CHAPTER III
PLAN OF THE STUDY

The objective of the present study is twofold: firstly, do the perceptions of Indians in the United States of America about Indians i.e. about their home country, culture and people undergo change as a result of their exposure to American experience? Secondly, what is the degree of social distance presently assigned to Indians by native-born Americans?

An answer to this twofold question involves evaluation of effects of cross-cultural interaction both on Indians and Americans. For a better appraisal of changes, if any, both in perceptions and social distance, it is necessary to have a close look at both the countries and their cultures.

India and Indians

Available pre-historic evidence points to the fact that India was among the earliest centers of human occupation. But it is only at about 3000 B.C. that India emerged on the stage of history as the seat of a great civilization (Panikkar, 1964).

India is the second largest in population and seventh
largest in area of the countries of the world. It is a union of 18 states and 9 territories (Family Almanac, 1972).

Guidelines for the Indian government are democracy, socialism and secularism so far as internal affairs are concerned, and nonalignment in external relations (Mrs. Gandhi, 1972).

India's population is 82% rural and 18% urban. Agriculture occupies 70%, 10% is engaged in industry and the rest in other sectors of economy (Family Almanac, 1972). India is technologically backward (Mrs. Gandhi, 1972). Therefore, there is almost a world's difference between large cities and small towns or villages in terms of various facilities available.

India's ethnic composition is mixed, as throughout its long history India has been invaded by a variety of peoples who amalgamated with the natives. Two major racial strains predominate in this amalgamation; the Aryan in the north and the Dravidian in the south. The distinctions between them are blurred, however. In addition to the ethnic amalgamation, climate, food habits, religion and philosophy have helped to create a recognizable Indian type with its own characteristics. Ralph Linton (1955) says, "India would thus offer the world's best field for studying the dynamics of human evolution if we only knew exactly what racial elements had gone into the making of the present
The population of India is predominantly Hindu in religious belief. The constitution guarantees freedom of worship and equal protection for the followers of all religions. Almost every religion and sect in the world is represented in India. Although it has been frequently stated that religion in India has a more important place in life than in any other country in the world, religious differences have also kept Indians from "melting together" (Our Wonderful World, 1966). It has also given rise to occasional riots between Hindus and Muslims. However, barring the Hindu Muslim tensions and strifes, the various other religions have shown tolerance for each other and have co-existed peacefully.

India was one of the world's cradles of civilization but it has remained backward and stagnated due to several factors such as superstition, religious fanaticism, castism and general lack of education. Those who could afford or were interested went to school. Lack of education greatly contributed to the continuation of the caste discrimination, increase in population and low standard of living for the vast majority. In the words of Mrs. Gandhi (1972), "Two centuries and more of history marked by foreign intervention, domination and exploitation left India backward, apathetic and stagnant. The general scene was one of decay, reflected
in the misery of the masses (p. 2)."

Since India gained her independence in 1947, progress is gradually being made in various areas. The constitution of India, promulgated in 1950 conferred equal social, economic and political rights on all citizens regardless of sex, religion or caste. Untouchability, an age-old curse, was legally abolished. Social equality between the castes is emphasized by the provision of specific educational and employment facilities for the scheduled and backward classes. The legal and social status of women has improved. The constitution now provides for free, compulsory education through age 14. Since independence, the number of universities in India has more than doubled. The national government realized from the beginning that unless India took advantage of modern scientific advances and trained her own personnel in the highest levels of research, she would not be able to bridge the gulf between herself and the technologically more advanced nations of the world. Senator Church (1972) says:

India today ranks as the world's eighth industrial nation. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
The government has worked hard to raise the living standards of the Indian people by providing extensive health services, raising life expectancy to 55 years today, by increasing the literacy rate from 14 percent in 1947 to over 30 percent in 1972, and by promoting effective family planning programs nationwide. (p. 1).

With all the remarkable progress India has made since independence, the fact still remains that India has a long
way to go yet. Still 80% of India lives in villages. The caste tensions, inequality of treatment and inferior status of women still continue. Marriages are typically arranged. Despite the achievement of women in recent years in the spheres of education, social work and rehabilitation, Indian woman, educated or uneducated still continues to be a second class citizen. India's per capita income of $72 (Family Almanac, 1972) is still way below poverty level by the American standard. Illiteracy is 71% (Family Almanac, 1972). Population growth and unemployment rate seem to eat up the gains India is making.

India has been described as a land of unity in diversity. Travelling form the North to the South, one finds marked ethnical differences, at least as great as those found in the whole continent of Europe (FR. Berard, 1962). However these very provincial diversities in regional groups who speak different languages, have their distinct caste variations, their own cultural traditions that create regional ethnocentrism to such a point that people at times lose sight of unity. In addition, there is also a diversity on the vertical plane. Mr. Galbraith (1972) says:

I have been writing of the regional diversity of India. There is also diversity on the vertical plane - a diversity that divides Indians into great, mostly non-communicating layers . . . . . . . . . . . . But progress is being made. By vertical diversity I refer to the line that divides village India, which is to say most of India, from modern urban,
bureaucratic and intellectual India . . . . . . . .

There are, to be sure, points where the two Indias come together. The fertilizers and hybrids that are making the green revolution are the result of such a conjunction (P. 39).

The culture of India is customarily labeled as "traditional," "spiritual," oriented toward acceptance and resignation, and centered on caste and family (Cohn, 1971; Ziller, Long, Ramana & Reddy, 1968).

The traditional family in India is often portrayed as being distinctly different from the family in the United States. The Indian's identity, occupation, and activities center around family and caste. The joint family is still common in villages. The joint family system and caste-based social organization of Hindus are believed to encourage respect for authority and to put a premium on conformity (Sundberg, Sharma, Woldtli & Rohila, 1969; Taylor, 1948).

