SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS AS SOCIAL DISTANCE: EVOLUTION OF MEASURING DEVICES

CHAP TER - IV

(1) **BOGARDUS' DEVICE FOR MEASURING SOCIAL DISTANCE**

(a) **Construction of Social Distance Scale**

A few decades ago sociologists attempted to measure the phenomenon of "social distance" and developed a series of measuring devices. Park (1924) had tried to quantify the phenomenon of social distance by defining it as "the grades and degrees of understanding and intimacy which characterized personal and social relationships generally". Following the lead given by Park, Bogardus (1925b) developed a Social Distance Scale, at the low end of which was the attitude toward permitting outsider into the country (requiring least intimacy), at the high end of which was the attitude toward intermarriage (requiring most intimacy). Bogardus indicated that by using this scale, the feeling of social distance between groups could be roughly learnt. In its original version, the Bogardus' Scale of social distance went like this. "According to my first feeling reactions, I would willingly admit members of each race (as a class and not the best, I have known nor the worst members) to one or more of the classifications under which I have placed a cross: (1) to close kinship by marriage (2) to my club as personal chums, (3) to my street as neighbours (4) to employment in my occupation in my country, (5) to citizenship in my country, (6) as visitors only to my country, (7) would exclude from my country".
Such a scale apparently provided a measure of the degree of social acceptability of any nationality group. The items were arranged in an order from that implying a willingness to accept a close social relationship to that implying a willingness to accept none at all. The individual's attitude was measured by the closeness of relationship that he was willing to accept. The various steps in the Bogardus Social Distance Scale were assumed to be on a quantitative scale that ranged from most favourable to least favourable. It was unlikely that all the respondents would regard the questions in this way or would agree entirely on the amount of social distance expressed by each question, but the instrument was seen of sufficient precision to give an approximate preference ranking of forty ethnic groups. Near the top were the British, native white Americans, and Canadians; then came French, Germans, Norwegians, Swedes, and other North Europeans; then Spaniards, Italians, South and East Europeans, and Jews; and near the bottom Negroes, Japanese, Chinese, Hindus, and Turks.

Bogardus first used this Scale among 110 business men and teachers who lived on the west coast and then compared his results with Thurston's (1928) study of 239 Midwestern college students. The two studies used different measuring devices but the rank order for categories which appeared in both studies was close to being identical. (Newcomb and Hartley, 1947: 204). Later, Bogardus (1928) studied nearly 2,000 American respondents to forty racial, national and religious categories.
Here it might be mentioned that Bogardus S.D. Test was considered to be the oldest and the most used one as a test for attitude measurement. Only Harper Test of Liberalism-Conservatism might be considered to be a little older among attitude tests that had been used beyond the research in which they were originally presented. Bogardus' Test appeared as a major instrument in Hartley's (1946) recent researches, that of Murphy and Likert (1937) Zeligs and Hendrickson (1933), and of many. This test had been used to measure hierarchy of preference for nationality and ethnic groups and to measure social distance toward professions, religious groups, conscientious objectors, etc.

However, inspite of the general acceptance, the Bogardus Scale had had a cinderalla like history into reputation for scientific respectability within the test and measurement fraternities. Bogardus first published his Scale in 1925. Allport and Hartmann published their article which was often cited as the beginning of scientific attitude measurement. Taking off from this article, L.L. Thurston (1928) threw the elaborate machinery of psychological methods into the problem of attitude tests construction. The weight of this tradition and its greater claims for mathematical sophistication gave the Thurston scales a superior prestige that today seemed largely apocryphal. Item homogeneity was today the main objective. So dominating was the aura of scientific respectability that even Bogardus himself felt its weight and in 1933 published a revision of his scale with equal steps, as established by
processing some sixty social distance statement through the Equal Appearing Intervals method. The items of this scale were as follows: (1) would marry, (2) would have as regular friends, (3) would work beside in an office, (4) would have several families in my neighbourhood, (5) would have merely as speaking acquaintances, (6) would have lived outside my neighbourhood, (7) would have lived outside my country.

