

## Group Judgments in the Philippines: Their Evaluative and Descriptive Aspects\*

Dean Peabody

People form very definite judgments about other individuals and groups. These judgments are typically expressed by trait-adjectives like "thrifty" or "impulsive." Two aspects of these judgments need to be distinguished. On the one hand, they usually involve a feeling of like or dislike of persons or groups, an evaluation of them as good or bad. Different judges would typically disagree about evaluation, since each tends to judge others less favorably than himself. Applied to judgments between groups, this principle might be rephrased, "We are good, they are bad," and corresponds to what Brown (1965) calls an "ethnocentrism of evaluation" and LeVine (1966), a "loyalistic bias." Table 1 shows how two groups would disagree in their reciprocal evaluations.<sup>1</sup>

Table 1  
*Reciprocal evaluations of two groups.*

<i>Judgment by</i>	<i>Judgment about</i>	
	<i>Group A</i>	<i>Group B</i>
Group A	Good	Bad
Group B	Bad	Good

\* The research on which this paper is based was part of the Ateneo-Penn State Basic Research Program, sponsored by the United States Office of Naval Research, with The Pennsylvania State University as prime contractor (Nonr-656 [37]). The author is indebted to several individuals for the invaluable aid and advice they gave him in the study. A. Paul Hare, George Guthrie, and Frank Lynch provided general encouragement and assistance. Felisa Berthol and the College of Business Administration of the University of the East in Manila provided the subjects. Research assistants in the Philippines were Mara Montelibano and Esperanza Juan. Data analysis in the United States was carried out by Elinor Schrader and William Kennedy using the Swarthmore College computer.

<sup>1</sup> Tables 1 and 2 are adapted from Campbell (1967).

Evaluation, however, is not the only—or necessarily even the most important—aspect of judgments about people. There is usually involved as well a judgment of their descriptive characteristics. Observers may agree about their descriptive judgments, while disagreeing about evaluation. An informal illustration is provided by the popular comic-strip "Peanuts." In this particular cartoon, Lucy is playing psychiatrist. She tells Charlie Brown, "The trouble with you is that you're wishy-washy." "What's the difference between being wishy-washy and being humble?" Charlie asks plaintively. Lucy fixes him with a finger and answers, "You are wishy-washy, I am humble."

In this example, there is not only disagreement about evaluation but also implicit agreement between the descriptive judgments of the unaggressive Charlie. As a more formal example, consider judgments between two groups that differ in control over impulse expression; between, for instance, Northern Europeans and Southern Europeans, middle class and working class, or as in the study reported here, the Chinese minority living in the Philippines and Filipinos. In particular, while there may be agreement that one group is less ready to spend money than the other, there may be disagreement on whether this is a good thing. This situation is represented in Table 2.

Table 2  
Reciprocal judgments of two groups.

Judgment by	Judgment about	
	Group A	Group B
Group A	(Good) thrifty	(Bad) extravagant
Group B	(Bad) stingy	(Good) generous

This paper will consider evidence for the two principles of group judgment represented in Table 2: Groups tend to disagree about evaluation but to agree in their descriptive judgments.

#### Previous Research

The difficulty is that a single judgment—for example, that a group is "thrifty"—normally combines both aspects: that the group is "good" and "tends not to spend money."

An earlier investigation of inferences between traits (Peabody 1967) dealt with this difficulty by selecting sets of trait-adjectives in order to separate descriptive similarity (e.g., *thrifty* and *stingy* versus *generous* and *extravagant*) from good and bad evaluation (e.g., *thrifty* and *generous* versus *stingy* and

*extravagant*). Subjects then made inferences between the traits. Results indicated that these inferences had a descriptive rather than an evaluative basis. Factor analysis yielded factors which were clearly descriptive.

The most important factor involved a general dimension of "tight" versus "loose" control in impulse expression. Some of the contrasting traits on this factor were *thrifty* (+) and *stingy* (−) versus *generous* (+) and *extravagant* (−); *self-controlled* (+) and *inhibited* (−) versus *uninhibited* (+) and *impulsive* (−); *serious* (+) and *grim* (−) versus *gay* (+) and *frivolous* (−). This dimension is reminiscent of the "Protestant ethic" proposed as important for economic activity in the classic work of Max Weber and, more recently, by McClelland (1961).

