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The problem. This study was undertaken to determine
the degrees of social distances expressed by a sample of Area
XI Community College students toward eleven selected minority
groups. In an exploratory manner, various socioeconomic var-
iables were tested in order to determine their relationship
to the expressed social distances.

Procedure. A pilot survey was administered in order
to determine those particular minority groups that would be
included in the major investigation. A social distance scale
as devised by Emory S. Bogardus was administered to a random
sample of Area XI Community College students. The variables
of social contact, race, age, sex, religion, politics, educa-
tion, marital status, residential characteristics, income,
and occupation were measured to determine any significant
relationship to the social distances.

An analysis of variance was performed to determine if
differences occurred among the mean social distance scores for
each of the independent variables. An F test was administered
to each variable in order to determine significance levels.
Cross-tabulation was also used in the analysis for further
explanation.

Findings. Differential degrees of social distance
were reported toward the eleven minority groups selected for
analysis. There were differences in the overall mean social
distance scores reported by the sub sample in this research,
to those last reported by Emory S. Bogardus in his 1956
regional study. Prior social contact was significant only for
the American Indian group. The socioeconomic variables of race,
population, and income were also significant in relationship
to the expressed social distances.

Conclusions. The Bogardus social distance scale
showed a general overall low amount of expressed social dis-
tance by the sample toward the eleven minority groups selected
for analysis.

Recommendations. The results of this study point to
the need of additional research, that analyzes the variables
of social contact, race, population, and income plus other
significant socioeconomic variables that influence social
distances.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Social conflicts between ethnic, racial, religious, social and other groups in American society have existed for centuries and continue to exist today. Those conflicts that have existed between various dominant and non-dominant groups have ebbed and flowed throughout numerous phases of social change. In addition to the fact that there have been changes in the relationships between these groups, it is crucial to point out that significant social distances between various groups still exist. Also important to note is the fact that there exists significant social distances expressed toward "current" minority groups as they appear in American society.

Research that focuses on conflict between groups generally heightens during and immediately after periods of "out-right" tension. However, it is the sociologists' "professional obligation" to conduct research that focuses on possible distances and changes occurring between groups during periods of time that are less stressful in American society.

---

1For the purpose of this thesis, the term "social distance" has reference to the perceived closeness or non-closeness that one group regards the total membership of other groups. The self-perceived definition is subjective on the part of the members of a group, and in general terms can be placed on a continuum of closeness.
Such research is important in that it tends to alert the sociologist to any significant changes occurring in the relationships between various groups.

The research reported in this thesis, therefore, has been conducted so as to provide specific data concerning any significant changes in expressed social distances toward particular minority groups. This study utilizes a random sample of community college students that generally represent a specific segment of the greater Des Moines metropolitan and Ankeny areas. In addition, the research will make an exploratory attempt to analyze the socioeconomic characteristics of the sample so as to determine what relationship(s), if any, these characteristics have to the social distances expressed toward the particular groups selected for analysis. Lastly, the amount of prior social contact that the respondents have had with particular members of the minority groups selected for analysis and the expressed social distances will be analyzed so as to examine any significant relationships.

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

In the process of monitoring and explaining the continuous social changes that occur in American society, the analysis of prejudice toward particular minority groups merits special investigation. The measurement of social distances between groups has traditionally contributed to the sociological analysis of prejudice. The importance of
conducting investigations of this type is articulated by Simpson and Yinger, who write:

The social scientist must study the traditional factor in prejudice. The fact that it is only "verbal," "skin-deep," and relatively nonfunctional should not be allowed to obscure the basic role it often plays. In any complete analysis of prejudice one cannot ignore the casual, verbal, "proper" prejudices of the average person, for they are involved in this important interactional way with the other factors in prejudice. They are not simply survivals of cultural lags that are gradually disappearing and meanwhile have little significance for social interaction. They are part of the total process by which prejudice is sustained and through which it functions.1

The view of prejudice as being expressed in degrees of social distance plays a significant role in sociological literature. Such literature offers various theoretical explanations for these distances. A few of these explanations will be discussed prior to a more in-depth discussion of the sociological importance of this type of research. A few historical comments on the above-mentioned explanations for social distance are necessary in order to "shed light" on the issues presented in this research.

II. HISTORICAL APPROACHES EXPLAINING SOCIAL DISTANCES

Historically, within American society, there exist various explanations for the distances between groups. These

explanations tend to analyze the occurring social distances in terms of cultural norms. Simpson and Yinger note, for example, that one approach views the prejudiced attitudes expressed toward a particular minority group as being part of a "folk-way" process.\(^1\) This approach emphasizes the idea that attitudes toward minority groups are a part of the cultural milieu, and subsequently learned; that is, an individual is taught prejudice against particular groups.

Another explanation used in investigating social distances between groups has been that of the "natural tendency" to dislike particular members of a minority group. This approach explains prejudiced attitudes expressed toward particular groups as originating through a "natural" phenomenon,\(^2\) i.e., a form of xenophobia (or the fear of outsiders) exists in all groups.

Lastly, research has indicated that there are important variables playing a significant part in the explanation of prejudiced attitudes during specified time periods. These variables include: religion, racial differentiation, economics, politics, social values, social norms, and others. American society experiences various social changes; the significance of these variables will differ in terms of their roles in explaining social distances between groups, i.e.,

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 109.  \(^2\)Ibid., p. 110.
each will have a variable influence upon prejudice depending upon time and space. Regarding the changes in the significance of these variables, Simpson and Yinger make note of current changes pertaining to the issue of race and religion as one example. Thus they state:

Strictly religious differentiation, however, is less often used for group conflict in modern society because the religious frame of reference is less crucial today. In a large measure racial differentiation, or supposed racial differentiation, has come to take its place. We now fight over economic and political opponents not by claiming that they believe the wrong things in religion but, claiming that they are natively inferior.¹

This last approach to the explanation of social distances between groups currently acknowledges the "differentiation" that exists amongst groups and the significant use of numerous variables in constructing such an explanation.

These approaches have been discussed briefly to point out the importance of continuing to up-date and evaluate, in the "milieu" of many societal changes, those degrees of social distances that prevail. The importance of this type of research will be discussed next.

III. THE SOCIOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL DISTANCES BETWEEN GROUPS

Historically, the social distances observed between groups in American society have been explained through the

¹Ibid., p. 84.
use of various theoretical perspectives. The importance of this type of research is that it contributes to the analysis of expressed prejudices between particular groups. More specifically, the question is raised: What do the distances between groups reveal about the attitudes and behaviors of its members? Currently, authors in the area of intergroup relations point out that research provides various significant insights; for instance, Kinloch states: "Some of the major sociological insights provided by the study of intergroup relations relate to the society's social structure, its internal social flexibility and change."\(^1\) Also, Kinloch notes that research concerning intergroup relations provides the sociologist with specific analysis which contributes to the following areas within the field of sociology:

1. **An Index of Social Tension:**
   
   This provides the sociologist with useful insight into the sources and levels of social tension.

2. **An Index of the Social Structure:**
   
   This provides the sociologist with insight into a society's order and the types of normative bonds.

3. **An Index of Social Flexibility:**
   
   This provides the sociologist with knowledge about the relationships between physical variables and social variables.

4. **An Index of Social Conformity:**
   
   This provides the sociologist with information concerning individual and group conformity.

---

5. **Relationships between Attitudes and Behavior:**

This provides the sociologist with information concerning the "actionized" behavior of individuals and groups and their relationships to attitudes.

6. **The Relationship between Needs and Behavior:**

This provides the sociologist with information concerning individual needs as it relates to the type of behavior expressed by actors.

7. **The Effects of Industrialization:**

This provides the sociologist with information concerning the effects that technological changes have upon society.

8. **The Historical Development of the Social Sciences:**

This provides the sociologist with information concerning the evolutionary unfolding of research.

9. **Intergroup Relations and Sociological Theory:**

This provides the sociologist with information concerning the traditional split between conflict and consensus oriented sociological theory.

10. **Intergroup Relations and Social Policy:**

This provides the sociologist with information concerning the relationship of research to the development of social policy.¹

These ten specific contributions point out the importance and significance that this type of analysis plays in social distance research. Obviously, it is beyond the scope of this research to contribute to all ten points delineated by Kinloch. However, this thesis will deal specifically with

¹Ibid., pp. 11-17.
the first point delineated above by contributing to "an index of social tension." The research herein will analyze social distance levels existing between particular categories of minority groups and the specified sample utilized in this study.

In reference to race relations, the analysis of social distances between groups is also important because of the current racial and social tensions and deprivations that exist within American society. This point is well summed up by Hardert, and others, when they state:

To anyone even faintly familiar with the "stuff" of American society it must appear redundant to defend the idea that race and racial categorization of peoples has had and continues to have a profound influence on our lives. The impact of such matters may be seen in a variety of contexts. We see angry, frustrated groups of Blacks bent on the destruction of large segments of urban areas. We see White mothers marching from Pontiac, Michigan, to Washington, D.C., to challenge the busing of children to achieve racial balance in public schools. We see Indian youth, who at birth face a life expectancy of forty-four years compared to one of seventy for their White counterparts. We see minority children whose crippling diseases might have been cured if they had had access to proper medical care. We see also differences in diet, quality, and variety of education, work opportunities, and many other matters that comprise one's lifestyle.¹

Further, the importance in analyzing social distances between groups, whether "racial or social," is significant by providing the sociologist with research that can be utilized

in determining any distances that may exist between particular groups currently residing within American society. A statement of the intent of this research follows.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In order to analyze social distances between groups, this research will measure those distances that were expressed by a random sample of community college students toward a variety of current racial, social, and ethnic groups as previously identified and classified in a pilot survey conducted by the author. The student populations will be representative of two of the Des Moines Area XI Community colleges. The Des Moines Area XI Community College has campuses located in eleven geographical areas surrounding the city of Des Moines. This research utilizes samples from two of these colleges, one located in Des Moines, (The Urban Center), and the other situated in Ankeny (The Ankeny Campus). From these campuses the student samples were drawn for research purposes.

The specific problem this research attempts to examine is the expressed social distance, its relationship, if any, to socioeconomic characteristics, regional variations, and also any significant relationships to prior social contact with minority members. In reference to the amount and type of social contact with minority members, Simpson and Vinger articulate the need for this type of analysis in social distance research as follows: "There is little or no
correlation between the amount and type of prejudice and the degree of contact with members of a minority group or extent of information about them."¹ Specifically, this research will attempt to examine the following:

1. The social distances expressed by the sample toward the particular minority groups selected for analysis.

2. A comparison of the overall distance expressed by the study sample with the last reported regionally in 1956 by Emory S. Bogardus.²

3. The relationship between the nature and types of prior social contacts with members of the particular minority groups and expressed social distances.

4. The relationships between the socioeconomic characteristics of the study sample with the expressed social distances measured.

These four problem areas, to be analyzed within this research, will be discussed in the form of statement of hypotheses. The justification for this research will be delineated throughout this chapter and Chapter 2, which discusses in more detail the numerous studies that have been currently conducted in these areas.

V. STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

As indicated, the importance of updating attitudinal or opinional tendencies toward specified minority groups

¹Simpson and Yinger, op. cit., p. 112.

²Ibid., p. 110. The range of scores possible on this index can be from 1.00 through 7.00. A score of 1.00 would indicate very high tolerance or low social distance while a score of 7.00 would be indicative of very low tolerance or high social distance.
appears warranted in social distance research. Based upon this importance, the following hypothesis was formulated and examined:

Hypothesis I:

There are differential degrees of social distance expressed (as defined through index scores) by the research sample toward the minority groups selected for study.

In 1956, Emory S. Bogardus last reported the regional overall mean social distance score for the North Midwest segment of the United States, which included the Des Moines and Ankeny areas. This overall mean was calculated from a national sample and was reported to be (1.96).\(^1\) This mean also illustrated that there was an overall low amount of social distance expressed in this geographical area toward thirty selected minority groups. In general, it is important to compare sub-populations to the overall regional means, as last reported by Bogardus, so as to delineate any significant changes that might have occurred. This point is well articulated by Simpson and Yinger, who write:

In the literature of social distance too little attention has been given to variations. Although there is substantial similarity among groups, some differences have been observed that should not be overlooked. Shared attitudes may be taught to members as part of a sub-culture.\(^2\)

In order to delineate any significant differences between the

\(^1\) Ibid.
\(^2\) Ibid.
overall mean last reported for this regional area by
Bogardus and that reported in this research sample, the fol-
lowing hypothesis appears justified for analysis:

**Hypothesis II:**

There are differences between the overall expressed social
distance indexes of the study sample toward the particular
minority groups selected for study and the 1956 regional
distances last reported by Emory S. Bogardus.

Also apparent is the fact that research dealing with
social distances needs to analyze more the amount and type of
prior social contact that individuals have had with members of
particular minority groups. This aspect of research is
significant in that studies have often indicated that the
amount and type of social contact with minority members
appears to affect attitudes of prejudice. The need for this
type of research does indeed exist and is well stated by
Simpson and Yinger when they state:

> From the results of such studies as we have
> reported we cannot conclude that a decrease in
> prejudice is the inevitable result of equal status
> contact. In the face of contradictory findings we
> must realize the need for a great deal of research
to explore the effects of specific conditions.  

However, this is not to say that research has failed to
indicate possible relationships between expressed prejudices
and social contact. Simpson and Yinger further surmise two
propositions that warrant investigation along these lines.

---


2. Ibid.
These propositions are as follows:

1. Pleasant equal-status contact that makes it necessary for the individuals to cross barriers of class, occupational, and educational differences as well as differences in symbolic (nonfunctional) group membership represented by such symbols as "race" is likely to reduce prejudice.

2. Contacts that bring people of minority and majority groups together in functionally important activities reduce prejudice.\(^1\)

The second proposition is obviously related to the first, and is merely articulated in order to point out the significance of analyzing this type of variable in the research herein presented.

The type of social contact that will be analyzed in this research will be that of "functional" or "positive" social contact that the research sample has had with members of the selected minority groups, and the relationships between this contact and the expressed social distances. These relationships, if any, are essential in analysis for the above-mentioned reasons. For purposes of this research, the amount and type of social contact will be: no contacts, few contacts, and several contacts. These categories will be operationalized as representing low, medium and high social contact, respectively. Hypothesis III then, merits investigation based on the above-mentioned notions. In terms of social contact, this research will address itself to the following hypothesis:

\(^1\)Ibid.
Hypothesis III:

The greater the amount of prior functional social contact with members of the minority groups tested in this study, the lower the expressed social distances.

Various studies focusing upon the area of social distances have acknowledged the fact that particular socioeconomic characteristics have significantly contributed to the degrees of distances reported. This research, in an exploratory manner, attempts to analyze any possible relationships that may exist in terms of race, age, sex, religion, politics, education, marital status, residence, income, and occupation with the mean distances reported by the study sample. Howard J. Ehrlich has drawn attention to the importance of analyzing such socioeconomic characteristics by mentioning the significance of these variables in the type of research being reported in this thesis. Thus, Ehrlich writes:

Behavioral norms are directed toward persons associated with the major social categories in a community or society. In western, industrialized societies these categories are age, sex, race, class (occupation, education and income), religion, nationality, ideology (particularly politician, economic, and religious beliefs), and appearance and interpersonal qualities.¹

These socioeconomic characteristics are significant for analysis in order to determine any particular

relationships that may exist in terms of expressed social
distances. In particular, one socioeconomic characteristic,
such as "race," is not sufficient in explaining degrees of
social distances between groups. This point is articulated
by Simpson and Yinger who write: "The study of "race" alone
will yield little understanding of the nature of prejudice
and discrimination. Prejudice and discrimination can be
understood only as manifestations of larger situations, not
as isolated phenomena."

This research will present a series of specific
hypotheses related to hypothesis number IV. Prior to
delineating the significance of each specific hypothesis,
hypothesis number IV, which warrants investigation for the
above-mentioned reasons, will be stated.

**Hypothesis IV:**

There are differential relationships between the socio-
economic characteristics of the study sample and the
overall mean distances reported toward the minority
groups selected for study.

Due to the general nature of this hypothesis, the significance
of each socioeconomic characteristic will be discussed, and a
specific hypothesis related to it will be articulated.

**Race.** The notion of "race" is significant in this
type of research because it provides an understanding of the
"symbol" that is utilized by populations and sub-populations

---

to set individuals apart in terms of differential social distances. In reference to this research, an attempt is made to determine if the samples' "race" characteristic is related to the social distances reported toward all of the enumerated minority groups. The studies on social distances have reported differences in mean distances according to "race". These studies, discussed in greater depth later in this thesis, generally indicate that both dominant and non-dominant populations differentiate between various minority groups. It is therefore essential to determine if a relationship does exist in terms of "race" for this research. Based on these notions, the following sub-hypothesis appears warranted:

Hypothesis IVa-Race.

There is a relationship between "race" and the over-all mean social distances expressed by the research sample.