(b) Evaluation of Bogardus Scale

Bogardus Scale was now widely considered as a very appropriate instrument for measuring social distance (acceptance and rejection) toward racial, national, religious, occupational or other definable social groups. It was suitable for adults and children down to the sixth grade. Kretch and Cruchfield (1948: 21-223) aptly discussed the value of the scale in the following way: "social distance is a complex quality, related to the most intimate way to the standards of the individual, his conceptions of prestige in the eyes of the group, etc. Even though a man may hate an ethnic category or group and place it in an extreme negative position on an attitude scale of the Thurston or Likert type, he might not reject them as residents in his own street. On the other hand, he might feel an indifferent affectivity toward a non-existent group but would place it far down on the Scale, being unwilling to see it on his way street or perhaps in his country because he considered it "foreign". The one would involve no feeling of lowered social prestige whereas the other would". It was the
"ego standards of the individual and his conceptions of pre-
tige in the eyes of the group, which were related to personal
identity". According further recognition to Bogardus Scale,
Kretch and Crutchfield pointed out that "The social distance
scale as it now stands seems to include two different types of
reactions of the individual; (1) his relative willingness or
unwillingness to be exposed to the object; (2) his relative
willingness or unwillingness to be identified with the object.
If Iranians are rejected from the person's club, it may be that
he does not want people to identify him with them or both. The
latter aspect seems to show the greatest promise for further
methodological exploitation. A generalized scale for measurement
of the threshold of tolerated closeness of identification with
a wide variety of objects might be developed. What such a
technique could provide would be measures that reflect genuine
attitudinal dispositions beyond mere opinions".

Bogardus (1960) himself, outlining the significance of
his scale, observed that it was a useful instrument for increa-
sing one's understanding of human relations; it brought to the
surface in measurable terms a significant picture of racial
reactions at a given time; when administered at intervals it
threw light on changes in racial distance that might be taking
place; it indicated the racial direction of these changes; when
members of individuals belonging to one racial group recorded
their reactions to other racial groups, the result provided a
study in group dislikes. Bogardus (1968) further pointed out
that the use of the scale in a country would indicate where
racial distances were more or less frozen at certain degrees of distance. Although Guttman (1941, 1944) did not expressly state so, the original Bogardus Scale was considered by him as a perfect illustration of the hierarchical unidimensional set of items that scale analysis required.

The Bogardus Scale shared, of course, the difficulties of all measuring instruments depending upon voluntary self-description by the population under study. This weakness was found in all published Attitude Tests and in all Interest Tests except those utilizing differential information profiles. Inspite of this limitation, much valuable research was done with such techniques, characteristically using anonymity as a substitute for disguise.

Furthermore, it might be observed that whereas in the studied of Hartley, Murphy and Likert, the social distance test involving a large number of outgroups was scored to get a general ethnocentrism or xenophobia score. As Cornbach (1951) so ably pointed out, any repetitive response required of the respondent might create "respondents" which in an irrelevant way increased the internal consistency of the test. Both Murphy and Likert and Hartley reported split-half reliabilities corrected in the range .949 to .97 with the social distance test involving twenty one to thirty two social groups to be judged. This reliability for a test taking but ten minutes was so high as to cause suspicion rather than comfort. This might also be interpreted as an evidence of response rather than validity.
Hartley's findings that social distance expression to three non-existent ethnic groups (e.g., Pireneans) correlated .80 with the composite social distance score based on thirty-two actual ethnic and nationality groups. These qualifications might be considered minor, however, and might not be taken to affect the more sociological use of the test for ranking social groups in popular favor. Among social attitude tests, the Social Distance Scale was so good and so naturally suited to its purpose, that if Bogardus had not invented it, someone else would have. Such a situation was rare indeed, in the social sciences.

Despite all the merits in the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, a good many scholars expressed doubts about its utility. Some of the important limitations of the Scale were mentioned as follows:

(1) The response positions in the Scale did not meet the conditions of equal appearing intervals. (Young, 1946; Goode and Halt, 1952).

(2) The Scale assumed that each point on it was necessarily "beyond" the preceding one. But this assumption was not demonstrated to hold true. Moreover, there was no known zero point. (Goode and Halt, 1952).

(3) Like most attitude scales, it did not cover the extremes of ethnic attitudes. (Jahoda, et al., 1951).

(4) The Scale presupposed a static conception of social distance. (Sherif, 1948).
(5) The Scale of this type was not easily tested for reliability by either the multiple-form or the split-half technique. (Goode and Hatt, 1952).

