In the preceding chapter the historical development of the classical and modern approaches of the phenomenon of social relationships typified most usually as a form of social distance was presented. It was observed that it was Park (1924) who sought to conceptualize this typical form of social distance in quantifiable terms. Bogardus (1925), picked up the lead given by Park, and developed an 'Ethnic Distance Scale'. With the help of this Scale Bogardus tested the ethnic distance of American students towards various ethnic categories. After Bogardus, there was a spate of sociological and psychological thinking in both conceptualizing the phenomenon of social relationships termed as social distance and in measuring it with the help of either Bogardus' Scale or especially developed techniques. Reviewing over a period from 1910 to 1986, a total of about 626 research papers, monographic studies, doctoral dissertations and books were identified from about 100 international journals. It was found that the maximum number of students (N=190) were conducted in the area of social distance and related fields, during the period marked by racial conflicts, racial riots, national wards, several nations attaining independence, increase in ethnocentricism, fundamentalism, regionalism, communalism, etc. While only a few studies (12.5%) devoted their attention to conceptual refinement and some (19.5%) to developing methodological tools, a good many (40%) of them were
concerned with empirical testing of the phenomenon of social
distance. A majority (75%) of these studies were conducted with
American subjects. However, the few studies conducted with
other nationals and nationalities provided important social
distance data from Arab countries, Great Britain, Canada, China,
Euthopia, Germany, Greece, Italy, Israel, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico,
Near East Countries, Philippines, Poland, Pakistan, Russia,
South Korea, Singapore, South African countries, Thailand,
Newzealand, East African countries, Turkey and Netherland. Most
of such studies were conducted by American sociologists and
psychologists and a few by social scientists of the countries
concerned.

In the present chapter an attempt has been made to broadly
review the 410 studies conducted during 1910-1986, with reference
to the hypotheses tested, subjects studied, sample sizes,
respondents' characteristics, response characteristics, etc.

(I) Hypotheses Tested: A good many of social distance
studies (45%) were conducted without any formal or informal
hypotheses. The formal hypotheses were generally either "like-
me" or "prestige" types, and tested social distances of individ-
uals or groups with reference to their ethnic groups or known
out-groups and unknown ethnic out-groups. Informal hypotheses
mostly sought to investigate social distances as such, i.e., what
the relative social distances of certain common relationships
might be, what groups a person was willing to admit to this or
that social relationship, etc. These relationships were examined
mostly either with reference to social nearness - farness continuum or in terms of sympathetic understanding among chosen ethnic groups themselves or in terms of historical prejudice or stereotype toward ethnic groups with which social distance was considered.

(II) **Subjects Studied** :- There was a predominant tendency among scholars to conduct social distance studies among course subjects and research students, school children and teachers, mostly whites and/or Negroes, being either native Americans or foreign nationals, or immigrants those returned back to their native countries. Besides, Kadusin (1950) studied social distances among Ministers, Physicians and Psychotherapists; Turbeville (1952) among specific groups in the city; Westie (1952) among persons with different socio-economic statuses; Protho and Melikian (1952) as also Diab (1959) between Christians and Muslims; Bhattachi (1959) among Northerners and Southerners; Fitzgerald (1963), among college women; Beshers (1964) among foreign stock subjects; Segal (1965) among Jews and non-Jews; Laumann (1965) among persons with different occupational positions; Perucci (1963) and Perucci and Perucci (1966) among attendants in a mental hospital; Ames, Moriwaki and Basu (1968) among students proportioned by area of country; Brewer (1968) among tribal subjects; Morris (1970) among households in segregated and integrated residences; Pavlak (1973) among working class subjects; Cobb (1974) among ecological sub-units of a city; etc.
(III) **Respondents' Characteristics** - Triandis (1960) found nationality, race and social class characteristics of the respondents as influencing their social distance attitudes. Bogardus (1959) had found age, sex, religion and region as important characteristics. Triandis (1963) found age, competence, and sex as important. Denet et al (1966a) found mental disorder and understanding as the determining stimulus characteristics. Denet et al (1966b) found dependability, friendliness and nationality as stimulus characteristics determining their social distance attitudes. Shim and Dole (1967) found national-ethnic origin, physical ability and understanding as significantly influencing the social distance behaviours of respondents.

Triandis and Triandis (1960) found race of the stimulus person to be the most prominent factor determining social distance for Americans with such factors influencing it as occupation, religion, and nationality, decreasing in importance in that order. Brown (1967) found the same for Ethiopian respondents; they reacting more strongly against ethnic groups than did the Americans. Triandis, Davis and Takazawa (1965a) found priorities for social distance toward other national groups to be occupation, religion, race and nationality for Germans. Wolf (1961), on the other hand, while examining the attitudes of Germans toward Orientals, however, found sex of the respondents as a strong determinant for social distance. For Greeks, Triandis and Triandis (1961) found the order of priorities determining social distance as nationality, religion, race and occupation. For Japanese, Triandis, Davis and Takerawa (1965a)
discovered the order of determining factors in importance as occupation, race and nationality.

