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Abstract

We examined the ascription of five characteristics (moral, peaceful, antagonistic, smart, show initiative) to Chechens and Jews in a large, diverse, sample of participants in the Russian Federation. Factor analysis showed these five characteristics to fit within the expected two-dimensional structure of power (smart, show initiative) and benevolence (moral, peaceful, antagonistic). Consistent with historical stereotypes, Factor analysis showed power to be the more empirically important dimension regarding Jews, whereas benevolence was the more empirically important dimension regarding Chechens. Although the two-dimensional model of judgment was supported, attention to the specific characteristics that fell along these dimensions offered complementary information. For example, the ascription of high benevolence to Jews was more pronounced on the characteristics antagonistic and peaceful than on morality. In contrast, the ascription of low benevolence to Chechens was more pronounced on the characteristic peaceful than on antagonistic or moral. Together, the two general dimensions of power and benevolence, and the specific characteristics that fall along these dimensions, offer a comprehensive model of the content of out-group stereotypes. Copyright © 2008 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

It has long been clear that the characteristics people use to evaluate others tend to fall along two general dimensions (Brown, 1965; Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957; Rosenberg, Nelson, & Vivekananthan, 1968; White, 1980). The names given to these two dimensions vary widely—dynamism and favorability, agency and communion, dominance and nurturance, or competence and warmth. However, the dimension variously referred to as agency, dominance, or competence includes the characteristics indicative of peoples’ power. The dimension variously referred to as communion, nurturance, or warmth includes the characteristics indicative of peoples’ benevolence. This is the conclusion drawn by Leach (2006) in his recent review of work on the evaluation of groups in the stereotyping, prejudice, attitude, and group bias literatures (see also Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007).

Most previous research at the group level has asked individuals to ascribe a set of traits to various out-groups. Traits presumed to indicate power or benevolence were then combined to create two (manifest) scales. This approach allowed researchers to locate out-groups along the (manifest) dimensions of power and benevolence, often with the aid of Multi-Dimensional Scaling. For example, Eagly and Kite (1987) used manifest measures to show that university students in the...
U.S. viewed Iranians as high in “agency” (e.g., dominant, aggressive, independent, egoistical) but low in “communion” (e.g., honest, kind, friendly, likable), whereas they viewed Poles as high in communality, but moderate in agency. With a sample of Eastern European secondary school students, Phalet and Poppe (1997) showed that people from European countries with greater economic and political power were viewed as highly “competent” (e.g., competitive, self-confident, intelligent, efficient). People from countries who were perceived to be in conflict with participants’ in-group were viewed as somewhat less “moral” (e.g., honest, tolerant, aggressive, selfish). More recently, Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, and Xu, (2002) showed that low status groups such as housewives were viewed as “warm” (e.g., trustworthy, sincere, warm, good-natured), but not “competent” (e.g., competitive, confident, independent, intelligent), whereas high status groups such as Jews were viewed as “competent”, but not “warm” (see also Conway et al., 1996; Poppe & Linssen, 1999).

Although previous studies appear to confirm the two-dimensional model of out-group judgement, it should be apparent that the two dimensions have been conceptualized and measured in different ways across studies (for a review, see Leach, 2006). For example, Eagly and Kite’s (1987) scale of perceived out-group power included characterizations of the out-groups as antagonistic and not peaceful. However, other researchers have measured out-group power only with characteristics like competent and confident. Another problem is that traits such as “aggressive” have been used to measure the power dimension in some studies (e.g., Eagly and Kite, 1987) and the benevolence dimension in other studies (e.g., Phalet & Poppe, 1997). Despite the fact that there is widespread agreement that there are two general dimensions of judgement, there is disagreement about how they should be conceptualized and measured.

In this paper, we offer a novel, two-level, approach to peoples’ views of out-group power and benevolence. We conceptually distinguish the general dimensions of power and benevolence from the more specific characteristics often used to measure these two dimensions (see also Leach et al., 2008; Osgood et al., 1957). Thus, at a general level of analysis, we conceptualize power and benevolence as latent dimensions that describe how out-groups are viewed in very general terms. Rather than creating manifest scales of power and benevolence from a variety of specific characteristics, we used Factor analysis to empirically examine whether five specific characteristics fall along latent dimensions that correspond to power and benevolence (see also Rosenberg et al., 1968; White, 1980). We assess the robustness of the two-dimensional model in part by examining whether it works to characterize views of two contrasting out-groups in the Russian Federation, Chechens and Jews.