(6) To demonstrate the validity of such a Scale required careful thinking. The application of the "known-group" method would involve finding groups known to be favourable toward some of the ethnic types and unfavourable toward others. It was only when the responses of these groups seemed probable. (Goode and Hatt, 1952).

(7) The Scale did not involve judgements of the general, negatively or positively of an object (i.e., the nationality group) by the individual. All it did on the manifest level was to elicit expressions of the degree of feeling of social distance from the object. Now, of course, to the extent that there was a correlation between social distance and general attitude toward the object, the Bogardus scale would yield attitudinal measures as well. And to this extent the relative placement of a nationality group on a social distance continuum should correspond to the placement of the nationality on a continuum of the Thurston or the Likest type. (Hill, 1953).

(8) The Scale required the respondent to make a judgement in terms of life situations that involved a relation to himself. (Kretch and Crutchfield, 1948: 223).

(9) Various factors, reported to be determinants of social distance attitudes, when studied by the Bogardus technique, got confounded. (Triandis and Triandis, 1960). For example, since most Irishmen are catholics one can not tell
whether a reported prejudice towards the Irish represents a prejudice towards the nationality or religion. Similarly, some groups may stress nationality more than other factors (Protho and Melikian, 1952); other groups religion (Phillippines: Catapusan, 1954a & b); still other groups race (White Americans). Thus the background characteristics of the subjects might be related to the weight given to the various factors determining social distance, which purpose was not served by the Bogardus scale. Triandis (1964a and b), therefore, observed that the Bogardus scale was no doubt a classic but had a serious defect in ambiguity due to the effects of a single stimuli.

(10) Since Bogardus scale essentially measured normative social distance but also implied the other dimensions (i.e., interactive, cultural and personal), a satisfactory analysis of discrepancies between dimensions of social distance in race relation was difficult if his scale was used. (Kadusin, 1962).

(11) It erroneously assumed a uni-dimensionality of attitudes toward occupations, racial, ethnic and other grouping. (Martin, 1963).

(12) Bogardus' list of various conduct norms, ranging from "extremely positive" to "extremely negative" behaviour toward others was standardized by him on a generalized basis in order to make comparison of relative "sympathetic" distances to various other groups possible. But this generalized standardization depended on the assumption that the scale could be designed without reference to the object group to which the
forms of conduct might apply. An experiment conducted at the Psychological Institute of the Free University of Berlin demonstrated that significant differences might be observed, depending on whether the scale was standardized for a generalized conduct situation (toward "someone") or to a specific one (for instance toward "Negroes"). The validity of the usual (Thurston) standardization procedure was therefore dubious and no other procedure was suitable for the standardization of generalized scales. The value of Bogardus type scales for comparing social distance might however, be realized by the use of different but equivalent scales, each standardized with reference to a specific object group. (Holzkamp, 1965).

(c) Applications of Bogardus Technique

Despite the above limitations pointed out by several authors, Bogardus Scale had been widely used for collecting social distance data from United States and other countries. In its original form, the scale was used by Ames and Moriwaki and Basu (1968) on a sample of 2605 white students; by Brown (1967; 1969) on a sample of Ethiopian students; by Bardis (1956; 1961; 1967) on samples of Greek orthodox subjects of 15-20 age-group; by Berger (1969) on 72 White males and females and 72 Black males and females in United States; by Bhattachi (1959) on Italian respondents: Northerners and Southerners; by Cowgill (1968) on 242 students in Thailand, drawn from 28 ethnic categories, of average 20 years of age and evenly balanced by sex; by Cochran (1972) on 78 school teachers in United States;
by Pagan and O'Neill (1965) on a sample of Negro students in United States; by Gray and Thompson (1953) on White and Negro student in U.S.A.; by Hough et al., (1969) on rural high school students seeking to measure their social distance towards several minority groups, by Johnnie (1973) on a sample of 202 white students; by Lever (1965; 1967a; 1968a; 1972) on various sampled students of South Africa; by Pettigrew (1960) on white south students in the University of Natal (South Africa) towards various outgroups; by Segal (1965a and b) on Jewish and Non-Jewish nationals; and (1966) on Pureto Rican residents of Philadelphia; by Vaughan (1957) on white Newzealand born students towards Maoris and other national groups; by Viljoen (1974) on 419 students in South Africa; by Zaidi (1967a and b) on 217 male and female students in Pakistan, seeking to measure their social distance towards ethnic groups; and so on.