Age. There have been numerous studies correlating the age of a population with prejudicial attitudes. Age, as a variable affecting social distances, can be influenced by a particular social setting. In general, studies have not drawn conclusive evidence to greatly support an assumption in terms of age and its relationship to prejudicial tendencies. The studies do state, however, that various age groups may

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., p. 66.
have experienced similar cultural norms that affect the attitudes of particular populations.¹ This research will attempt to analyze any possible relationship, in an exploratory manner, between age and the distances expressed. The following sub-hypothesis, therefore, appears warranted.

**Hypothesis IVb-Age.**

There are differential relationships between the age characteristics of the research sample and the overall mean distances expressed toward the minority groups selected for study.

**Sex.** In 1956 Bogardus found that women expressed greater social distances toward 29 of the 30 minority groups he analyzed.² In regard to sex, reported research findings have varied. Research is still not conclusive enough to determine if sex plays a major part in determining social distance degrees. Therefore, this research will analyze, in an exploratory manner, any possible relationship between sex and the social distances expressed. The following sub-hypothesis, therefore, appears warranted:

**Hypothesis IVc-Sex.**

There are differential relationships between the sex characteristics of the research sample and the overall mean distances expressed toward the particular minority groups selected for study.

**Religion.** Simpson and Vinger note that religious characteristics are significant in terms of prejudices

¹bid.
²bid., p. 110.
attitudes. In their analysis of this topic, they state:

The religious life of the dominant group, as well as of minorities, reflects and affects intergroup relations. We need to ask, therefore, how religious belief and practice affect individual prejudices and how dominant churches respond to minority-group members?¹

As indicated above, there is a need to ask this significant question in research focusing on this area. Religion, as a major variable of concentration, has been associated with numerous research studies delving into the arena of social distances. The variable of religion needs little examination in this type of research. This point is so aptly supported by Simpson and Yinger who point out the role of religion and prejudice.

One might suppose that highly religious people would be less prejudiced against minority groups than would nonreligious people. Indeed it is easy to document the fact that religious motives play an important part in current integration efforts. On the other hand, churches have often been strongholds of bigotry and religious people are among the most intolerant—not simply of those who disagree with them religiously but of minority groups as well.²

Implied within these notions is the point that religion may be considered significant for certain groups in influencing prejudices. Therefore, in an exploratory manner, the following sub-hypothesis merits investigation:

**Hypothesis IVd-Religion.**

There are differential relationships between the religious characteristics of the research sample

---

¹Ibid., p. 387. ²Ibid., p. 396.
and the overall mean distances expressed toward the particular minority groups selected for study.

Political. The political characteristics of a population are important in an analysis involving minority groups. Political characteristics and the importance it plays in influencing prejudicial attitudes is but a part of the numerous complex traits involved.

Historically, events that began during and prior to the slavery era affected the ways of thinking of many individuals. The "Jim Crow" laws that existed in the South, for instance, influenced the political ideologies of many. Currently, because of discrimination in various areas, the Supreme Court has been supportive of legislation affecting the particular character of employment and education. Political characteristics are important in the research under investigation because varying political issues affect varying prejudicial tendencies. In an exploratory manner, therefore, the following sub-hypothesis merits investigation:

**Hypothesis IVe-Politics.**

There are differential relationships between the political characteristics of the research sample, and the overall mean distances expressed toward the particular minority groups selected for study.

**Education.** A number of studies have analyzed the importance of education and its relationship to prejudice.

---

¹Ibid., pp. 190-191.
Many of the social distance studies have utilized student samples in this type of research. Researchers have often analyzed intelligence quotients of various samples and its relationship to social distances. The analysis of education and social distance is significant in that most authorities contend that education reduces prejudice. Education as a variable is significant in this type of research in view of the various Supreme Court decisions making integration of public schools mandatory. In view of such conclusions, education does indeed seem to play an important role in shaping attitudes. Specifically, the effect of education upon individuals appears to be related to the degree of prejudice subsequently exerted by persons and/or groups. Thus, on this point Simpson and Yinger state:

Education can reduce prejudice. There is no likelihood that schools, communities adult education programs, and the like will suddenly develop adequate and widespread studies of prejudice, for they are part of the total society, largely reflecting its traditions and power structure. As with all other variables discussed within this research, education alone cannot adequately give an explanation for prejudice. However, based upon the research currently available, the following sub-hypothesis will be investigated:

**Hypothesis IVf-Education.**

There are differential relationships between the educational characteristics of the research sample, and the overall mean distances expressed toward the particular minority groups selected for study.

---

1. Ibid., p. 511.  
2. Ibid.
Marital status. The investigation of marital status merits analysis in order to determine any possible significant relationship to expressed social distances. American society has within the last decade gone through substantial changes in terms of marriage and family structure.\(^1\) The family unit, and marriage in particular, has been and continues to be a strong socialization agent. It appears that in contemporary mass society, marriage functions to integrate individuals in terms of alienation.\(^2\) The effects of marriage upon prejudiced attitudes merits considerable investigation.

One area that has been explored is that of interracial marriages. This area is discussed herein simply to point out that American society, in terms of prejudice, has experienced various changes. In 1967, for instance, the Supreme Court removed legal barriers that existed for over two hundred years against interracial marriages. It appears that, in general, the American public has become more liberal in terms of accepting interracial marriage as a variable social alternative.\(^3\)

Other studies have concluded that in many instances marriage leads to an integration of the "self."\(^4\) In regard to the particular research selected for this thesis it is important in light of these findings to investigate the

---


\(^2\) Ibid., p. 4.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 278.

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 14.
possible impact that marital status may have upon expressed social distances. Therefore, the following sub-hypothesis will be investigated:

**Hypothesis IVg-Marital Status.**

There is a differential relationship between the marital status of the research sample, and the overall mean distances expressed toward the particular minority groups selected for study.

**Residence.** In regard to residence and the studies on social distance, Emory S. Bogardus and others have investigated possible relationships that may exist. Bogardus, as mentioned earlier, was concerned with the significance of the relationship between geographical areas and social distance. This research attempts to analyze any possible relationships between delineated residential characteristics and the social distances expressed.

Current studies have generally indicated that for various socioeconomic reasons as urban areas grow in size, minority membership also tends to grow. In turn, there appears to be greater social contact between dominant and non-dominant groups in these expanding urban areas, thus in some instances allowing for lesser prejudicial attitudes between groups. In contrast, the lack of numerous minority groups in rural areas leads to lesser social contact and greater prejudices between dominant and non-dominant
groups. In terms of this research, therefore, the following sub-hypothesis will be investigated so as to discern any significant relationships between urban characteristics and social distances:

**Hypothesis IVh-Urban Characteristics.**

The greater the extent of urbanization for the research sample, the lesser the overall mean social distances that will be expressed toward the minority groups selected for study.

**Income.** Income has been selected as a variable for inclusion in this research. Simpson and Yinger note the significance that income plays with reference to prejudiced attitudes. These authors point out that it is more difficult to isolate income as an explanation of prejudice than it is with other variables. Income along with occupation are important stratification variables that usually are included in this type of research so as to investigate their effects upon social distances. These variables will be discussed in more depth in Chapter Two. It is important to note, however, that income as a variable component of social class appears frequently in the literature that focuses upon social distance. Income is usually considered as a social class variable that allows individuals in American society to

---

2 Simpson and Yinger, op. cit., p. 61.
3 Ibid.
achieve status. This status may take various forms. It is important to investigate what effects income has on prejudicial attitudes. Studies that include student populations, such as the one herein presented, generally, although not always, conclude that populations with higher incomes express lower social distances. This is particularly true of studies that have included an analysis of the upper-class strata.

These findings, however, will vary depending upon the other significant variables involved. Based upon the current research focus and need, as indicated by the literature on social class and social distances, the following sub-hypothesis appears warranted:

Hypotnesis IVi-Income.

The higher the reported income of the research sample, the lesser the overall mean social distances expressed toward the minority groups selected for study.

Occupation. Finally, the variable of occupation appears to be important in this type of research for reasons similar to those outlined above. Occupation, like income, is a social class variable that has been correlated with social distances. Research in this area has recently flourished and will be discussed later in this thesis. The following sub-hypothesis will be investigated:

1Ibid., p. 116.
Hypothesis IV j-Occupation.

There are differential relationships between the occupational characteristics of the research sample and the overall mean distances expressed toward the particular minority groups selected for study.

The reader should be aware of the limitations that exist in this research. These limitations will be discussed in the following segment of this chapter.

VI. DELIMITATIONS

The research discussed thus far and later presented in this thesis will have certain limitations. These limitations will be listed in order to clarify methodological and theoretical assumptions.

1. The analysis presented within this research will be of a descriptive nature.

2. Social distances between groups will be measured and viewed as "expressed attitudes or opinions" toward or about particular minority groups. The limitation is, that what a respondent may tabulate on paper, may not necessarily indicate precisely the "true" nature of his or her attitude or opinion.

3. The distances reported in this research are applicable to the period of time and geographical area in which the study was conducted.

4. Many of the socioeconomic characteristics are exploratory in nature in order to determine any possible significant relationships.
In summary, the distances that have occurred between groups have been historically significant within American society, particularly when sociological analysis has been applied. These distances have been expressions of the very nature of prejudice, and have also occurred during those periods of time when religion or "race" have played an important part as a distinguishing factor within American society. The sociologist has the task of documenting the current waves of distances between groups in order to keep pace with the changes that are occurring within the society. This research, then, attempts to descriptively measure the distances between specific groups by utilizing a tool that has historically shown marked reliability and validity of purpose.

The general and specific hypotheses will be tested utilizing the Bogardus Social Distance Scale in an attempt to go beyond simply measuring the expressed social distances of a population.

The socioeconomic characteristics and the amount of "functional" social contact are two significant variables that are incorporated into the analysis. There are delimitations placed upon this research that have been acknowledged.
Chapter 2

PERTINENT LITERATURE RELATING TO THE PROBLEM

The concept of social distance has been empirically measured for over forty years. There have been a variety of techniques utilized in the analysis of social distance. In this chapter, the author will: (1) review the beginnings of the concept of social distance; and (2) discuss early and recent studies and literature focusing on social distance.

Many authors have given much credit for the formulation of the social distance concept to Emory S. Bogardus. However, it is important to note that prior to the operationalization of this idea in terms of research, the concept of social distance was coined by Robert E. Park. This point has been mentioned throughout various articles and is expressed more explicitly by Robert L. Brown.¹ The scales to empirically measure social distance were devised by Bogardus in the 1920's. According to Robert L. Brown, Park initially defined the concept of social distance as: "The degrees and

grades of understanding and feeling that persons experience regarding each other.\textsuperscript{1} Bogardus operationalized this concept and pioneered the early studies on social distance.

I. EARLY STUDIES AND SOCIAL DISTANCE

In 1926 Bogardus first tested the social distance scale. In order to test the scale, Bogardus utilized a population of 1,725 individuals, ages eighteen to thirty-five. Half of these sampled individuals were college students and the other half were college graduates. The respondents that Bogardus used represented thirty-two different geographical areas in the United States. In the total sample, Bogardus utilized 10 percent Black respondents. Bogardus tested the responses of the total group toward thirty different minority groups.\textsuperscript{2} Traditionally, the Bogardus Scale has ranged from 1.00 (the lowest possible distance score) to 7.00 (the highest possible distance score). Bogardus replicated his study again in 1946 (with 1,950 subjects), in 1956 (with 2,053 subjects), and again in 1966 (with 2,650 subjects).\textsuperscript{3} These findings are illustrated in Table I on page 31. Bogardus asked his subjects to mark the relationships to

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{3} Ibid.
which they would be willing to admit members of various minority groups according to differing social relationships. The statements were numbered according to the levels of these relationships and given a numerical value, as follows:

(1 Point) To close kinship by marriage.
(2 Points) To my club as personal chum.
(3 Points) To my street as neighbors.
(4 Points) To employment in my occupation.
(5 Points) To citizenship in my country.
(6 Points) As visitors only to my country.
(7 Points) Would exclude from my country.

Each relationship, beginning with one point, represents the degree to which an individual would accept a minority group member. One point represents the lowest degree of expressed social distance, seven points represents the highest expressed social distance.

During his first investigation in 1926, Bogardus found the following groups to have lesser expressed social distance indexes: First, English (1.06), native White Americans (1.10), and other European groups; then, Spaniards (1.72), Italians (1.94), and generally Southern and Eastern Europeans with the next lowest expressed social distance scores. Lastly, the minority groups with the greatest expressed social distance were Orientals (2.80-3.00), and Blacks (3.28). These mean index scores are illustrated in Column I, Table I on page 31.

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
There are other important points mentioned in the research done by Bogardus that warrants notation. Bogardus himself noted that a majority of the individuals that filled out the questionnaires were of Northern European ancestry. This factor supported the proposition that: "The members of a racial group will give the racial group representing their own ethnic heritage the least distance scores."¹ According to Bogardus the above characteristics appear to be based on the acquaintance and, probably more important, the loyalties of each group to its own ethnic group.

There are other important points that should also be enumerated before continuing the discussion of the distances for the other time periods. Bogardus mentioned that the middle sectors (see Table I, sectors 11-19), represent chiefly people with Southern and Eastern European backgrounds. Also, Mexican-American and Japanese-Americans were not listed by Bogardus in the first column because there were too few numbers of these minority groups to justify their inclusion.² These points are important for the following reasons: (1) it is significant to analyze the similarities in distances expressed in his later studies, and (2) the distances in all of his studies appear to cluster around the same distance degrees for particular groups. Bogardus

²Ibid.
Table 1: Changes in Racial Distance Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Racial Distance Indices Given</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Racial Distance Indices Given</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>Racial Distance Indices Given</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Racial Distance Indices Given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racial Groups in 1926 by 1,725 Selected Persons throughout the U.S.</td>
<td>Racial Groups in 1946 by 1,950 Selected Persons throughout the U.S.</td>
<td>Racial Groups in 1956 by 2,053 Selected Persons throughout the U.S.</td>
<td>Racial Groups in 1966 by 2,605 Selected Persons throughout the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. English</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Americans (U.S. white)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Canadians</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Scots</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Irish</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. French</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Germans</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Swedish</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hollanders</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Norwegians</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Spanish</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Finns</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Russians</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Italians</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Poles</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Armenians</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Czechs</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Indians (American)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Jews</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Greeks</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Mexicans</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mexican Americans</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Japanese</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Japanese Americans</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Filipinos</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Negroes</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Turks</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Chinese</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Koreans</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Indians (from India)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arithmetic Mean of 48,300 Racial Reactions: 2.14
Spread in Distance: 2.85

Arithmetic Mean of 58,500 Racial Reactions: 2.12
Spread in Distance: 2.87

Arithmetic Mean of 61,590 Racial Reactions: 2.08
Spread in Distance: 1.75

Arithmetic Mean of 78,150 Racial Reactions: 1.92
Spread in Distance: 1.56

Source: Emory S. Bogardus, "Comparing Racial Distance in Ethiopia, South Africa, and the United States," Sociology and Social Research, LII (1968), 152. (By permission of Emory S. Bogardus and Sociology and Social Research; University of Southern California; Los Angeles, California 90007).
reported in his writings that when comparing the distances in the first two columns, the Racial Distance Indices given to the minority groups in 1926 by 1,725 selected persons and the Racial Distance Indices given to the minority groups in 1946 by 1,950 selected persons show similarities. Specifically, the minority groups in the upper two sections showed no great changes during these periods between 1926 and 1946. (See the arrows indicating changes in direction on page 31, Table I.) Bogardus mentioned, however, that when one analyzes the bottom sectors across all columns, a marked decrease in the expressed Social Distance Index scores occurred.\(^1\) In general, Bogardus stated:

The arithmetic mean of all the racial distance scores decreased by short steps from 2.14 in 1926 to 1.92 in 1946, or 22 points. While not extensive, this decrease is large enough to suggest a limited closing of racial ranks.\(^2\)

Also, interestingly enough, the changes in distances between the periods of 1946 and 1956 were affected by social changes within American society closely associated with World War II.

The specific studies that were conducted by Bogardus during the various time periods noted above provided him with numerous hypotheses that were and continue to be utilized in up-dating and testing. Bogardus has summed up his findings

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 154.
\(^2\)Ibid.
and provided his hypotheses for other researchers to utilize in conducting additional analysis. These hypotheses are stated below.

1. Over a forty-year span there has been a measurable decrease in racial distances in the United States experienced by many races.

2. This comprehensive decrease in racial distances would have been greater had it not been slowed down by World War II, the Cold War, a serious economic Depression, and by antiracial propaganda that usually accompanies social conflicts.

3. The decrease in racial distances in the United States, barring a national catastrophe, may be expected to continue in the next forty years very much as it has done in the past forty years, but at a decreasing rate as the distances between the nearest races and the other races become progressively shortened. Moreover, the data of this study do not indicate that racial distances will disappear entirely in any foreseeable future.

4. The over-all decrease in social distance has been fostered by a developing appreciation of the similarities in the basic human needs and longings of all racial groups.

5. These developments in sympathetic understanding have been stimulated by persons acting both as individuals and as members of social organizations and institutions, such as the public schools, which have proved a common ground on which most American youth have been able to meet regularly in terms of democratic interaction.

6. The decrease in racial distances in the United States indicates that there is taking place, however slowly and irregularly, a melding of cultures from many lands into an American culture more composite and more cosmopolitan, also more dynamic and stimulating than has heretofore functioned in the United States.