As a complement to the general level of analysis offered by the dimensions of power and benevolence, we also conceptualize the content of out-group stereotypes at a more specific level. Thus, we treat the specific out-group characteristics that fall along the general dimensions of power (i.e., smart, show initiative) and benevolence (i.e., moral, peaceful, antagonistic) as manifest variables that are measured directly. Although the two-dimensional model of judgement is useful at a general level of analysis, it is clear that individuals view out-groups in more specific terms than power and benevolence. For example, in a recent study, Leach et al. (2007, study 3) showed important differences in the way that the specific characteristics of morality (i.e., honest, sincere) and sociability (i.e., warm, likeable) were related to the positive evaluation of out-groups. When a relevant out-group was said to be more successful than the in-group, this out-group’s perceived morality was more empirically important to positive evaluation than its perceived sociability. However, when this same out-group was said to be less successful than the in-group, it was the perceived sociability of the out-group that was most empirically important to participants’ positive evaluation of the out-group. Although the characteristics of sociability and morality should both fall along the general dimension of benevolence, they capture different facets of benevolence (Leach, 2006). Attention to such specific out-group characteristics complements the general level at which most previous research on power and benevolence has been conducted.

The present study aimed to demonstrate the value in examining both the generality and the specificity of stereotype content. We used a large, diverse sample in the largest country in the world—the Russian Federation—to examine views of two contrasting out-groups. Because Jews and Chechens should be viewed in particular ways, we examine whether the power and benevolence dimensions, and the more specific characteristics that fall along them, offer complementary characterizations of the stereotypes of these two out-groups.

**TWO GENERAL DIMENSIONS: POWER AND BENEVOLENCE**

Most previous studies at the group level have treated power and benevolence as manifest variables, where a wide range of specific traits have been combined to create unitary scales. As mentioned above, this has led researchers to employ quite
different measures of power and benevolence across studies. Perhaps more importantly, using power and benevolence as manifest measures has resulted in little work examining whether specific characteristics actually fall within the expected two-dimensional structure. Thus, our first broad aim was to examine whether the latent structure of five out-group characteristics—antagonistic, peaceful, moral, smart, and show initiative—is better characterized by dimensions of power and benevolence than by a single dimension (i.e., hypothesis 1). This approach is common in research on implicit personality theory, which examines the two-dimensional latent structure within which specific personality characteristics fall (e.g., Rosenberg et al., 1968).

Treating power and benevolence as latent dimensions also enables an unobtrusive assessment of the empirical importance of each dimension in how out-groups are viewed (Osgood et al., 1957). Thus, we used Factor analysis to examine whether the power or the benevolence dimension explains more of the variance common to all of the characteristics ascribed to out-groups. This method has been used in studies of the characteristics ascribed to groups (Eagly & Kite, 1987; Leach et al., 2007) as well as a wide variety of other entities (Osgood et al., 1957). However, most previous research has simply presumed the empirical importance of a dimension from the degree to which it is ascribed to a group. Unfortunately, the degree to which a characteristic is ascribed to a group is not an unambiguous indication of its empirical importance to the evaluation of the group (Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt, & Kashima, 2005; Leach et al., 2007).

From a theoretical point of view, assessing the empirical importance of power and benevolence in views of out-groups is necessary because there is a long-standing notion that some out-groups are stereotyped mainly in terms of their power, whereas others are stereotyped mainly in terms of their benevolence. For instance, Bettelheim and Janowitz’s (1950) analysis of working class war veterans’ prejudice suggested that superego-based stereotypes of Jews focused on their “exercising control, having power.” In contrast, id-based stereotypes of African Americans focused on their “primitive” and “socially unacceptable” behavior. Although, contemporary theory tends to eschew such psychodynamic concepts, there is broad agreement that power and benevolence are differentially important to views of out-groups (e.g., Fiske et al., 2002; Judd et al., 2005). For example, Alexander, Brewer, and Herrmann (1999) suggest that some low-status out-groups are viewed as (antagonistic and immoral) “barbarians”, whereas some high-status out-groups are viewed as (competent, but immoral) “imperialists” comes close to Bettelheim and Janowitz’s distinction (see also Fiske et al., 2002; Phalet & Poppe, 1997).

