Assessing the Existence of Social Distance and
Factors That Affect its Magnitude at a Southern University

Jerry Vincent Nix

University of Mississippi
Department of Sociology

May, 1993

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The existence of social distance between various ethnic groups was investigated and substantiated. The Social Learning Theory was assessed as a way to explain factors that influence social distance. Social Distance was measured by an adaptation of the Bogardus-scale.

A questionnaire was administered to 131 graduate and undergraduate, American and International students, living in residence halls on the university campus. The instrument asked various demographic questions and included a social distance scale.

Respondents were classified into three broad ethnic groups. Data were collected from these anonymous survey questionnaires and quantitatively analyzed by a computer-driven statistical program (SPSS-X). Among the relevant findings, it was shown that social distance is a function of ethnic background, current educational level, and previous interaction with other ethnic groups. It was found that whether or not the respondent was an international or American student significantly affected social distance. Social distance also seems to be a function of current worldly events. All variables were assessed at the .05 significance level. Results lend credence to the Social Learning Theory as a tool for explaining social distance between ethnic/cultural groups.

Assessing the Existence of Social Distance and
Factors that affect its Magnitude at a Southern University.

Robert E. Park first defined the term and concept of "social distance" while serving

as a Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago. The "American Negro" problem,

and the strife caused by the "yellow devils" from the Orient led many social scientists to

begin the study of prejudice and racial attitudes. The Negro began to dislike "his place"

in society, and Asian immigrants were just beginning to compete for scarce resources in

society. Dr. Park defined social distance as, "the grades and degrees of understanding

and intimacy which characterize personal and social relations generally" (Park, 1924).

Dr. Emory S. Bogardus, professor at the University of Southern California,

developed the first scale widely accepted as a reliable indicator of social distance.

Bogardus' scale was scrutinized by 100 academia, who rated sixty statements that

expressed social distance. The judges ranked each statement on a scale from one to

seven, one being the least social distance, and seven being the most social distance.

Scores for each statement were added, and the arithmetic mean of each statement was

recorded. The statement receiving a mean closest to one was judged to express the

least social distance. The statement with the mean closest to the value of two was

judged to express the next level of social distance, and so on (Bogardus, 1936).

Bogardus used the scale throughout his distinguished career as an aid in valuable

research. His most widely read studies were conducted at ten-year intervals. The results

of these studies (no study was carried out in 1936 because Dr. Bogardus was out of the

country) indicated that social distance scores were decreasing over time. These studies also revealed that the relative positions of distinct ethnic groups were stable.

Dr. Bogardus' death in 1973 threatened to end a distinct line of research in American sociological history. Fortunately several sociologists, and social-psychologists have continued Dr. Bogardus' studies. A 1975 study found a higher overall social distance score than Dr. Bogardus' last study (Crull and Bruton, 1976). Another study in 1977 found that social distance scores were relatively stable (Owens, et. al, 1978). The overall social distance score means and standard deviations for the Bogardus and the Owens, et al. studies are presented in table one.

_____

Insert table 1 about here

_____

Studies on social distance in other countries have demonstrated U.S. citizens to be less prejudiced than those countries' citizens. Perhaps this trend can be explained by the increasing diversity in the United States (Sell, 1989; Hraba, Hagendoorn, and Hagendoorn, 1989; Goldberg and Kirschenbaum, 1989; McAllister and Moore, 1991; Netting, 1991).

An interesting trend that has surfaced is that social distance tends to be a function of worldly events. Bogardus (1926, 1946, 1956, and 1966) found that this trend continued over time. In his 1926 study, the Turks were the most outcast of all groups

surveyed. This was attributed to the national and worldly headlines, detailing the Turks'

atrocities toward the Armenians. Bogardus' 1946 research had the Japanese at the

bottom of the list, probably due to the attack on Pearl Harbor. In the 1956 study. the

Japanese rose dramatically, and Bogardus attributed this to the newly democratized

Japan, under U.S. occupation (Bogardus, 1968). In the 1966 survey, Koreans were at

the bottom, while "Negroes" began their upward move in the rankings (Owen, et al,

1978). In the same 1978 study, Owen, et al, found that Southeastern Asians occupied

most of the lower rankings on the social distance scale.