7. While the statistical study of racial relations over forty years points to changes in, and possibly to trends in these, the research is made more meaningful by comprehensive interviewing in depth of representative persons in order to ascertain the nature and the strength of the motivational forces.1

---

1 Ibid., pp. 155-156.
After Bogardus did his first study on social distance in 1926, other researchers followed the recommended practices for social distance analysis and conducted numerous investigations. Bogardus himself replicated his original studies with different populations. An example of such replication was a study utilizing a population of 110 businessmen and school teachers on the West coast. Bogardus found patterns of distances expressed by these groups toward the various minority groups similar to those he had found in his prior research.¹ Other authors that conducted early studies on social distance include: Guilford, Hartley, Zeligs and Hendrickson, Katz and Braly, Bayton, Ehrlich, Prothro and Jenson, and Gilbert. These authors' contributions will be individually discussed, for they have contributed greatly to the total research done in the area of social distance.

In 1931, Guilford analyzed patterns of prejudice for seven separate colleges in the United States, finding patterns of similar distances among the institutions. The authors found correlations ranging from .84 to .99, indicating high expressed social distances.²

---


In reference to cross-comparative research and social distances, between 1926-1936 investigators discovered that when they applied the social distance scale to various populations, similar distances were expressed toward particular minority groups by these populations. For instance, Hartley researched cross-comparatively the attitudes toward various minority groups for two different female college populations (Bennington College, Vermont, and Howard University, Washington, D.C.). In 1946, Hartley found the same pattern of distances expressed by both populations toward the various minority groups as Bogardus had found in 1926. This investigation led Hartley to state that: "This pattern of prejudice is practically an American institution."\(^1\)

Earlier researchers also became interested in the types of responses that would be given by minority groups themselves in terms of expressed social distances. Zeligs and Hendrickson, for instance, found a correlation of .87 between the rankings of Jewish and non-Jewish children.\(^2\) Bogardus himself cross-compared the findings of the

---


previously mentioned authors to those of the minority groups that were tested and found marked similarities in expressed distances. Table 2 illustrates these similar expressed social distances given by minority groups themselves to those given in the study done by Zeligs and Hendrickson.

Table 2*

Comparison by Bogardus of Expressed Distances Toward Various Minority Groups in Different Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native White Businessmen and School Teachers</th>
<th>American Negroes</th>
<th>Native-born Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. French</td>
<td>2. French</td>
<td>2. English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Italian</td>
<td>5. Mexican</td>
<td>5. Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This comparison leads to the following conclusions when comparing the expressed social distances for the three groups in these studies:

1. The indigenous populations tended to rank themselves highest.
2. The distances expressed toward the various groups appeared to have a similar pattern in each study.

The early studies discussed above are significant in that they paved the way for other research done in the area of social distance. Early studies that dealt with social distances between groups also took other significant trends in research analysis. These other early studies will be discussed next.

A. OTHER EARLY SOCIAL DISTANCE STUDIES

In regard to other early studies that bear significant contributions to social distance literature, the analysis of comparing responses by sex was conducted. For example, Bogardus tested and found greater distances expressed by females than by males toward the thirty minority groups that were selected for analysis in a study administered in 1956. Bogardus found at the time of the study the following expressed social distance averages toward the thirty groups: For females the average was (2.17), and for males the average was (1.97). This analysis is important for the research presented in this thesis in that the sex characteristic may affect social distances as it did in the above-mentioned study conducted by Bogardus.

In reference to regional variations, Bogardus during this time period found expressed social distance averages to vary according to geographic region. Thus, he found higher expressed social distances in the Southern portion of the United States than elsewhere. Specifically, these findings were as follows: Northeast 2.06, South 2.10, North Midwest 1.96, and Pacific West 1.97. The significance of these findings is noted in that within the geographical confines of the research found in this thesis, the overall social distances in comparison to these findings mentioned above warrant analysis.

All of the studies on social distances discussed thus far attempted to describe the "typical" members and the distances between these groups.

Another approach that began to emerge in the late 1950's and early 1960's was not only to tabulate general social distances of student population but also to tabulate responses pertaining to certain groups in other social situations. This approach was taken by Westie who began to tabulate responses toward Blacks in varying occupations.  

---


Westie measured the responses of White respondents to different occupations of Blacks. The sample was comprised of sixty lower class, fifty-six middle class, and fifty-eight upper-class Whites that were chosen as a random sample in Indianapolis. Westie also utilized the social distance method in his study for analytical purposes. A summary of the findings is as follows:

1. Lower-class Whites made very little distinction of Blacks in various occupations, whether the Blacks were doctors, bankers, machine operators, or ditch diggers.

2. The score of 24 represented the maximum social distance. Lower-class Whites averaged from 14.03 to 15.10, for the eight occupations listed in the study. This was a range of only 1.07.

3. The middle-class Whites ranged in scores from 10.91 to 13.09, thus indicating, according to the author, less distance and willingness to distinguish more sharply among Blacks in various occupational groups.

The author pointed out that the study was crude in terms of social class and encouraged researchers to incorporate other significant variables, such as education, region of birth, residence, and other socioeconomic indicators. As indicated at the beginning of this thesis, the analysis of income and occupation merit further observation in this type of research as indicated by the work of Westie and other significant research studies in this area.

\[1\text{Ibid., p. 558.}\]  \[2\text{Ibid.}\]
Another significant study that investigated social class was the study done by Triandis and Triandis. These authors also viewed various populations and began to incorporate miscellaneous socioeconomic variables, such as social class, into their analysis. For instance, the authors found that race accounted for 77 percent of the distances between Whites and other groups, and class accounted for 16.6 percent.\(^1\) These authors also point out the significance of these variables for further analysis in this type of research.

The above enumerated research paved the way for other recent analyses in the area of social distance. The contributions made by various studies will be discussed in the following segment of this chapter.

II. RECENT STUDIES AND SOCIAL DISTANCE

Within the last decade the reported literature concerning social distance has followed numerous trends. Among these trends, cross-comparative analysis has focused on various other societies. Among the more important of the variables that have been controlled are occupation, income, race, residence, and education. These studies are varied and will be selectively discussed in this section.

Recently, Osgood and others, in a manner similar to that used by Bogardus, have devised various methods of measuring differential responses toward minority groups. For instance, the Semantic Differential Test is an instrument devised with twelve pairs of adjectives. Only six of the adjectives are used to evaluate the respondent's attitudinal response toward a member or members of a particular group. The adjectives are placed on a continuum. In a method similar to that developed by Bogardus, the respondent receives a score that can range from one through seven. The number one represents the least favorable response while seven characterizes the most favorable answer. This technique is discussed here because the process of tabulation is similar to that devised by Emory S. Bogardus. The term depicting a minority group, concept, or individual is placed at the top of the major instrument and the respondent reacts to the adjectives that have been selected for measurement randomly along the continuum. The adjectives that are used in the evaluation alternate, beginning with unpleasant, good, foul, clean, nice, and sacred. Table 3 illustrates this technique. Utilizing this particular method, Morland and Williams administered the Semantic Differential Test to measure attitudes of five groupings in four other societies.

Table 3
Osgood Differential Continuum

Person

unpleasant:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: ________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: pleasant
strong:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: weak
good:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: bad
slow:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: fast
fool:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: fragrant
small:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: large
clean:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: dirty
call:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: sharp
cute:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: awful
active:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: passive
sacred:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: profane
heavy:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________:________: light


Note: The 12 pairs of adjectives were used for each of the racial-ethnic concepts. The pairs of evaluative adjectives were also used to determine attitude-indexes.
The groupings measured were: American Caucasians, American Blacks, Asiatic Indians, German Caucasian, and Hong Kong Chinese. The sample was comprised of the following: 180 American Caucasians (110 from Wake Forrest University and 70 from Washburn University); 60 American Blacks from Winston-Salem College; 60 Asiatic Indians from Government College in Culbaria, Andra Pradesh, and from the School of Social Work in Hyderabad; 29 German Caucasians from West Germany, and 60 Hong Kong Chinese. The sample had equal representation of males and females except for the Indian group. 1 As mentioned earlier, the author used the Osgood Semantic Differential Test which was devised in 1957. The words that were listed were translated for each group into the appropriate language. The mean scores were calculated and a summary was made of the findings. The authors found the following:

1. The word "friend" was favored or evaluated more favorably than the word "enemy."
2. The word "foreigner" was rated less favorably than the word "citizen."
3. Each group rated its own group favorable.
4. The Chinese rated themselves most favorable of all.
5. The study concluded that cross-cultural measurement did produce some similarities to social distance responses. 2

1 Morland and Williams, op. cit., p. 107.
2 Ibid., op. 110-112.
This particular research utilized a methodological approach in measuring responses toward minority groups that was similar to that utilized by Bogardus. The authors plotted mean distances or directions based on the adjectives that acted as stimuli.

In the application of the social distance scale numerous attempts have been made to utilize the technique for educational purposes. For instance, a study conducted by Lever, in 1965, attempted to apply educational stimuli to those students that expressed greater distances. The subjects were composed of 210 students that were attending a first year course in Sociology at Witwatersrand University, South Africa. This was a "before and after" type of research in which the students were given the Bogardus social distance scale before and after various situations. The students were exposed to different educational stimuli, such as a value lecture, a discussion group, a reading group, and a neutral lecture. The researchers were interested in tabulating the attitudes toward "Africans and Coloreus." In the first instance the subjects were asked to respond to various groups, such as: African Whites, African (natives of Bantu), Coloreus (non-whites of mixed blood), Afrikaans (whites who speak South African), British, Indians, Germans, and Winarians (an invented or contrived
the subjects into four main experimental groups. These
groups were matched according to: (1) sex, and (2) religious
affiliation, and, obviously, (3) social distance expressed
toward the "Coloreds" and "Africans." The authors then
exposed these four experimental groups to various stimuli.

The stimuli were the following:

1. Group I was exposed to a lecture session with a
White lecturer concerning "race" and intelligence.
Environmental influences on "race" and intelligence
was also discussed. This group was comprised of
fifty-four subjects.

2. Group II was given the same information as Group I,
except that the lecture was mimeographed and the
students were asked to familiarize themselves with
the material. This group was comprised of thirty
subjects.

3. Group III was given the articles and did not dis-
cuss the material. This group was comprised of
fifty-one subjects.

4. Group IV was the control group. This group was
exposed to neutral lectures without any internal
attitudinal influences, the topic being "Sociology
of Art." This group was comprised of seventy-five
subjects.

The subjects were not aware of their participation in this
experiment. The students were also made to attend the
sessions for twelve weeks. During this period, two tests

\[1\] H. Lever, "An Experimental Modification of Social
Distance in South Africa," Human Relations, XVII (Septem-
ber, 1965), 150.

\[2\] Ibid.

\[3\] Ibid., p. 151.
were given, one at the beginning and another at the end of the course.\(^1\) Based upon the research, the authors concluded the following:

1. The distance decreased toward "Afrikans" the greatest for the group exposed toward the lecturer which discussed the topic of environmental influences on race and intelligence.

2. The distance decreased the least for the reading group.

3. The same distances were held toward the "Coloreds."

4. The lecture and discussion groups had the greatest effect on the distances.\(^2\)

This type of research found an effective method of utilizing the Social Distance Scale in an educational setting and attempted to change attitudinal directions by exposing students to various stimuli. There are other significant studies that have emerged and will now be enumerated.

A. Income and Occupation

Recent social distance studies focusing upon justifications for the inclusion of income and occupation as significant variables for analysis in this research was discussed briefly in Chapter 1. Further, recently research on social distance has been completed correlating the variables of income and occupation into the analysis. For example, Laumann analyzed the Subjective Social Distance toward various

\(^1\)Ibid.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 155.
occupations and how this was related to occupational and class locations. In this study, 422 white males from Cambridge and Belmont, Massachusetts, were utilized.¹ Laumann was particularly interested in the stratification variable of occupation as well as the preference the subjects showed in desiring to interact with others of higher occupational prestige.² Laumann defined Subjective Social Distance as: "The attitude of a person toward another person with a particular status attribute (occupationally) which determines the character of the interaction the person would take."³

The author utilized the Bogardus Social Distance Scale which he revised by incorporating into it a Likert-type means of analysis. The subjects were asked to agree or disagree in degrees to the Bogardus social relationships. The author also stratified the populations according to how the subjects viewed themselves in terms of stratification. The following conclusions were attained by Laumann as a result of this research:

1. The upper-class individuals felt closer to higher status occupations than the lower-class individuals.

2. The subjects preferred to establish intimate social relationships with other persons of comparable occupational status or prestige.


²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 28.
3. The respondents preferred contacts with individuals having higher prestige and occupations of higher status.\(^1\)

Another study that also analyzes occupation and income as variables in social distance research is reported by Green and Alston. The authors in this particular research were interested in the similarities and differences of the expressed attitudinal distances among eight broad occupational categories in the United States. The authors utilized 113 national survey questions that came from the Gallup polls, and three National Opinion Research Center surveys that were conducted between 1953-1965.\(^2\) The authors concluded the following:

1. Skilled workers, considered as a whole, were more similar in reported attitudes and behaviors to the rest of the Working Class than to White-Collar workers.

2. All categories within the working class were found by the authors to be similar to one another.

3. All the non-manual categories were similar to one another, but Middle-Class individuals lacked consensus.

4. Farmers, considered as a whole, were more similar in reported attitudes and behaviors to the Working Class than to the Middle-Class.

5. Lastly, skilled manual workers in the United States on a whole were considered more of a part of the Working Class than the Middle Class or of a Middle-Class mass.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 26.


\(^3\) Ibid., p. 55-56.
These previously mentioned studies discuss the relevance that the variables of income and occupation play in social distance research. The studies also point out the need for further analysis of these variables, a major focus of the research reported in this thesis.

Another study that has analyzed the variable of occupation in a cross-comparative approach was reported by Davis and Orgen. In this particular study, the authors were concerned with the occupational variable and the role distances that occurred in the Kibbutz communal working environment.\(^1\) Utilizing the analytical technique of participant observation, the authors were interested in the following: "How much role or social distance will suffice without disruption to the enterprise and what the devices and strategies are that facilitate the maintenance of adequate, non-disruptive social distance at work?"\(^2\) The authors in this analysis described the historical development and how this accounted for the different types of ethnic groups that comprised the Kibbutz system. The authors mentioned that the Kibbutz was developed by Canadians, Americans, Arabs, and Israelites.\(^3\) The authors observed and concluded

---


\(^2\) Ibid.

\(^3\) Ibid.
the following:

1. Some of the Kibbutz members preferred jobs with minimal contacts with others.

2. The "sick-role" as a traditional social distance idea with regard to actors deviating from being "well" in the American society was not similarly observed in the Kibbutz.

3. The greatest social distance, occupationally, was displayed toward other Kibbutz members during work by those members of the Kibbutz that prepared the meals.1

Additionally, in this research, Davis and Orgen introduced the concept of "Social Space." The authors suggested that "Social Space" should be incorporated along with the analysis of social distance.

These studies illustrate the current trend that income and occupation is taking as variables in social distance research. The emphasis appears to be not solely in prejudicial tendencies, but also in expressed attitudes in various social situations. Further, the studies demonstrate that various strata and sub-populations will react differently in terms of expressed social distances.

In regard to the research that deals with social distances between groups, several observers have become interested in the stereotyping of particular minority groups. This type of analysis goes beyond the simple tabulation of social distances, the context in which these

1Ibid., p. 200.
social distances occur is analyzed. Recent analysis indicates that stereotyping has appeared to be significant within the area of social distance research. The following section will discuss some of the early and recent studies as they relate to the area of social distances.

B. Stereotyping As a Variable in Social Distance Research

At the turn of the decade, between 1930-1940, researchers became interested not only in social distances, but also the patterns of stereotyping that were occurring in American society. During this time researchers began to study the particular stereotypes that groups expressed toward each other. For instance, Katz and Braly implemented the idea of utilizing and testing various adjectives that were attributed to certain minority groups. The authors adapted information from other social distance studies in order to test attitudes with respect to these adjectives. Katz and Braly asked those students who were used as subjects to list traits they felt were typical of certain minority groups. The researchers enumerated over eighty-four traits on a list. The most typical traits that appeared repeatedly were analyzed and included the following for Blacks: "superstitious, lazy, happy-go-lucky, ignorant and musical." The traits most attributed the German group were: "scientifically-minded, industrious, stolid, intelligent, and ambitious." The traits most attributed to the Jewish group
were "shrewd, mercenary, industrious, grasping, intelligent
and ambitious."\(^1\) Out of eighty-four traits the student
sample selected those traits mentioned above repeatedly for
those particular minority groups.\(^2\)

Another study, conducted by Bayton, utilized tech-
niques similar to those previously employed by Katz and Braly.
The authors, however, were interested in stereotyping stemming
from minority groups themselves.\(^3\) Utilizing one hundred Black
students from Virginia State College, Bayton demonstrated that
minority members themselves expressed stereotypes of various
minority groups similar to those stated by dominant groups.\(^4\)

During the period between 1950-1960, researchers
found that the pattern of stereotyping various minority
groups had definitely existed. For example, Howard Ehrlich
asked university students in midwestern schools to react to
forty-seven traits that were unfavorable of Blacks and Jews,
or both. Ehrlich found that eight traits were assigned to
Jews, including the following: "distinctive, cohesive,
econic, elite, exclusive and ethnocentric, and aggressive
and exploitative." Five characteristics were given for

\(^1\) David Katz and Kenneth Braly, "Racial Stereotypes
of One Hundred College Students," Journal of Abnormal
Psychology, XXVII (October, 1935), 280-290, cited in Simpson
and Vinger, op. cit., p. 115.

