts. For more understanding, these phases are listed below in progressional order.

(1) Specification: the process of obtaining information about an individual through a specific experience. (e.g., I observe that Joe is doing karate).

(2) Generalization: the process of forming an idea or judgment applicable to an entire class of objects, individuals, or events. Generalization includes stereotype, a belief about a group of individuals. (e.g., I observed that Joe was doing karate. Joe is Japanese, so I think that Japanese do karate).

(2') Stereotype: a belief about a group of individuals. (e.g., I think that Japanese do karate).

(3) The application of stereotype: the application of a belief about a group of individuals to an individual from the group. (e.g., I think that Japanese do karate. Ken is Japanese, so I think that Ken does karate).

Our cognitive processes as regard to stereotype are assumed to be:

1. (1) specification alone;
2. (1) specification - (2) generalization - (2') stereotype;
3. (1) specification - (2) generalization - (2') stereotype -
(3) the application of stereotype;
4. (2) generalization - (2') stereotype alone;
5. (2) generalization - (2') stereotype - (3) the application of stereotype.

Illustrative examples using the above progressional model are:

1. (1) specification alone

If one experiences Kathy's kindness, it is specification. Then, if that one does not attribute the kindness to any of Kathy's group memberships, this cognitive process is still explained by this phase. Another example is that an old man was

kindly helped by a young man on the street, but the old man never changed his stereotype of believing that the younger generation is unkind. This process is also specification alone.

2. (1) specification - (2) generalization - (2') stereotype

If you see Tim being good at playing baseball, but never finishing his homework, this process is specification. If you further think that baseball players are not diligent students, this process is generalization, and stereotype as well. Nevertheless, if you do not have an opportunity to get to know another student who plays baseball, you do not have a chance to apply the stereotype. Therefore, the cognitive processes remain in this phase.

3. (1) specification - (2) generalization - (2') stereotype - (3) the application of stereotype

If you see Tim being good at playing baseball, but never finishing his homework, this process is specification. If you then think that baseball players are not diligent students, this process is both generalization and stereotype. Finally, if you think that Ben, one of your classmates or cousins, must not be a diligent student because he is a baseball player, this process is the application of stereotype. Therefore, these processes fit into this progressional phase. Although the beliefs in specification and the application of stereotype seem to have similar content, their progressional phases are different.

4. (2) generalization - (2') stereotype

We can have generalization and stereotype without a previous experience connected with an individual. If you read an article that says that Asians are hard workers, and you believe it, this is an example of the establishment of generalization and stereotype with no previous experience. Then, if you do not have an opportunity to actually meet an Asian individual, you do not have an opportunity to apply the stereotype. Therefore, this process is understood through this phase. Or, you hear that Asians are hard workers, and you assume that because Japanese are Asians, Japanese must be hard workers too. These processes are still generalization and stereotype alone, since both beliefs are about groups of individuals. The processes remain in this phase. And vice versa, if you read that the Japanese are hard workers, and you consequently think that Asians must be hard workers, these processes remain within the generalization and stereotype phase.

5. (2) generalization - (2') stereotype - (3) the application of stereotype

If you read an article that says that Asians are hard workers, and you believe it, this is generalization and stereotype with no previous specification experience. Then, if you have an opportunity to meet with Naomi, an Asian woman, and assume her to be a hard worker, this process is the application of stereotype. Another example is that you heard that your father saying that physicians are busy, and if you believe that comment, this process is generalization and stereotype. After this part of the process, if you think that Jane, a physician who

lives in your neighborhood, must be busy, this process is the application of stereotype.

Applications of the Model

There have been numerous studies conducted to understand the issues related to stereotype (Blair, Ma, & Lenton, 2001; Brauer, Judd, & Jacquelin, 2001; Plaks, Stroessner, Dweck, & Sherman, 2001; Sechrist & Stangor, 2001). Many of the studies seem to contain definitions that come closer to the definition discussed in the present article, so there are not extensive discrepancies in the usage of the term between the studies and this article. Yet it is assumed that if stereotype-concerned research is done with attention to the sequence of the progressional model presented, the results could possibly advance farther. This is because the model offers a chronological comprehension of the matter. The following are some examples of research hypotheses and questions that are generated through the adoption of the model.