In a study conducted in Texas (Dyer, Vedlitz, and Worchel, 1986) concluded that

minorities place more social distance between themselves and other minorities, than

between themselves and whites. This study claimed that minorities might possibly model

their behavior after the members of the majority, since the majority constitutes a powerful

model in our society. Prejudice seems to be one of the behaviors that might be modeled.

This same study also found that social distance decreased as educational level

increased, particularly among minority groups. Similar results had been noted in a study

at Syracuse University (Ames and Sakuma, 1969).

Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977) assumes several factors play important

roles in whether or not people's actions are based on what they have learned. According

to this theory, important factors in learning are cross-cultural awareness, culture,

language, socialization, roles, attitudes, rules, and behavior (or modeling). The Social

Learning theory is unique as a learning theory, since it claims behavior can be reinforced by one's self, as well as by others that might desire a certain behavior of an individual. This reinforcement can be immediate, or delayed. Humans are unique then, as a species, since they are able to plan actions based on what they have learned will be the consequences for certain behaviors or actions (Heydari, 1988). My research was interested in what (if any) effect some of the variables of the Social Learning theory had on social distance.

The hypotheses formulated for this (quasi-experimental) study, based on the Social Learning Theory are:

1) individuals who have had close contact with persons of a different

ethnic background should place less social distance between

themselves and the out-group than persons who have had

limited or no cross-cultural experience;

1b) Persons from an urban background should have had more

opportunities to interact with other ethnic groups. Following from

hypothesis #1, they should place less social distance between

themselves and the out-group, than people from a rural

background.

2) Females are socialized to be more caring and nurturing than males are. Women have traditionally been discriminated against and should be more empathetic to minority groups than men are. Women are not criticized for being emotionally involved, as men frequently are. Perhaps women band together to secure equality in the work-place, this should produce less social distance than men place between themselves and out-groups.

3) Religious persons are usually in close contact with people who share the same beliefs. Religions are not noted for being overly accepting of other religious groups. Religious organizations are generally stratified along racial lines. Persons who attend religious services frequently should place more social distance between themselves and out-groups.

4) Individuals who are highly educated have had a greater chance to associate with other ethnic groups. They should have less social distance than less-educated persons. Furthermore, since parents constitute powerful role models, respondents with highly educated parents should also place less social distance between themselves and out-groups.

5) Liberal Arts' majors should have a more diverse curriculum and training, so should be even less prejudiced than other college students or graduates.

6) Members of the majority make up powerful role models for minority groups. Following from this, prejudice should be a modeled behavior. Minority groups should place more social distance between themselves and other minorities than between themselves and whites.

7) This researcher was particularly interested in whether direct interaction between international students would decrease social distance from international students. In a residence hall with a majority of its population international students, social distance scores for international students should be lower than at residence halls that have less international students to interact with. The staff in residence halls are generally more liberal. They also constitute powerful role models for the students who live in the halls. Therefore it was hypothesized that the social distance should decrease as the time one lives in a residence hall increases (negative correlation.)

This study also investigated findings of other social distance research. The null hypothesis that (U.S. of) Americans would place equal overall social distance between themselves and out groups was tested. This study also assessed the significance of current worldly events to effect social distance.

Method

<u>Subjects</u>

The subjects in this quasi-experiment were drawn from a non-random sample. The sample was purposive due mainly to time constraints of this experiment. The subjects were selected from three primary groups. Group one, was taken from a graduate resident hall (Grant Hall), of which the experimenter is the director. This hall had a population of roughly 85% international students. Group two was drawn from a male residence hall with a population of 30% international students. Group three consisted of female Resident Advisors, currently employed by the Department of Student Housing and Residence Life. The first group was chosen simply for convenience. The second group was chosen for its close proximity to the experimenter's residence (next door.) The third group was added when it became apparent that the sample would consist of mainly males. The Ss were divided into two groups: "Grant Hall" and "other". Total Ss for this experiment were 131. 56 of the Ss came from Grant Hall and 75 came from other halls on the campus. 106 Ss were U.S. citizens, and 25 were international students. 21 Ss were married and 109 were single. One of the Ss did not answer the question on marital status. There were 60 females and 71 males in the total sample. 68