\(^2\) Ibid.

\(^3\) J. A. Bayton, "The Racial Stereotypes of Negro Col-
lege Students," Journal of American Sociological Publication,

\(^4\) Ibid.
Blacks, including the following: "classic, primitive, 
irresponsible, lazy and ignorant."1 The author pointed out 
that eight other unfavorable traits were given to both, and 
that these negative traits were qualified by the assignment 
of twenty-four favorable statements to each group.2

Another study, this one reported by Gilbert, found 
that there were some variations in the original study done 
by Katz and Braly. Gilbert noted some similar responses with 
reference to traits reported, but also found that there was 
some resistance to stereotyping. This resisting took the 
form of few respondents reporting the same traits that had 
been reported in Katz and Braly's earlier study.3 In 
replicating the study done by Katz and Braly, Gilbert found 
changes in the stereotyping toward the Black group.4 These 
changes are represented below in figures and percentages. 
The reader should note the following: (1) The first figure 
represents the percentage who in 1953 checked the adjective 
applying to Blacks in the Katz and Braly study. (2) The 
figure following represents the percentage who checked that

1Howard Ehrlich, "Stereotyping and Negro-Jewish 

2Ibid.

3R. M. Gilbert, "Stereotyping Persistence and Change 
Among College Students," Journal of American Sociological 

4Ibid., p. 251.
adjective in Gilbert's study. This comparison is illustrated as follows: superstitious, 84 (41); lazy, 75 (31); happy-go-lucky, 38 (17); ignorant, 38 (24); and musical, 26 (33).\(^1\) Gilbert also suggested in his study that there were changes in stereotyping for Germans, Jews and Italians; thus, suggesting a reduction in stereotyping.\(^2\) The author also suggested that the changes were due to: (1) changes in student body, (2) the growth and influence of the social sciences, and (3) a reduction in the stereotyping in the media.\(^3\)

Recently, studies that analyze stereotyping and social distances have shown changes in the patterns of stereotyping. There are, however, studies that indicate that there still remains apparent stereotyping toward particular minority groups. For example, Alfert analyzed the existence of stereotyping in a recent study. The author selected subjects who were participating in a training program. The respondents were asked to rate one White and Black class member of the same sex who were unknown to them at the time of the first meeting of the training session.\(^4\) The author utilized this procedure in order to acquire responses from subjects that were a non-college population. The author in this particular

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 252.  
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 253.  
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 254.  
study was interested in knowing whether or not there had occurred modification in stereotyping due to changes in the society, especially in such areas as the media and education. The subjects were asked to respond to those traits they felt belonged to Whites and Blacks. The traits included such items as the following: "superstitious, religious, interesting, individualistic, demanding, loyal, inhibited," as well as others. Based on her study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Black members were seen by their White peers as more "superstitious and more religious."

2. While Whites were seen as more "interesting, individualistic, demanding, loyal, impulsive, outspoken, self-assured, and more conceited."

3. Blacks were seen as more "inhibited, and envious."

4. The adjective that significantly discriminated between Whites and Blacks was "superstitious."

5. The author stated that: "even though recent studies have indicated decreases in stereotyping, it still appears."

Other studies of stereotyping have shown, in particular, a relationship to social distances. One such study was done by Henning G. Viljoen. In this particular research, Viljoen demonstrated the partial relationship that stereotyping had with social distances. Subjects were asked to

---

1Ibid.  
2Ibid., p. 90.  
3Ibid., p. 90.  
respond to ethnic groups in South Africa. Specifically, this study was aimed at determining the stereotypes and social distances of African and Indian students toward the different ethnic groups in South Africa. The particular minority groups in South Africa were: Afrikaans, English-speaking Whites, Coloreds, Jews, and Indians. The authors used the Katz and Braly technique for measuring stereotypes. Also, the Bogardus Social Distance Scale was employed in measuring the distances. Viljoen used first-year university students in psychology classes at the African universities. The subjects were described as coming from the following areas: North, (125 subjects), Fort Hare (90 subjects), Zululand (100 subjects), and (104 subjects) from the Indian University at Durban. The author's analysis illustrated the partial relationship between stereotyping and social distance with the following conclusions:

1. An overall positive stereotype image of an ethnic group was accompanied by fairly close social contact.

2. Subjects of all universities stereotyped English-speaking Whites in positive terms, such as "courteous, hospitable, generous, intelligent, and liberalistic."

3. The second dimension of closeness on the scale, "admit them to my club as personal friends," was 35-55 percent of all the responses, but without corresponding negative or positive stereotypes.

---

1 Ibid. 2 Ibid., p. 314. 3 Ibid. 4 Ibid., p. 317.
4. English-speaking Whites were stereotyped, according to the author, in more positive terms than the self-stereotype of the Africans and Indians, or the stereotypes of the other dark-skinned ethnic group; the "Coloreds."

5. Viljoen, however, pointed out in this study that maintenance of a closer social distance with members of similar in-groups, or other darker-skinned ethnic groups, was preferred to that with the English-speaking Whites.

6. Viljoen mentioned that the assumed relationship between stereotyping and social distances could be established for all ethnic groups.¹

This study is important for it demonstrates the relationship between stereotyping and social distance.

Currently, within American society, research studies have questioned the existing amount and type of stereotyping. As noted above, studies have varied on this point. Recently, studies such as the one conducted by Terrence S. Luce continue to point out the existence of stereotyping toward particular groups.² The analysis of stereotyping within the area of social distance research is significant for analysis because of the fact that it allows the sociologist to determine the social climate in which social distances are expressed.

One other area that merits discussion within the scope of stereotyping and social distances is that of sex

¹Ibid.

²Terrence S. Luce, "Blacks, Whites and Yellows: They All Look Alike to Me," Psychology Today, November, 1974, pp. 100-108.
differences. As noted at the beginning of this chapter, Bogardus indicated that expressed distances occurred more frequently by females toward the thirty minority groups investigated in his analysis.¹ Studies that deal with stereotyping, social distances and sex differences have indicated the need for further analysis. Meni Koslowsky has recently illustrated this point in a study that analyzes sex differences in stereotyping.² Koslowsky discusses such studies as the one done by Abate and Berrien in 1967, that mentioned that females stereotype more than males.³ This particular research, conducted by Koslowsky, concluded that females stereotype less than males.⁴ The study examined stereotyping for each sex by comparing the degrees of uniformity in the assigning of adjectives to various ethnic groups. The data revealed that for four ethnic groups, Jews, Germans, Japanese, and Israelis, a sample of 214 males and 186 females expressed a difference when responding to the above mentioned adjectives. The author found that, in

¹For a further discussion, the reader should see pp. 37-38 of this thesis.


⁴Koslowsky, op. cit.
general, more stereotyping existed by males than females toward these four minority groups. The researcher also noted that perhaps these findings were due to females being more "receptive than males to inner stimuli such as emotional, intuitive cues." This study indicates the need for further analysis with regard to attitudes expressed toward varying minority groups by males and females.

C. Other Social Distance Studies

Within the area of social distance research, as indicated above, studies have utilized various variables for analysis. In this section the author will discuss other specific studies that have been done in the area of social distance. To begin with, as noted throughout this chapter, the studies that have analyzed expressed social distances have utilized various student populations in the analysis. A current example of this technique is the study done by Payne, and others. The researchers of this particular analysis gathered data from four colleges. The researchers, employing the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, utilized four introduction to psychology classes at different schools in Georgia. The authors generally concluded that social distances had decreased toward most of the minority groups

---

1 Ibid., p. 670.
tested in this geographic area by Bogardus.\(^1\) However, the researchers found that the social distances continued to occur toward the following groups: Cubans, Filipinos, and Blacks.\(^2\) As indicated by this study, variations in expressed social distances appear to continue by various sub-populations.

Lastly, with regard to changes in social distances that have been currently expressed by minority groups themselves, other authors have indicated changes for particular minority groups. For instance, Prothro and Jensen found that Blacks expressed greater distances toward the Jewish group in their study.\(^3\)

There are many other significant studies that have analyzed the various variables discussed throughout this chapter. In light of all the above mentioned research, the analysis of social distances within American society continues to draw the attention of sociologists.

III. SUMMARY

Much research focusing on the subject of social distance has taken place within the last forty years. The

---

\(^1\) H. Carr Payne, Jr., C. Michael York, and John Fayan, "Changes in Measured Social Distance over Time," Sociometry, XXXVII, No. 1 (Fall, 1974), 131-136.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 131.

concept of social distance, although measured by Emory S. Bogardus, was originally coined by Robert E. Parks. The Bogardus studies in 1926, 1956, and 1966 utilized national samples in measuring the distances that occurred toward various minority groups during those particular time periods. In general, within American society, the social distance scales administered between the 1920's and 1950's showed a similar pattern of distances for particular groups, especially those groups within the society influenced by cultural variation or changes in attitudes during and after periods of war. Although the mean distances toward a number of groups has remained the same, studies done in the early 1960's indicate a change in some of the mean distances reported. Researchers became interested during this period in tabulating not only the attitudes expressed from the dominant group within the society toward various minority groups, but also, the distances that were expressed by minority groups toward themselves and other groups.

Recent studies on social distance have shown various trends. The increased use of cross-comparative analysis is one such trend that has occurred in the research on social distances. Miscellaneous socioeconomic variables have been associated with social distances. The research indicates a need for further analysis of these variables and the role they play in social distance research. Also, recently, the
variables of income and occupation appear to draw much attention for research. The need for further analysis of these particular variables and the role they play in social distance research is well documented by studies discussed within this thesis.

The issue of stereotyping has also played a significant part in the social distance literature, for researchers have established the relationship that exists between stereotyping and social distances. The investigation of stereotyping in social distance analysis is crucial in that stereotyping research contributes to the analysis of contextual social distances. This contributes not only to the fact that social distances occur between particular groups, but also the analysis contributes to an understanding of what the stereotypes are that groups have toward each other. Katz and Braly began to analyze the notions of particular characteristics that have been applied to various minority groups. The Osgood Semantic Differential contributed greatly to measuring these traits or adjectives by specifically utilizing a continuum approach, methodologically similar to the method used by Bogardus. Recent studies have also pointed out the need for further analysis of sex differences, social distances and stereotyping. Finally, the literature in social distance research has indicated that changes in social distances prevail, but continue to exist and should be of interest to the sociologist.
Chapter 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter will deal with the theoretical and conceptual framework from which the research reported in this thesis will be explained. Specifically, the theoretical framework utilized herein will focus on perspectives relating to social change. Within the general framework of social change, conflict theory will be delineated as the particular focal point from which the herein defined research will be analyzed. The justification for utilizing conflict theory in this type of research will be delineated in the discussion. Also, in order to maintain clarity, pertinent concepts will be defined so as to provide the reader with a consistent and definitive interpretive scheme.

I. SOCIAL CHANGE AND ITS MEANING

Theoretically, Vander Zanden maintains that social change processes within American society are not static. The basic precepts that lie behind social change have usually been applied to the inevitable accumulation and growth of technology and urbanization. However, social change is also applicable analytically to the interaction
processes that occur between and among social groups. Vander Zanden contends that these changes are important for analysis.¹

Social change theory maintains that the interaction processes between individuals, groups, or societies are not static, but rather are in a process of continuous motion. This is significant for this thesis, because, as mentioned in the previous chapter, it is vital to update and analyze the changes taking place between groups with regard to human interaction.

Social change has been defined as a non-static phenomenon, as is well stated by Zaltman who writes:

We define social change as a process by which alteration occurs in the structure and function of a social system. Change is seen as a process, not as a state. Because of its process nature, social change is without beginning or end, continuous and flowing through time. For analytical purposes, we often dissect social change as if the process could be temporarily and heuristically stopped.²

Implicit within this definition is the basic conceptualization that human behavior is undergoing a constant or continuous flow of change. With these basic ideas in mind, we

should be able to analytically view social distance between
groups as perpetually in the process of being affected by
social structural changes.

The necessity of utilizing social change as a
theoretical framework in social distance research, while
keeping in mind some of the problems with this theoretical
analysis, is articulated particularly well by Nelson and
Strauss who write:

Change is a normal process and a trait of social
life. Socialization processes changes the individual.
Despite the rich tradition in sociology devoted to the
analysis of change— as witnessed by Marx's notions
about economy, Spencer's ideas on differentiation,
Comte on the stages of society, explaining change is
still a problem. There are various theories, linear-
evolutionary theories, and equilibrium theories, but,
currently, none have acquired widespread acceptance.
Each theory is suited for explaining a specific set
of circumstances. Conceptually, the problem of change
is faced with defining at what time is one thing old
or new? Another problem is acquiring information from
the past. Countless attempts have been made to con-
trast contemporary attitudes with attitudes of the
past. The past attitudes are not really a clear
measure. However, replication is relevant to analyze
changes.1

As mentioned above, one of the theoretical problems
that must be approached concerns the need for any particular
theory of social change to adequately explain those social
phenomena under observation. Before elaborating on the
particular theory of social change utilized in this

1Murray A. Strauss and Joel I. Nelson, Sociological
Analysis: An Empirical Approach Through Replication
research, it is appropriate, in light of "change," to view various authors' contributions to the theoretical perspectives of social change.

II. THEORIES OF SOCIAL CHANGE

In this section, the author proposes to discuss representative theories of social change. These theories will be discussed in order to give the reader an introduction to the general types and nature of social change theory. Also, this analysis is vital for it traces those significant contributions to social change theory. The understanding of the role social change theory has played and continues to play is vital as part of this type of research.

As noted by Appelbaum, theories of social change generally deal with two phenomena: (1) social, and (2) change.1 The sociologist is interested in how the behavior of an actor reflects the "exteriority" of a group and vice versa. Socially, the group is important. In terms of change, various dimensions are theoretically analyzed. These dimensions include: magnitude of change, time span, and effects.2 In general, according to Appelbaum, social change theories appear to be of four types.

---

2Ibid.
1. **Evolutionary Theory**: Which characterizes change as occurring in a smooth, cumulative, linear fashion and in the direction of complexity and adaptability.

2. **Equilibrium Theory**: Characterized by the concept of homeostasis, and focuses on stable conditions.

3. **Conflict Theory**: Characterized by change being endemic to social systems and focuses on conditions that are contributory in terms of instability.

4. **Rise and Fall Theory**: Characterized by assumptions that societies and social systems regress as well as grow.¹

These four types of social change theory will be discussed as delineated by Appelbaum accordingly.

Initially, evolutionary theories and social change may be considered to have reached full-stature with Darwin. Darwin, in 1887, borrowed the idea from Malthus of "survival of the species." The four basic ideas behind Darwin's Evolutionary Approach were: (1) variability exists among the species, (2) the population of any given species tends to increase beyond its means of subsistence, (3) as a result, there is a struggle for existence within and among species, and finally, (4) in this struggle, the strongest or most fit, that is, the best adapted, would survive in the long run.² Darwin, as other writers who wrote during the same basic period of time on evolutionary theories, associated biological organisms to society. This comparison led to a basic mode of thinking in terms of linear evolution.

¹ *ibid.*, pp. 7-10. ² *ibid.*, p. 30.
Credit is given to other classical writers whose works appeared before Darwin's time. Specific attention has been given to such authors as Comte, who wrote on the various stages of society. However, these earlier writers will be discussed later in light of their contributions to conflict theory.

Evolutionary theory, such as that discussed previously by Darwin, influenced many other writers, among them Spencer and Durkheim. For instance, Spencer was influenced by Darwin's ideas concerning the evolution of society. Spencer contributed to the analysis of society by paralleling Darwin's ideas on evolution to the organismic approach. Durkheim followed the basic notions of Spencer, concerning both evolution and the development of societal processes. Durkheim incorporated into the sociological analysis of society his conviction that the analysis of society should be more methodologically sound. To provide for this analysis, Durkheim created what he called "social facts."¹ In regard to social change, Durkheim discussed societies' movements occurring from two perspectives: (1) mechanical solidarity--arising from the necessary similarities among individuals--and (2) organic solidarity--the great differences and few shared beliefs among individuals.²

¹ ibid.  
² ibid., p. 32.
More recently, evolutionary theory has been expanded by such theorists as Julian Steward. For instance, in 1959, Steward expanded the basic ideas of evolutionary theory by contributing to the conceptualization of multilinear evolution. For Steward, culture evolved along a number of different lines. "We must think of evolution not as unilinear, but multilinear."1

Evolutionary theory, in terms of social change, has had an impact on current theoretical thinking by influencing the conceptual notions that analyze the evolutionary stages of a developing society and the evolution of culture.