Ghei (1966) says: "Generally speaking, in India deferent patterns of behavior are highly reinforced from early childhood as the development of individualism and autonomy in the members of a joint family would be detrimental to the maintenance of the system (p. 583)."

Even in nuclear Indian families there is an emphasis on deference, conformity and higher identification with parents. (Ziller et al., 1968).

Indian adolescents perceive their families as more
cohesive than American youngsters (Sundberg et al., 1969). Indian families have stronger intra-familial relations than American families. The Indian child is more enmeshed in the family matrix which largely determines the child's social universe. The Indian child tends to be the focal point of the family, the family's reason for being (Ziller et al., 1968). Children in India are not exposed to much frustration, pressure from adults, conflict with authority; anger and aggression are not stimulated. By the same token, aggression does not have a chance to be patterned and shaped as it happens with American children. In the United States a child is expected to use physical expression of aggression until the age of four and gradually to substitute verbal methods of standing up for his rights, getting what he wants (Murphy, 1955).

Empirical research has almost confirmed the observation that self in the Indian society has little meaning except in relation to the family and in serving that family (Cohn, 1971; Fuster, 1962; Ghei, 1966; Gordon & Kakkar, 1966; Kakkar and Gordon, 1966; Mukherjee, 1967).

Karmic determinism, external control or dependence on elders for many important decisions in life dominates the popular understanding and life style of Hindus. Although this type of dependence shows respect for age and experience, it does not make a person fully responsible for his actions.
Indian adolescents have been found to lay more emphasis on sympathetic concern (Sing P., Huang & Thompson, 1962), service to others (Kilby, 1956), and benevolence (Gordon & Kakkar, 1966; Kakkar and Gordon, 1966) than Americans. In the Indian family system, ego needs and expressions of dominance are discouraged during adolescence. Self-sacrifice is emphasized unusually (Ziller et al., 1968).

Indians have been described as family and group oriented, but general observations show that they are not individually as socially outgoing with people in general. They tend to prefer deep personal relations with few persons to casual and less enduring contacts with many people. Indians lay emphasis on self-containment (Jones and Block, 1960), higher social interest but reduced range of identification with significant others and higher self-centrality (Ziller et al., 1968).

Generally Indians place emphasis on constraint versus self-expression, self-control versus sensuous enjoyment (Jones and Block, 1960), moral absolutism versus relativistic ethics, scholarly versus practical and scientific values, extrinsic work values versus interest in work.

India does not seem to be a highly achievement-oriented society. Meade's (1968) study reveals that the level of aspiration of Indians was less realistic than their counterparts in America. Indian people in general seem to prefer
security to change, variety, mobility or adventure. They often like the comfort and security of their homes so much that many young men are unwilling to leave their home even to seek better work opportunities elsewhere (Sing P. et al., 1962). Considerable time is wasted in such passive pastimes as gossiping, playing cards, frequently visiting friends, etc.

One of the outstanding features of Indian culture, despite India being a democracy is that Indians are more authoritarian than Americans. Studies of Meade (1967) and Meade and Whittaker (1967) have shown that not only are Indians more authoritarian than Americans, but they also tend to work better in an authoritarian rather than a democratic set up. The Indian caste system is frequently cited as an example of prejudice and oppression. Despite the outlawing of untouchability, many Indians still practice discrimination against scheduled castes. They still show caste stereotypes, although they are fading somewhat.

Most observers of Indian society and culture find that most relations and most values come down to a question of hierarchy. One can find that there are almost no peer relations in the family. The father is dominant over his sons; males are dominant over females; older brothers over younger. Few behaviors in the family indicate equality.
The underlying fact in Indian society that must be grasped is that it is a group-based, not an individual-based society. Most action and behavior in which an individual Indian engages are in relation to and mediated by the various groups to which he belongs (Cohn, 1971; Sundberg, Rohila & Tyler, 1970).

Analysis of the findings of various studies discussed so far reveals a personality structure of Indians which differs from Americans due to differences in Indian and American cultures.

Deference, conformity, dependence, intra-familial closeness, need for security, self-control, sympathetic concern for others, endurance, religiosity, and inadequate motivation to achieve or excel others seem to be some of the constituents of Indian personality structure.

The Indians show more marked sex differences in their personality pattern than the Americans which is consistent with a sharper difference in sex roles in India.

America and Americans

Columbus' discovery of America was probably the most important event in the history of Western Civilization. With its sparse population and vast resources the New World enriched and enlightened both those who came to develop it and, indirectly, those who remained behind (Encyclopedia International, 1967, p. 466).
The United States of America is the world's fourth largest country both in area and in population. It is larger in area but smaller in population than India. It is composed of the District of Columbia and 50 states. It has a democratic form of government (Family Almanac, 1972).

There are points of similarities between India and the United States of America. Both have an anti-colonialist background; both have a democratic approach to problems, a faith in democratic institutions, individual liberty, freedom of the press, the determination of policies by public discussion, religious tolerance, and faith in people of different racial origins living together - to mention only a few of the ideas they share (Panikkar, 1960).

There are also points of dissimilarities between India and the United States. The United States of America is technologically one of the most advanced countries in the world, India, one of the developing countries. Indian history and civilization dates back to the pre-Christian era; American history and civilization began with the British settlement in the 17th century. India won her national independence from Britain only twenty-five years ago, the United States at the end of the eighteenth century. Both countries have sharply different backgrounds. Their outlooks on innumerable questions of family life, religion, philosophy and social organizations are strikingly dissimilar.
The United States' population is 73.5% urban and 26.5% rural. There is not much difference in the life styles of people living either in urban or rural areas because of the relatively less difference between them in terms of facilities available. The general standard of living is very high. Per capita income is $3,910. The average factory worker earns about $150 a week (Family Almanac, 1972).