of the Ss were Liberal Arts majors, and 63 were majoring in another field. Three broad

racial/ethnic groups were represented: African, Asian, and European. Approximately 25

surveys were not used in the quasi-experiment because the Ss were from multiple ethnic

backgrounds that did not make up a substantial group of responses. 109 of the Ss were

aged 29 years or less, 22 were 30 or more years of age. Ss received nothing for their

participation other than a heartfelt "thank-you" from the experimenter.

Procedure

200 questionnaires (see appendix) were distributed. 100 in Grant Hall and 100 to

the other halls. Of the instruments received in time to be counted, 56 came from Grant

Hall and 75 from other halls on campus. The survey questionnaires were distributed by

hand to residents in Grant hall. The researcher delivered the instruments to other hall

directors on campus. The other hall directors then distributed the questionnaires to

residents in their respective halls.

After collection, the researcher and his spouse entered the data into a mainframe

computer using the statistical package SPSS-X. Social Distance as a dependent variable

was computed by adding all social distance scores given to all groups named on the

survey and dividing by the number of groups (48). This procedure has been used in all

reviewed studies to date. It was possible to compute several dependent variables using

these data. The main dependent variable used in analyzing data from this experiment

was "social distance from international students." For hypothesis number six, a different

dependent variable was used, "social distance for nonwhites." Table two gives an overall

view of the different "social distances" that were computed from these data, and their

scores.

_____

Insert table 2 about here

_____

Analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not the independent

variables had any significant effect on the social distance scores obtained. It has been

shown that Analysis of variance is one of the most powerful statistical tools, especially

when two or more independent variables are being examined (Runyon in Heydari, 1988).

This technique avoids the ambiguity of assessing differences in variances using multiple

comparisons.

Results

So that the analyses of this project may be compared to most other social

distance studies, results are reported in arithmetic means. The overall social distance

score for the 48 ethnic/racial/religious groups was 2.43 (SD = 1.29). The social distance

scores for international students was 2.50 (SD = 1.31).

Further analyses of the data revealed which independent variables affected the

dependent variable "social distance for international students." Closer looks at each

research hypothesis revealed the following results:

1) Social Distance is a function of previous contact with other ethnic groups. The

social distances reported generally decreased as respondents' contacts with

other ethnic groups increased. There was a marked increase in social distance

responses from people who claimed their neighbors were all from the same

ethnic group as themselves. Table three gives an overall view of social distance

in relation to this variable.

_____

Insert Table 3 about here

_____

2) The home-size of the respondent did affect social distance scores obtained.

Once the population of the Ss' home communities reached 40,000, there was a

dramatic decrease in social distance. Table four reveals the dispersion of social

distance means.

_____

Insert Table 4 about here

_____

3) Although males did place more social distance between themselves and the

out-groups, as hypothesized, the results were not significant at the .05

significance level. The mean social distance given by males was 2.50 ($\underline{SD}$ =1.30). Female data yielded a social distance mean of 2.30 ($\underline{SD}$ = 1.28).

4) Educational level of the respondent did influence social distance scores. The mean social distance gradually decreased from freshmen Ss to senior Ss. The social distance mean for graduate students was very low. Table five details these results. Educational level of Ss' parents did not significantly affect social distance. In fact, educational level of Ss' mothers seemingly had no effect whatsoever on social distance scores.

—————————

Insert Table 5 about here

—————————

5) Liberal Arts majors were slightly more accepting than Ss who were majoring in other areas. The social distance mean of Liberal Arts majors was 2.294 ($\underline{SD}$ = 1.22). Mean social distance for all other majors' Ss was 2.71 ($\underline{SD}$ = 1.39). This difference was not significant.

6) There was no significant difference in social distance for non-whites obtained. Minorities seemingly place the same social distance between themselves and other minorities as themselves and whites.