The second type of social change theory is that of equilibrium theory. The term homeostasis was borrowed from the field of mechanics. The term means:

```
... a uniform state, a condition of a system whereby the state of the elements that enter the system and of the mutual relationships between them is such that any small change in one of the elements will be followed by changes in the other elements, tending to reduce the amount of that change.2
```

Equilibrium theory takes into consideration change as affecting its parts or elements of society and thus having an effect on the whole. This theory was the major beginning of structural-functional theory.

Equilibrium theory, with reference to social change, was influenced by William F. Ogburn who coined the theoretical concept of "cultural lag." Ogburn's theory

1 Ibid., p. 54.  
2 Ibid., p. 55.
contends that changes which upset equilibrium in one social unit therefore upset equilibrium in the whole system. The major elements of the theory are:

1. There must be at least two variables defined.
2. There must be a demonstration that these two variables are in adjustment.
3. There must be a demonstration that one variable changes in degree in comparison to the other.
4. When one variable changes in degree in comparison to another, less satisfactory adjustment in the entire system ensues.\(^1\)

Thus, equilibrium theory considers social change to be a part of the process. This process of change affects the stability of the entire system.

The third type of social change theory is that with which this research is concerned: conflict theory. Herein, the author will generally discuss conflict theories and will deal with more of its elements and the justification for its use as it pertains to the topic of this thesis later in the chapter.

The theories of social change discussed thus far were generally concerned with a fair degree of stability and equate the parts or elements of society "hanging" together in a system of functional interdependence, much like a human body, or any other discrete social organism. All three theories view change as inherent in all societies. Change in

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 74.
conflict theory, by definition, is continuous. Conflict theory has many of its roots in the writings of Comte, Hegel and Marx. The major focus of conflict theory is the continuous change that occurs in the specific elements of a system as well as the system as a whole. Conflict theory has been associated with "negativism" by many sociologists, yet, its merits should not be overlooked. This point will be elaborated on further in the discussion on conflict theory.

Lastly, rise and fall theories are distinct systems of ideas that contribute to the theoretical body of social change. These theories see societies or civilizations going through periods of growth and decline. Like evolutionary and equilibrium theories, these conceptualizations draw analogies between the developmental process of societies as being tantamount to human organisms. The three sociologists most commonly associated with those theories of society termed "rise and fall" by Appelbaum are Spengler, Sorokin, and Weber. For Spengler, culture is an organismic system that lasts in its development, for certain periods of time. Thus, "cultures are organisms, and world history is their collective biography. Culture is a stage process lasting certain periods of time."

---

1Ibid., p. 94. 2Ibid., p. 99. 3Ibid.
For Sorokin, societies evolve through three systems: (1) the Sensate System—which is characterized by "sensation," or belief systems, (2) the Ideational System—which is characterized by "supernatural" forces which validate belief, and (3) Idealistic System—characterized by sensation and supernatural forces. According to Sorokin, the three systems that emerge from these processes are science, religion, and logic. Additionally, the constant interaction that exists between these systems perpetrates growth and decline.

Lastly, Weber's theory concerning social change largely stems from his theory of "social action." In this focus, Weber was primarily concerned with the types of legitimate characteristics of different social orders. Social change for Weber is derived from his four types of social action:

1. "Zweckrational" - rational orientation to a system of discrete individual ends.
2. "Wertrational" - involving a conscious belief in the absolute value of some value system.
3. Affectual orientation - involving feelings and emotions of an actor.
4. Tradition - involving habit of long practice.

These rise and fall theories are significant for they contribute greatly to the theoretical analysis of

---

1Ibid. 2Ibid. 3Ibid.
social change. Weber, Spengler, and Sorokin took into account changes, which is so often overlooked by theorists in their analyses. The selected classical theories of social change do take equilibrium into account and should not be thought of as merely expressing movement of and within societies exclusively.

Social change theory is contingent upon history. The past, as well as the present, is an important time factor in determining the changes that have affected any society. In explaining phenomena, such as social distance, social change theory is best applied from a macro (multi-variate) perspective for analysis. There is, however, a mechanism that can be analytically applied to the delineated problem—conflict theory. This theory will be dealt with as it relates to this thesis, after a discussion of writers who have contributed to conflict ideology and theory.

III. CONFLICT THEORY: HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

As mentioned above, history plays an important part in the analysis of social change. In order to acquire an adequate understanding of conflict theory, it is crucial to trace the theories and ideologies of those who have affected contemporary conflict theories. In order to accomplish this task, there follows a brief discussion of those authors who have influenced, if not "changed," conflict theory.
A. Early Conflict Theorists

Conflict ideology can be traced to the doctrines of the Sophists and Epicureans as far back as 342-270 B.C.\(^1\) The earliest contribution to conflict ideology (with reference to social and cultural change) that occurred during the 18th century, and for that matter, prior to this period, was that of both Hegel and Comte. Hegel introduced the idea of society evolving through three phases: (1) thesis—a state of contact, (2) antithesis—a state of conflict, and (3) synthesis—a state of cooperation. Utilizing this scheme, Hegel contended that society was in perpetual conflict between these enumerated masses. Comte introduced ideas concerning the evolutionary stage processes of society and, additionally, contributed greatly to its analysis in sociology. He did this by classifying and analyzing society according to the basic conceptualizations of statics and dynamics.\(^2\)

Ibn Khaldun was born in Tunis, Arabia, in 1332. These basic ideas concerning conflict within society was most fully interpreted by Polybius during this particular


period. Later in history, Ibn Khaldun and certain followers contributed greatly to conflict theory. According to Khaldun, conflict was at the core of the stability of society. That is to say, Khaldun believed that society was built on wars and the winners of these wars ultimately produced the greatest cohesiveness or stability in their societies.¹

Another writer who contributed to early conflict ideology was Machiavelli. Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) is specifically noted for his writings of The Prince, and Discourse on the First Ten Books of Titus Livius. In The Prince, the notion of constraint was introduced as being conflict oriented. In this sense, he believed that: "Men are good only when they are constrained."²

During his life, between 1530 and 1590, Jean Bodin, who was a political and social writer in France, also contributed to conflict ideology. For Bodin the major concern was that of the changes in the location of political authority. Changes that occurred in this area were viewed as evolutionary in nature.³

Historically, another major conflict-oriented writer was Thomas Hobbes, who lived between 1588-1679. Hobbes saw conflict stemming from competition, distrust and the constant struggle for prestige.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 132. ²Ibid., p. 134. ³Ibid., p. 136. ⁴Ibid.
David Hume, who lived between 1711-1776, contributed to conflict writing by incorporating an empirical foundation to the analysis. Also, Hume felt power was a crucial variable and stated: "right is right to power and right to property." Hume contended that power was important for the state and acquiring it through force was legitimate.

Adam Ferguson, 1732-1816, was another conflict writer whose book, Institutes of Moral Philosophy, written in 1769, dealt with conflict issues. Ferguson's major point on conflict ideology was that governments are not copied but instilled. Conflict, according to Ferguson, was a necessary method of progress. Without war, Ferguson felt that "civil society" itself could not be established.

Lastly, Robert Jacques Turgot, who was an early conflict writer and lived between 1727 and 1781, penned his basic ideas in a book published in 1766, entitled Réflexions sur la formation et la distribution des Richesses. Turgot contended that conflict was necessary for progress. According to Turgot, social institutions are important and he therefore paid special attention to their role in social change. Thus Turgot stated: "As culture develops, educational and religious institutions play a role in social change. Conflict is the source of all

---

1 Ibid., p. 138.  
2 Ibid., p. 140.
Early conflict writers were highly influenced by the political affairs of their times. Thus, conflict ideologies and theories prior to the 18th century generally were concerned with political issues. Eighteenth century conflict theorists began to express concern for more economic factors in determining and influencing social change. The "physiocrats," as they were called, believed that there is a natural order in society which men could analyze and control. Adam Smith, who wrote *The Wealth of Nations* in 1776, laid much of the theoretical groundwork for this economic consideration which affected later conflict theorists. Traditionally, conflict theory had made the state the central object of analysis. The "physiocrats," however, shifted the focus of the analysis to the struggle for the necessities of life.

After the writings of Smith, Thomas Malthus, who lived between 1766 and 1834, noted in his "Essay on the Principle of Population," written in 1798, that the competition and the struggle between population and subsistence is an especially important economic factor. At that time, Malthus contended that human beings have a tendency to want to "increase nourishment" beyond what is available to them.

---

Also, interestingly enough, Malthus predicted many of the social and economic problems present in American society today. Malthus made the prediction that the American Indian, as a group, would be driven farther into the country until they would be "exterminated" because of insatiable competition for land.\(^1\) There are other theories and ideologies that have affected conflict theory. Some of the major aspects of these theories and ideologies will next be discussed.

B. Later Conflict Theorists

No account of conflict analysis can be culminated without tracing the vital contributions made by Karl Marx. Marx, who lived between 1818 and 1883, was influenced by writers such as Comte, Hegel, Malthus, and Adam Smith. Marx’s closest friend and regular collaborator was Frederick Engels.\(^2\) The major contributions to conflict theory that Marx made were his analyses focusing on an economic basis of society’s conflict between classes. There were many other contributions Marx made in his general economic theories, but for purposes herein, Marx’s basic postulates regarding class structure will be delineated.

The basic postulates contributed by the writings of Karl Marx were:

\(^{1}\)Ibid., p. 145.  
\(^{2}\)Ibid., p. 157.
1. In a capitalistic society, classes tend to polarize increasingly: society breaks up into two hostile classes, the "bourgeoisie and proletariat."

2. As the classes polarize, their situations become increasingly concentrated in the hands of a relative few.

3. As the classes polarize, they become more homogeneous internally with other groupings absorbed into two classes.

4. Once these processes reach their extremes, revolution terminates the existing arrangement and a new society emerges, with the formerly oppressed class in power, the proletarian revolution ultimately results in a classless society.\(^1\)

For Marx and Engels, production and more specifically the division of labor were crucial in determining the interaction processes between groups in the society. According to Marx, the constant struggles in societies exist as conflict between the "haves" and "have nots."

During this period of intellectual outpourings, there were other writers who contributed to conflict theory. For instance, William Graham Sumner, who lived between 1849-1910, wrote and accepted the position that the struggle for human existence between classes was originally a "natural" phenomenon. As such, his conflict orientation held that "Inequality of the social classes is normal."\(^2\)

Another writer who lived between 1816 and 1822 and provided a major contribution to conflict theory was

---

\(^1\)Appelbaum, op. cit., pp. 63-64.

\(^2\)Martindale, op. cit., p. 163.
Arthur de Gobineau. Gobineau was concerned with the political development of France during the French Revolutions, and the effects this had on the masses. Thus he wrote, in his *Inequality of Human Races*, about the French Revolution and its impact on various groups.¹

Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855-1927) also contributed to conflict theory in his book, *Foundations of the 19th Century*. This work focused on the derivation of modern civilization which, Chamberlain contended, stemmed from four sources: Greek, Roman, Jewish, and Teutonic civilizations.²

During the period of 1857-1936, Karl Pearson carried on the works which had been completed earlier by Galton. These works were based on the theory that biological factors are dominant in the evolution of mankind. According to Pearson, these biological factors alone shed light on the rise and fall of nations.³

Along the lines of "race" superiority and inferiority, Lothrop Stoddard (1833-1950), also focused on the "multiplication of superiors, and elimination of inferiors, or "race cleansing."⁴ Although these ideologies were not necessarily in a total conflict tradition, they did pave the way for much research that was to come.

Finally, many other conflict theorists wrote during this era, such as Bagehot (1826-1877), Ludwig Gumplowicz

---

¹Ibid., p. 168.  
²Ibid., p. 169.  
³Ibid., p. 172.  
⁴Ibid.
(1838-1909), Gustan Ratzenhofer (1842-1904), Albion Woodbury Small (1854-1926), Franz Oppenheimer (1864-1943), and George Bryan Void. All these authors elaborated or expanded on the notions of conflict theory and change. ¹

With this background, it now makes it possible to relate the impact all of these early writers have had on recent conflict theory. It is upon this issue, and the relevance of conflict theory, that this research will now focus. This attempt is made so as to demonstrate the significance of conflict orientation in explaining social distance.

IV. RECENT CONFLICT THEORY AND SOCIAL DISTANCES

Based upon research that has articulated the major notions of conflict theory, this approach appears to be relevant to the explanation and analysis of social distance research. The term "conflict," unfortunately, is misinterpreted as it applies to sociological theory. Conflict theory has been selected in the unit of analysis for the observation of distances between groups because conflict theory assumes continuous change occurring in the relationships between various segments of human society. ² The misunderstanding that generally takes place in terms of

¹Ibid., op. 173-200.
²Vander Zanden, op. cit., p. 158.
³Ibid.
acknowledging clearly the processes in conflict theory is
well articulated by Coae and Rosenberg who write:

Conflict theory is a phenomenon which might appear
to be very opposite that of cohesion. Yet such a
common-sense view, certain conservative thinkers not-
withstanding, is quite mistaken. Indeed as the
excerpts from the work of Karl Marx indicate, social
conflict with some brings in its wake social cohesion
with others. Social conflict while seemingly a nega-
tive phenomenon which simply "tears down," is seen
upon inspection to increase the cohesion of conflict-
ing groups within a society.1

These notions are important for they help to explain the
social distances between groups as a non-static phenomenon.
Theoretically, studies have demonstrated that the patterns
of social distances have changed. These changes represent
a non-static process which is a major tenet in conflict
theory. Conflict theory helps to explain these non-static
processes as they are affected by the social structure.

There are various authors who have currently
contributed to conflict theory. Shaling, Eisenstadt, and
Moore are but a few current writers in this area.

It is significant to bear in mind that theory does
not exclusively explain phenomena in society. In a general
manner, social theory simply presents a framework from
which researchers can operate. There are many theories
that have attempted to explain group conflicts within the

1Lewis A. Coae and Bernard Rosenberg, Sociological
Theory: A Book of Readings (New York: Macmillan Co.,
society and most of them have only significantly, under a specific set of conditions, been able to explain the processes involved. The notion of "integroup" relations has been introduced here conceptually because it appears that the field of sociology is currently focusing on this as one very significant area of research. The conflicts that exist between groups are intergroup conflicts, and not necessarily only "race" conflicts.

Dahrendorf's theory in its general and specific form is one theory that is useful in explaining any possible social distances between groups. One of the basic premises in this research is that the distances between groups constantly ebb and flow through social change. Historically, attitudes have remained stable toward certain minority groups during certain periods of time. However, changes have also occurred. This phenomena of dynamics in intergroup relations is significant for there appears to be constant interaction or conflict between various groups in the society. In reference to the research in this thesis, these conflicts representing any possible social distances that exist between the sample toward particular minority groups, is explained in Dahrendorf's theoretical notions.

In regard to Ralf Dahrendorf's specific notions on intergroup relations, theoretically, he has taken the basic tenets expressed by Marx. Dahrendorf has incorporated into his own theories some of Marx's theoretical notions. For instance, Marx believed that class is property relations, whereas Dahrendorf defined class in terms of authority relationships.¹ This is discussed merely to point out the impact that early conflict theorist, as discussed throughout this chapter, have had on contemporary social theorist.

Prior to relating Dahrendorf's theory to the research herein, it is significant to first discuss his specific theory of intergroup relations. The elements of Dahrendorf's specific theory of intergroup relations include the following:

1. In every imperatively coordinated group, the carriers of positive and negative dominance roles determine two quasigroups with opposite latent interests. We call them "quasigroups" because we have to do here with mere aggregates, not organized units; We speak of "latent interests" because opposition of outlook may not be conscious on this level; it may exist only in the form of expectations associated with certain positions. The opposition of interests has here quite a formal meaning, namely, the expectation that an interest in the preservation of the status quo is associated with the positive dominance roles and an interest in the change of the status quo is associated with the negative dominance roles.

2. The bearers of positive and negative dominance roles, that is, the members of the opposing quasigroups, organize themselves into groups with manifest interests, unless certain empirically

¹Appelbaum, op. cit., p. 46.
variable conditions (the condition of organization) intervene. Interest groups, in contrast to quasigroups, are organized entities, such as parties and trade unions, the manifest interests are formulated program and ideologies.

3. Interest groups which originate in this manner are in constant conflict over the preservation or change of the status quo. The form and intensity of the conflict are determined by empirically variable conditions (the conditions of conflict).

4. The conflict among interest groups in this sense of the model leads to changes in the dominance relations. The kind, the speed, and the depth of this development depend on empirically variable conditions (conditions of structural change).¹

Dahrendorf's first point is the assumption that groups will differ in their interests. In terms of social distances, groups will express different attitudinal distances; which, if analytical comparisons are allowed, is similar to Dahrendorf's first point noted above.

Dahrendorf makes the second point that "interest" groups become organized within society. A parallel can be drawn on this notion between what Dahrendorf calls "interest" groups to such current groups as N.C.W. (National Organization of Women), A.A.A.C.P. (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), etcetera, as examples.