1. When there is a need to improve the content of a person's stereotype, it may be necessary to find out their previous specification connected with an individual and explore what kind of experience made the person start thinking about a certain group in a certain way. Then, the modification or improvement of such cognition regarding the specification can be attempted.

2. When there is a need to improve the content of a person's stereotype, there may also be a need to reduce the person's tendency to apply the stereotype. If this hypothesis is valid, efforts should be made to scrutinize the psychological mechanisms in the shift from stereotype to the application of stereotype.

3. Certain groups tend to have certain stereotype content imposed on them repeatedly over time (Schaller, Conway, & Tanchuk, 2002). For instance, some ethnic groups have continually faced negative stereotypes that portray them as less intelligent (Schmader, Major, & Gramzow, 2001). This may be based on the tendency of certain group members to impress others with that specification, so that this information may become a generalization (and a stereotype) to many out-group people and consequently may become widespread.

4. As well as having stereotypes held by out-groups, we have in-group stereotypes that are stereotypes about a group held by the group members themselves (Prentice & Miller, 2002). From the standpoint of the model, the psychological mechanism of the latter is exactly the same as that of the former.

5. While one person believes a certain stereotype and applies it to an individual, another person may not apply the same or similar stereotype to an individual, even though that person also believes the stereotype. Investigating the causes of this presumed phenomena may lead to clues in comprehending and dealing with the nature of stereotype.

6. The influence of generalization (and stereotype) may be stronger and more persistent than that of specification. In other words, getting information about a

group of individuals through other people may be more influential than making an assumption about a group of individuals through one's own direct experience. This is because individuals who have a stereotype may not have always experienced specification, as Sechrist and Stangor (2001) noted. Conflicts, such as misunderstanding and discrimination, resulting from certain beliefs may be produced more by generalization (and stereotype) than by specification.

7. When someone has a certain specification, but does not develop it as generalization (and stereotype), what kind of mechanisms underlie that process in the person? What kind of personal traits, what kind of surroundings, or what kind of other conditions make the person not hold any generalization (and stereotype) in spite of having the previous specification?

8. If a person's generalization (and stereotype) concept is persistently held, is that person's application of stereotype persistently held, too?

9. What are the person's experiences like, in consequence of applying his or her stereotype to an individual? Which is more reinforced, stereotype or the application of stereotype?

10. An individual may have a tendency toward the whole sequential process, such as specification, generalization (and stereotype), and the application of stereotype, while the process may cease at some earlier point in another individual. Is this phenomena caused by each individual's personality differences or by some other factor?

11. In recent years, the activation of stereotype has been much studied (e.g., Kunda, Davies, Adams, & Spencer, 2002; Monteith, Ashburn-Nardo, Voils, & Czapp, 2002; Shih et al., 2002). Those studies focus on understanding the mechanisms of activation regarding the interaction of people who have stereotypes with others who are stereotyped in social settings. According to the results of the studies, the mechanism is automatic and hard to control. The activation of stereotype and the application of stereotype may overlap significantly and indicate some commonalities. However, it seems that the activation of stereotype is more of a cognitive-behavioral process, and the application of stereotype is more a cognitive process. The question that arises from this is what kind of connections are there between stereotype application in a person's mind and stereotype activation toward others?

The above hypotheses and questions originating from the progressional model imply that research on stereotype needs more intensive investigation on individual cognitions, as well as focusing on social situations and factors. Besides, the hypotheses and questions suggest that it is important for researchers to deliberate the chronological order that exists within stereotype-related cognition, since mechanisms and content can differ in obedience to each order.

Summary and Conclusion

At first, two components, such as a belief and a group concept, were noticed

as the most used components to explain the term stereotype. Then, stereotype was defined as a belief about a group of individuals. The application of stereotype is a belief about an individual from the stereotyped group; stereotype is a kind of generalization; and some generalizations are derived from specification. These four categories appeared to be essential in understanding what stereotype is.