Turning to the other indices of prosperity, life expectancy in the United States is 70.2 years, literacy is 99% (Family Almanac, 1972). Until very recently unemployment was not a problem. It is only recently that unemployment of about six to seven percent of the population is indicated. However, there are other securities such as, welfare or similar schemes. Therefore, unemployment and poverty almost do not exist in the United States by Indian standard.

Education is free, universal and compulsory up to graduation from high school. There are opportunities of earning and learning simultaneously. There are enormous library facilities and various kinds of literature available in almost all areas of knowledge. Importance of education for national growth, international understanding and better relations with other nations is realized. Therefore, education of the foreign nationals is encouraged by offering
scholarships under various schemes. Thus, the number of foreign students is increasing in the United States.

English is the official and predominant language. Spanish is the preferred language of sizeable minorities. In recent years, there is an emphasis on learning foreign languages.

The major faith is Christianity. About two thirds of the population is Protestant, one fourth Roman Catholic, 3% Jewish, and the rest of other or no affiliation (Family Almanac, 1972). Religion is much more formalized in the United States. The sermons are related to community, national and international situations. Therefore, the religious institutions perform a very useful function in the life of the community. The head of the church also functions as a counselor to people who have individual or family problems.

With all the prosperity America enjoys, there are also many problems. Some of them are due to ideological differences between people and others of a psychological nature. Family Almanac (1972) reports:

A national survey published at midyear reported that the American people were showing 'a new and urgent concern over national unity, political stability, and law and order.' This concern had increased so sharply, according to the survey, that 47 percent of the people - almost one in every two and a majority of those with an opinion - had come to believe that unrest was likely to lead to 'a real breakdown in this country' (p. 807).
The Vietnam War, inflation, continuing rise in pollution and environmental deterioration, increase in crime rate and drug abuse are some of the sources of present unrest.

The social unrest in the United States is also due to ethnocentrism and group-glorification of its own subculture and rejection of the subcultures of other groups. The "we-group" and everything it does is right and good, while there is suspicion about the outsider or the stranger. The literature of ethnocentrism is vast, and its manifestations against the Negroes and Jews in the United States and against other minorities constitute national and international problems of the first magnitude.

Ethnocentrism fluctuates in intensity with the degree of contact between less or more divergent groups and with the extent of the differential interests in wealth, techniques, and prestige involved.

The nations' ethnic diversity is chiefly due to large-scale immigration from various countries of the world. Whites comprise about 88% of the population, Negroes 11% and other ethnic groups the remaining 1% (Family Almanac, 1972).

American society can be described as composed of a number of "pots," or "subsocieties," three of which can further be described as religious containers marked Protestant, Catholic, and Jews, which are in the process
of melting down the white nationality background communities contained within them; Negroes and other nationality backgrounds who are racially visible are not allowed to melt structurally. Therefore, contacts between the majority and the minority groups remain at a secondary level of making a living and carrying out certain duties of political citizenship (Gordon, 1967).

However, the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics Reports of mid 1972 indicate that black people in the United States have made substantial gains in many social and economic areas but still lag far behind whites (Family Almanac, 1972). Considering the state of affairs in the past, this improvement is very encouraging.

The social unrest between the minority ethnic groups and the majority White Community is comparable to scheduled caste minority and caste Hindu community in India. Legislation and its implementation has improved the situation in the areas of education, increase in the rate of employment at various levels, awareness of equality of rights, but the real conversion of ideas and change of heart necessary for the eradication of prejudice and personal and social acceptance both at the societal and individual level has yet to take place on a large scale.

Now turning to American culture, like India, we find unity in diversity. However, this is mainly due to large-
scale immigration from all the countries of the world rather than by natural growth of population. In India the diversities are more along regional, and linguistic lines. In the United States, they are along ethnic pluralism. The immigrants brought with them the traditions and mores of their countries, which contributed to the "core culture" of the American society. This core society is made up essentially of White Protestant, middle-class community to which all other communities are attracted or take their major impress from.

Thus over-all American culture which serves as a reference point for immigrants and their children, can best be described as the middle-class cultural patterns of, largely, White Protestant, Anglo-Saxon origins with some reciprocal influences on this culture exercised by the culture of later entry into the United States.

The American culture is often characterized as "modern," "materialistic," "oriented toward achievement and competition," and "individualistic" (Ziller et al., 1968).

Individualism or self-reliance is believed to be one of the basic values. Moreno (1956) says:

One of the first, principles which Americans proclaim is: 'We Americans are governed by law, not by men.' This conveys the meaning of extreme individualism, a spirit of independence, unwillingness to surrender to ideas of others (p. 352).
Therefore, unlike India the qualities of initiative, independence, and individualism are deeply reinforced from early childhood both by the family and the society (Ghei, 1966). The new American family resembles more nearly a cooperative enterprise in which husband, wife and children have equal rights.

Revolt against authority is described as the characteristic attitude of the American people (Labarre, 1946). Thus American youth has been described as self-oriented and valuing autonomy more than what Indians do (Fuster, 1962; Mukherjee, 1967; Sing P. et al., 1962; Sundberg et al., 1969).

Unlike Indian, the American adolescent is frequently reminded that he should make his decisions himself and be willing to accept the responsibility for the consequences (Sundberg et al., 1970). Americans clearly see themselves as being the most important agents in decisions made about their own lives (Sundberg et al., 1969). Americans have been found to score higher than Indians on the 'Need for dominance (Fuster, 1962).'