Thus, a host of characteristics attributed to respondents were investigated as the determining factors of their social distance behaviours. The various empirical studies highlighted the significance of such characteristics among others as determining social distance attitudes as race or ethnicity, nationality, age, sex, education, occupation, religion, socio-economic status, political ideology or orientation, parental background and social contacts.

(1) Race or Ethnicity: Two types of empirical studies were available indicating the influence of race or ethnicity on social distance attitudes. One type of studies sought to find out the relative significance of racial characteristics of the respondents vis-a-vis some other known characteristics. In another type of studies, race of the respondents was studied along with several other factors.

Thus, for Pakistanis, Zaidi (1967a) found relation as factor as more important than race as the determining characteristic of the respondents. For New Zealanders, Vaughan (1957) found physical similarity than race as the most important determinant of their social distance attitudes. For Near East People, Prothe and Melikian (1953) found that although ethnocentrism characterized their cultures, yet there was no evidence that a generalized personality factor was present to determine their attitudes. For Russians, Beshers, Laumann and Bradshaw
(1964) found congregation and segregation to have the greatest relative social distance for any other ethnic group and the general population and thus they appeared to occupy a relatively low position in the stratification system. In other words, they did not consider race as an important determinant of social distance but laid greater emphasis on ecology more than race. Thus, instead of comparing each ethnic group with the native population of the United States or of any other ethnic stock they compared ethnic groups ecologically among themselves. For South Africa, MacCrome (1949) and Lever (1969a) found the Ethnic group to which the respondent belonged as the most important determinant of social distance attitudes toward other ethnic groups. An interesting finding about South Africans came from a recent study from Edelstein (1972) who found that African respondents associated more readily with fellow Africans than they did with members of out-groups. Furthermore, they found members of a particular ethnic group associating more readily with members of the same ethnic group.

Brown (1973) found that the respondent's own ethnic group membership influenced placement of his own group and there was differential placement of particular other ethnic groups in reflection of the status of, as well as the relationship with, his own ethnic group. Placement of other diverse groups would have a relationship to respondents' own groups' status. Ames and Sakuma (1969) showed how caucasians, Negroes, and Orientals placed themselves and other groups with whom they identified higher on the list. However, these were contradictory to the
Some scholars tried to analyse the relative importance of "race" and "belief" as determinants of social distance responses e.g., Insko and Robinson, 1967; Rokeach, 1961; Smith, Williams and Willis, 1967; Triandis 1961; Triandis and Davis 1965b; Koulack 1973; Tan 1970). Triandis and Davis observed that the relative importance of race and belief stimulus characteristics varied systematically with the degree of intimacy implied by particular factors involved. They found race to be relatively more influential than belief in determining more intimate behaviour intentions, for example, marriage, whereas the reverse was true for less intimate behaviour as friendship, fraternity and acceptance. Koulack, emphasizing the significance of beliefs over race, concluded that a minority group member was more accepted by the white group majority than his majority group counterpart, when they both expressed high intensity beliefs similar to those of the majority, and that a majority group member was less rejected by the majority than a majority group when both expressed high intensity beliefs dissimilar to those of majority.

Gordon (1964) analysed the relative importance of race and social class. He concluded that social class was more important than the ethnic group as a determinant of cultural behaviour. Prejudiced subjects were also noted to pay greater attention to the race than to the social class of the stimulus persons. Triandis and Triandis (1960) also noted that insecure subjects
in both America and Greece responded with greater social distance toward minority groups. They also found that some child training practices in both cultures were correlated with social distance attitudes.

Another type of social distance studies involving race as a determinant were conducted with reference to physical similarities and dissimilarities. The presumption was that important racial stocks differed significantly in terms of their physiognomy. Thus, it was visualized that if race was an important criterion for determining social nearness or disliking of physically similar or dissimilar persons. These similarities and dissimilarities were easily discernible in skin colour, hair colour, height etc. Vaughan (1967); Brewer (1968), Koch (1946), Berger (1969), Morris (1970), Singer (1966), Kramer (1969), Masuoka (1936), Clark and Clark (1958), Freeman et al. (1966), Pinkney (1963) and Timms (1969) especially conducted such studies. Timms (1969: 371) found significant interrelationships among various measures of dissimilarity of immigrant groups from the Australian born members. Brewer (1968) found that the more similar the outgroup the lower the social distance. Freeman et al (1966) found white children rejecting Negroes on the basis of physical characteristics. Similarly, Clark and Clark (1958) found white children rejecting brown dolls.