Another important factor involved a dimension of self-assertiveness, with a contrast between such traits as *confident* (+) and *conceited* (−) versus *modest* (+) and *self-disparaging* (−); and *individualistic* (+) and *uncooperative* (−) versus *cooperative* (+) and *conforming* (−).

#### *The Present Study*

The crucial feature of the earlier study was the use of traits which were selected so as to separate evaluative and descriptive aspects of judgment. The present study adapts this method to judgments between groups. Previous investigations, beginning with the classic study of Katz and Braly (1933), have used only single traits and scales, and thus have left undetermined the relative importance of evaluative and descriptive aspects. In contrast, the study reported here used pairs of matched scales (e.g., *thrifty—extravagant* and *generous—stingy*) which were selected so that evaluative similarity and descriptive similarity were in opposite directions. It thus became possible to examine separately evidence for the two effects considered earlier; namely, that: (1) Judges from different groups tend to disagree about evaluation, according to the principle "They are bad, we are good"; and (2) Judges tend to agree about the descriptive characteristics of each group.

The research was carried out in the Philippines during the summer of 1967. The Philippines has several advantages for a study of group judgments. Unlike many Americans, people in the Philippines generally do not object in principle to judging group characteristics. Also, the widespread knowledge of English made it possible to make use of the previous classification of traits in English. On the other hand, even among university students, not everyone would have the refined knowledge of English necessary to handle such nuances as the difference between "thrifty" and "stingy." This problem was met in two ways: (1) An explanatory word or phrase was added in parentheses to the trait-name itself—e.g., "extravagant: (spends more than necessary)"; and (2) Subjects were eliminated if they showed a deviant understanding of many words, a procedure described in detail below.

### Method

*Subjects.* The subjects were students in a college of business administration at a large university in Manila. They were classified as Chinese or Filipino on the basis of their answers to some background questions, particularly questions about the language or dialect spoken at home. The results for a few subjects were eliminated for reasons explained below. Results reported here are for 22 Chinese and 66 Filipino "judges" (Js).

*Materials.* The judges rated groups as "stimuli" (Si) on a series of scales. Four groups were judged as stimuli: Chinese living in the Philippines, Filipinos, Americans, and Japanese. The results of theoretical importance are for the first two groups, to which the judges belonged.

There were 14 pairs of matched scales (e.g., *thrifty—extravagant, generous—stingy*), chosen so that evaluative and descriptive directions could be separated. There were four additional separate scales: *desirable—undesirable, intelligent—stupid, hardworking—lazy, honest—dishonest*. The 32 scales appeared as four pages of eight; the two scales from a pair were two pages apart. The favorable end of successive scales alternated between left and right. For each scale there was a horizontal line running between the two traits. Six points along the line were specifically defined as indicating that either trait, as compared with the other, was *slightly, quite, or very likely* to describe a member of the group. Although the instructions permitted marking the scale in places other than these six points, only a few subjects did so. To make scoring simpler, the results of these subjects were eliminated.

At the end of the questionnaire, subjects were presented each pair of traits that had defined a scale, and asked to mark which trait was the more favorable and which the less favorable. The number of pairs where a subject made evaluations opposite those of American judges indicated a deviant use of the trait-words. Eight subjects who made such deviant choices on 12 or more of the 32 trait-pairs were eliminated. The 88 remaining subjects averaged two deviant choices out of 32 scales, with 93 per cent of their choices in the same direction as American judges.

### Findings

On each scale, the three degrees of response were scored either +10, +30, +50 in the direction of the favorable trait (e.g., *thrifty, generous*), or -10, -30, -50 in the direction of the unfavorable trait (e.g., *stingy, extravagant*).

The findings of theoretical relevance are presented in Tables 3 and 4. These tables consider the judgments about either the Chinese or Filipinos as stimuli by the two groups of Chinese and Filipino judges on each pair of matched scales. Table 3 presents the means for these judgments, and Table 4 considers the differences between the means for the two groups of judges and the two scales in each pair.

Table 3

Mean scores for group perception classified by scale, crossclassified by nationality of stimulus group and of judge group.