7) Ss who were housed in Grant Hall were less ethno-centric than respondents housed in other halls. The mean social distance obtained by Grant Hall residents was 2.23 ($\underline{SD}$ = 1.22). The group consisting of residents housed in various different halls yielded a mean of 2.67 ($\underline{SD}$ = 1.34). These results were not significant at the .05 level. Length of stay in a residence hall did significantly affect social distance for Grant Hall and the other Ss as well. Table 6 provides a detailed look.

_____

Insert Table 6 about here

_____

The data from this research supports studies mentioned above in that Americans seem far less prejudiced than citizens from other countries. The overall social distance score given by U.S. citizens was 2.25 ($\underline{SD}$ = 1.13). For internationals the social distance score given was 3.19 ($\underline{SD}$ = 1.67). Analysis of variance revealed a significant effect, $\underline{F}$(1,126) = 10.02, $\underline{p}$=.002.

Analyses of variance reveal exactly which of the independent variables of this

study significantly affected social distance scores. The results of the ANOVAs are shown in Table 7.

_____

Insert Table 7 about here

_____

The F-statistics in Table 7 are exact.

This research clearly indicates that social distance is a function of worldly events. The out-groups receiving the highest social distance scores were the Iraqis ($\underline{M}$ = 3.47, $\underline{SD}$ = 2.14) and Iranians ($\underline{M}$ = 3.34, $\underline{SD}$ = 2.03). Overall, every group from the region we call the "Mid-East" was ranked very low. Table 8 lists all social distance scores obtained.

_____

Insert Table 8 about here

_____

Discussion

This research has added to the long list of studies carried out in an attempt to analyze social distance. Hopefully it has been a beneficial addition.

Overall the social distance scores obtained in this quasi-experiment were somewhat higher than expected. The results were especially discouraging when considering that the sample was supposedly liberally biased.

The study does lend moderate support to the Social Learning Theory as a predictor of social distance scores. This research also makes it apparent that a more diverse model, possibly combining elements from functional, conflict, and balance theories might be a stronger predictor. This is strongly evident in the hypothesis for home-size of the respondent. The social distance scores generally decrease as home-size increases. The glaring exception is for home-sizes in the 20,001-30,000 population range. The extremely high social distance mean for this group defies explanation. It is possible that many suburbs have populations in this range. Perhaps suburbs are very segregated. This would tend to increase social distance. This particular area in itself justifies further research.

One thing the study failed to do was reinforce the belief that social distance is continuing to decrease in our society simply as a function of time. Perhaps the high social distance means are due to the study being undertaken in the deep South. It could be that the study has reinforced the belief that social distance is a function of worldly

events. The university involved in this experiment has certainly had its share of racial

tensions recently. These tensions seem to be increasing daily, rather than subsiding.

The main objective of this study was to determine whether or not social distance

existed between international and American students. It was determined that social

distance exists between these two groups. Encouraging findings of the study include the

suggestion that more education decreases social distances. The implication is to get

people in school and keep them there. This study had very severe limitations. Time limit

was the most pronounced, and as a result of that the sample was rather small to draw

serious inferences from. If this study sparks interest in others to continue the research

began by Dr. Bogardus nearly 70 years ago, the researcher will consider it a success.

References

Ames, Richard G. & Sakuma, Arline F. (1969). Criteria for evaluating others: A re-examination of the Bogardus social distance scale. <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>, <u>54</u>,(October), 5-24.

Bandura, Albert. (Ed.). 1977). <u>Social learning theory</u>. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bogardus, Emory S. (1925). Social distance and its origins. <u>Journal of Applied Sociology</u>, <u>9</u>, 216-225.

Bogardus, Emory S. (1925). Measuring social distances. <u>Journal of Applied Sociology</u>, <u>9</u>, 299-308.

Bogardus, Emory S. (1928). <u>Immigration and race attitudes</u>. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company .

Bogardus, Emory S. (1933). A social distance scale. <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>, (January-February), 265-271.

Bogardus, Emory S. (1936). <u>Introduction to social research</u>. Los Angeles: Suttonhouse Ltd.

Bogardus, Emory S. (1958). Racial distance changes in the United States during the past thirty years. <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>, <u>43</u>, (2), 127-135.