But, like race, the physical dissimilarity hypothesis was also challenged. While Masuoka (1936) did not find any
significant difference in social distances of physically dis-
similar persons, Pinkney (1963) did not consider it to be the
only significant determinant. There were other factors than
visibility, e.g., cultural factors, including religion, which
played an equally important part. He distinguished between
social distance directed toward members of a racial (inherited
physical differences) minority and that directed toward members
of an ethnic (cultural differences) minority. Whether the
minority was characterized by racial or cultural differences
was of crucial significance in the United States. He identified
sociological factors, other than racism, as: (1) the climate of
opinion in the community (2) economic property of both the
dominant group and the minorities; (3) the degree of urbanism
in the community and region; and (4) historical factors in the
community and area.

It might be said that in all such studies, as reported
above, social distance was seen as a result of the historical
process of immigration of different nationals and racial groups
into a given country, e.g., America. Thus the relative status
of the various racial, national and religious groups had been
suggested in the literature to have been determined by the
degree of similarity of their characteristics with those of the
dominant northern white Protestant group. The degree of actual
(or perceived) cultural similarity of each of the entering groups
to the dominant group was seen as a partial determinant of the
latter's willingness to establish primary relations with the
observed that, however important this might have been in the part, mass immigration to the United States had been substantially diminished since the enactment of the 1920 Immigration Quota Laws. Furthermore, Gordon (1964) argued that acculturation i.e., internationalization of dominant values had already occurred for the majority of sub-groups in the United States as the children of the various immigrants had assumed their role as Americans. If this be true, then the basis of real or perceived cultural differences should no longer exist.

Brown (1969) found that the social rejection of Israeli and Jordanians for each other was due to the historical fact borne out of bitterness in the tense middle east situation. This bitterness might be seen to have had a long history. It began about the year 1400 B.C. when Abraham banished Hagar, the mother Ishmael, into the wilderness in favour of his wife Sarah, who bore him Issac. The history could be traced through the events in which the Jewish eventually were despatched from the land of Palestine with the resultant occupation of the whole land by what were to-day the Arab peoples, and the eventual desire for and the gradual return to Palestine by a trickle of Jews in the years preceeding World War II. Then the trickle grew into a flood, accompanied by Arab fear and anger, following World War II. Eventual independence of the state of Israel was coupled with war between the Israeli and their Arab neighbours, ending in the establishment of the Israeli government. Then in 1956, the Israeli along with the French and English attacked Egypt. Thus upto June 1967 there were two wars and many border
incidents. Increasing frustrations, irritation and overt clashes continued to be a rising fever in which a Third war broke out in 1967 between the Israeli and the Arab states. This last encounter was not history, but the frustration and the intensity of bitter feelings never subsided. During June 1967 and May 1968 there were 24 clashes, including one serious incident, the sinking of the Israeli destroyer.

Brown (1973) still further concluded that the distance toward Italians was due to historical reasons. The same was true for Negroes and American Indians. For historical reasons Mexican Americans were found to be more suspicious of others. It might be further added that the differential rating by the Mexican American sub-sample might be attributed to historic-cultural developments and inferior status forced upon them leading to suspicion of, hence rejection, some groups and more acceptance of others for which they shared the same similarity of characteristics.

Hunt (1956) found that social distance attitudes varied almost midway between desirability of close relations with American whites and an indifference to such relationships. Hunt and Lacar (1973) found that it varied between indifference and hostility, although still closer to the indifferent side. There was a smaller unfavourable trend toward relationships with the Spanish but a somewhat greater degree of acceptance of both Chinese and American-Blocks.
Laumann (1965: 171) concluded in a similar tone that the differences in values between Catholics and Protestants of America were apparently pervasive enough to produce differences in attitudes and behaviour in present day American life. The greater acceptance of other people found among the Catholics was the result of very long standing differences in social history. Simpson and Yinger (1965) as also Lever (1968a) arrived at similar conclusions.

Thus both types of evidences were available, race being as important determinant of social distance attitudes and it being not so. Even where race was considered to be an important criterion, the rankings and placements of each ethnic group for themselves and for other ethnic groups differed significantly. For example, Bogardus (1959) found the ranking by Americans of Russians as higher as compared to Greeks, Chinese and Turks, while Prothos and Miles (1953) found the ranking of Russians as lower than that of Greeks, Turks and Chinese and even Hindus. Ames and Sakuma (1969: 21) concluded that although the prominent criteria used in evaluating others was race or ethnicity, yet such findings had to be conditionally specified. Differentiation on the basis of race might simply be one mechanism for perceived cultural similarity or dissimilarity. Accordingly, Rollins (1970) also found no significant relation between the ethnic involvement of group members and the social distance attitudes displayed by members toward other groups.