Wilkinson (1929) used it with occupations; Hunt (1956) in Philippines; Kirsh (1957) in connection with voting behaviour; Best and Sohner (1956) with political, economic, racial, religious, and nationality groups.

(d) Adaptations of Bogardus Technique

Various adaptations of Bogardus scale were also used in conducting social distance studies. One adaptation of the Bogardus technique has been made by Crespi (1944) in the form of a "Social Rejection Thermometer" for measurement of attitudes towards conscientious objectors. The scale statements were as follows:
1. I would treat a conscientious objector with no differently than I would any other person, even so far as having him become a close relative by marriage.

2. I would accept conscientious objectors only so far as having them for friends.

3. I would accept conscientious objectors only so far as having them for speaking acquaintances.

4. I don't want anything to do with conscientious objectors.

5. I feel that conscientious objectors should be imprisoned.

6. I feel that conscientious objectors should be treated as traitors.

It was notable that in building this scale Crespi found it necessary to include steps 5 and 6, which went beyond a mere statement of psychological "distance" from the object.

Another variant of the social distance scale was that of Dodd (1935) who constructed the following five-step scale to measure attitudes toward 15 national, 11 religious, 5 economic and 3 educational groupings in the Near East:

1. If I wanted to marry, I would marry any one of them.

2. I would be willing to have one as a guest for a meal.

3. I prefer to have one merely as an acquaintance to whom one talks on meeting in the street.

4. I do not enjoy the companionship of these people.

5. I wish someone would kill all these individuals.

Dodd's items were also used by Colman (1970) in his study of authoritarianism and race attitudes in South Africa on a sample of 60 White college students. Subsequently Protho
and Melikian (1953) used them in a study of social distance
and social change in the Near East. They, however, modified
Dodd's scale by adding the following items:

6. I Know nothing about this group; and
7. I can't express an attitude.

Triandis and Trandis (1960) found the results of Bogardus
(1928a) as ambiguous. Bogardus had found that the greatest
amount of social distance was found for people who differed
from the subjects with respect to racial characteristics (such
as orientals and Negros). But Triandis and Trandis observed
that when an American white subject indicated much social
distance toward Negros, it was difficult to know whether he
rejected them because of their physical type of their probable
lower-class background. Triandis and Trandis avoided this
ambiguity by asking their White American subjects to react to
hypothetical persons who were described in greater detail than
was customary in studies of social distance. They devised a
11-item social distance scale, a significant variation of
Bogardus scale. The first statement "I would marry this person",
was included as an anchor, and defined the zero social distance
point; the last statement "I would kill this person if I had
the chance", was included as the anchor for the other end of
the scale. The agreement with the sixth statement, "would
exclude from the neighbourhood" implied consideration of social
distance-say six points on an 11-point scale.

Horton and Hunt (1972) in seeking to measure social
distance on the campus used a variant of Bogardus scale in which they formulated the seven items as: (1) would work beside a job, (2) would live in the same block, (3) would have as an intimate friend; (4) would date or allow child to date, (5) would marry, (6) would bar from social club, and (7) would bar from the block.

Smyth and Kono (1953) administered a variant of Bogardus scale on 52 University students of Japan to measure their social distance towards Eta caste minority known as Burakumin. The scale items were modified as follows:

1. Marry to Burakumin.
2. Join Burakumin clubs and other organizations.
3. Become a close friend of the Burakumin.
4. Live in the "special community" as neighbours of Burakumin.
5. Enter occupations in which only Burakumin work now.
6. Have Burakumin as visitors in my home.
7. Admit Burakumin into any school as my classmate.
8. Have the Burakumin excluded and cut away from Japan.

Elles (1956) likewise changed scale items in his study of social distance in Jamaica, and Hunt (1956) in the Phillipines.