The present study compared views of two relatively small ethnic groups that have long been viewed as problems in Russia—Chechens and Jews (Markowitz, 1999). We focus on these two out-groups because history and politics suggest that Chechens are seen as a problem because of their perceived (lack of) benevolence, whereas Jews are seen as a problem because of their perceived power. More specifically, Jews are seen as having too much influence in business and politics, despite their very small numbers (Gibson & Duch, 1992; Korey, 1972). It appears that the classic stereotype of Jews as unscrupulously entrepreneurial has re-emerged in the Russian Federation. In contrast, Chechens’ reputation as “ruthless and bloodthirsty” mountain warriors (Russell, 2002, p. 87) was reinvigorated in the early 20th century when they initiated a war of independence. Chechnya’s recent violent efforts to separate from Russia have further fuelled their image as barbaric and violent people who are inherently antagonistic to others (Jersild, 2004). The popular notion that Chechen separatism is fuelled by Islamic fundamentalism and international terrorism serves to reinforce their image as immoral and antagonistic people who prefer violence to peace (Russell, 2002, 2005; Markowitz, 1999).

Fifty years after Bettelheim and Janowitz, and in a very different cultural and political context, we expect that the characteristics ascribed to Jews will still focus on their power (i.e., being smart, showing initiative). In contrast, we expect the characteristics ascribed to Chechens to focus on their perceived (lack of) benevolence (i.e., being antagonistic, not peaceful, not moral). More specifically, we expect the power dimension to be more empirically important to the stereotypes of Jews, explaining more of the common variance in the characteristics ascribed to this out-group. In contrast, we expect the benevolence dimension to be more empirically important to the characteristics ascribed to Chechens (hypothesis 2a).

Treating power and benevolence as latent dimensions also enables a more accurate assessment of the association between the two dimensions. Assessing the association between the power and benevolence dimensions is important because they are not necessarily orthogonal, as is often presumed. For example, Judd et al. (2005) recently showed that the association between power and benevolence varies across out-group targets. Where an out-group is viewed as like the in-group, or is admired, its perceived power and benevolence are positively correlated (Judd et al., 2005; Leach et al., 2007, study 3). As we expect Jews to be viewed as having both power and benevolence, these general dimensions should be
moderately inter-correlated. This suggests a view of Jews as a benevolent power (Phalet & Poppe, 1997). In contrast, we expect Chechens to be viewed as “terrorists,” who have the power to harm, but lack benevolence (Russell, 2005). Thus, we expect little or no correlation between the power and benevolence dimensions when they are ascribed to Chechens. Together these expectations comprise Hypothesis 2b.

**SPECIFIC OUT-GROUP CHARACTERISTICS**

That manifest measures of power and benevolence are too general to characterize the views held of many out-groups is apparent in previous research (for a review, see Leach, 2006). For instance, Eagly and Kite (1987) found U.S. university students to ascribe near equal “agency” to Iranians, Irish, Israelis, Japanese, and Russians. In studies by Fiske et al. (2002), Jews, Blacks, Feminists, Hispanics, Muslims, men, and Native Americans were all ascribed moderate “warmth.” It seems highly unlikely that these quite different out-groups are viewed in such similar ways. Even where dimensions of power and benevolence are used together, they sometimes fail to characterize how salient and important out-groups are viewed. For example, in Eagly and Kite (1987), Spanish, Mexicans, East Germans, and Afghans were all viewed as moderately agentic and communal. In Fiske et al. (2002), Arabs, Blacks, blue-collar workers, Muslims, migrant workers, and Native Americans were all viewed as moderately competent and warm.

That many different out-groups are viewed as having similar power and/or benevolence may be seen as suggesting that the two-dimensional model of judgement is too general to adequately account for the content of stereotypes. This may be why some researchers have developed frameworks that offer a greater number of out-group characteristics (e.g., Alexander et al., 1999; Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). However, we think the problem is not with the two-dimensional model itself, but rather with the way in which the specificity of the characteristics that fall along the two dimensions has been wholly subsumed under the more general level of analysis. This is why we view the analysis of specific out-group characteristics as complementing the analysis of the general dimensions of power and benevolence along which the specific characteristics should fall. Thus, our second broad aim is to examine the degree to which five specific characteristics offer a more nuanced characterization of how two contrasting out-groups are viewed than do the more general dimensions of power and benevolence.