An important observation made by some of the scholars that
race was a strong determinant of social distance mostly in the case of minorities because it was a question of survival for them. Thus Berger (1969) pointed out that race sensitivity feelings were more acute among blacks than whites because of the necessity for survival in a black environment. Lambert and Dickson (1952) found that such ethnocentricism increased with the size of the minority groups. Where the proportion of the majority group was much larger as compared to that of minority group, ethnographic isolation was most likely to be found, which finally resulted in social and cultural distance (Catapusan 1954a).

Again, it was noteworthy that race as a determinant of social distance for the same respondents did not remain to be constant but changed in the light of specific incidents, for example, war, riots, international disputes, etc. Bogardus (1967) compared the social distance of Americans toward various ethnic groups for over a period of 40 years and found changes in social distance attitudes.

(2) **Nationality**: Zaidi (1967b) found nationality of respondents to be more important a factor than religion as the determinant of social distance. Similarly, Best (1956), Triandis (1960), Beshers (1964), Cowgill (1968). Ames and Sakuma (1969) Triandis and Triandis (1962, 1965) found nationality of respondents as an important factor. But Yang et al. (1963), Protho and Melikian (1952), Shim and Dole (1967), Turbeville (1952), Koch (1946) and Triandis (1960) found for white subjects that race
and social class were important determinants of social distance than religion or nationality. Similarly, Ames and S tokauma (1969), Protho and Melikian (1953) did not find any evidence to show that the nationality of respondents significantly influenced their social distance attitudes.

(3) Age: Bogardus (1928a), Gray and Thompson, (1953), Turbeville (1952), Kinloch and Borders (1972), Koch (1946), Woolstone (1934) and Kim (1973) found age of respondents as influencing their social distance attitudes. But contrary findings were reported by Bardis (1961, 1967), Masuaka (1936), Noel and Pinkney (1964), and Morris (1970).

(4) Sex: It was Poole, Jr. (1927a) who first suggested that women were more rejecting of others and the reason he attributed to this variability was that women used social distance to create a defense against personal distance. His findings subsequently found support from Swift (1944), Bogardus (1959; 1968), Brown (1967; 1973), Cowgill (1968), Just (1954), Pettigrew (1960), Yang et al. (1963), Lever (1968a), Landis et al. (1968) and Descroches and Kaiman (1964). In all these studies it was found that women were more variable in their responses to racial and ethnic groups between whom there was less social distance and less variable for groups which were seen as more distant. Derbyshire et al. (1964) pointed out that the sex differences were, in fact, related to the social roles and behavior patterns ascribed to Negro males and females when interacting with the white social world. Bogardus (1967) however,
attributed another plausible reason for strong variations in social distance attitudes with respect to sex differences. He observed that girls had less contact with people of other races than boys due to restricted movement and lack of work contacts. Lack of contact with others might lead to a perception of dissimilarity even when none existed. Brown (1967) also found Ethiopian women reacting more strongly than did their counterparts. Wolf (1961), while examining the attitudes of Germans toward Orientals, found sex of the respondents as a strong determinant of attitudes of social distance. Bardis (1961) also found sex as the most important determinant of social distance attitudes, education coming next.

But studies by Martin (1963), Brown (1969), Masuoka (1936), Neol and Pinkney (1964), Gray and Thompson (1953) did not find sex differences among respondents as significantly affecting social distances between groups. Pintler et al. (1946), attributed women rejecting more than men due to their greater stereotyping behaviour, as they advanced the plea that social distance was determined normatively rather than ideosynacratically.

(5) Education: In examining the influence of respondents' level of education achieved as determining their social distance behaviours toward outgroups it was invariably found that this characteristic of the respondents was an important factor in lesser social distances being in evidence or in the reduction of social distances. It was observed that the greater the level of education attained the more liberal respondents became.
Some scholars like Lever (1965a, 1967a), Bardis (1961, 1967), Turbeville (1952), Kim (1973) experimented with enlarging the cognitive level of respondents by giving them lectures on race and intelligence, conducting Anthropological classes, and subsequently testing their social distances toward various out-groups. The results showed a reduction in their prejudices and social distance. A solitary example was that of a study conducted by Neol and Pinkney (1964) who found no significant relation between education and social distance. While all other scholars relied upon the increasing level of awareness through education as a mitigating factor in social distance, Catapusan (1954) attributed this phenomenon to the fact that the so-called educated classes appeared as a distinct group and their college degrees kept them out of touch of the common man.