Crull, Sue R., & Bruton, Brent T. (1976). Bogardus social distance in the 1970s. <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>, <u>63</u>, (4), 771-783.

Dyer, James, Vedlitz, Arnold, & Worchel, Stephen. (1989). Social distance among racial and ethnic groups in Texas: Some demographic correlates. <u>Social Science Quarterly</u>. <u>70</u>, (3), 607-616.

Goldberg, Albert I., & Kirschenbaum, Alan. (1989). Black newcomers to Israel: Contact situations and social distance.<u>Sociology and Social Research</u>, <u>74</u>, (1), 52-57.

Heydari, Ahmad. (1988). An empirical test of two conceptual models concerning american students' social distance from international students. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 8823752.

McAllister, Ian, & Moore, Rhonda. (1991). Social distance among Australian ethnic groups. <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>. <u>75</u>, (2), 95-100.

Netting, Nancy S. (1991). Chinese aloofness from other groups: Social distance data from a city in British Columbia. <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>. <u>75</u>, (2), 101-104.

Owen, Carolyn A., Eisner, Howard C., & McFaul, Thomas R. (1977). A half-century of social distance research: National replication of the Bogardus' studies. <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>, <u>66</u>, (1), 80-98.

Park, Robert E. (1924). The concept of social distance: As applied to the study of racial relations. <u>Journal of Applied Sociology</u>, <u>8</u>, (July-August), 339-334.

Table 1

Social Distance as a Function of Time

	Year of Study				
Statistics	1926	1946	1956	1966	1976
M	2.14	2.12	2.08	1.92	1.91
SD	2.85	2.57	1.75	1.56	1.48

Table 2

Social Distance as a Function of Ethnic, Religious, or Racial Group

Social Distance	Ethnic Background of Respondent		
	African	Asian	European
Overall			
M	2.47	3.13	2.19
SD	1.45	1.67	1.14
Whites			
M	2.33	2.91	1.72
SD	1.19	1.60	0.79
Non-Whites			
M	2.53	3.18	2.42
SD	1.13	1.65	1.33
Africans			
M	1.88	3.00	2.31
SD	0.81	1.82	1.36
Asians			
M	2.51	2.87	2.22
SD	1.13	1.63	1.34
Religions			
M	2.81	3.19	2.57
SD	1.45	1.87	1.42
Europeans			
M	2.41	2.99	1.91
SD	1.27	1.65	0.96
International Students			
M	2.54	3.13	2.29
SD	1.22	1.57	1.21

Table 3

Social Distance as a Function of Respondents' Neighbors' Ethnicity

		Proportion of Neighbors with Same Ethnicity		
Statistics	All	Most	Some	None
M	3.09	2.05	2.21	2.21
SD	1.36	0.94	1.50	1.08
n	51	49	14	13

Note. n is less than 131 due to missing values for some Ss.

Table 4

Social Distance Scores by Respondents' Home-sizes

		Statistics	
Home-size	n	M	SD
Less than 1,000	8	2.58	1.92
1,000 - 5,000	12	2.44	1.03
5,001 - 10,000	14	2.24	1.00
10,001- 20,000	14	2.68	0.97
20,001- 30,000	14	3.65	1.15
30,001- 40,000	13	2.79	1.55
40,001- 50,000	7	2.21	1.04
50,000 or More	46	2.13	1.31

Note . Three cases were missing in the 50,000 or more group.

Table 5

Social Distance Scores by Current Educational Level of Respondent

		Statistics	
Education Level	na	M	SD
Freshman	9	3.45	0.56
Sophomore	15	3.16	1.11
Junior	23	2.74	1.21
Senior	31	2.47	1.48
Graduate	51	1.88	1.09

Note . The Freshman and Senior groups each had one missing case.

aOne subject was not included because she was not currently a student.

Table 6

Social Distance Scores by Length of Stay in a Residence Hall

| | | Statistics | |
Months	n	M	SD
0- 6	40	2.72	1.58
7-12	18	3.10	0.92
13-18	14	2.42	1.33
19-24	17	2.50	1.19
25 or more	34	1.92	1.03

Note . Three cases were missing from the 0-6 month group.