A large body of research shows that there are important differences between the specific characteristics that indicate individuals’ power and benevolence (Rosenberg et al., 1968; White, 1980; Wiggins, 1979). Although there is less research on groups, the characteristics of out-group sociability, morality, peacefulness, and antagonism each appear to tap specific aspects of the more general dimension of benevolence (e.g., Osgood et al., 1957; Williams & Best, 1982; for a review, see Leach, 2006). Some support for this comes from recent studies by Leach et al. (2007). They used Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor analysis to show that the group characteristics of morality (e.g., honest, sincere) and sociability (e.g., nice, warm) are distinct from each other. In addition, they used experimental manipulations of group sociability and morality to show that these characteristics have distinct effects on self-perception and emotion.

We wish to demonstrate that attention to the specificity of the characteristics that indicate out-group power and benevolence allows more precise hypotheses about which groups should be seen in what ways. Although the historical stereotype of Jews (in the Russian Federation and more generally) suggests that they will be viewed as powerful, it also suggests a more specific view of Jews as showing initiative and very smart. Thus, Jews should be seen as showing more initiative and as (much) smarter than Chechens. Although benevolence should be less empirically important to the characteristics ascribed to Jews, they should also be seen as much less antagonistic and more peaceful than the Chechens (hypothesis 3a). Despite this view of Jews as generally benevolent, the notion that they aim to achieve, even by trickery and deceit, suggests that Jews will not be seen as moral. Thus, Jews should be seen as less moral than peaceful and (non-)antagonistic (hypothesis 3b about Jews).

The characteristics antagonistic and peaceful, rather than morality, should be the most central aspects of stereotypes regarding Chechen benevolence. If Chechens are indeed seen as the kind of “primitive barbarian” described by Bettelheim and Janowitz (1950) and Alexander et al. (1999), it is Chechen’s presumed antagonism and lack of peacefulness that should take center stage in this stereotype. Thus, Chechens should be stereotyped as more antagonistic, than peaceful or moral. This pattern would fit the “terrorist” label salient in the present political moment. Given Chechens presumed political ambition, they should also be seen as showing initiative more than being smart (hypothesis 3b about
Chechens. Put in relative terms, Chechens should be viewed as much more antagonistic and less peaceful than Jews (hypothesis 3a). The difference between the out-groups’ perceived morality should be smaller.

**METHOD**

**Participants and Procedure**

Participants came from urban population samples of about 1,000 in 10 autonomous republics in the Russian Federation. In 1999 and 2000, 10,415 respondents were interviewed face-to-face, with a near equal number of Russians and non-Russians participating in each republic (for details, see Hagendoorn, Poppe, & Minescu, 2008; Minescu, Hagendoorn, & Poppe, 2008). The 150 questions of the survey focused on demographics and attitudes toward politics and inter-group relations.

The present study focused on seven traits that participants were asked about two salient out-groups in the Russian Federation, Chechens and Jews. Likely due to the sensitive nature of the items, as well as normal attrition, 4356 people (42%) either refused to answer or chose a “don’t know” response on all trait items. Supplemental analyses showed the respondents analyzed below to differ very little from non-respondents on in-group identification or attitudes relevant to stereotyping. In addition, participants included in this study had demographic characteristics extremely similar to that of the full sample: M_age = 42 SD_age = 16; 56% female, 44% male. In any case, sample attrition is fairly unimportant as we are uninterested in making claims about the population as a whole.