(6) Occupation: It was Bogardus (1928) who first suggested the relevance of studying social distance among occupational groups. Bogardus came to the conclusion that (i) each occupational group tended to give itself a higher rating, a phenomenon he called "occupational centricism", (ii) occupation that had the same social status and had no vertical distance between them might be distinguished in the minds of respondents as such factors as differences in the content of training, cultural make up and functional activity; (iii) differential complexity of occupations tended to engender great vertical distance between them. Westie (1952) also came to the conclusion that the social distance between Negroes and Whites, as expressed by whites, varied with the differences in the occupational status of the Negro, the
less the distance that was expressed towards him. But the extent to which the responses of whites to Negroes were effective by Negro occupational status varied considerably depending upon the socio-economic status of the responding white - the higher the SES of the responding white the greater was the attraction response with variations in the occupational status of the Negro. Then, Wilkinson (1929) also found, like Bogardus, a tendency toward occupational centricism and toward expressing less social distance toward occupation with higher prestige and status.

Brown (1969), Neel and Pinkney (1964), Morris (1970) and others, on the other hand, did not find occupational status of the respondents as having any significant impact on the variations of their social distance attitudes toward other occupational groups having different prestige values. Laumann (1965) and Beshers (1967) conducted studies with reference to respondent's place in the urban occupational stratification and the degree of occupational mobility. Whyte (1961: 350), made the observation that the segregation of occupational and private roles generally bore on the maintainance of social distance at work. It was evident that this every segregation occasioned problematic choices of residential area, partners for and type of social life, religious activities, leisure pursuits and acceptable spouse behaviour.

Martin (1963), Duncan and Duncan (1955), Duncan and Lieberson (1959), Feldman and Tilly (1960), Perucci (1963), Segal (1965), Turbeville (1952), Schuman (1970), Stephenson (1965) and Lever (1965c) also conducted studies of social distance behaviours on subjects who differed in their occupational statuses and roles. However, these studies were not identical and did not finally go to support the hypothesis that occupational status of respondents influenced their social distance behaviours.

It was Masuoka (1936) who first discovered that the SES of the respondents was an important variable of their social distance behaviours. Following him, Catapusan (1954) discovered that socio-economic inequalities increased social distance between rich and poor. Gordon (1964) observed that membership in an ethnic class (a subsociety defined by the intersection of ethnic group, such as race, nationality, religion etc.) had direct consequences for the way one was orientated to group identity, social participation and other forms of cultural behaviour. People of the same class tended to act alike and tended to have the same values even if they had different ethnic backgrounds. He argued that people tended to confine their primary relationships to their own social class within their own ethnic group. His findings found support from Landis et al. (1966) and by Triandis (1960). Subsequently, Kinloch and Borders (1972) found that the higher a group's SES and cultural viability the more likely it was that its members rejected individuals of other race groups. Martin (1963) also observed among the adolescents that the upper classes were more discriminating than the lower classes in terms of their acceptance
of incumbents of diverse occupations. Pavlak (1973) attributed ethnic social distance to the dominant working class social structure of the ethnic community rather than to ethnicity per se.

But there were a good many other scholars who did not find social class of respondents as having any significant relationships with social distance attitudes. Horowitz (1944), surveying literature on social class and anti-Negro attitudes observed no consistent differences in social distances on the basis of variations in socio-economic backgrounds. However, he cautioned not to conclude that SES and racial attitudes were not corresponding because studies in this area were inconclusive, unsystematic and poorly contributed. Westie and Westie (1957) also observed that sociological theory dealing with the relationship between social class and social distance toward minorities was so incoherent and contradictory that clear cut relationship between the two variables could hardly emerged. Earlier, Westie (1952) had emphasized that we should not only study the social status of the respondents to evaluate their social distance attitudes but also the variations in the status of the persons toward whom attitudes were expressed. Similarly, Brown (1967; 1969; 1973) also did not find clear-cut results of relationship between income of the respondents and their social distance attitudes.

Mention may also be made of such studies as conducted by Epstein (1965), Beshers et al. (1964), Derbyshire (1964, 1966), Pavlak (1973), Triandis and Triandis (1962), Perucci and Perucci
(1966), Hatt (1948), Horowitz (1944), Epstein and Komorita (1966), Turbeville (1952), Vaughan (1957), Kim (1973), Felipe (1966), Kinloch (1973), Singer (1967) and Berger (1969), who conducted similar investigations about the socio-economic status of respondents as influencing their social distance behaviours. But their findings were not conclusive.

Religion dealt with ultimate values of life. It provided definitions suitable for transcendental pursuits. Religious values were not readily compromised. Therefore, it was reasonable to expect that the greater the similarities in religious orientations the less would be social distances between persons. Accordingly, Lenski (1963) suggested that historically, Protestants were more liberal than Catholics. Triandis and Triandis (1960), Bogardus (1928, 1959, 1968), Berghe (1962) Protho and Melikian (1953), Pettigrew (1960), Cowgill (1968) and Catapusan (1954) found support to the above religious differences influencing social distance hypothesis. But subsequent researches by Glouch and Stark (1966), Gordon (1964), Bards (1967) Bealer et al. (1963), Brown (1967) found little or no difference in social distance attitudes between any two given religious groups.