Americans are described as more extraverted than Indians. Ability to get along well with others and make friends easily is emphasized. Studies reveal that Americans score higher on sociability and affiliation than Indians (Fuster, 1962; Ghei, 1967). Sociability, affiliation and
generosity are recognized as values to temper extreme individualism. Competitiveness is tempered by the value of fair play and cooperation in the common welfare (Gillin, 1955).

Science, and knowledge-seeking activities are more valued in the American society (Sing P. et al., 1962). Generally, Science is appreciated so long as it is applied in such a way as to make things work better. Low rating is given to the passive contemplation of unsolved mysteries or for sheer aesthetic or other impractical reasons. Thus pragmatic ingenuity, hard work, sharp trading, getting things done are drilled into boys and girls in business, factory work, farm, military or other vocations (Gillin, 1955; Lee, 1957).

The Mechanistic world view, hedonistic present time orientation, emphasis on money in terms of what money can buy to make life happy and materially comfortable (Gillin, 1955), fun morality are some of the recent developments in American culture. Instead of feeling guilty for having too much fun, one is inclined to feel ashamed if one does not have enough. Fun and play have assumed a new obligatory aspect. While gratification of forbidden impulses traditionally aroused guilt, failure to have fun currently occasions lowered self-esteem. One is apt to feel inadequate, impotent, and also unwanted. In business and professional
life work and play have become fused. Activities formerly sharply isolated from work, such as entertainment, have become part of business relations.

Religiosity in the United States is intellectual, reflective and verbal, calling for self-conscious affiliation, confessions, and affirmation of creed.

Some studies reveal that Americans give more importance to having interesting work and less importance to extrinsic work values than Indians (Sing P. et al., 1962; Sundberg et al., 1970).

America is described as an achievement-oriented society. Much of American striving clusters around the symbols of dynamism, success, power, open society, the hunger for prestige and the valuing of love or happiness or joining or whatever else will anneal the devastating sense of loneliness that Americans feel. These life-purposes and value clusters are what give direction to American striving, and furnish the frame within which institutions and norms of conduct operate (Lerner, 1951).

In America change and novelty are values in themselves within some areas of culture, such as, styles of consumer goods, amusements etc. (Gillin, 1955). Values of variety and change are associated with abundance of opportunities and resources. Studies report that Americans scored higher than Indians on the values of variety and change (Sundberg
Americans appear to love excitement that accompanies activities involving personal risk (Sing P. et al., 1962). Compared to Indians, Americans are higher on democratic values and lower on authoritarian values (Sing P. et al., 1962). Freedom or liberty for the individual is prized. However, despite their professed egalitarian ideology they seem almost just as prejudiced with regard to minority ethnic groups as any other country in the world.

It will be noticed that no place is given to values of a "spiritual" or "transcendental type." Foreign observers frequently ask: Is there nothing Americans value beyond these? What are the ultimate goals of existence? In the American culture, certain values of a spiritual and transcendental nature do exist, of which few Americans are consciously aware (Gillin, 1955).

Emphasis on extreme individualism, lack of respect for authority, neglect of older people in terms of not having an important place in the family unit has created many problems. There is an increase in divorce rate, inadequate parental interest, loneliness, juvenile delinquency and drug abuse as an escape.

Racial or ethnic preferences or prejudices have generated tensions and conflicts between the majority and the minority groups in the American Society.
Thus in the midst of great material prosperity, there are several problems both at an individual and societal level.

Selection of the Subjects

In executing the present study on the "Perceptions of Indians in the United States of America", three distinct groups of 200 subjects in each group, 100 females and 100 males selected on a random basis were utilized. The groups were as follows:

1. Indian Control Group:
   Consisting of Indians living in different cities of Maharashtra state viz., Bombay, Poona and Kolhapur. This group will be designated as I-I, i.e. Indians in India.

2. Indian Experimental Group:
   Consisting of Indians living in different cities of the states of New York and New Jersey viz., New York City, Newark, Montclair, Clifton and nearby towns. This group will be designated as I-A, i.e. Indians in America.

3. American Control Group:
   Consisting of native-born Americans living in different cities of the states of New York and New Jersey viz., New York City, Newark, Montclair, Clifton and nearby towns. This group will be designated as A-A, i.e. Americans in America.

The ages of the subjects in all the three groups ranged between 21 and 40 years as this is the most active period in the life of an individual whether residing in the United States or India. Their minimum level of educational requirement was two years beyond high school as it was felt that
this was necessary for the understanding of the words used in all the scales especially for the I-I group.

The two control groups viz., I-I and A-A were included as a methodological necessity to compare the perceptions of subjects in the I-A group (experimental) against the perceptions of those constituting the I-I and A-A groups.

The Instruments Used

1. The Accompanying letter.
2. The Background Information Blank.
3. The Rutgers Social Attribute Inventory (RSAI).
4. The Checklist.
5. The Bogardus Social Distance Scale.

1. The Accompanying Letter

This explained the purpose of the study. It gave information about the Rutgers Social Attribute Inventory and instructions were given to fill the Inventory since no such instructions were given by the author on the Inventory form.

2. The Background Information Blank

This blank was designed to furnish important information about the subject, viz., sex, age group, level of education, type of education, degree or diploma received, place of birth, present residence, population of the city in which the subject resided, countries he had visited. For the I-A group, the additional information required was "length of residence in the United States" and for the A-A group, the
"number of Indians acquainted with".

3. The Rutgers Social Attribute Inventory (RSAI)

This is a questionnaire form designed by Dr. William D. Wells (1959) to help raters record their impressions of persons. The author of the Inventory claims that it is broad in coverage and easy to use - broad enough to cover a very wide range of distinctive human traits and features, and easy enough to be used by untrained raters. The experience of the present investigator confirms the claim of the author.