Scale	Chinese Si			Filipino Si		
	Ch Js (N=22)	F Js (N=66)	Means	Ch Js (N=22)	F Js (N=66)	Means
1. a. Thrifty-Extravagant	37	27	32	-29	-8	-18
b. Generous-Stingy	20	-7	7	10	24	17
	29	10		-9	8	
2. a. Self-controlled-Impulsive	33	15	24	-20	4	-8
b. Spontaneous-Inhibited	10	1	6	7	9	8
	21	8		-6	6	
3. a. Firm-Lax	22	11	16	-15	1	-7
b. Lenient-Strict	4	-4	0	6	14	10
4. a. Serious-Frivolous	34	21	27	4	20	12
b. Gay-Grim	1	-3	-1	21	24	23
	17	9		13	22	
5. a. Persistent-Vacillating	30	23	26	-2	7	3
b. Flexible-Inflexible	17	11	14	14	14	14
	24	17		6	11	
6. a. Independent-Conforming	19	12	16	-34	-23	-28
b. Cooperative-Uncooperative	23	-1	11	10	21	16
	21	6		-12	-1	
7. a. Skeptical-Gullible	7	6	7	-20	-5	-12
b. Trusting-Distrustful	13	-8	3	-6	16	5
	10	-1		-13	6	
8. a. Cautious-Rash	34	18	26	-8	2	-3
b. Bold-Timid	17	10	14	-1	0	-1
	26	14		-4	1	
9. a. Tactful-Tactless	22	12	17	2	21	12
b. Frank-Devious	1	0	1	-2	-9	-5
	11	6		0	6	
10. a. Selective-Undiscriminating	29	16	22	-8	19	6
b. Broad-minded-Choosy	3	-8	-3	-10	-1	-5
	16	4		-9	9	
11. a. Active-Inactive	32	32	32	-6	6	0
b. Calm-Agitated	17	13	15	-7	5	-1

Table 3 (continued)

Scale	Chinese Si			Filipino Si		
	Ch Js (N=22)	F Js (N=66)	Means	Ch Js (N=22)	F Js (N=65)	Means
	25	23		-7	5	
12. a. Practical-Impractical	20	18	19	6	9	8
b. Idealistic-Opportunistic	22	-2	10	-13	9	-2
	21	8		-3	9	
13. a. Modest-Conceited	23	18	20	-1	19	9
b. Self-confident-Unassured	25	11	18	1	5	3
	24	15		0	12	
14. a. Forceful-Passive	7	3	5	-24	-7	-15
b. Peaceful-Aggressive	34	12	23	-15	11	-2
	21	8		-20	2	
Combined Means	20	9	15	-5	7	1
(Desirable-Undesirable)	31	2	16	4	26	15

Table 4

Differences between mean scores for group perception classified by scale, cross-classified by nationality of stimulus group and difference being measured (between judges and between scales).<sup>1</sup>

Scale	Chinese Si		Filipino Si	
	Judges (Ch-F)	Scales (a-b)	Judges (Ch-F)	Scales (a-b)
1. a. Thrifty-Extravagant	19	25	-17	-35
b. Generous-Stingy	***	***	**	***
2. a. Self-controlled-Impulsive	13	18	-12	-16
b. Spontaneous-Inhibited	**	***	*(**)	***
3. a. Firm-Lax	10	16	-12	-17
b. Lenient-Strict	*	**	*	***
4. a. Serious-Frivolous	8	28	-9	-11
b. Gay-Grim	n.s.	***	*	*
5. a. Persistent-Vacillating	7	12	-5	-11
b. Flexible-Inflexible	n.s.	**	n.s.	*
6. a. Independent-Conforming	15	5	-11	-44
b. Cooperative-Uncooperative	**	n.s.	*	***

Table 4 (continued)

Scale	Chinese Si		Filipino Si	
	Judges (Ch-F)	Scales (a-b)	Judges (Ch-F)	Scales (a-b)
7. a. Skeptical-Gullible	11	4	-19	-17
b. Trusting-Distrustful	*	n.s.	**	***
8. a. Cautious-Rash	12	12	-5	-2
b. Bold-Timid	*	**	n.s.	n.s.
9. a. Tactful-Tactless	5	16	-6	17
b. Frank-Devious	n.s.	***	n.s.(**)	***
10. a. Selective-Undiscriminating	12	25	-18	11
b. Broad-minded-Choosy	**	***	***	*
11. a. Active-Inactive	2	17	-12	1
b. Calm-Agitated	n.s.	***	*	n.s.
12. a. Practical-Impractical	13	9	-12	10
b. Idealistic-Opportunistic	**(*)	n.s.	*(*)	*
13. a. Modest-Conceited	9	2	-12	6
b. Self-confident-Unassured	*	n.s.	*	n.s.
14. a. Forceful-Passive	13	-18	-22	-13
b. Peaceful-Aggressive	**(*)	***	***	*
Means	11	15	-12	15