(8) **Political Orientation** :- Some scholars sought to relate social distance attitudes of respondents to their political orientations. Mention might be made of Woolstone (1934), Best and Sohner (1956), Yang et al. (1963), Lever et al. (1970) and Crowell (1972). While Woolstone and Lever found political orientations of respondents were not effecting their social
distance behaviours with other groups, the rest found it quite a significant determinant. Yang et al. (1963) found political events, especially recent, as important determinants of group prejudice. Best and Sohner (1956) found that respondents' political orientation influenced their distances from fascists, anarchists and communists.

(9) Parental Background: - Attempts made by scholars to find variations in social distances, depending upon education, place of birth, occupation, family position and punitive attitudes of the parents of respondents, were based on the presumption that these existed in every society and in adolescent's sub-culture different from that of the adults. This difference was generally known as the generation-gap. Allport (1961) identified the area of race relations as one of the primary areas of current inter-generational conflict. He suggested that current social changes made it difficult to propagate previous attitude of coldness toward coloured people of the world or to maintain traditional practices of discrimination and segregation. As a result, racial attitudes of younger people differed significantly from those of other generations. These differences found expressions in intra-family and intra-generational conflict. Gray and Thompson (1953), Lever and Wagner (1965b) found the education of the father's of the respondents significantly influenced their social distance attitudes. Parents who were college graduates or well-educated were found to be more liberal than those whose parents had a
little or no education. Lever (1965a) and MacCrone (1954) explored the place of the birth of the father as significantly related to social distance behaviours. Bardis (1967), did not find the education of parents, maternal and parental occupation, as significant determinants of social distance. His findings found support by Edwards (1972) who among Negro families did not find any consistent pattern in respect of their social distance attitudes. Hollingshed (1949: 9), on the other hand, found that social behaviour of adolescents was related functionally to the position their family occupied in the social structure of the community. Gray and Thompson (1953) further discovered that religion and income of parents did not affect the degree of liberality.

(10) Social Contacts: Deutsch and Collins (1958) observed, on the basis of a review of available literature, that frequency of social contact between opposite groups resulted in the lowering of social distance feelings. Caplow and Ferman (1950), Rose (1948), Taba et al. (1950), Bardis (1956, 1961, 1962, 1967) also found international and intersocial contacts reducing feelings of social distance. The social contact theory of social distance found support from Bogardus (1967), Bell (1961), Felipe (1966), Kim (1973), Ibrahim (1970), Davis (1971), Gray and Thompson (1952) and Smith (1970). Bell (1961) made an interesting observation that the less the contact with members of other group, the more hostile was the feeling against them. Those toward whom we felt most distant socially were frequently groups we had never seen. It meant that opportunities to learn about people of
other groups might tend to replace group hostility with understanding, trust and even affection. Learning through education alone accomplished this to some extent. Those with less schooling, first hand contact with people of other groups was even more affective in destroying groups boundaries. Bogardus (1967) also observed that lack of contact with others might lead to a perception of dissimilarity of belief even where none existed. Similarly, Viljoen (1974) found that over all positive stereotype image of an ethnic group was accompanied by fairly close social contacts.

As a variant of the social contact theory Morris (1960: 7) advanced the "Two-way Mirror Theory". While Ibrahim (1970) found strong evidence for this theory Davis (1961, 1963) found little support for it. Bogardus (1950), Katz and Braley (1935), Katz (1960) and Gilbert (1951), among others, conducted several studies to explore the general relationships between ethnocentricity, stereotyping, interaction and attitudes.

social participation, as significantly related to social distance attitudes.

Hollingshead (1949) reported the existence of norms defining difference between groups. Colman (1970) laid emphasis on personality differences as influencing social distance attitudes. He observed that in a society in which race prejudice was encouraged, prejudiced attitudes served a utilitarian function for many of its members, rather than an ego-defensive function. Diab (1959), Pettigrew (1960) and Photiadis and Westie (1962) found significant relationship between authoritarianism and social distance attitudes. But Kim (1973), Noel and Pinkney (1964) and Lever and Wagner (1970) found no support for such findings.

(IV) Response Characteristics:

(1) Perceived Similarity: Rokeach (1961, 1960) maintained that the primary determinant of social distance was the degree of perceived similarity of belief between the respondent and the stimulus person, and the works of Harry Triandis et al. (1956) including Brewer (1968) and Schwartz (1966) have attested to the general importance of perceived similarity as a determinant of "distance" responses. Byrne (1969), and Newcomb (1956) reported that the perceived similarity variable was related to attraction. In another study, Brewer (1968) found that familiarity, linking and perceived similarity among African tribes significantly influenced the inter-tribal social distance responses, that is, the greater familiarity, liking and perceived similarity, the
less social distance Triandis, Loh and Levin, (1966), Brewer (1968) found that social distance, perceived similarity, liking, and familiarity were co-symptoms of an intimacy-friendship syndrome in interpersonal relations. The degree of intimacy implied in the behaviour described as social distance was a strong determinant of the social distance response. Triandis and Davis, (1965b) described social distance and marital factors as more intimate than friendship and superordinate-subordinate factors and these, in turn, as more intimate than the respect factors.