The Inventory consists of a set of 24 eight-step trait scales presented in the general format of the semantic differential (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957). Scales are defined by adjectives at the opposing poles and have adverbs of degree printed beneath a line connecting the two pole adjectives. The author has made an appropriate choice of eight categories to increase discrimination, the even number being intended to eliminate the catch-all, middle-of-the-road choice. Most of the scales tap personality traits, like "good natured and agreeable...stubborn and inclined to be difficult." A few tap physical appearance characteristics, like "tall...short." Dr. Wells maintains that the physical characteristics are included because of their personal and social connotations.

Among the various types of studies that can be done
with the use of the Inventory, Dr. Wells lists "Perceptions of Classes of Persons". The present investigation falls in this category.

4. The Checklist

The checklist consisted of 60 important attributes or trait names. This list was originally prepared and used by Rath and Das (1957; 1958) in their stereotype studies. The list was selected by the authors out of 100 common adjectives after a discussion with professors of literature and pre-test.

Out of 60 attributes on the original list, only two attributes were modified by the present investigator. The attribute "Anti-Indian" was substituted for "Anti-Oriya" for obvious reasons. The attribute "conniving" was substituted for "wire-puller". It was the general consensus of some psychologists that "conniving would be better understood than "wire-puller".

The attributes were arranged alphabetically. The original authors maintain that there are about as many favorable attributes as unfavorable ones. However, the present investigator after discussion with a group of psychologists classified 25 attributes as favorable and 35 as unfavorable. The five attributes viz., effeminate, formal, grave, homesick, militaristic seemed neutral. But they were treated as unfavorable because of general
consensus that they have unfavorable connotations.

The subjects were given written instructions to read through the list and choose 10 attributes which seemed to them typical characteristics of Indians and number them from 1 to 10, in order of their preference. If they did not find appropriate attributes for all the typical Indian characteristics, they were also asked to mention any appropriate attributes which were not given in the list.

5. The Bogardus Social Distance Scale

The Bogardus Social Distance Scale (1925a) was used only on the A-A group to estimate the degree of social distance Americans assign to Indians.

The Social Distance Scale consists of seven statements to elicit responses indicative of the subject's degree of acceptance of any nationality group.

The only item in the seven statements that was modified in the present investigation was that in the second statement the word "friends" was substituted for "chums". This modification was done because the present investigator felt that the word "chums" is not as much in current use as the word "friends" in the United States.

The written instructions were also modified to read as follows...

According to my first feeling reactions I would willingly admit Indians (from the country India) as a
group (and, not the best individual I have known, nor the worst) to one or more of the classifications after which I have placed a cross (x).

Administration of the Scales

The subjects were not required to give their names and addresses on any of the forms. The Scales were administered as follows:

Administration to the I-I group

In the middle and the later part of 1970, a group of Indians from Bombay who were visiting the United States were contacted for the distribution of forms in the various parts of Bombay, Poona and Kolhapur, and collecting them back and forwarding them to the investigator. The group agreed to undertake the responsibility of carrying out the field work with the help of some volunteer workers. In all 300 copies of each form with the exception of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale were given to the group of visitors. They were instructed to get the forms printed in India if necessary with the exception of the Rutgers Social Attribute Inventory form. Additional 200 forms were printed in India. Two hundred Rutgers Social Attribute Inventory Forms were mailed to Bombay from the United States. In all 231 (104 females and 127 males) completed forms were received from India in the middle of 1971 by mail.

Administration to the I-A group
This was the experimental group. Initially an effort was made to get a list of Indians in the United States through the Indian Consulate in New York but this effort met with failure because the Consulate reported that they did not have such a list. Different Indian organizations were contacted by mail and by phone but no cooperation could be secured. However, some people volunteered to collect data.

The investigator then contacted a group of Indians living in New York and vicinity and requested them to distribute the forms among Indians living in the various parts of New York, Newark, Montclair, Clifton and other towns in the vicinity of New York. They were requested to mail the forms to the investigator as soon as the forms were received by them. In all 300 copies of each form with the exception of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale were given to the field workers. Completed forms of 211 Indians in America (103 females and 108 males) were received early 1971, mostly by mail.

Administration to the A-A group

In the middle of 1970, a number of native-born Americans representing different walks of life were contacted and requested to distribute the forms among native-born Americans living in the various parts of New York, Newark, Montclair, Clifton and other towns in the vicinity of New York City.
The field workers were requested to mail the forms to the investigator as soon as they were received by them. In all 300 copies of each form including the Bogardus Social Distance Scale were given to the field workers. Completed forms of 200 native-born Americans (100 females and 100 males) were received early 1971, mostly by mail.

Although none of the forms in any of the three groups viz., I-I, I-A and A-A required the subjects to sign, all forms were numbered and coded in accordance with their group identification. The field workers were familiarized regarding the purpose of numbering and coding, especially for the "Reliability studies".

The field workers, both in India and in the United States were instructed to follow the random sampling procedures keeping in mind the qualification of age and education required of the subjects.

The procedure of random sampling was also adopted in the selection of 200 forms (100 females and 100 males) for those groups in which more than 200 correctly completed forms were received.

Reliability and Validity of the Scales

**Reliability of the Rutgers Social Attribute Inventory.**

In order to establish the reliability of the Rutgers Social Attribute Inventory forms were sent to 100 subjects of the
original sample chosen on a random basis. The number of subjects who participated in retesting was 81. The time gap between testing and retesting ranged from four to six weeks.

The Pearson or Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient \( r \) was calculated. It was as follows:

\[ r = .865 \]

This Correlation Coefficient is greater than \( 0.283 \) at 1\% level of significance, based on 79 \((81-2)\) degrees of freedom. This evidences that similar responses were obtained of the same subjects on retesting. Therefore, the Rutgers Social Attribute Inventory is a reliable scale for measuring the perceptions of people.