<sup>1</sup> The significance of each difference is indicated beneath it, as follows: \*\*\* probability less than 0.001; \*\* probability less than 0.01; \* probability less than 0.05; n.s.—not significant.

Significant Judge by Scale interactions are indicated in parentheses between the columns.

The analysis of these results will be illustrated for the first pair of scales. There are two effects to be examined. The first hypothesis is that judges will tend to disagree about evaluation, making more favorable judgments of their own group. As Table 3 shows, the Chinese stimuli receive more favorable judgments on both scales from Chinese judges (+37 and +20, averaging +29) than from Filipino judges (+27 and -7, averaging +10). The difference between these averages for Chinese minus Filipino judges (29-10=19) is given in the first column of Table 4. Conversely, the Filipino stimuli receive less favorable judgments on both scales from Chinese judges (-29 and +10, averaging -9) than from Filipino judges (-8 and +24, averaging +8). The difference between these averages for Chinese minus Filipino judges (-9-8 = -17) is given in the third column of Table 4. In general, this first effect appears as a difference between judges when averaged across a pair of scales.

The second is that judges will tend to agree in judging the descriptive characteristics of a group. Since the evaluatively favorable trait is scored as positive on every scale, the descriptive direction (e.g., *thrifty* and *stingy* versus *generous* and *extravagant*) is reflected in the *difference* between scores on a pair of matched scales. As Table 3 shows, the Chinese stimuli are rated higher by both Chinese and Filipino judges on the scale *thrifty—extravagant* (+37 and +27, averaging +32) than on *generous—stingy* (+20 and -7, averaging +7). The difference between these averages for the two scales (+32 - 7 = 25) is given in the second column of Table 4. In contrast, the Filipino stimuli are rated lower by both Chinese and Filipino judges on *thrifty—extravagant* (-29 and -8, averaging -18) than on *generous—stingy* (+10 and +24, averaging +17). The difference between these averages for the two scales (-18 - 17 = -35) is given in the fourth column of Table 4.<sup>2</sup> In general, this second effect appears as a difference between a pair of scales when averaged across both sets of judges.

The two effects just illustrated for the first pair of scales can be examined for each of the 14 pairs of scales and each of the two groups of stimuli—a total of 28 separate analyses. In each case, the two effects were tested in an analysis of variance (cf. Winer 1962: 374-78). Levels of significance for the two effects, as well as for cases of significant interaction, are shown in Table 4. Each of the main effects is significant in 21 of the 28 analyses, whereas Judge by Scale interaction is significant in only five of 28 analyses. Both effects of theoretical interest—disagreement in evaluation and agreement in judging descriptive characteristics—are thus strongly confirmed.

*Evaluation.* The tendency for judges from the ingroup to be more favorable to themselves than to others is consistent and powerful. Let us first consider judgments about the Chinese stimuli. Table 3 shows that the Chinese judges rate themselves positively on every single scale—the combined mean of the scales being +20! While mean ratings of Chinese by Filipino judges are also positive in most scales (combined mean of +9), they are less strongly so. The difference, shown in the first column of Table 4, appears in every case and is generally significant. In contrast to the Filipino evaluation of Chinese, the Chinese judges give many negative means for Filipino stimuli, the combined mean of the scales being -5. Surprisingly, Filipino judges give themselves ratings that have an average that is only slightly positive (a combined mean of +7, which is less favorable than that they give the Chinese). In any

<sup>2</sup> Note that the signs of the means in Tables 3 and 6 correspond to the positive or negative evaluation on each scale. In contrast, the signs of the differences in Tables 4 and 6 are basically arbitrary. For differences between judges, Filipino judges were subtracted from Chinese judges. For the scales, each pair is arranged so that after subtraction (scale a—scale b), the differences represent the general factor of tight versus loose control, a positive difference representing relatively tight control and a negative difference relatively loose impulse expression.



case, as shown in the third column of Table 4, on every scale the Filipinos receive higher ratings from Filipino than Chinese judges, and the differences are usually significant.