Finally, it is Dahrendorf's third point that groups formulated around particular "interests" are in

continuous conflict over preservation or change of the status-quo. This is obviously implicit for all the groups that will be measured or analyzed in this research because the mean distances between groups have changed throughout time. These changes take the form of increases or decreases toward particular minority groups, thus indicating that the relationships between these groups are non-static.

The types of distances that occur within the society will depend upon the social-structural changes that take place in the society. For instance, distances toward particular groups will vary according to such social-structural features as: (1) time, (2) location, (3) social psychological changes within the culture, (4) cultural changes, and (5) physical changes such as technological, and urbanization, as well as other significant variables.

What Danreendorf has really established is a theory of social group conflict, extrapolating from Marx's theories. The necessity of contributing to this theory in terms of research is expressed by Appelbaum who writes: "Whether Danreendorf's theory will prove fruitful in the more limited analysis of interest group conflict and structural change remains to be demonstrated."1

Also significant, in terms of conflict theory as it related to social distances, is Danreendorf's general notions

---

1Appelbaum, op. cit., p. 97.
on social change and conflict. These notions are stated by Dahrendorf as follows:

1. Every society is subjected at every moment to change; social change is ubiquitous.
2. Every society experiences at every moment social conflict; social conflict is ubiquitous.
3. Every element in a society contributes to its change.
4. Every society rests on constraint of some of its members by others.1

These theoretical notions will be utilized in helping to explain the research findings reported in this thesis. It is important to clarify the utilization of certain concepts discussed in this thesis. These concepts will be discussed next.

V. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The following concepts are discussed and defined so as to bring clarity to the methodology presented and elaborations contained in the following chapters:

1. Social distance and attitude: The term, social distance, has been used synonymously with racial, attitudinal, and ethnic distance. Within this research the term, social distance, will be used to connote mean (X) distances between scores obtained for particular groups selected for analysis (as measured by the Bogardus Social Distance Scale).

1 Dahrendorf, op. cit., p. 103.
2. **Attitudes**: Attitudes in this research are tendencies expressed by the measurements of social distances.

3. **Feminist**: Currently, there is an uncertainty among sociologists as to whether or not the Feminist group should be conceptually considered a minority. Within this research, it is important to note that this particular group will be considered a minority in the sense of "power and dominance" within American society. The Feminist group has evolved from society and has brought about attitudinal tendencies that are desirable to measure. More important to this research is whether or not there are social distances expressed toward this group. The term "Feminist" will be used, as defined by Julian, to mean a person or persons who:

   (1) believes in the current "movement," (2) is actually participating in the "movement," and (3) denies or rejects the "traditional" feminine role.¹

It is not the task of this research to conceptually clarify the role of the Feminist group within American society as a minority. However, it is significant to note that as current groups evolve within American society their significance cannot be overlooked. Pierre Vanden Berghe summed up this above point by stating:

Current sociological research has not only discarded the older assumptions about racial characteristics but it is approaching the problem of "race-relations" from a different standpoint. For the sociologist the problem of "race-relations" has become a problem of intergroup relations.¹

4. **Minority**: With reference to the concept of minority, no precise definition has been agreed upon. However, for conceptual clarity, the definition used herein will incorporate the definitional traits posed by Wagley and Harris (as cited in a text by Vander Zanden) and included the following:

1. A minority is a social group whose members experience at the hands of another social group various disabilities in the form of prejudice, discrimination, segregation, or persecution (or any combination of these).

2. Disabilities experienced by minorities are related to special characteristics that its members share, either physical or cultural or both, which the dominant group holds in low esteem.

3. Minorities are self-conscious social units; they are characterized by a consciousness of kind.

4. Generally a person does not become a member of a minority voluntarily; he or she is born into it.

5. Members of a minority group, by choice or necessity, tend to marry within their own group.²

¹Werghe, op. cit., p. 23.
²Vander Zanden, op. cit., p. 10.
VI. SUMMARY

The theories focusing upon social change are applicable to the social relationships between groups. Social change theories focus analytically on changes occurring within society and maintain that even though equilibrium or order exists, this order exists in the processes of continuous social change.

Generally, according to Appelbaum, there are four types of social change theories in the field of sociology. The theoretical perspectives are terminologically called: evolutionary, equilibrium, conflict, and rise and fall theories.

The basic framework within which this research operates is that of conflict theory. Conflict theory is seen by some sociologists as a "negative" or destructive analysis.\(^1\) However, conflict theory in this research is utilized in explaining any possible social distances that may occur between those groups researched.

Historically, conflict ideology existed as early as 542-270 B.C. Many theories have contributed to the development of this perspective. During the 17th and 18th centuries, conflict theorists were concerned primarily with the economic variables which were different from the earlier concerns that involved politics.

\(^1\)Wahrendorf, op. cit., pp. 161-162.
Karl Marx contributed a considerable amount to the general area of conflict theory. More recently, conflict theorists, notably Dahrendorf, have re-expressed and modified the contentions of Karl Marx.

The present research will utilize social change theory, especially that of conflict theory expressed by Dahrendorf. This will be utilized to illuminate the social distances that exist between groups.

There is no one theory that can be used to adequately explain the phenomena of distances between groups, for these distances are caused and explained by a number of factors. However, conflict theory contributes to the explanation of changes within the American society of various group interaction processes. This idea is well stated by Appelbaum who writes:

A conflict theory will thus enable the social scientist to "derive social conflicts from structural arrangements and thus show these conflicts systematically generated"; it will further "account for both the multiplicity of forms of conflict and for their degrees of intensity."\(^1\)

It is with the overriding impact of these notions, particularly with the ideas of social distance degrees, that this research is conducted. For conceptual clarity, concepts utilized within this research have also been discussed and defined.

\(^1\)Appelbaum, op. cit., p. 95.
Chapter 4

RESEARCH DESIGN

It is the purpose of this chapter to delineate the research design utilized in this thesis. The focus of this chapter will, therefore, be upon the following: (I) The pilot survey, the population of the pilot sample, the techniques employed in the pilot survey, and the techniques selected for the analysis of the pilot survey. Additionally, this chapter will describe: (II) The general design of the investigation, the techniques utilized in the investigation, and the population sample selected for the investigation.

I. THE PILOT SURVEY

A. The Study Sample

Earlier, in the beginning stages of this thesis, it was suggested that a pilot survey should be completed so as to isolate and enumerate those particular groups that have had and are having distances expressed toward them.¹ Such an analysis could allow for a clarification of local or regional variables. A pilot survey was therefore conducted

¹Conversation with Dr. Roy Dean Wright, Associate Professor of Sociology, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, July 1, 1974.
in the fall of 1974. The sample for the pilot survey was drawn from ten randomly selected college classes at the Des Moines Area XI Community Colleges. Seven of these ten classes were selected in the Ankeny campus and three from the Urban Center campus in Des Moines. The sample totaled 306 students. This sample was selected so as to provide a general representation of the student population of both the Urban and Ankeny campuses. Of the 306 surveys distributed, 177 were returned that contained appropriate information that could be utilized for analysis.

B. Techniques Utilized in the Pilot Survey

The primary purpose of the pilot survey was to acquire information about those particular groups residing in the Des Moines and Ankeny areas that have had social distance expressed toward them (as explained above). In order to acquire accurate information about those particular groups that are disliked or toward whom people generally feel negative in these geographic areas, a questionnaire was utilized. This instrument requested the respondent to rank, in order of "dislikeness," those groups listed. This method was also used in order to determine the correct labels and questions that would elicit the appropriate responses in the major investigation. The importance of determining appropriate labels and questions in this type of research
has been well discussed and documented by Stephen Thayer in a study entitled, "Racial Attitudes or Reactions to Racial Labels: What Is Being Measured?"¹

The question in the pilot survey was asked in a manner so as to elicit explicit meaningful responses from the participants. The question dealing with the respondents' expressed dislike toward a minority group is illustrated in Appendix A. This method is important in acquiring the appropriate information about those groups that express favorable or unfavorable tendencies toward, or opinions about, various minority groups. Such procedure is also noted and recommended by Delbert C. Miller as a technique in surveying respondents when conducting research of this type.²

Another procedure was utilized to solicit response toward other groups located in the Mid-Iowa areas that have expressed social distances. A question was asked that allowed the respondents to enumerate or list any of these groups separately and make comments concerning them. This is also illustrated in Appendix A, questions nine and ten.

In order to guarantee as much as possible the acquisition of accurate information in the pilot survey, an


interviewer comment sheet was made and administered to each respondent prior to the survey. (See Appendix B). As noted above, the respondents were selected randomly from the Fall listing of those classes offered at the Des Moines Area Community College. The selected members of each class that had been chosen were then interviewed at the college during their class periods and in their own homes. This procedure was selected because of the difficulties involved in "tracking down" or arranging interviews for all of the various students in their homes.

C. Techniques for Analyzing the Pilot Survey

The procedures used in analyzing the information contained within the pilot survey focused upon the frequencies of responses that were given for each group in terms of degrees of dislikeliness. In an ordinal scale fashion, each group was ranked from 1 (the highest disliked group) to 10 (the lowest disliked group). The frequencies expressed by the pilot sample for each group and/or category were then converted in terms of "high, medium and low" degrees of dislikeliness. This technique was utilized in order to acquire a general idea of the expressed frequencies that had been given by the respondents. The respondents were also allowed to indicate, by listing, any other groups or categories toward whom they felt dislike.
II. GENERAL DESIGN OF THE INVESTIGATION

The research technique that was utilized in the major investigation was focused upon the administration of a Social Distance Scale as devised by Emory S. Bogardus. This particular technique was utilized so as to provide for the tabulation of distances as calculated from the data toward eleven minority groups in the Des Moines and Ankeny areas. The eleven minority groups and labels selected for inclusion were based on the pilot survey discussed above. These groups are: Feminists, Koreans, American Indians, Russians, Blacks, Jews, Japanese, Italians, Chinese, Mexican Americans, and Vietnamese. The respondents were also asked to list and fill in various socioeconomic characteristics pertaining to themselves. The socioeconomic characteristics that were obtained are as follows: (1) race, (2) age, (3) sex, (4) religion—religious affiliation and the importance of religion in the life of each respondent, (5) politics—the importance of politics in the life of the respondent, political participation in terms of state and national elections, and political self views (liberal, conservative, radical, or independent), (6) education—the current enrollment status, academic or vocational; status of attendance, full or part time; and total amount of formal education completed, (7) marital status, (8) residential area—the town in which born and raised and approximate size of
town, (9) income, and (10) the respondent's occupation.

In the last section of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to check the amount of prior social contact they had had with each of the groups analyzed and as defined in Chapter 1 of this thesis.

A. The Population and Sample of the Investigation

The Des Moines Area XI Community College population at the time of this research consisted of 3,736 students. Of this number, 2,293 students attended school full time and 1,443 were part time students. These figures represent the two major colleges from which the samples were drawn—the Ankeny campus, and the urban campus in Des Moines. The minority composition, population-wise, totaled 352 students, or (9.5 percent) of the total student body. The minority population was comprised of Blacks, American Indian, Asian-American, and Spanish American. The remaining 3,384 students were Caucasian. In terms of male and female populations, 1,599 students were females and 2,137 were males.

The Des Moines Area XI Community College population was unique because of the variety of people from different age groups attending school. This feature makes the student body an interesting population. For instance, at the time of this research, there were students attending the school who ranged in ages from 17 to 65. The largest percentage,
in terms of attendance, was comprised of students between the ages of 18 and 35. This age group made up over 80 percent of the total campus population.

In terms of marital status, the student population was comprised of 56.5 percent single, 35.8 percent married, 5.5 percent divorced, 0.9 percent widowed, and 1.3 percent separated.

Family incomes also varied for this population accordingly:

7.3 percent had incomes under $3,000
11.8 percent had incomes ranging from $3,000 - $5,999,
13.4 percent had incomes ranging from $6,000 - $8,999,
16.7 percent had incomes ranging from $9,000 - $11,999,
13.0 percent had incomes ranging from $12,000 - $14,999,
7.1 percent had incomes ranging from $15,000 - $17,999,
10.5 percent had incomes ranging from $18,000 plus,
20.3 percent had unknown incomes.¹

The sample selected for this research consisted of 150 randomly selected students attending the Des Moines Area XI Community College during the Spring Semester of 1975. The selection was derived from a computer print-out list acquired through the Office of the Registrar. A total of 75 males and 75 females were selected at random from this list. A Table of Random Numbers printed in Hubert M. Blalock, Jr.'s

¹Information acquired through the Registrar's Office, Ankeny Campus Building, Ankeny, Iowa, April, 1975.
Social Statistics text was utilized.\(^1\) The procedures for selecting and administering the questionnaire were as follows:

1. A computer print-out was acquired in the Spring of 1975, which contained all of the basic student information.

2. The list was numbered from 1 to 3,736.

3. The list was sorted according to sex.

4. The first four digits of the rows in the Table of Random Numbers were utilized in the selection of the sample.

5. The persons who comprised the sample were called at their place of residence and appointments were scheduled either at the respondent's home or at an interviewing room secured on both college campuses.

6. The questionnaires were administered in the Spring of 1975 and the findings of the research tabulated. The actual sample reported in this thesis was 108. Forty-two of the respondents refused to take the survey.

Following the above-enumerated procedures, the questionnaires were coded and the data were tabulated.

B. Techniques Utilized in the Investigation

Prior to administering the actual questionnaire, a pre-test was given to two sociology classes at the Area XI College so as to determine the following:

1. The amount of time needed to complete the questionnaire.

2. The overall clarity of the directions and questions contained in the instrument.

3. Any problems that might arise in administering the questionnaire.

In the first section of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to check or fill in the appropriate socioeconomic characteristics. In the second section of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to rate each group listed. The person did this by placing an "X" for each group in the appropriate column box designated for each of the seven types of relationships with other groups that they would be willing to accept. The types of relationships were listed as follows:

1. To close kinship by marriage,
2. to my club as a personal chum,
3. to my street as neighbors,
4. to employment in my occupation,
5. to citizenship in my country,
6. only as visitors to my country, and
7. would exclude from my country.

The techniques that were utilized in the investigation warrant a few comments and observations that have been made by researchers. The first point is that the social distance scales do not represent one scale but rather a series of scales. That is, the scales in this study represent rankings for eleven various groups. There is, however,
the continuum idea that the relationship expressed by type (1), to close kinship by marriage, expresses the lowest degree of social distance and the subsequent relationships represent greater distances. These points in between each relationship, then, methodologically are considered ordinal for this analysis. There have been various attempts to define this seven-point scale, devised by Bogardus, in an interval fashion. However, for this type of research it is recommended by Goode and Hatt, for instance, that simple tabulations of mean distances are just as accurate, if not in reality more so, than other methods utilized. Therefore, based upon these observations, the procedure for analyzing the research reported in this thesis will be as follows:

1. The respondent was asked to place an "x" along the 7-point scale of social distance. The subject was requested to work rapidly, thus avoiding rationalization in tabulations.

2. The numbers nearest the left column that marked the most intimate relationship were added together.

3. The responses were then divided by (n), the number of respondents.

4. The (E.S.D.I.) or Expressed Social Distance Index was then calculated.

5. The lowest (E.S.D.I.) Expressed Social Distance Index possible was designated as 1.00 and the highest as 7.00.

---

6. The formula for computation of the mean is:

\[
\frac{\text{Total } F \times X}{\text{Total } F} = \text{mean}
\]

These procedures have also been highly recommended by Strauss and Nelson. 1

In the last section of the questionnaire the respondents were asked to check the amount of social contact they had previously experienced with a member(s) of each group. Social contact in this study was defined as: "Relationships on an acquaintance or friendship basis." As discussed previously, the amount of social contact(s) was defined as follows: (a) few contacts meant one to three contacts, (b) several contacts means four or more. The above definitions were based on the information gathered in the pretests. The method of acquiring information on social contact is illustrated on the last page of the questionnaire in Appendix C.

The primary statistical technique used for analysis in this investigation will be discussed as it applies to this research. In order to test the null hypothesis, an analysis of variance test was conducted for each independent variable.

For purposes of this research, an independent variable is judged to have a significant effect upon the

dependent variable if the significance level of F reaches the .05 level. Where appropriate, additional analysis is performed using chi-square and Pearson's correlation statistical technique. These are also judged to be significant at the .05 level or above. Chapter 5 discusses the findings of this research.

---


Chapter 5

FINDINGS

Within this chapter the author will delineate the results of the pilot survey and the major investigation. Conclusions and recommendations will be discussed in the final chapter of this thesis.

A. Results of the Pilot Survey

The pilot survey was administered in the Fall of 1974, so as to provide a means of acquiring a general response profile concerning such factors as:

1. Socioeconomic characteristics of the population which could potentially be significant in the major research project and upon which the investigation should focus.

2. The variety and types of problems that could be anticipated with reference to those general attitudinal tendencies that are directed toward various minority groups; and

3. To acquire basic information pertaining to the general population, including the degrees of dislike expressed toward various minority groups.

An analysis of the pilot survey provided the author with information relative to the above three areas. Listed below are the general characteristics enumerated by the Des Moines and Ankeny student populations that constituted the pilot survey.
1. **Age**—the sample ranged in age composition from 17 to 36.

2. **Sex**—an almost equal representation of males and females were included in the sample.