**Measures**

In one section of the survey, participants were asked, “How many Chechens, in your opinion, have the following characteristic?” They were then presented with a list of traits used in previous research (e.g., Poppe & Linssen, 1999), including peaceful, hostile, rude, honest, deceitful, smart, and show initiative. Responses were given on a scale that ranged from 0% to 100%. The same question was then asked about Jews. For analysis, all measures were recoded from 0 to 1. Based on Leach’s (2006) review of the indicators of group power and benevolence and Leach et al.’s (2007) recent studies, the traits honest and deceitful (reversed) were used to measure the characteristic moral \( \rho = .51, p < .001 \) for Jews, and \( \rho = .51, p < .001 \), for Chechens). The traits hostile and rude were treated as indicators of the characteristic antagonistic \( \rho = .54, p < .001 \) for Jews, and \( \rho = .57, p < .001 \), for Chechens).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Two General Dimensions**

We expected the characteristics of moral, peaceful, antagonistic, smart, and show initiative to fall along the two general dimensions of power and benevolence (i.e., hypothesis 1). To assess this, we submitted the five characteristics to Principal-Axis Factor Analyses with maximum likelihood estimation and Oblimin rotation (\( \Delta = 0 \)). We use Factor analysis in a way that is roughly equivalent to the Multi-Dimensional Scaling used in most other research on power and benevolence.

1Comparisons between respondents and non-respondents on several measures related to stereotypes—such as authoritarianism, distrust, social distance, nationalism, and ethnic identification—were statistically reliable, \( p < .05 \). However, these effects were very small, All \( \text{partial} \gamma^2 < .003 \). The mean differences ranged from .01 to .04 (on normalized scales from 0 to 1), yielding small effect sizes: Cohen’s \( d = .05–.10 \). Comparisons between respondents and non-respondents on several demographic measures showed only very small differences. For example, there were more missing values for women (43%) than men (40%). In addition, non-respondents were two years older—\( F (1, 10400) = 47.70, p < .001, \text{partial} \gamma^2 = .005 \), Cohen’s \( d = .13 \), and slightly less educated \( F (1, 10253) = 17.05, p < .001, \text{partial} \gamma^2 < .001 \).

2Factor analysis appeared appropriate as the five characteristics ascribed to Chechens had low (moral-show initiative, \( r = .046 \)) to moderate (moral-antagonistic, \( r = -.503 \)) inter-correlations, KMO measure of sampling adequacy = .670. The five characteristics ascribed to Jews also had low (moral-show initiative, \( r = -.035 \)) to moderate (smart-show initiative, \( r = .500 \)) inter-correlations, KMO measure of sampling adequacy = .666.
However, Factor analysis has the benefit of being based in the more readily understood common factor model, which treats power and benevolence as latent dimensions that can be rotated non-orthogonally. In addition, Factor analysis with oblique rotation can empirically assess the correlation between the two dimensions in a way not possible with Multi-Dimensional Scaling (see Kruskal & Wish, 1978).

The characteristics ascribed to Chechens fit the expected two-dimensional structure, $\chi^2 (1) = 39.20, p < .001$. A one-dimensional solution produced a very poor model fit, $\chi^2 (5) = 984.55, p < .001$. A three-dimensional solution could not be examined with five items.

The characteristics of peaceful, moral, and antagonistic fell on one dimension (i.e., benevolence), whereas smart and initiative fell on a second dimension (i.e., power). Upon initial extraction, the benevolence dimension explained almost twice the common variance as the power dimension. The two dimensions were weakly correlated. These results are shown in Figure 1a.

![Factor analysis of characteristics ascribed to Chechens, 2-dimensional solution](image)

![Factor analysis of characteristics ascribed to Jews, 2-dimensional solution](image)

Note: Moral (honest, deceitful) and antagonistic (hostile, rude) are an average of two traits.

Figure 1. (a) Factor analysis of characteristics ascribed to Chechens, 2-dimensional solution. (b) Factor analysis of characteristics ascribed to Jews, 2-dimensional solution.
A parallel analysis showed the characteristics ascribed to Jews to also fit the expected two-dimensional structure, \( \chi^2 (1) = 73.22, p < .001 \). A one-dimensional solution produced a very poor model fit, \( \chi^2 (5) = 869.65, p < .001 \). Upon initial extraction the power dimension explained almost twice the common variance as the benevolence dimension. The two dimensions were moderately correlated. These results are shown in Figure 1b.

In support of hypothesis 1, five specific characteristics fit within the expected two-dimensional structure. Whether the out-group was Jews or Chechens, power and benevolence appeared to characterize the content of stereotypes at a general level. In line with hypothesis 2a, benevolence was the dimension that was most empirically important in the view of Chechens, as it explained more of the variance the characteristics had in common. In the view of Jews, the power dimension was more important empirically.