The present article aimed at developing a clear usage of the term, stereotype. According to the logic here, the usage is non-judgmental and undeterminable. Therefore, more judgmental and determinable adjectives can be attached when necessary. Examples may be: positive stereotype, inaccurate stereotype, cultural stereotype, ethnic stereotype, and gender stereotype. It seems that such usages here are not different from most of the former usages. It was then hypothesized that there are five types of progressions regarding stereotype. The progressions are: (a) specification alone; (b) from specification to generalization (and stereotype); (c) from specification to generalization (and stereotype) to the application of stereotype; (d) generalization (and stereotype) alone; and (e) from generalization (and stereotype) to the application of stereotype. The cognitive processes may cease anywhere within the above progressional phases. This is because we can deny or forget some stereotypic information and because there is some evidence that suggests that stereotype can be modified, reduced, and extinguished as a result of a personal desire or through some social experiences, such as discussion and interaction with others (e.g., Braurer, Judd, & Jacquelin, 2001; Hasegawa & Okado, 1973; Jones, 1992; Queller & Smith, 2002; Weary et al., 2001).

Overall, this article demonstrated diverse approaches in directing attention to a shift seen in individuals regarding stereotype. Within the present definition, cognitions toward an individual and toward a group of individuals have been differentiated. Although the terminology here is mostly restricted to the realm of the cognitive process, it can be expanded to more interpersonal overt behaviors, such as the activation of stereotype. Likewise, the terminology is applicable and transferable to the majority of classic studies in the field, such as studies of the content of stereotype. The significance of the present article is to offer a comprehensive clarification of stereotype and newer perspectives for its concerns. It is proposed that an important avenue for future stereotype research is to include this progression-based aspect into further investigations.

References

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Allport, G. W. (1958). *The nature of prejudice*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company.
- Barker, R. L. (1991). *The social work dictionary*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Blair, I. V., Ma, J. E., & Lenton, A. P. (2001). Imagining stereotypes away: The moderation of implicit stereotypes through mental imagery. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(5), 828-841.
- Brauer, M., Judd, C. M., & Jacquelin, V. (2001). The communication of social stereotypes: The effects of group discussion and information distribution on stereotypic appraisals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(3), 463-475.
- Brigham, J. C. (1971). Ethnic stereotypes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 76, 15-38.
- Bruno, F. J. (1986). *Dictionary of key words in psychology*. Tokyo, Japan: Japan UNI Agency.
- Chaplin, J. P. (1985). *Dictionary of psychology*. New York: A Laurel Book.
- Coon, D. (1994). *Essentials of psychology: Exploration and application (6th ed.)*. St. Paul, MN: West.
- Furuhata, K. & Oka, T. (2002). *Shakaisinrigaku sho-jiten [The compact dictionary of social psychology]*. Tokyo, Japan: Yuhikaku.
- Giddens, A. (2001). *Sociology (4th ed.)*. Oxford, England: Polity.
- Hamilton, D. L. (Ed.). (1981). *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hasegawa, H. & Okado, T. (1973). *Ningenkankei no shakaishinri [Social psychology on human relations]*. Tokyo, Japan: Kanazawa Bunko.
- Hayes, N. (1994). *Psychology*. Oxson, England: Teach Yourself Books.
- Hippel, W. V., Hawkins, C., & Schooler, J. W. (2001). Stereotype distinctiveness: How counterstereotypic behavior shapes the self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(2), 193-205.
- Jones, J. M. (1992). Understanding the mental health consequences of race: Contributions of basic social psychological processes. In D. N. Ruble, P. R. Costanzo, & M. E. Oliveri (Eds.), *The social psychology of mental health: Basic mechanism and applications* (pp. 199-240). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Katz, D. & Braly, K. W. (1935). Racial prejudice and racial stereotypes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 30, 175-193.
- Klineberg, O. (1951). The scientific study of national stereotypes. *International Social Science Bulletin*, 3, 505-515.
- Krech, D., Crutchfield, R. S., & Ballachey, E. L. (1962). *Individual in society: A textbook of social psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kunda, Z., Davies, P. G., Adams, B. D., & Spencer, S. (2002). The dynamic time course of stereotype activation: Activation, dissipation, and resurrection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(3), 283-299.