Table 7

Anova Results of the Social Distance Survey Data

	Statistics		
Independent Variable	F	df	p
Ethnicity of Neighbors	4.914	4	.001
Home-size of Respondent	2.542	7	.018
Gender	0.657	1	.419
Religiosity	0.927	8	.500
Educational Level of Respondent	5.341	4	.001
Mother's Educational Level	0.886	4	.475
Father's Educational Level	2.105	4	.084
School	3.296	1	.072
Ethnicity	2.629	2	.076
Residence Hall Assignment	3.374	1	.069
Length of Stay in Residence Hall	2.883	4	.025

Table 8

Social Distance for each Ethnic, Racial, and Religious Group

	Statistics	
Group	M	SD
African-Americans	2.08	1.33
Anglo-Americans	1.63	1.11
Asian Americans	2.21	1.36
Africans	2.35	1.46
Buddhist	2.61	1.59
Bulgarian	2.45	1.52
Canadian	1.92	1.29
Chinese	2.37	1.50
Croatian	2.55	1.56
Cuban	2.60	1.70
Dutch	2.12	1.36
English	1.78	1.19
French	2.01	1.32
Filipino	2.47	1.48
German	2.17	1.34
Greek	2.17	1.34
Haitian	2.57	1.65
Hispanic-American	2.37	1.57
Hindu	2.75	1.60
Hungarian	2.45	1.54
HongKonger	2.51	1.60
Indian	2.53	1.54
Iranian	3.34	2.03
Iraqi	3.47	2.14
Irish	2.10	1.38
Israeli	2.88	1.76
Italian	2.28	1.39
Japanese	2.21	1.37
Jewish	2.48	1.46
Korean	2.36	1.39
Lebanese	2.75	1.71
Malaysian	2.30	1.43
Mexican	2.47	1.59

Table 8 (Continued)

Statistics

Group	M	SD
Muslim	2.82	1.67
Norwegian	2.28	1.43
Pakistani	2.89	1.66
Palestinian	2.95	1.71
Portuguese	2.44	1.46
Polish	2.37	1.42
Rumanian	2.53	1.53
Russian	2.45	1.55
Serbian	2.63	1.64
Scottish	2.12	1.30
Spanish	2.14	1.33
Swedish	1.99	1.31
Taiwanese	2.44	1.53
Turkish	2.62	1.57
Viet-Namese	2.61	1.59

APPENDIX

<u>No.</u>   <u>Date</u>

The following information is being collected for statistical purposes only. These data are being used to satisfy a senior-undergraduate research assignment. These data will be used only to infer how various people view their social environment. The answers you give will not be shared with any other person. No one will ever know who filled out this particular survey. Please be as honest as possible while answering these questions.

     Please record the number that matches your answer in the space provided to the left of the question.