**Validity of the Rutgers Social Attribute Inventory.**

The Inventory is listed in Buros (1961) "Tests in Print". It has also received a review in Buros (1956) "The Sixth Mental Measurement Yearbook". However, review of literature did not reveal any published studies with the use of this scale.

Dr. Wells, the author of the Inventory Scale has given a graphic presentation of the results of three unpublished studies in his Manual (1959) of the Scale. The unpublished studies are as follows:

1. Ratings "The Ideal Professor" and "The Average Professor" by fifty Rutgers undergraduates.
2. Study of Interpersonal Relations in hospitals.
3. "The Kind of Person I Would Most Like To Be" by 100 New York housewives.

In addition, the author has presented results of a study in terms of "salient" characteristics of the "kinds of women who shop in" stores rated as A; B; C; and D.

There are also references to unpublished studies of the personality of smokers and non-smokers and characteristics of the users of various coffee brands in the same manual.

Several efforts were made to get the literature on these unpublished studies but none of the efforts met with success. Efforts were also directed to contact Dr. Wells for a considerable period of time. Ultimately, he responded on August 23, 1972. Pertaining to the validity of the Scale, he writes:

The question of validity is difficult to handle outside a specific context. Since the scales are usually used to measure the respondent's perceptions of himself and/or others, one must make a judgment, based on the context in which the scales are used, as to whether the respondent is apt to be telling the truth. Even then, an answer may be "invalid" in the sense that a respondent's perceptions may not correspond with some objectively-defined reality. One must then ask whether the perception or the reality was the object of the investigation.

I know this is not very helpful if you are looking for some "official" validity figures to put into a dissertation, but for these scales such figures simply do not exist. They are much more like a public opinion questionnaire, which depends upon face validity, than they are like a standardized psychometric test.

None of the unpublished studies mentioned in the manual
of the scale make reference to the validity of the scale. To give more meaning to his Inventory the author Dr. Wells (1959) in the same manual writes, "For the most part, the scales are simplified translations of the basic personality dimensions found in factor analyses of personality ratings and personality inventories - Cattell, 1957; Guilford; 1959 (p. 2)."

The 24 Scale items of the Rutgers Social Attribute Inventory (RSAI) therefore, were compared with the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire ("16 PF") or Cattell and Eber (1962). The scale of 16 PF was first published in 1954. The analysis of the items of the scale revealed that eighteen out of 24 items of the RSAI were analogous or comparable to Cattell and Eber's sixteen personality factors. These sixteen personality factors are described as factor analytically derived, functionally-independent, psychologically meaningful dimensions of personality. Therefore, RSAI has a factorially designed validity. The details of the comparable factors between RSAI and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire are as follows:

(1)

Good natured and agreeable. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Stubborn and inclined to be "difficult"

warmhearted, participating

The person who scores high... on Factor A tends to be goodnatured, easy-go-

FACTOR A

reserved, detached, to be difficult

The person who scores low... on Factor A tends to be stiff... and avoid-
ing, emotionally expressive, ready to cooperate, ... adaptable ... ing compromises of viewpoints ... He may tend, at times, to be critical, obstructive, or hard.

Intelligent. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Unintelligent

**FACTOR B**

More Intelligent, VS Less Intelligent,
  bright
  The person who scores
  high on Factor B tends to be
  quick to grasp ideas, a fast
  learner, intelligent ...
  slow to learn and grasp,
  dull, ... reflection of
  low intelligence, ...

Tense and nervous. . . . . . . . . . . Relaxed and calm

**FACTOR O**

Apprehensive, worrying, VS Placid, Self-assured, confident, serene
depressive, troubled
  The person who scores
  high on Factor O tends to
  be ... moody, a worrier,
  full of foreboding, and
  brooding. He has a childlike
  tendency to anxiety in
difficulties ...
  placid, with unshakable
  nerve. He has a mature,
  unanxious confidence in him-
  self and his capacity to
deal with things ...

**FACTOR Q4**

Tense VS Relaxed
  The person who scores
  high on Factor Q4 tends to
  be tense, excitable, rest-
  less, fretful, impatient ...
  low on Factor Q4 tends to
  be sedate, relaxed, com-
  posed, ...

(5)
Behaves childishly. . . . . . . . . Behavedly maturely

**FACTOR C**

Affected by feelings, VS Emotionally stable, faces
  easily upset
  The person who scores
  low on Factor C tends to be
  low in frustration tolerance
  for unsatisfactory con-
  ditions, changeable and
  plastic, evading necessary
  reality demands ...

  reality, calm, mature
  The person who scores
  high on Factor C tends to
  be emotionally mature,
  stable, realistic about
  life, ...
Conservative, respecting established ideas, tolerant of traditional difficulties. The person who scores low on Factor Q1 is confident in what he has been taught to believe, and accepts the "tried and true" despite inconsistencies, when something else might be better. Thus, he tends to oppose and postpone change, is inclined to go along with tradition, is more conservative.

Bossy and dominating. Submissive; tends to give in easily

Assertive, independent, aggressive, stubborn VS Humble, mild, accommodating, conforming The person who scores high on Factor E is assertive, self-assured, and independent-minded. A law to himself. Authoritarian.

Adventurous and ready to try anything. Cautious and afraid of new situations

Venturesome, socially-bold, uninhibited, spontaneous VS Shy, restrained, diffident, timid The person who scores high on Factor H is sociable bold, ready to try new things.