3. **Religion**—most members of the sample listed themselves as Protestant rather than Jewish, Catholic, or any other religion.

4. **Residence**—most members of the sample were reared in and resided in the Des Moines metropolitan area.

5. **Education**—most of the students had received from one to two years of college.

6. **Income**—most of the students had incomes ranging from zero to $7,999 per year.

Table 3 illustrates the summary of the pilot sample and the various socioeconomic characteristics.
Table 3
Summary of the Pilot Socioeconomic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>A. 17-25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 26-35</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. 36 % over</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex</td>
<td>A. Male</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Female</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religion</td>
<td>A. Catholic</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Protestant</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Jewish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. No Religion</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Race</td>
<td>A. Caucasian</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Mongoloid</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Black</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Residence</td>
<td>A. Des Moines</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Ankeny</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Education</td>
<td>A. College (1st year)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. College (2nd year)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. College Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Annual Income of Student</td>
<td>A. 0- $7,999</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. $8,000-$13,999</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. $14,000 and over</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=177

*Frequency not listed because most students listed none.
The second general area elicited from the pilot survey concerned the types of research difficulties that could be anticipated in conducting the major survey. The following points were enumerated:

1. In terms of expressing dislikes, the respondents had difficulty in reacting to groups as a whole in a ranked order.

2. The respondents had to be encouraged to respond to the questionnaire.

The third and final general area detailed from the pilot survey concerned the delineation of the dislikes expressed toward those levels representative of the various minority groups. This analysis was done by tallying the numerous ranked order frequencies given by each respondent. The frequencies with medium and high responses for each of the levels representing the various minority groups and other "current" groups were then utilized in the major research. Table 4 illustrates these frequencies expressed by the sample.
Table 4
Summary of Expressed Dislikeness in Order of
High, Medium and Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Expressed Dislikeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Blacks</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Poor Whites</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Mexicans</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Spanish</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Orientals (Chinese, Japanese)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Koreans</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. American Indians</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Jews</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Women Libers</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Europeans (French, Italians, Germans)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=177

The respondents did not list any other group significantly enough to merit investigation. Based upon these responses, the major investigation was begun.

So as to provide a maximum utilization of available data it was suggested that any other "current" groups that may be entering the American society in substantial numbers be included in the investigation. Therefore, the following groups and labels were selected for study: Feminist, Korean,

1Conversation with Dr. Roy Dean Wright, Associate Professor, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, Winter, 1974.
American Indian, Russian, Blacks, Jews, Japanese, Italian, Chinese, Mexican and Vietnamese.

B. Results of the Major Investigation

The major research in this thesis was conducted in the spring of 1975. The population utilized in this research consisted of a random sample of 150 students selected from 3,736 students representing the Ankeny campus and the Des Moines Urban Center of the Area XI Community College.

In order to focus more clearly on the results of the investigation, a brief discussion will be made concerning the Bogardus Scale. As indicated earlier, a mean of (1.00) indicates a low amount of social distance. A mean of (7.00) indicates a high amount of social distance. It should be evident to the reader from the discussion in Chapter 4, that these degrees do not represent one scale, but a series of scales. The various mean distances researched are assumed to be in an ordinal fashion.

In reporting the results of the primary investigation, each major hypothesis will be stated and a discussion pertaining to the results will follow.
Hypothesis I

There are differential degrees of expressed social distance indexes by the study sample toward the minority groups selected for study.

The results indicated that there were differential degrees of social distances expressed toward the eleven minority groups. The group with the highest mean tabulated was that for the Vietnamese group, with a reported mean of (1.84). The group with the lowest mean reported was that for the Italians, with a mean of (1.24). The next highest mean reported was that reported for Russians, with a tabulated score of (1.70). Also, Blacks constituted the third highest mean, which was (1.64). The Chinese group had a mean of (1.60). The Feminist and Korean groups had similar means at the (1.55) level. The Mexicans, American Indians and Jewish groups also had similar means at the (1.52) level. The Japanese listed the next to the lowest mean which was (1.48).

Overall, the grand mean reported for all eleven groups in this study was calculated to be (1.50). These means, and the order in which the groups were ranked, is illustrated in Table 5.
Table 5

Ranking of Groups by E.S.D.I. * for Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>E.S.D.I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Koreans</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>American Indians</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Mean Total 1.56
N = 108

*Expressed Social Distance Index.

The group with the highest mean was the Vietnamese category. Because of the recent political conflicts in Vietnam, this group is also the most current minority unit to have immigrated into the United States. It is plausible that the "newness" of this group to this country has resulted in higher expressed distances.

The Russians and the Blacks also had higher reported distances. It is interesting to note the comparisons of the findings reported in this study with conclusions from the Bogardus research conducted in 1960. Both of these groups
had higher distances relative to the other minority groups in Bogarduses' 1966 study. The mean distances reported in 1966 toward Russians was (2.38), and toward Blacks (2.56). These two groups were found to have higher expressed social distance indexes in the present study, which is consistent with the findings reported by Bogardus.

The Chinese group had high social distance indexes in all four time periods when Bogardus reported his research. In 1966, Bogardus found a mean of (2.34) expressed toward the Chinese group, which was the lowest mean expressed over a forty year period. In the current research, the mean of (1.60) reported toward the Chinese group generally indicated a low amount of social distance and is also consistent with the general means reported in the Bogardus studies.

The Feminist group also was found to have a low amount of social distance, and fell almost in the middle relative to the other expressed means. This finding indicates that most of the sample is willing to accept relationships that are intimate for the membership of this category.

The mean distance expressed toward the Koreans was also low and in comparison fell in the middle of the scores. As such the category was viewed in a manner similar to the Feminist group.

The Mexican group had a mean score reported by Bogardus in 1966 of (2.56) and was rated as one of the
of the categories with higher social distance scores. In the present study the Mexicans had low social distances reported. It is plausible that the Koreans and Mexicans both had lower means in this study because of their relative density in these geographical areas.

In 1966, Bogardus found the American Indian to have a mean score of (2.12), indicating in his study a fair amount of social distance. In this study the American Indians were characterized as having a low amount of social distance.

The Jewish group also exhibited a low amount of social distance in this study. Perhaps the lower distances calculated for this collectivity are due to assimilation factors.

The Japanese had a (2.41) overall mean in 1966, and indicated having high distances reported by Bogardus, with a slight increase occurring between 1956 and 1966. In the present study, the Japanese reported a low amount of social distance. This group was second from the lowest with the tabulated distances, indicating perhaps that assimilation has been occurring.

Lastly, it is interesting to note that between the periods of 1956 and 1966, Bogardus found a definite decrease of reported distances toward the Italian group. In 1956, the expressed social distance index was (1.89) and it decreased to a (1.51) in 1966. The findings within this research also
appear to be consistent with Bogardus' conclusions, in that the Italian group exhibited the lowest amount of social distance, which was tabulated to be (1.24). Also important, is the fact that the Italian group, in comparison to the other minority groups in this study, have been in this country the longest and have perhaps assimilated more.

The more visible and current groups, such as the Blacks, Chinese, Vietnamese and Russians, appear to have the higher distances reported. This is consistent with the findings reported in the Bogardus studies.

Finally, overall, there appeared a decrease in the expressed social distances reported in this study and those groups that were compared to the Bogardus findings.

**Hypothesis II**

There are differences between the overall expressed social distance indexes of the study sample toward the particular minority groups selected for study, and the 1950 regional distances last reported by Emory S. Bogardus.

In 1950, Bogardus reported an overall regional mean average of (1.90) from a national sample of 2,053. This mean represented the North Midwest Iowa area, including Des Moines and Ankeny. The overall mean reported in this sub-population was a (1.56). These differences are illustrated in Table 6.

---

1 Delbert C. Miller, *Handbook of Research and Social Measurement* (New York: David McKay Company, 1970), p. 225. (The original study done by Bogardus was not available.)
This finding has certain limitations placed upon it. These limitations are:

1. The discrete groups utilized in this research totaled only to eleven and included "current" groups, while Bogardus utilized 30 groups that were significant in terms of analysis during the period of time when Bogardus conducted his research.

2. This research included a sample which was considerably smaller than the sample utilized by Bogardus, and thus makes it inaccurate to cross-compare any further.

Within these limitations, this comparison was made in order to analyze any geographical deviations from the overall means last reported by Bogardus in his study conducted in 1956. Also, as discussed in the theoretical framework of this thesis, the changes that take place with reference to attitudinal tendencies within American society are significant in terms of analysis.

It appears then, that in terms of this study, overall expressed prejudices have decreased. This finding is consistent with Bogardus' analysis which indicated that the society appears to be integrating various minority groups. Hypotheses I and II were supported with the above limitations.
**Hypothesis III**

The greater the amount of social contact with members of the minority groups tested in this sample, the lower the expressed social distances.

For statistical purposes, the following hypotheses (III and IV) are stated in the null form. These null hypotheses are tested by analysis of variance. It is expected, however, that higher frequency of contact will produce less social distance. Also, the relationships predicted in hypothesis IV should show significant relationships.

In general, for all the groups, except the American Indian group, the analysis of variance indicated in the Anova Tables that the null hypotheses be accepted. However, as indicated above, there did appear to occur higher frequency of contact among those groups which expressed lesser social distances. Table 7, on page 118, summarizes the findings of the expressed social distance indexes according to high, medium, and low social contact. The following discussions will be concerned with these findings.

**Feminists.** An analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis be accepted. Therefore, there was no significant relationship reported between the amount and type of prior social contact to the expressed social distances reported. However, it should be noted that those respondents reporting greater expressed distances also reported having
medium and low social contacts with members of this group. Those respondents with the highest expressed distances (1.67) also reported low amounts of contact.

Koreans. Analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis concerning the amount of social contact and expressed social distances be accepted. However, those respondents that reported the highest distances also reported a low amount of contact.

American Indians. Analysis of variance indicated that social contact did have a significant effect on the level of expressed social distance. Table 7 illustrates the significance of F at the .01 level. Further, an analysis utilizing a Pearsonian Correlation indicated a significance of (r=-.29). It appears that for the American Indian group, according to these findings, those respondents that expressed the greatest distances had the lowest social contact. This is especially true for the respondents that reported a mean of expressed social distance of (2.25) and had low social contact. This finding might be explained in that this population may have had "non-functional" and limited contact with American Indians that appear to exist in substantial numbers in these geographical areas. Also, perhaps more important is the fact that currently movements such as A.I.N. and the Wounded Knee incidents have altered the type of expressed attitudes and amount of social contact with American Indians.
Table 7

E.S.D.I. for All Groups According to High, Medium, and Low Social Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>E.S.D.I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreans</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>9.19*</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=108

*Significant at the .01 Level.

Rусские. Analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis concerning the amount of social contact and expressed social distances be accepted. Therefore, there was no significant relationship. However, the respondents that reported the lowest expressed social distance index of (1.33), also had reported a high amount of social contact with Russians.

Blacks. Analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis focusing on the amount of social contact and expressed social distances be accepted. Therefore,
there was no significant relationship between contact and expressed social distances for this group. However, the respondents that reported the highest expressed social distance index of (1.95) also reported having medium social contact with members of the Black group.

Jews. Analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis with reference to the amount of social contact and expressed social distances be accepted. Thus, there was no significant relationship. However, the highest social distance expressed which for this particular group was (1.75), was expressed by those respondents with medium social contacts.

Japanese. Analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis concerning the amount of social contact and expressed social distances be accepted. Thus, there was no significant relationship. It should be noted, however, that the highest social distance expressed in this study, which was (1.64), was reported by those respondents in this group with a low amount of social contact. The respondents that reported the next highest distance, which was (1.53), reported having a medium amount of social contact with Japanese members. Lastly, for this group, the respondents that reported the lowest expressed social distance index of (1.17), also reported having high social contact.

Italians. Analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis with reference to social contact and
expressed social distances be accepted. Therefore, there was no significant relationship established. The respondents that reported having the highest expressed social distances, which was (1.40), also reported having a medium amount of social contact with members of this particular minority group. Also, the respondents that reported having the lowest expressed mean distance reported having high social contact with members of this group.

Chinese. Analysis of variance also indicated acceptance of the null hypothesis for the Chinese group in terms of the amount of expressed social distances and social contact. Thus, no significant relationship was established. It is important to note, however, that the highest expressed social distance index of (1.76) was noted by those individuals who reported having low amounts of social contact with members of the Chinese group. The next highest expressed social distance index reported by the respondents for this particular group was (1.58). The respondents that reported this mean had also reported medium amounts of social contact with Chinese members. Also, the lowest expressed social distance index of (1.08) was reported by those respondents that reported having high amounts of social contact with Chinese members.

Mexicans. An analysis of variance also indicated that there was no significant relationship in regard to social
contact and social distance indexes for the Mexican category. It is important to note, however, that the group that reported the highest mean of (1.65) also expressed having low social contact with members of this group.

Vietnamese. Finally, the null hypothesis pertaining to expressed social distance and amount of social contact was also accepted as reported by the analysis of variance for this group. There was no significant relationship reported. However, the group that expressed the highest social distance index of (2.33) was reported by those respondents having a medium amount of social contact with this group. Also, the second highest expressed social distance index of (1.86) was reported by those respondents having a low amount of social contact. Also important was the fact that for this group the respondents reporting the lowest expressed social distance index of (1.22) also reported having high amounts of social contact with members of the Vietnamese group. The findings in terms of socioeconomic characteristics will be discussed next.

Hypothesis IV

There are differential relationships between the socioeconomic characteristics of the study sample and the overall mean distances reported toward the minority groups selected for study.

Hypothesis IV, A through J, delineated from the general hypothesis, as stated above, will be discussed under
each independent variable analyzed in the study. The reader should note that these specific hypotheses will be discussed and expressed in terms of the null form. The following discussions will be illustrated in Table 8 in the Appendix.

Race. An analysis of variance indicated that there is a significant relationship between race and the mean social distances expressed by the study sample. A significance level of F was reported at the .05 level, (F=6.17, P < .05). The F test was significant, thus indicating the rejection of the null hypothesis. Race, therefore, did significantly affect the expressed social distance indexes. In this study, it was found that Blacks expressed a higher social distance index than whites. Blacks reported a mean of (2.30) in comparison with Whites who reported a mean of (1.51). However, further analysis of cross-tabulation pointed out that a large percentage of whites reported greater mean distances whereas only a small percentage of Blacks reported greater mean distances, thus affecting the overall findings. These findings appear to indicate, with the above limitation, that the few Blacks that did report expressed greater social distances.

This finding may be explained by the literature herein indicating that in social distance research minority groups themselves have responded with social distance toward other minority groups. This response may be a suppressed response taken out on "fellow" minority members. This point is well
explained by Vander Zanden who writes:

The dictates and requirements of the social order may be such that minority group members must of necessity contain and suppress a good many of their hostile impulses toward the dominant group. Some of the aggression that otherwise might be directed at the dominant group may be redirected, or displaced, against one's fellows.¹

Age. An analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis be accepted. Therefore, age did not significantly influence the expressed social distance scores. It should be noted, however, that the age groups between 17 and 25 in this study reported higher expressed social distance scores.

There are many plausible explanations for these feelings. One explanation may be that the older individuals in this study may have experienced "positive" prior social contacts with the varying minority groups. Also, the "aged," constituting a minority themselves, may have greater sympathy for minority status within the American society and may also be more stable and secure.² This stability and security, in terms of status, may cause older people to be more self-assured and feel less threatened by minority members.

Sex. An analysis of variance indicated that the null hypothesis be accepted. Thus, there was no significant


relationship reported between the sex variable and expressed social distances. However, females expressed a slightly higher degree of social distance (1.59) in comparison to males who reported (1.53). This finding is consistent with the Bogardus findings in 1966, in terms of sex. This finding was not significant enough to merit other conclusions.

Religion. An analysis of variance test showed no significant relationship between the religious characteristics of the study sample and the expressed social distance indexes. The null hypothesis was also accepted for this variable.

In reference to religious affiliation, the Protestants and those reporting no religion reported higher expressed social distance scores. This may be explained by the fact that a large percentage of the respondents were Protestants and 24 respondents reported no religion.

The respondents that strongly agreed that religion was important in their lives reported the lowest expressed social distance index. This may be explained by the fact that religion, acting as an agent of social control, may affect individuals in terms of "feeling" more integrated about life and others.¹

Politics. An analysis of variance indicated no significant relationships between the political characteristics and the expressed social distance indexes. The null hypothesis was accepted due to this investigation.

In regard to political views, the highest distances were reported by the independent self-reported group (1.70). This may be due to the lack of a particular political ideology, political knowledge and possibly lower education.

The next highest expressed social distance index of (1.69) was reported by conservatives. This may be due to the lack of expressing social and political change that could be congruent with a politically conservative doctrine.

The liberal respondents and particularly the radicals, expressed the lower social distance indexes (1.45) and (1.02), respectively. This finding may be explained in terms of accepting and encouraging social and political changes which are also generally part of these political doctrines.

In regard to the importance of politics in their lives, the respondents that expressed the highest expressed social distance index, which was (1.70), also reported disagreement, strong disagreement or indecision. This finding may also be explained by less political knowledge and education.