___1. Gender: 1. Male   2. Female

___2. What is your current educational level?

             1. Freshman

             2. Sophomore

             3. Junior

             4. Senior

             5. Graduate Student or Post-Graduate

___3. What is your school/division?

             1. Liberal Arts   2. Business

             3. Pharmacy   4. Law

             5. Engineering   6. Education

             7. Other

___4. What is the main source of funds for your education?

             1. Family resources   2. Spouse

             3. Scholarship   4. Grants

             5. Work-study   6. Full-time job

___5. How large is your home community?

             1. under 1,000   2. 1,000- 5,000

             3. 5,001-10,000   4. 10,001-20,000

             5. 20,001-30,000   6. 30,001-40,000

             7. 40,001-50,000   8. 50,001 +

___6. My home community is in:_____(country)

_____(state, province, prefecture)

_____(city, town, community)

___7. Marital Status: 1. Married   2. Single

___8. Are you a member of any Church?

1. Yes   2. No

___9. If you answered yes to the previous question, how often do you attend church?

1. Once a week, or more

2. Twice a month

3. Once a month

4. Less than once a month

5. Never

___10. Which statement best describes your belief in God, or a
Supreme Being?

1. Pray, ask guidance every day

2. Firm belief, important part of my life

3. Belief, but not really important to me

4. I am not sure

5. I do not believe in a Supreme Being

___11. Do you believe there are major cultural barriers between American and International
Students?

1. Yes   2. No

___12. If you answered "yes" to question #11, what do you feel is the primary barrier?

1. Religion

2. Student Attitudes

3. Clothing

4. Language

5. Norms and values

___13. What is your ethnic heritage background?

1. African   2. Asian

3. European   4. Middle Eastern

5. Native American   6. Other

__14. Think of your home community. What proportion of your neighbors were of the same ethnic background as you?

      1. My neighbors were of my ethnic background

      2. Most neighbors were of my ethnicity

      3. Some of my neighbors were of my ethnicity

      4. Most neighbors were a different ethnicity

      5. None of my neighbors were of my ethnicity

__15. How much contact have you had in your lifetime with persons of a different racial or ethnic background than your own.

      1. A great deal of contact

      2. Some contact

      3. Very little contact

      4. No contact

__16. What is the highest level of education completed by your father, or male guardian?

      1. Grade school or less

      2. Some High school

      3. High school graduate

      4. Some beyond high school

      5. College graduate

      6. Graduate/Professional school after college

__17. What is the highest level of education completed by your mother, or female guardian?

      1. Grade school or less

      2. Some high school

      3. High school graduate

      4. Some beyond high school

      5. College graduate

      6. Graduate/professional school after college

__18. How would you describe your father's occupation?

      1. Blue collar

      2. White collar

      3. Actual occupation_____

__19. How would you describe your mother's occupation?

      1. Blue collar

      2. White collar

      3. Actual occupation_____

__20. How would you rate your cross-cultural experiences at (Insert your University here, originally it was Ole Miss.)?

          1. Extremely positive

          2. Generally positive

          3. Somewhat positive

          4. Somewhat negative

          5. Generally negative

          6. Extremely negative

__21. Are you a member of any student organization at (Your school?)

          1. Yes   2. No

__22. If yes to question # 21, how often do you attend?

          1. Regularly

          2. Irregularly

          3. Never

__23. Are any of your friends international students?

          1. Yes   2. No

__24. If yes to the previous question, how often do you have interaction with your international friends?

          1. Often

          2. Occasionally

          3. Rarely

__25. Are you an international Student?

          1. Yes   2. No

__26. If yes to question number 25, do you have any friends who are American students?

          1. Yes   2. No

__27. How often do you have interaction with your American friends?

          1. Often

          2. Occasionally

          3. Rarely

          4. I do not have any American friends

__28. As of your last birthday, what is your age? _____

....29. I have lived in Grant Hall for ____years, ___months.

   If you lived in another hall at this university, please tell which hall and how long you lived there :_____

30. After completing your degree, where will you work?

                              1. In the U.S.A
                              2. Outside the U.S.A
                              3. Wherever a job is offered

Please follow the Instructions carefully:

   According to my first feelings (reactions), I would willingly admit members of each ethnic or racial group into the following classifications (please think of each group as a whole, and not of the best representative, nor the worst representative of that group you have known) :

1. close kinship by marriage
2. very close friends
3. as my neighbors
4. into my work group
5. as a speaking acquaintance only
6. as visitors only to my country
7. exclude from my country.

Please write the number of the statement above that corresponds to your feeling in the space provided to the left of each group name:

___African-American   ___Israeli

___Anglo-American   ___Italian

___Asian-American   ___Japanese

___African   ___Jewish

___Buddhist   ___Korean

___Canadian   ___Lebanese

___Chinese   ___Malaysian

___Croatian   ___Mexican

___Cuban   ___Muslim

___Dutch   ___Norwegian

___English   ___Pakistani

___French   ___Palestinian

___Filipino   ___Portuguese

___German   ___Polish

___Greek   ___Rumanian

___Haitian   ___Russian

___Hispanic-American   ___Serbian

___Hindu   ___Scottish

___Hongkonger   ___Spanish

___Indian   ___Swedish

___Iranian   ___Taiwanese

___Iraqi   ___Turkish

___Irish   ___VietNamese