Lazy. Ambitious

Forthright, natural, artless Shrewd, calculating, worldly, penetrating
The person who scores low on Factor N tends to be unsophisticated, ... easily pleased and content

Optimistic (looks at the bright side)... (looks at the dark side)

The person who scores high on Factor N tends to be polished, experienced, worldly, shrewd ...

FACTOR F

Happy-go-lucky, impulsive, lively, gay, enthusiastic

The person who scores high on this trait tends to be cheerful, active, talkative, frank, expressive, ...

Sober, prudent, serious, taciturn

The person who scores low on Factor F tends to be restrained, reticent, introspective. He is sometimes dour, pessimistic, unduly deliberate, ...

Masculine.

Feminine

FACTOR I

Tough-minded, self-reliant, realistic, no-nonsense

The person who scores low on Factor I tends to be practical, realistic, masculine, ...

Tender-minded, dependent, overprotected, sensitive

The person who scores high on Factor I tends to be tender-minded, daydreaming, artistic, fastidious, feminine ...

Responsible and determined.

Irresponsible and quitting

FACTOR G

Conscientious, persevering, staid, rule-bound

The person who scores high on Factor G tends to be exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty, persevering, responsible, ...

Expeditious, evades rules, feels few obligations

The person who scores low on Factor G tends to be unsteady in purpose. He is often casual and lacking in effort for group undertakings and cultural demands ...

Crude and vulgar.

Refined

FACTOR Q3
Undisciplined self-conflict, careless of protocol, follows own urges
The person who scores low on Factor Q3 will not be bothered with will control and regard for social demands.

Controlled, socially-precise, following self-image
The person who scores high on Factor Q3 tends to have strong control of his emotions and general behavior, is inclined to be socially aware and careful, and evidences what is commonly termed "self-respect" and regard for social reputation.

(17) Susupicious of others
Susupicious, self-opinionated, hard to fool
The person who scores high of Factor L tends to be mistrustful and doubtful.

Trust of others
Trusty, adaptable, free of jealousy, easy to get on with
The person who scores low on Factor L tends to be free of jealous tendencies, adaptable.

(18) Talkative
Happy-to-lucky, impulsive-ly lively, gay, enthusiastic
The person who scores high on this trait tends to be cheerful, active, talkative.

Quiet
Sober, prudent, serious, taciturn
The person who scores low on Factor F tends to be restrained, reticent, introspective.

(19) Thrifty
Controlled, socially-precise, following self-image
The person who scores high on Factor Q3 tends to have strong control of his emotions and general behavior, is inclined to be socially aware and careful.

Wasteful
Undisciplined self-conflict, careless of protocol, follows own urges
The person who scores low on Factor Q3 will not be bothered with will control and regard for social demands. He is not overly considerate, careful, or painstaking.
(20)
Dependent on 
others. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Self-reliant

FACTOR Q2
Group-dependent, a "joiner" VS Self-sufficient, prefers
and sound follower own decisions, resourceful
The person who scores low
on Factor Q2 prefers to work
and make decisions with
other people, likes and
depends on social approval
and admiration...

Cold-hearted and
unsympathetic. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . sympathetic

FACTOR A
Reserved, detached, VS Outgoing, warmhearted, easy-
critical cool going, participating
The person who scores low
on Factor A tends to be stiff,
cool, aloof. He likes things
rather than people, . . .
may tend, at times, to be
critical, obstructive, or
hard

Conventional (tries to be like others). . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . (tries to be different from others)

FACTOR M
Practical, careful, con- Imaginative, wrapped up in
ventional, regulated by inner urgencies, careless of
external realities, proper practical matters, Bohemian
The person who scores low
on Factor M tends to be anxious to do the right
things, attentive to
practical matters, and sub-
tected to the 'dictation of
what is obviously possible.

The validity of the Sixteen Personality Factor Question-
naire (16 PF.) is meant to be a concept (or "construct")
validity. That is to say, the test questions are chosen as being good measures of the personality factors, as these factors are represented in research analysis. The concept validity of the 16 PF. is .85, which is acceptable (Cattell & Eber, 1962).

(4)
Physically strong. Physically weak

(8)
Thin. Fat

(13)
Young. Old

(16)
Tall. Short

(22)
Good looking. Plain

(24)
Rich (in money or possessions). Poor (in money or possessions)

The first five of these scale items relate to physical appearance and the last to the economic factor. The author of the scale Dr. Wells (1959) says, "A few of the scales are not factor-derived. They were added because they have proved especially useful in research on the perception of persons (p. 2)."

Reliability of the Checklist Scale. Test to establish reliability was conducted by sending forms to 75 subjects
chosen on a random basis for retesting from the same sample of the three groups. The time gap between testing and retesting ranged from four to six weeks. The number of subjects that participated both in testing and retesting was 55.

The Pearson or Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient \(r\) was calculated. It was as follows:

\[ r = .616 \]

This correlation coefficient is greater than 0.354 at .01 level of significance, based on 53 (55-2) degrees of freedom. This therefore evidences that similar responses were obtained of the same subjects on retesting. Therefore, the checklist scale is reliable to measure perceptions of people.

**Validity of the Checklist Scale.** In the previous study made by Rath and Das (1958), the same checklist was used. In that study there were 23 attributes whose frequency score for the group mentioned as "Service holders" was more than 20%. In the present study, the frequency score of the same 23 attributes of the I-I group which is comparable to the service holder group both in age and education was considered. The scores on 23 attributes of both the studies were tabulated for the calculation of the Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (\(r\)). The obtained value of \(r = 0.523\). This value is greater than 0.428 which is
significant at .05 level.

The Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was also calculated on all the 60 attributes of both the studies. The obtained value of $r = 0.833$. This value is greater than 0.478 which is significant at .01 level.