*Descriptive characteristics.* The massive evaluation effects just considered would tend to restrict the possible effects of descriptive judgment running counter to evaluation. Nevertheless, such effects consistently appear and are, on the average, even larger. Thus, though the Chinese give themselves favorable ratings on both scales of a pair, they typically give the *more* favorable ratings on the same scale as the Filipino judges. The differences between scales, shown in the second and fourth columns of Table 4, are generally significant and, on the average, are even larger (15 and 15) than the differences between judges (11 and -12).

Thus, the results show major effects of both kinds: (1) regarding evaluation, judges tend to disagree, with those from the ingroup giving more favorable ratings to themselves; (2) regarding descriptive direction, judges tend to agree, as shown on pairs of scales that separate descriptive direction from evaluation.

*Comparison of all stimuli.* We now turn from this analysis of reciprocal judgments between Chinese and Filipinos, which is of theoretical importance, to an overall comparison of the descriptive characteristics attributed to all four groups. Table 5 summarizes the significant effects for all four groups of stimuli. As would be expected, the Chinese and Filipino judges are less likely to disagree about the evaluation of third parties such as Americans and Japanese. At the same time, they continue to agree on the descriptive characteristics of each group. To permit comparison of these characteristics, Table 6 repeats for Chinese and Filipino stimuli the average scores<sup>8</sup> on each scale found in Table 3 as well as the differences found in Table 4; it also includes the comparable results for American and Japanese stimuli.

Table 5

*Significant effects observed in 14 analyses, classified by kind of effect, cross-classified by nationality of stimulus group.*

Effect	Stimuli			
	Chinese	Filipinos	Americans	Japanese
Evaluation: Judges	10	11	3	3
Descriptive: Scales	10	11	10	9
Interaction: Judges x Scales	2	3	3	1

<sup>8</sup> In each case, this average is the unweighted mean for the two sets of judges.

Table 6

Scale means and interscale differences, classified by scale, crossclassified by nationality of stimulus group<sup>1</sup>

Scale	Stimuli							
	Chinese Scale means		Filipinos Scale means		Americans Scale means		Japanese Scale means	
	a-b	a-b	a-b	a-b	a-b	a-b	a-b	
1. a. Thrifty-Extravagant	32	-18		-20		23		
b. Generous-Stingy	7	17		28		7		
		25		-35		-48		
		***		***		***		
							16	
							***	
2. a. Self-controlled-Impulsive	24	-8		11		13		
b. Spontaneous-Inhibited	6	8		22		15		
		18		-16		-11		
		***		***		*		
							-2	
							n.s.	
3. a. Firm-Lax	16	-7		22		26		
b. Lenient-Strict	0	10		13		-16		
		16		-17		9		
		**		***		n.s.		
							42	
							***	
4. a. Serious-Frivolous	27	12		26		22		
b. Gay-Grim	-1	23		16		0		
		28		-11		10		
		***		*		*		
							22	
							***	
5. a. Persistent-Vacillating	26	3		23		22		
b. Flexible-Inflexible	14	14		22		15		
		12		-11		1		
		**		*		n.s.		
							7	
							n.s.	
6. a. Independent-Conforming	16	-28		35		18		
b. Cooperative-Uncooperative	11	16		28		17		
		5		-44		7		
		n.s.		***		n.s.		
							1	
							n.s.	
7. a. Skeptical-Gullible	7	-12		9		8		
b. Trusting-Distrustful	3	5		20		2		
		4		-17		-11		
		n.s.		***		*		
							6	
							n.s.	
8. a. Cautious-Rash	26	-3		8		19		
b. Bold-Timid	14	-1		28		25		

Table 6 (continued)