Although the two-dimensional latent structure of the characteristics appeared consistent across the two out-groups, the association between the two dimensions varied. In line with hypothesis 2b, power and benevolence were only weakly correlated regarding Chechens, but were moderately correlated regarding Jews. A Fisher’s r to z’ transformation showed these two correlations to differ reliably, \( z = 10.18, p < .001 \) (CI = 10.14 to 10.22). This suggests that the Jewish stereotype is more of a positive gestalt that views this out-group as a benevolent power. On the other hand, Chechen’s perceived power was not seen as implying much benevolence. This is consistent with the image of Chechens as dangerous “terrorists” who may use their power to harm others.

### Specific Group Characteristics

We used a series of paired samples t-tests to examine participants’ ascription of the five characteristics to Jews and Chechens (see Figure 2). Given the very large sample size, we report Cohen’s (1990) d statistic to aid interpretation (see Tables 1 and 2). Cohen’s d reports the effect size of mean differences in terms of a pooled standard deviation (Devillely, 2004).

In order to test hypothesis 3a, we compared the degree to which each characteristic was ascribed to Chechens versus Jews (see Table 1). The differences on the characteristics that fall along the general dimension of benevolence were as hypothesized. Thus, Jews were seen as much more peaceful and less antagonistic than Chechens. Neither group was seen

---

**Table 1. Comparison of characteristics ascribed to Chechens versus Jews (paired samples t-tests)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antagonistic: Chechens versus Jews</td>
<td>81.94</td>
<td>3920</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral: Chechens versus Jews</td>
<td>−25.20</td>
<td>3860</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful: Chechens versus Jews</td>
<td>−79.82</td>
<td>3796</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart: Chechens versus Jews</td>
<td>−67.61</td>
<td>3721</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show initiative: Chechens versus Jews</td>
<td>−32.32</td>
<td>3771</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Interpretation of Cohen’s d measure of effect size: .20 = small, .50 = medium, .80 = large.*
as particularly moral, although Jews were viewed as moderately more moral than Chechens. These results suggest the value of differentiating the specific characteristics that indicate out-group benevolence. If morality, antagonism, and peacefulness were combined into a general benevolence score, we might have been unable to observe the differences in how the out-groups were viewed. It was the antagonistic and peaceful characteristics that signal cooperativeness (Alexander et al., 1999) that best differentiated the stereotypes of Chechens and Jews. Morality was less diagnostic of the differences in views of Jews’ and Chechens’ benevolence (see also Leach et al., 2007).

Further results show the value of differentiating the specific characteristics that fall along the general dimension of out-group power. In support of hypothesis 3a, Jews were seen as much more smart than Chechens. Both groups were seen as showing initiative, although Jews were viewed as moderately higher in this specific characteristic. The use of a general measure of power would have obscured these differences.

Comparing the degree to which the five characteristics were ascribed to each out-group separately offers further support of our approach. Consistent with hypothesis 3b, Jews were seen as much less moral than peaceful and (non-)antagonistic (see Table 2). However, there was very little difference in the degree to which participants viewed Jews as smart and showing initiative (Table 2). Although the power dimension is more empirically important in the stereotype of Jews, the specific characteristic of morality (which falls along the benevolence dimension) shows an important element of the negative view of Jews in the past and in the present study.

Consistent with hypothesis 3b, Chechens were differentially ascribed the five specific characteristics in ways quite different to that observed for Jews. For instance, Chechens were viewed as showing initiative more than being smart (see Table 2). Showing initiative is not inconsistent with the image of Chechens as violent barbarians who are focused on achieving their political goals at the expense of others. Indeed, Chechens were viewed as less peaceful than moral or non-antagonistic. Although benevolence was the general dimension most empirically important to the stereotypes ascribed to Chechens, participants’ most extreme view was expressed in terms of Chechens’ presumed lack of peacefulness. This fits with the historical and contemporary view of Chechens as violent barbarians and terrorists.

### CONCLUSION

The two-dimensional model of judgement applies to a wide variety of entities. Thus, there was good reason to expect that the dimensions of power and benevolence characterize the content of out-group stereotypes. However, previous studies were hampered by inconsistent conceptualization and measurement. Previous research also suffered from not distinguishing the general dimensions of power and benevolence from the more specific characteristics that fall along these two general dimensions. We offered an approach to the content and structure of out-group stereotypes that was guided by this distinction between the general and specific levels of analysis.