- Lindgren, H. C. (1994). Stereotyping. In R. J. Corsini (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of psychology* (pp. 468-469). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public opinion*. New York: Macmillan.
- McCauley, C. & Stitt, C. L. (1978). An individual and quantitative measure of stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 929-940.
- Monteith, M. J., Ashburn-Nardo, L., Voils, C. I., & Czopp, A. M. (2002). Putting the brakes on prejudice: On the development and operation of cues for control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(5), 1029-1050.
- Ormrod, J. E. (1995). *Human learning* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill, Prentice Hall.
- Plaks, J. E., Stroessner, S. J., Dweck, C. S., & Sherman, J. W. (2001). Person theories and attention allocation: Preferences for stereotypic versus counterstereotypic information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(6), 876-893.
- Prentice, D. A. & Miller, D. T. (2002). The emergence of homegrown stereotypes. *American Psychologist*, 57(5), 352-359.
- Queller, S. & Smith, E. R. (2002). Subtyping versus bookkeeping in stereotype learning and change: Connectionist simulations and empirical findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(3), 300-313.
- Reber, A. S. (1995). *The penguin dictionary of psychology* (2nd ed.). London, England: Penguin Books.
- Samovar, L. A. & Porter, R. E. (1988). *Intercultural communication: A reader*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Schaller, M., Conway, III, L. G., & Tanchuk, T. L. (2002). Selective pressures on the once and future contents of ethnic stereotypes: Effects of the communicability of traits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 861-876.
- Schmader, T., Major, B., & Gramzow, R. H. (2001). Coping with ethnic stereotypes in the academic domain: Perceived injustice and psychological disengagement. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(1), 93-111.
- Sechrist, G. B. & Stangor, C. (2001). Perceived consensus influences intergroup behavior and stereotype accessibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(4), 645-654.
- Secord, P. F. (1959). Stereotyping and favorableness in the perception of Negro faces. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59, 309-315.
- Shih, M., Ambady, N., Richeson, J. A., Fujita, K., & Gray, H. M. (2002). Stereotype performance boosts: The impact of self-relevance and the manner of stereotype activation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(3), 638-647.
- Sills, D. L. (Ed.). (1968). *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*. New York: The Macmillan Company & The Free Press.

- Stroebe, W. & Insko, C. A. (1989). Stereotype, prejudice, and discrimination: Changing conceptions in theory and research. In D. Bar-Tal, C. F. Graumann, A. W. Kruglanski, & W. Stroebe (Eds.), *Stereotype and prejudice: Changing conceptions* (pp. 3-34). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Sugimori, S. (1999). Stereotype. In Y. Nakajima (Ed.), *The Yuhikaku dictionary of psychology* (pp. 473). Tokyo, Japan: Yuhikaku.
- Taylor, D. M. (1981). Stereotypes and intergroup relations. In R. C. Gardner & R. Kalin (Eds.), *A Canadian social psychology of ethnic relations* (pp. 151-171). Toronto, Canada: Methuen.
- Taylor, S. E., Peplau, L. A., & Sears, D. O. (1994). *Social psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Todd, J. & Bohart, A. C. (1994). *Foundations of clinical and counseling psychology (2nd ed.)*. New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.
- Vander Zanden, J. W. (1988). *The social experience: An introduction to sociology*. New York: Random House.
- Vinacke, W. E. (1949). Stereotyping among national-racial groups in Hawaii: A study in ethnocentrism. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 265-291.
- Vinacke, W. E. (1957). Stereotypes as social concepts. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 229-243.
- Watson, P. (Ed.). (1974). *Psychology and Race*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Weary, G., Jacobson, J. A., Edwards, J. A., & Tobin, S. J. (2001). Chronic and temporarily activated casual uncertainty beliefs and stereotype usage. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(2), 206-219.
- Weber, A. L. (1991). *Introduction to psychology*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Williams, J. E. & Best, D. L. (1986). Sex stereotypes and intergroup relations. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Zanna, M. P. & Olson, J. M. (1994). *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium*, volume 7. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Copyright of Individual Differences Research is the property of IDR Publishing and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.