Scale	Stimuli			
	Chinese Scale means a-b	Filipinos Scale means a-b	Americans Scale means a-b	Japanese Scale means a-b
	12 **	-2 n.s.	-20 ***	-6 n.s.
9. a. Tactful-Tactless	17	12	25	19
b. Frank-Devious	<u>1</u>	<u>-5</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>4</u>
	16 ***	17 ***	-16 ***	15 ***
10. a. Selective- undiscriminating	22	6	23	17
b. Broad-minded-Choosy	<u>-3</u>	<u>-5</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>4</u>
	25 ***	11 *	5 n.s.	13 **
11. a. Active-Inactive	32	0	34	37
b. Calm-Agitated	<u>15</u>	<u>-1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
	17 ***	1 n.s.	29 ***	31 ***
12. a. Practical-Impractical	19	8	35	26
b. Idealistic- Opportunistic	<u>10</u>	<u>-2</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
	9 n.s.	10 *	23 ***	13 **
13. a. Modest-Conceited	20	9	-8	11
b. Self-confident- Unassured	<u>18</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>25</u>
	2 n.s.	6 n.s.	-41 ***	-14 **
14. a. Forceful-Passive	5	-15	24	19
b. Peaceful-Aggressive	<u>23</u>	<u>-2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>-2</u>
	-18 ***	-13 *	22 ***	21 ***
Combined Means	15	13	19	14
	15	15	18	15

<sup>1</sup> The scale means in all cases represent unweighted averages of the means for the two sets of judges. The significance of each difference is indicated beneath it, as follows: \*\*\* probability less than 0.001; \*\* probability less than 0.01; \* probability less than 0.05; n.s.—not significant.

In examining the results in Table 6, we may recall that the scales were so arranged that the differences would represent the factor of tight versus loose control in impulse expression with positive differences representing tight control and negative differences loose expression. In these terms, the Chinese are judged as relatively "tight" on 13 of the 14 pairs of scales.<sup>4</sup> To consider only the significant differences, the Chinese are judged relatively *thrifty, self-controlled, firm, serious, persistent, cautious, tactful, selective, and active*. This remarkably consistent portrait is in accord with those painted by other observers of the Chinese. As Weber pointed out, these qualities are also those appropriate for economic activity. They are thus consistent with the major economic role of the Chinese in Southeast Asia.

The Japanese generally present a similar picture, being judged relatively "tight" on most scales. The few cases where they differ in direction from the Chinese occur mostly in the area of self-assertiveness, the Japanese being judged more *forceful* (scale 14), *self-confident* (13), and *bold* (8). The student judges were too young to have experienced the Japanese Occupation during the Second World War, and many commented that they did not know any Japanese. Nevertheless, their judgments generally agree with those based on acquaintance with Japanese in Hawaii and Japan (Vinacke 1949; Abate and Berrien 1967).

In contrast to the judgment of Chinese and Japanese as relatively "tight," the Filipinos are judged relatively "loose." This appears clearly on the first seven pairs of scales, where the Filipinos are significantly judged to be relatively *generous, spontaneous, lenient, gay, flexible, cooperative, and trusting*. However, as scales 9 through 13 show, the Filipinos are not judged as unmixed examples of impulse expression on a "Latin" or "Mediterranean" model. The most striking instance is scale pair 9, where Filipinos are judged *tactful* (and *devious*) rather than *frank* (and *tactless*). This finding corresponds to the observation of anthropologists that Filipinos tend to preserve "smooth interpersonal relations" by avoiding the statement of unpleasant truths (e.g., Lynch 1964: 10-12).

On the scales related to self-assertiveness, particularly pairs 6 and 14, the Filipinos are judged even more unassertive than the Chinese, as *conforming, cooperative, and passive*. This same lack of self-assertiveness is revealed in a different way in the willingness of the Filipino judges to give themselves relatively unfavorable ratings on the scales generally; in fact, as mentioned above, they give themselves a relatively less favorable average rating (+7) than that they give the Chinese (+9). On the other hand, this relative self-denigration disappears on the separate scale *desirable—undesirable*, shown in

<sup>4</sup> The only exception, pair 14, is only a partial one. This pair represents the factor of self-assertiveness (along with pairs 13, 8, and 6) at least as much as the factor of tight versus loose control. The Chinese are judged relatively unassertive on all these pairs.

the bottom of Table 3, where they rate themselves +26 and the Chinese only +2. It is as if the Filipinos are willing to admit that they are relatively low on such favorable "tight" characteristics as *thrifty*, but do not consider this fact as very important in their own global self-appraisal.