---

Table 2. Comparison of characteristics ascribed to Jews, Chechens (paired samples t-tests)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-group: Jews</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Cohen’s d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral versus non-antagonistic</td>
<td>-70.09</td>
<td>4614</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral versus peaceful</td>
<td>-36.02</td>
<td>4626</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-antagonistic versus peaceful</td>
<td>32.63</td>
<td>4584</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart versus showing initiative</td>
<td>06.59</td>
<td>4884</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-group: Chechens</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral versus non-antagonistic</td>
<td>04.04</td>
<td>4488</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral versus peaceful</td>
<td>33.39</td>
<td>4353</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-antagonistic versus peaceful</td>
<td>37.84</td>
<td>4455</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart versus showing initiative</td>
<td>-28.36</td>
<td>4017</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Interpretation of Cohen’s $d$ measure of effect size: .20 = small, .50 = medium, .80 = large.

The scale for “antagonistic” was reversed in order to allow for comparisons with the other two characteristics of benevolence (such that higher scores = more benevolence).

DOI: 10.1002/ejsp
In analyses more common in the examination of individual personality traits than group characteristics, we used Factor analysis to show that five specific out-group characteristics fell along more general dimensions that corresponded to power and benevolence. Although Jews and Chechens are viewed quite differently in the Russian Federation (and more generally), the two-dimensional model appeared to fit the specific characteristics ascribed to both out-groups. Thus, the present study used a large, diverse sample to provide novel evidence in support of the two-dimensional model. We also showed that the two general dimensions are not necessarily associated in the same way across all out-groups (see also Judd et al., 2005; Leach et al., 2007, study 3). Consistent with the more positive view of Jews among participants, their perceived power and benevolence was moderately correlated. Thus, Jews tended to be stereotyped as a benevolent power (Phalet & Poppe, 1997). Chechens’ perceived power did not, however, suggest their benevolence.

Often, the stereotype of an out-group as powerful and achievement-oriented (i.e., the classic stereotype of Jews in Europe) has been contrasted to the stereotype of an out-group as dangerous and conflict-oriented (i.e., the classic stereotype of those of African heritage, barbarians, or of contemporary terrorists). We found support for these two stereotypes, with the image of Jews corresponding to Bettleheim and Janowitz’s (1950) superego-based stereotype and the image of Chechens corresponding to their id-based stereotype (see also Fiske et al., 2002). Consistent with the view that Jews are a prestigious minority in the Russian Federation, the power dimension explained nearly twice of the variance common to the five specific characteristics than did the benevolence dimension. However, consistent with the image fuelled by Chechens’ violent independence movement within this largely Muslim republic, participants’ view of Chechens was better explained by the benevolence than the power dimension.

Complementing our support for the general dimensions of power and benevolence was evidence that the five more specific characteristics offered a more nuanced characterization of the content of stereotypes. Thus, consistent with historical views, Jews were ascribed the characteristics smart, showing initiative. However, continuing the long-standing trend to stereotype Jews as deceitful, they were not seen as especially moral despite being viewed as peaceful and non-antagonistic. This suggests that Jewish benevolence is viewed more in terms of cooperation-conflict than in terms of morality. Participants also reproduced the long-standing view of Chechens as non-peaceful, an image only increased by their portrayal as “terrorists.” Although Chechens were viewed as neither moral nor non-antagonistic, the most extreme view was expressed in terms of the specific characteristic of non-peaceful.

Future research would do well to examine the two general dimensions, and the specific characteristics that fall along them, across a wider variety of in-group and out-groups. It is important to know if contextual factors might moderate the content and structure of out-group stereotypes. Although there appears to be a good deal of consensus in stereotyping, particular inter-group relations might alter this (Leach, 2006; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). For example, the in-group’s relation to the out-group may alter (1) the specific characteristics that are relevant to the stereotypes of out-group, (2) the exact location of the specific characteristics within the two-dimensional structure, or (3) the association between power and benevolence (see Leach, 2006). We believe that the approach that we have offered here serves as a useful way to examine both the specificity and the generality of the content and structure of peoples’ views of groups.
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