(2) Assumed Similarity: Fielder (1953a) defined psychological distance in terms of the degree of similarity people assumed existed between themselves and others. Since relatively high degrees of assumed similarity were characterized by "...feelings of warmth and closeness", Fielder suggested that assumed similarity defined a "psychological distance" continuum of how "close" a person felt towards others, the greater the assumed similarity the less the "distance".

Brown (1973) noted that differential ratings by the Mexican-Americans might be attributed to historical-culture developments and inferior status forced upon them feelings of suspicion of, hence rejection of, some groups and more acceptance of others for which they shared some similarity of characteristics.

(3) Assumed Similarity of Opposites: On another task subjects provided the responses of two poles of some specified
continuum, e.g., the most liked and disliked persons and the best and poorest cooperators. Fieldler (1953) defined the degree of similarity imputed by subject to exist between two "Polar" persons as the "assumed similarity of opposites (ASO). High and low ASO score indicated, therefore, subjects' perception of relative similarity and difference between two "opposites". Therefore, the non-discriminating high ASO was presumed to be psychologically equidistant from two persons related to subject in some "opposite" way. In relation to the "best" and "poorest" co-worker, high in contrast to low ASO were depicted as relatively more dependent, more concerned with the feeling of the others and less able, therefore, to reject persons with whom they could not work effectively, i.e., poor co-workers.

Those psychotherapists inferred to be psychologically "closer" to their patients (i.e., having relatively higher Assumed Similarity scores) in contrast to those therapists conferred to be more "distant" (i.e., having a lower level of assumed similarity scores were considered to be more competent by their supervisors (Dymond, 1952). However, psychological "closeness" among team members of task-oriented groups, such as, basketball team (Fielder, Hartman, Rudin 1952), and civil engineering student survey teams (Fielder, 1953) found to be detrimental to the effective student performance of team work. The key men of the best teams, when compared with those of the worst teams, maintained, in general, psychologically more "distant" relationships with their team-mates, that is, they linked to assume less similarity between themselves and their other team-mates in
general, as well as between their best and poorest team-mates in particular.

(4) **Self-Disclosure** - One's readiness to confide personal information or make oneself known to others was termed "self-disclosure" (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958) and "social accessibility" (Rickers-Ovsiankina and Kusmin, 1958). Both the content and target of "self-disclosure were found to be important aspects of "social distance" or "closeness" that characterized relationships (Fitzgerald, 1963; Jourard, 1959).

Subjects indicated the kinds of personal items, e.g., attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, work or studies, money, personality and body, which they disclosed to specify target persons: to mother, father, male and female friends and spouse (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958), to mother, "closest" male and female friends (Jourard, 1961), to a girl liked best, and "average girl", and girl liked "least" (Fitzgerald, 1963), to faculty members of a nursing college (Jourard, 1959), and to a stranger, acquaintance and best friend (Rickers-Ovsiankina and Kusmin, 1958). Two studies found "touch" disclosure, that is, the extent to which college students touched and had been touched by parents and "closest" friends of either sex (Jourard, 1966; Jourard and Rubin, 1968a). Subjects generally reported themselves as having disclosed more willingly attitudes, opinions and tastes than information concerning their personalities, finances, or bodies (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958; Fitzgerald, 1963). Whites disclosed more than Negroes and
females more than males. Married subjects disclosed more to their spouses than to any target persons, any young unmarried girls revealed most to mothers and girl friends and less to father and boy friend.

The "closeness" of the relationships between subjects and target persons predicted the degree of subjects' self-disclosure. Subjects revealed more to a "best-friend" than to an acquaintance" or stranger (Rickers-Ovsiankinas Kusmin 1958).

The degree of liking, in particular, was found to influence self-disclosure attitudes. Girls indicated they disclosed more to a "girl liked best" than to an "average girl" or a "girl liked best" (Fitzerald, 1963). Subjects' "liking" for parents (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958), and for fellow faculty members for a nursing college (Epstein-Komorita 1965) was highly correlated with the amount of self-disclosure: the greater the liking for the other person, the more of the "self" disclosed.