Americans, as seen by these judges in the Philippines, receive highly favorable judgments, averaging +19 across all 28 scales and scoring negative in only two cases, *extravagant* and *conceited*. Traditional analysis might have interpreted this simply as an undifferentiated "halo effect."<sup>5</sup> The present method, however, shows that such an interpretation is wrong: Judges agree in making *more* favorable judgments on one of the paired scales, and the *differences* between paired scales are generally as large and as significant for Americans as for the other three nationalities. On some characteristics, Americans are judged relatively "loose": *generous*, *spontaneous*, and *trusting* (like Filipinos), and *frank* (unlike all three Oriental groups). On other characteristics, they are judged relatively "tight": *serious* and *active* (like the Chinese and Japanese), and *practical* (like all the groups considered). On traits of self-assertiveness, they are judged (like the Japanese, and unlike the Chinese and Filipinos) as relatively *forceful*, *self-confident*, and *bold*. One irony of these results is that the Chinese and Japanese are judged to embody the "Protestant ethic" more consistently than the Americans!

### Discussion

The crucial feature of the present analysis is the separation of the evaluative and descriptive aspects of a judgment, which are usually confounded with each other. This separation makes it possible to demonstrate the effects of both aspects on group judgment. This point is brought out by a comparison of this study with previous studies of group judgments or "stereotypes," including studies in the Philippines using the same groups (e.g., Willis 1966). In terms of factual comparison, the results show high agreement. The crucial difference, however, lies in the possibility of clear interpretation: Previous studies used traits that were not selected in order to distinguish evaluation from descriptive judgment. Under these circumstances, interpretation was ambiguous, and it was easy to make interpretations that overemphasized the importance of evaluation. For example, if the results for Americans shown in Table 6 included only the second scale of each pair, all of the means would be positive, and it might seem natural to interpret this as a simple "halo effect" involving positive evaluation. But, as we have just seen, such an interpretation is inadequate, since the judges also agree on significant differences between the two scales for ten out of 14 pairs. By making a systematic separation of the evaluative

<sup>5</sup> The "halo effect" refers to a tendency to judge something as generally favorable or unfavorable.

from the descriptive aspects, the present analysis is able to demonstrate clearly the major effects of both in reciprocal judgments between groups.

The findings fit the general interpretation suggested by Campbell (1967) that judges make similar descriptive judgments but evaluate them according to different perspectives. Campbell shows that this interpretation may apply, not only when the judgments of groups differ on some characteristics, but also when they are similar. In both cases, the judgments may reflect both agreement about the characteristics and disagreement about evaluation. The present study provides a systematic method, through the use of paired scales, to demonstrate both of these effects.

## REFERENCES

- Abate, M., and F. K. Berrien  
1967 Validation of stereotypes: Japanese versus American students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 7: 435-438.
- Brown, R. W.  
1965 *Social psychology*. New York, Free Press.
- Campbell, D. T.  
1967 Stereotypes and the perception of group differences. *American Psychologist* 22: 817-829.
- Hovland, C. I., and M. Sherif  
1952 Judgmental phenomena and scales of attitude measurement: item displacement in Thurstone scales. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 47: 822-832.
- Katz, D., and K. Braly  
1933 Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 28: 280-290.
- LeVine, R. A.  
1966 Outsider's judgments: an ethnographic approach to group differences in personality. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 22(2): 101-116.
- Lynch, F.  
1964 Social acceptance. *In* Four readings on Philippine values ("IPC Papers," No. 2). Frank Lynch, compiler. Quezon City, Philippines, Ateneo de Manila University Press. Pp. 1-21.
- McClelland, D. C.  
1961 *The achieving society*. Princeton, Van Nostrand.
- Peabody, D.  
1967 Trait inferences: evaluative and descriptive aspects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (monograph) 7: 1-18 (whole no. 644).
- Vinacke, W. E.  
1949 Stereotyping among national-racial groups in Hawaii: a study in ethnocentrism. *Journal of Social Psychology* 30: 265-291.
- Willis, R. H.  
1966 Ethnic and national images among Filipino university students. Paper read to the Philippine Sociological Society. Manila, May.
- Winer, B. J.  
1962 *Statistical principles in experimental design*. New York, McGraw-Hill.