Hypes (1928) used another adaptation of Bogardus scale with reference to black colour and skin. The social relationships or situations included in his adapted scale were as follows:
1. to admit to close kinship by marriage.
2. to have as "chums".
3. to accept as an official of one's Church or social club.
4. to admit as member of one's Church or social club.
5. to have as a neighbour in the same apartment/house in the same community.
6. to accept as an official in public office (civic).
7. to admit to membership in one's occupation in one's country.
8. to admit as a citizen of one's country.
9. to admit membership in one's political party.
10. to deal with the business transactions.
11. to admit as a visitor to one's country.
12. to recognize as a casual acquaintance.

Protho and Miles (1953) administered an adaptation of Bogardus scale to 500 middle class adults from 30 towns and cities of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Georgia (USA). His modified version was as follows:

1. I would accept a member of this group as my husband/wife.
2. I would accept a member of this group as a personal chum in my club.
3. I would accept a member of this group as one of my business friends.
4. I would accept a member of this group as a house servant.
5. I would share a taxi with a member of this group.
6. I would grant citizenship only to members of this group who adopt our customs and mores.
7. I would eliminate members of this group from my neighbourhood by zoning laws.
8. I would prohibit members of this group from voting.
9. I would exterminate all members of this group.

Muraskin and Inverson (1958) used the following adaptation of Bogardus scale to measure both social distance and social expectancy. The respondents were instructed to indicate the numbers of the classifications to which they would admit each of the nationality, religions or minority groups (a total of 20) listed on a mimeographed form:

1. Would exclude from my country.
2. Would allow as visitors only to my country.
3. Would admit to citizenship in my country.
4. Would admit to employment in my occupation.
5. Would admit to my school as students.
6. Would admit to my street as neighbours.
7. Would admit to my club as personal chums.
8. Would admit to close kinship by marriage.

Mitchell (1956; 1974) adopting Bogardus technique conducted two studies in Zambia (Africa). The first study was concerned with the African respondents' feeling of social distance, that is, "sympathetic understanding", from specified set of ethnic categories and the second was concerned with the ethnic composition of aggregates of men living together in "single-quarter" accommodation in towns situated along the north-south railway line in Zambia. The first set included questions on whether respondents would willingly admit members
from arbitrarily specified ethnic groups into close kinship by marriage, a village, tribal area, work situation or allow strangers as visitors to home areas.

Landis, Datwyler and Dorh (1966) adapted Bogardus scale in a study of race and social class as determinants of social distance on a sample of middle and lower class, male and female, whites and Negros. Some religious ethnic groups were added to the Bogardus list, and several groups from it were dropped. To test the hypotheses that prejudice tended to be generalized to nonexistent or "non-such" groups, "Chinquies", "Hamitians", and "Negretians", were added to the list. The adapted social distance scale consisted of 37 nationality, racial, and religious ethnic groups and three non-such groups in alphabetical order.

Lever (1967b) adapted Bogardus' original scale of seven-items in an experimental study on 320 students (almost all whites) of Africa. Subjects were assigned at random to a control group and four experimental groups. Three of the Experimental Groups were designed to reduce social distances to Africans and coloureds. The fourth Experimental Group listened to a lecture on "The History of Sociology". Experimental Group I listened to a lecture delivered by a white lecturer on "Race and Intelligence", emphasizing that differences in intelligence between whites and Negros could not be explained in terms of innate differences. The text of the lectures to Experimental Groups I and II were standardized so that subjects in both groups listened to the same material.
The subjects in Experimental Group III were addressed by an African lecturer who spoke on the type of incidents Africans encounter in the course of their everyday lives. After the subjects in the Control and Experimental Groups had listened to their respective lectures a questionnaire which included a social distance test (original Bogardus) was administered. Thus, the experiment, was of the after-only or 'simultaneous' type. No measurement of social distance was taken before exposure to the experimental stimuli, it being assumed that before exposure to the experimental stimuli subjects in the experimental groups expressed the same social distances as subjects in the control group, since the method of randomization was used to allocate subjects to Control and Experimental Groups.

Smith (1970) adapted the Bogardus scale in his study of 356 students; 230 of Japanese ancestry, 54 of racial mixtures, 22 of Okinawan ancestry, 21 parents of students of Japanese ancestry, and 29 homogeneous and not Japanese. The Bogardus scale was modified to include only those ethnic groups present on the island of Hawaii, and the categories of social contact were made more sensitive to the mores of Hilo: (a) would you marry this person? (b) would you hate this person? (c) would you have this person as a close friend? (d) would you work in the same office as these people? (e) would you have this person as a next door neighbour? (f) would you speak to this person as an acquaintance? (g) would you exclude these people from your activities? (h)
would you keep these people out of Hawaii?. In scoring, intensity of feeling was measured on a six point scale: (1) prefer or yes, (2) probably, (3) not sure, (4) probably not, (5) no or never, and (6) no opinion.