Thus the cross-validation of the scale indicates that it has maintained its validity over a period of 14 years.

Dr. Rath, one of the two authors of the checklist in his letter to this investigator mentions that the studies conducted on several samples, unpublished so far, gave consistent results. This is in favor of the validity of the checklist.

Reliability of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. Murphy and Likert (1938) report the reliability of the scale to be .94 (p. 136) and Hartley (1946) reports .97 (p. 21) involving 21 and 32 social groups respectively.

About the sociological use of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale for ranking social groups Dr. Campbell in Buros' (1953) The Fourth Mental Measurement Yearbook says, "Among social attitude tests, the Social Distance Scale is so good, and so naturally suited to its purpose that if Bogardus had not invented it, someone else would have. Such a situation is rare indeed in the social sciences (pp. 151-152)."

Validity of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. The
validity of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale was established by calculating the Rank Order Correlation Coefficient. Studies of 30 ethnic groups was made by Bogardus in the years 1926, 1946, 1956, and 1966 (Bogardus, 1968). Out of these 30 ethnic groups 28 ethnic groups were selected for the purposes of present calculations and two ethnic groups, viz., Mexican Americans and Japanese Americans were omitted. The two ethnic groups were omitted because Bogardus had only listed them in his original study of 1926 without numerical values of Racial Distance Indices.

Rank Order Correlation Coefficient of the above four studies yielded the results as follows:

(1) 1926 vs 1946 - $p = .943$
(2) 1926 vs 1956 - $p = .919$
(3) 1926 vs 1966 - $p = .886$

The value of the Rank Order Correlation Coefficient i.e. $p$ at $N$, 28 is .496 at .01 level of significance in accordance with the table value (Spence, Underwood, Duncan & Cotton, 1968, p. 237).

Since all the values of $p$ of the past studies mentioned above (1926, 1946, 1956 and 1966) are greater than the critical value given in the table, there is a higher correlation in their rank order i.e. at .01 level of significance.

Despite the fact that these various studies cover a
span of forty years, there is a significant correlation in
the rank order of the "Racial Distance Indices" of various
ethnic groups. This goes to prove the validity of the
Bogardus Social Distance Scale.

Scoring

The methods of scoring used in the present investigation
for the three scales are as follows:

The Rutgers Social Attribute Inventory

The Inventory consists of 24 eight-step rating scales.
The scales are defined by adjectives at the poles and the
poles are connected by adverbs indicating degree. Subjects
indicated their choice by encircling one out of eight steps
on each of the 24 rating scales.

Numerical values from 1 to 8 were assigned in the
ascending order to each of the eight steps in accordance
with the degree of favorableness of an attribute. The most
unfavorable polar end was assigned the numerical value of
1 and the most favorable that of 8. In between the numerical
values were assigned in accordance with the degree of favor-
ableness or unfavorableness represented by the adverbs, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>good natured and agreeable</th>
<th>stubborn and inclined to be difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tense and nervous</th>
<th>relaxed and calm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extremely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In other words, as the score increases perceptions become more positive and as the score decreases, perceptions become more negative.

An aggregate score of 24 on 24 attributes for any one individual form represents the negative end of the dimension and a score of 192 the positive end. Thus mathematically, a score of 108 represents a neutral point.

The individual scores of all the subjects in the study were calculated and recorded.

The Checklist

Out of 60 attributes, 25 attributes were considered as positive by the general consensus of a group of psychologists. The rest were considered negative. The positive attributes were numbered from 1 to 25 in accordance with their alphabetical order. The negative attributes were numbered from 26 to 60 in accordance with their alphabetical order.

The 10 attributes selected out of 60 by each subject were tabulated. Each chosen positive attribute was assigned a numerical value of +1 and a chosen negative attribute -1.

To avoid a minus sign of the score, a constant of +10 was added to each subject's score.

An aggregate score of 0 on any one individual form represents the negative end of the dimension and a score of 20 the positive end. Thus mathematically, a score of 10 represents a neutral point.
The scores of all the subjects in the study were calculated and recorded.

**The Bogardus Social Distance Scale**

The seven statements of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale indicate the degree of acceptance by the subject. The numerical value of 1 represents the least social distance and the value of 7, the greatest social distance, the other values fall in between.

The first five statements were interpreted for the purposes of calculation as follows:

If an item of greater degree of acceptance was chosen by a subject, lesser degree of acceptance was covered by it e.g. if statement 1 was accepted, then 2, 3, 4, 5 were accepted. Therefore, if a subject accepted the statement 1, he received the numerical value of 1 i.e. least social distance.

However, if the statement number 6 was marked, statement number 7 was not covered by it due to the very nature of the statement.

**Social Contact Range (S.C.R.)**

If a subject marks statement number 1 i.e. kinship by marriage, it is obvious that the subject is prepared to accept in four more social contacts viz., friendship, neighborhood, employment and citizenship. Thus the S.C.R. of the subject who markes statement number 1 is 5.
Similarly the subjects who mark statements 2, 3, 4, 5 their S.C.R. is 4, 3, 2, 1 respectively.

The statements 6 and 7 do not come under S.C.R. due to the very nature of the statements.

Social Contact Quality (S.C.Q.)

Social Distance and Social Contact Range indicate the quantitative variation. Therefore, Qualitative Variation was found by Social Contact Quality (S.C.Q.). The first statement was given a value of 7; the second, a value of 6, thus 7 values were assigned to seven statements in descending order. Thus those who marked the first five statements, their S.C.Q. was 25 (7+6+5+4+3). Those who marked the 6th statement, received the S.C.Q. of "2" and those who marked the 7th statement received the S.C.Q. of "1". Thus the minimum S.C.Q. is 1 and the maximum S.C.Q. is 25.