Jourard (1964) noted the importance of perceived interpersonal similarity to self-disclosure. On the basis of the kinds of persons subjects indicated they disclosed themselves to, Jourard concluded that "...disclosure of the self is a by-product among other thing, of the perception or belief that

1. For a more detailed summary of the findings and validity of the self-disclosure questionnaires, see Jourard (1964) and Darhl M. Pedersen and V.J. Breglio (1968).
the other, the target person, is a similar to the self

(v) **Generalization Hypothesis**

Allport (1959) reported that people who rejected one outgroup would tend to reject other groups, and than prejudice seemed to be a generalized phenomenon. This question was studied in various ways by psychologists and sociologists. When Adorno et al. (1950) tested college students and adults, they found fairly high correlation between feelings toward Jews, Negroes and other minority groups. Hartley (1946) sampled college students and found high correlations between feelings toward minority groups and feelings toward majority or non-existent groups. The evidence seemed to be consistent and indicated that prejudice, viewed as a socialization process, did not usually confine itself to one ethnic or racial group but in a generalized way to several or many such groups. Landis et al. (1966) indicated that prejudice defined in terms of social distance tended to be generalized to other groups.

(vi) **Generalizations**

Allport (1954: 20) subsumed the various approaches to the study of social distance and prejudice as: historical, socio-cultural, situational, psychodynamic, phenomenological, and stimulus-object. Pettigrew (1968: 279), on the other hand, considered only four approaches as important: historical, socio-

---

2. The significance of self-disclosure for the facilitation of "human dialogue" and the creative human experience and mental health which ensures have been discussed by Jourard, (1968).
cultural, individual and situational. The historical approach was based on the exploitation theory; the socio-cultural on urban social contact theory; a blending of the two on the community pattern theory; situational on the atmosphere, employment situation, social mobility types of contact, and density of groups theory; psychodynamic, on the frustration, scapegoat and nature of man theories; phenomenological on stereotype and social perception theories; and stimulus object approach on earned reputation and interaction theories. Lastly, there was the multiple causation approach.

All the above approaches laid emphasis on a single factor as causing variation in social distance attitudes. The review of various studies presented above went to explode the myth of all such approaches and theories. No one factor was found to be completely and singly affecting the social distance attitudes of the people. Moreover, social distance was found to be changing from time to time. Also, it differed from group to group. It was influenced by various combinations of characteristics of both the stimulus persons and response objects. Characteristically, most of the studies concentrated on the respondents' and response characteristics and very few taking into account the response object characteristics. The samples on which such studies have been conducted have been generally very small and consisted of students in schools, colleges and universities and could hardly be considered representative of the country's populations. With a few exceptions, no study was conducted involving the entire cross-
section of a population. Mostly, data were collected of social distance attitudes through the use of Bogardus' social distance scale, whose unidimensionality stood challenged. Doubts were also expressed as to the usefulness of applying Bogardus Social Distance Scale in other spheres of social and cultural life, other than race and ethnicity. It was also true that with the development of means of transport and communication, mass media, increased international and interracial and intera-group contacts spread of education, increasing pace of industrialization and urbanizations, and growth in scientific knowledge and technological progress, prejudices and stereotypes ceased to be that effective determinants of social distance among and between groups.

It might be observed here that psycho-social, in contrast to proxemic or spatial, interpersonal orientations, pertained to those social psychological determinants of a person's willingness, as indicated by responses on questionnaires, to accept or associate with certain designated "others" in situations varying in intimacy. Many researchers (e.g., Bogardus and Triandis) by describing these orientations in terms of "distances" posited either explicitly or implicitly the existence of a fundamental psychological "distance" continuum. Regarding the "position" along such a continuum a person was considered "close" or "near", or "distant" or "far", to the extent that his score on some psychological scale indicated that he was relatively more or less willing to accord another person intimacy in relation to himself. Many studies showed
that the specific behaviours involved as well as the stimulus and respondent characteristics all influenced interpersonal psychological "distance" orientations. Furthermore, the studies repeatedly pointed out to the pervasive influence of some broader fundamental stimulus-based dimensions, e.g., perceived similarity affect, and attraction, people generally considered themselves psychologically "closer" to others who were liked, positive, attractive, or perceived as similar. Between intimacy and privacy, man found his equilibria determined by the nature of those to whom he related, his own background and his perceptions of others.

Finally, it may be mentioned that most of the samples studied had a size between 501 and 1000 subjects. Only a few studies had a sample size of 2000 or more subjects. But such samples suffered from the effect of homogeneity. The conclusions drawn on the basis of such studies, with few exceptions of Bogardus (1926, 1946 and 1966), Ames and Sakuma (1969), Bealer, Willits and Bender (1963), Cowgill (1968), Hoult (1954), Hunt (1956), Schuman and Gruenberg (1970); Segal (1956), Landis, Datwyler and Dorn (1966); and Lever (1965a, b,c, 1967a, b, c; 1969a, b; 1970), may not be regarded as valid for the whole population. The samples were neither random, nor stratified or proportional or representative in any other way.