The next highest expressed social distance index was reported by those that agreed (1.52), and the lowest
expressed social distance index (1.24) was enumerated by those that strongly agreed.

Finally, in regard to political participation, the highest expressed social distance index was reported by those respondents that were undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed.

The respondents with the lower expressed social distance indexes of (1.46) and (1.50) agreed and strongly agreed in participating in national and state voting elections on a yearly basis. Again, these differences in expressed social distance indexes may be attributed to the lack of political knowledge and education.

**Education.** In regard to educational characteristics, an analysis of variance indicated no significant relationships between expressed social distance and the educational characteristics. However, a slightly higher social distance index was reported by the vocational respondents. This score was (1.62) in comparison to the academic students who reported a mean social distance index of (1.50). This may be explained by the fact that perhaps those students acquiring liberal academic backgrounds may have gained more knowledge and understanding of minority groups through the study of such subjects as sociology and psychology.

The full-time students expressed a slightly higher degree of social distance, which may be attributed to the
The notion that perhaps the students attending part-time do so because they are employed and are therefore more "experienced".

In regard to the amount of education, the highest expressed social distance index was reported by those respondents currently enrolled at the college, who reported a mean of (1.61). This finding, as with age, may be due to the lack of contact and experience with other minorities as well as the fact that they have recently begun a liberal education.

The lowest expressed social distance index of (1.34) was reported by individuals who were college graduates and who had higher schooling. This finding may perhaps be explained by a quote stated by Simpson and Yinger, who write: "education can reduce prejudice".  

Marital status. An analysis of variance indicated no significant relationship between marital status and expressed social distance scores. It should be noted, however, that the highest reported mean distance was enumerated by the single respondents (1.60). This finding may be explained in terms of youth lacking "life experiences" and contact with varying minority members. Also, along the same point, those married reported (1.50) and those widowed,  

---

separated, and divorced reported the lowest index of (1.23). These findings may be explained by the possibility that those married, divorced, separated and widowed are older and have therefore had more "life experiences" and, as a result, more contact with various minority members.

Residential characteristics. An analysis of variance showed no significant relationship existing between the town the respondents were born and raised in and expressed social distances. However, there was a significant relationship between the extent of urbanization and the social distances expressed. The null hypothesis, then, was rejected in terms of urbanization. The analysis of variance indicated this rejection of the null hypothesis.

Although there was no significant relationship in terms of the town in which the respondents were born and raised, Urbandale, for instance, showed the greatest expressed social distance index, which was (2.02). This may be explained by the fact that not many minorities live in the Urbandale area. The city is characteristically comprised of peoples from varying middle and upper class stratas, thus allowing for little contact between dominant and minority groups in this area.

The next highest social distance index was reported by respondents who were born and raised out-of-town. This would be difficult to speculate upon due to the lack of
sufficient information pertaining to geographical areas.

Ankeny respondents reported the third highest expressed social distance index scores, which may be explained in terms of rural populations that generally lack minority groups. Des Moines reported an index of (1.47), which was the second lowest. This may be explained by the extent of urbanization and the related number of minorities in Des Moines. Lastly, the fact that West Des Moines is part of Des Moines and is largely populated by liberal and educated residents of middle and upper class status may explain the findings of the lowest mean distance index, which was reported as (1.36).

An analysis of variance demonstrated a significant relationship between population and expressed social distance indexes. The significance level of $F$ was reported at the .05 level, ($F = 3.42$, $P < .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Also, the correlation coefficient was significant ($-.2019$). Generally, the findings indicate that as population or extent of urbanization increases, social distances decrease. For instance, in this study, the higher reported social distance indexes were reported by respondents who resided in areas with populations ranging between less than 1,999 and 40,999. These indexes were reported as follows: less than 1,999 population = (1.74), 2,000 - 9,999 = (1.60), 10,000 - 40,999 = (2.24).
The respondents that reported the lower social distance indexes were raised in areas with populations ranging from 50,000 to 300,000, and over. This finding may be explained in terms of urbanization as discussed in the beginning of this thesis. The socioeconomic conditions that currently exist in most large urban areas encourage minority groups to reside in these areas and thus allows, although not in all instances, for more "functional" contact to occur between dominant and minority group members.

**Income.** An analysis of variance demonstrated a significant relationship between the income characteristics of the study sample and the expressed social distance indexes. The significance level of F was demonstrated at the .05 level. The coefficient correlation was also significant ($F = 3.03$, $r = -.200$, $P < .05$). Thus the null hypothesis was rejected.

The findings indicated that income was related to expressed social distances. Generally, groups with higher incomes expressed lower social distances. The findings in this study indicated that the highest expressed social distance index was reported by respondents who earned up to $3,999 as annual income. The index reported for this group was (1.65). The next group of respondents with incomes ranging from $4,000 - $5,999 annually, reported the next highest social distance index which was (1.47). Respondents with incomes ranging from $6,000 - $10,000, and over, reported lower social distance indexes. These findings may
be explained in terms of stratification; the higher one is on the stratification level, the more education, socialization, and possibly the more exposure to minorities. Therefore, one should expect to find lesser social distances.

Occupation. The analysis of variance indicated that there is no significant relationship between occupation and expressed social distances. However, those respondents that reported the highest expressed social distance index scores, which was (1.62), were students who also reported having no occupation. The next highest expressed social distance index was reported by those in white collar professions who reported a (1.37) index. Lastly, blue collar workers reported the lowest index of (1.30). These findings may also be explained for this study by the possibility that perhaps the blue collar workers in this study have had more education and more "life experiences."

The final chapter will discuss conclusions and recommendations for this type of research.
Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. CONCLUSIONS

The results in this research generally indicate that changes in terms of dominant and minority group relationships have occurred within the geographical confines wherein this research occurred. The research indicates that, although overall expressed social distances have decreased, current groups, such as the Vietnamese category that currently immigrate into the American society, continue to be victims of expressed social distances.

In terms of conflict theory, theoretically, there appears to be non-static relationships that do prevail. This research generally supplements the replication studies done by Bogardus and other researchers, and demonstrates that although expressed prejudices exist in American society toward numerous minority groups in varying degrees, generally it appears that within these geographical confines for this particular time period, expressed social distances are decreasing.

The results in this research supported Hypothesis 1, for there were varying degrees of social distances expressed
by the Ankeny and Des Moines Community College students toward the eleven groups selected for analysis. The fact that all groups generally reported a mean of 1.00 indicates that the sub-population is generally willing to accept all members of the minority groups tested in this study into intimate relationships.

Hypothesis II in this research endeavor was supported with the limitations delineated. It appears that overall, as indicated above, and in comparison to Bogardus' 1966 study, that social distances appear to be decreasing.

Hypothesis III was not supported in its entirety. The only significant relationship that was demonstrated was the amount of social contact that members had with occupants of the American Indian minority group.

There were certain variables that appeared to be significant in terms of the socioeconomic characteristics of the study sample. These variables were: race, population, and income. The study demonstrated that the respondents who showed the highest social distances were associated significantly to those variables listed above. In regard to race, Blacks in this study demonstrated greater social distances toward the eleven minority groups. This finding, in terms of race, although indicating certain limitations, perhaps indicates the inner frustrations that may be encountered by this group. This frustration may take the form of responding
negatively to other minority group members because of the conflicts and problems members of the Black group are having and have had in the past.

The findings on population indicate that the extent of urbanization plays a significant part in socializing and possibly influencing one's prejudicial tendencies. The possible existence of minority groups in larger urban areas may account for these findings.

The results in this research also demonstrated that income plays a significant part in terms of expressed social distances.

In general, the following conclusions appear warranted:

1. There are differential degrees of expressed social distances by a random sample of Des Moines Area XI Community College students toward eleven minority groups selected for study.

2. There is currently within the geographical confines, time specifications and limitations placed upon this study, decreases in overall social distances expressed toward the eleven minority groups studied in this research compared with the 1960 findings of Bogardus.

3. The amount and type of prior social contact appears to be associated and is significantly so, particularly for the American Indians who had expressed social distances.

4. The socioeconomic characteristics of race, population, and income appear to be significantly related to expressed social distances.
II. RECOMMENDATIONS

The sample in this study attempted to represent a cross segment of the student populations on the Ankeny and Urban campuses of the Des Moines Area XI Community College. Most other social distance studies have utilized student populations that represent specific classes, such as introductory Sociology courses. It is highly recommended that other samples that are relevant today be selected for analysis. For instance, working groups, current minority groups, and older populations. Also, traditionally, most social distance studies have simply tabulated the distances between groups and have not attempted to go beyond this tabulation.

As indicated in this particular study, there are certain socioeconomic variables that appear to be significant in this type of research. It is suggested, therefore, that further analysis utilizing these types of variables be conducted. Also, it is suggested that in terms of socioeconomic characteristics, other variables such as parental socialization, sub-cultural socialization and the like, be incorporated into the analysis.

Finally, as pointed out so explicitly by Bogardus, replication of this research could indicate the social changes that would be taking place within the society in
the midst of inevitable distances that exist between particular groups, in particular places, during particular periods of time.
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APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A
S.D. (PILOT SURVEY)

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Social Background:
   Age____ Sex: Male____ Female____

2. Religious Background: Catholic____ Protestant____
   Jewish____ Other____

3. Racial Background: Caucasian____ Mongoloid____
   Black____ Other____

4. Residence: Des Moines____ Ankeny____ Other____

5. Educational Background: Elementary____ J.H.S.____
   H.S.____ College____
   Graduate School____ Ph.D Program____

6. Annual Income: (in thousands) 0-3____ 4-5____
   6-7____ 8-9____ 10-11____ 12-13____
   14 and over____

7. List Occupation__________________________________________

8. Which American minority groups of people do you dislike the most in this area? Please list these in order of dislikeness: (#1 the highest dislike, to #10 the lowest). Respond once for each group.

     Group                         Order
     A. Blacks                  ______
     B. Poor Whites             ______
     C. Mexicans                ______
     D. Spanish                 ______
     E. Orientals (Chinese, Japanese) ______
     F. Koreans                 ______
     G. Indian (American)       ______
     H. Jews                    ______
     I. Women Libers            ______
     J. Europeans (French, Italians, Germans) ______
APPENDIX A--(continued)

9. Please list, any other groups you do not like in this area. ______________________________________

10. Please comment on any of these groups listed above. ______

_________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEWER COMMENTS

The following interview will be used for research of minority groups in this area. The intent is to provide information about how much contact you have had with any of these groups. This information will be kept in strict confidence and this is why we are not asking for your name or address.

Please note the following:

1. I would like for you to be honest about what you tell me in order that I may gather clear and truthful opinions.

2. As an interviewer we are to remain objective and only record your feelings and opinions for this total research.

3. I am a student, and I am doing this only to learn how to interview people.

4. Let us begin with your true feelings . . .

5. Proceed to fill in the information portion. Remind interviewer that this is only background information and no name is required.
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: The following questions are part of a thesis research project by one of the instructors here at the college. This information will only be used as part of the total research. The information is to remain confidential. This is why your name is not asked. Please answer the following questions as accurately as possible.

Check or Fill In:

1. Date_____ Year_____

2. Race: White_____ Black_____ Other _______________

3. Age: 17-20____ 21-25____ 26-30____ 31-35____
   36-40____ 41-45____ 45 or over_____

4. Sex: Male_____ Female_____

5. Religion: A. Protestant_____ Catholic_____
   Jewish_____ No Religion_____
   B. Religion is important in my life:
   strongly agree____ agree____
   undecided____ disagree____
   strongly disagree____

6. Politics: A. Politics is important in my life:
   strongly agree____ agree____
   undecided____ disagree____
   strongly disagree____
APPENDIX C--(continued)

B. I participate in voting elections for state and national offices on a yearly basis:

strongly agree_____ agree_____ 
undecided_____ disagree_____ 
strongly disagree_____

C. In terms of political views, generally which do you consider yourself?

Liberal_____ Conservative_____ 
Radical_____ Independent_____ 

7. Education:

A. Currently, what program are you enrolled in at the college?

General Ed. (Arts & Science)_____ 
Career Ed._____ 

B. Part-Time_____ Full-Time_____ 

C. Check or list the amount of education you have had.

8th grade or less_____ some high school_____ 
high school_____ 
1 year college_____ 2 years college_____ 
3 years college_____ 
4 years college_____ college degree_____ 
graduate student_____ graduate degree_____ 

8. Marital Status:

Single_____ Married_____ Divorced_____ 
Separated_____ Widowed_____
APPENDIX C—(continued)

9. Residence: (List the area you were born and raised in.)
   A. Name of Town: Ankeny____ Des Moines____
      West Des Moines____ Urbandale____
      Out-of-town (List)_____________________

B. What is the estimate of the town above?
   Less than 1,999____ 2,000- 4,999____
   5,000-9,999____ 10,000-19,999____
   20,000-40,999____ 50,000-60,999____
   70,000-80,999____ 90,000-100,999____
   101,000-200,999____ 300,000 or over____

10. Income: None____ 4,000-5,999____
     6,000-7,999____ 8,000-9,999____
     10,000-11,999____ 12,000-13,999____
     14,000-15,999____ 16,000-17,999____
     18,000-19,999____ 20,000 and over____

11. Occupation:
   Student____; Professional, Executive or Proprietor
   of a Large Business____; Business Manager, less
   or professional, proprietor of medium size busi-
   ness____; Administrative personnel, owner of
   small business, minor professional____; Clerical
   or sales worker, technician, manager or proprietor
   of small business____; Skilled manual worker____;
   Machine operator, semi-skilled worker, small
   farmer____; Unskilled worker, tenant farmer____.
APPENDIX D--SOCIAL CONTACT

Directions: If you would be willing to accept the members of a certain group to any one or more of the relationships indicated in the left-hand column, mark an X for each group in the appropriate column box assigned for each group. Give your reaction to typical members, not the best or worst members you have known. Work rapidly please.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN NUMBER</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Feminist</td>
<td>Koreans</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TYPES OF RELATIONSHIPS

1. To Close Kinship by Marriage
2. To My Club as a Personal Chum
3. To My Street as Neighbors
4. To Employment in my Occupation
5. To Citizenship in My Country
6. Only as Visitors to My Country
7. Would Exclude from My Country

*Feminist means a person who believes in (1) equality for females; (2) the current feminist movement; and (3) is actively engaging in this movement.
APPENDIX D--(continued)

Directions: Check the Amount of Social Contact you have had with a member(s) of each group.

NOTE: 1. Social contact means relationships on an acquaintance or friendship basis.
       2. Few contact means: (1-3 contacts)
       3. Several contact means: (4 or more contacts)

1. The social contact(s) with a member(s) of the feminist group.
   No Contact(s)  Few Contacts (1-3)  Several Contacts (4 or more)

2. The social contact(s) with a member(s) of the Korean group.
   No Contact(s)  Few Contacts (1-3)  Several Contacts (4 or more)

3. The social contact(s) with a member(s) of the American Indian group.
   No Contact(s)  Few Contacts (1-3)  Several Contacts (4 or more)

4. The social contact(s) with a member(s) of the Russian group.
   No Contact(s)  Few Contacts (1-3)  Several Contacts (4 or more)

5. The social contact(s) with a member(s) of the Black group.
   No Contact(s)  Few Contacts (1-3)  Several Contacts (4 or more)

6. The social contact(s) with a member(s) of the Jewish group.
   No Contact(s)  Few Contacts (1-3)  Several Contacts (4 or more)

7. The social contact(s) with a member(s) of the Japanese group.
   No Contact(s)  Few Contacts (1-3)  Several Contacts (4 or more)

8. The social contact(s) with a member(s) of the Italian group.
   No Contact(s)  Few Contacts (1-3)  Several Contacts (4 or more)
APPENDIX D--(continued)

9. The social contact(s) with a member(s) of the Chinese group.
   No Contact(s)    Few Contacts (1-3)    Several Contacts (4 or more)

10. The social contact(s) with a member(s) of the Mexican American group.
    No Contact(s)    Few Contacts (1-3)    Several Contacts (4 or more)

11. The social contact(s) with a member(s) of the Vietnamese group.
    No Contact(s)    Few Contacts (1-3)    Several Contacts (4 or more)

Thank you very much for your cooperation!
**Table 8**

**E.S.D.I. For All Groups According to Socioeconomic Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E.S.D.I. Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. White</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>*6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 17-20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 21-25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 26-30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 31-45 and over</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Protestant</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Catholic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. No Religion</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Religion and its</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Strongly Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Undecided, Disagree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Politics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-Political Views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Conservative</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Liberal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Radical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Independent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Politics and its Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participation in Voting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Strongly Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Academic</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Vocational</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Part-time</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Full-time</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amount of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. High School or Less</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Currently Enrolled in College</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. College Graduate or More</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Married</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8—(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Residential Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Town Born and Raised In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Ankeny</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Des Moines</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. West Des Moines</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Urbandale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Out-of-town</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Less than 1,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 2,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 10,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 50,000 - 100,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 101,000 - 300,000 and Over</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Up to 3,999</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 4,000 - 5,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 6,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 10,000 and Over</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. None (Student)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. White Collar</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Blue Collar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.