Derbyshire and Brody (1964a & b) adapted Bogardus scale in a study of social distance and identity among 102 students from sociology classes at Morgan State college (USA). The major modifications they made in their adaptation were (1) the deletion of a number of ethnic categories raising feelings of antipathies or closeness (i.e., Pole and Scotch) while at the same time keeping others (e.g., American and Turk); (2) adding other racial and ethnic categories (e.g., light-skinned Negro and Puerto Rican); (3) the addition of one more degree of freedom for further rejection. The eight possible responses on the modified Bogardus social distance test were divided by following method. (A) **Assimilative Responses** (1) To close kinship by marriage and "To my social club as personal chums", (B) **Accommodative Responses**: (3) "To my street as neighbours", (4) "To employment in occupation", and (5) "To citizenship in my country", (C) **Ethnocentric Responses**: (6) "As visitors only to my country", (7) "Could exclude from my country", and (8) "Prefer they were annihilated".

Hunt and Lacar (1973) used a variant of Bogardus social distance test in Philippines. In its modified adaptation, a four-point gradient was used, allowing the respondent to indicate whether he felt that participation in the specified
relationship was desirable, a matter of indifference, of wild hostility, or of extreme antagonism. These were numbered 1 to 4, and the total score represented the average of the group for all relationships. Reactions were obtained to five types of relationships with non Filipinos. These relationships were: Roommate in a Dormitory; Business Partner; Husband or Wife; Citizens of the country; and Important Government Officials. The relationships were listed in order of favourable acceptance which were the same for all groups.

Dent, et al., (1964) adapted a scale of social distance consisting of four dimensions. A desirable or an undesirable descriptive term for each of four components was presented randomly in all possible combinations, yielding 16 hypothetical stimulus persons. The four components were: physical ability - "physically normal" or "without two legs"; understanding - "understanding others" ("able to perceive clearly the nature of another's behaviour") or "lacks understanding of others"; competence - "competent" ("qualified, capable of fulfilling all requirements") or "barely competent"; and national - ethnic origin - "of your own nationality" or "Negro". In responding to this scale subjects were asked to rate the 16 stimulus persons on nine social distance steps using a five-point Likert scale of acceptability. For example, one of the hypothetical person was described as "understands others, without two legs, highly competent, of your own nationality". Respondents were asked, "would you... marry a person like this?" "Have as a counsellor on intimate problems?"
"Employ as third grade Teacher"? "Work in same office?" 
"Have as a speaking acquaintance?" "Accept in your family's school?" "Permit to vote?" Subjects were instructed to respond to each person as follows: 5 for absolutely, 4 for probably, 3 for not sure or cannot say, 2 for probably not, and 1 for absolutely not." The successive social distance steps were adapted from Bogardus, validity of the scale was exampled through semistructured interviews with selected subjects and through a preliminary study.

(e) **Improvements in Bogardus Technique**

Westie (1952) improved upon Bogardus in two ways. Firstly, he developed four sub-component scales of social distance: "Residential Distance", "Positional Distance", "Inter-personal-physical Distance", and "Interpersonal social distance". In addition, he introduced some stimulus dimensions, i.e., race and occupation instead of Bogardus' one. Statements presented all combinations of eight occupations and two races. By summat ing subjects responses toward Negroes and whites both within and across occupations Westie was able to obtain estimates of distance towards Negroes and Caucasians in each of eight occupations as well as toward the "average" Negro man and the "average" White man.

Triandis and Triandis (1960) improved upon Westie's innovation by introducing a more complex multi-dimensional method of stimulus persuasion whereby a number of stimulus characteristics, e.g., race, religion, nationality, were
systematically varied in a number of combinations. Fractional analysis of variance permitted the determination of the relative contribution of each stimulus component singly and in combination towards the total variance.

Cook and Seltiz (1964) noted that Henry Triandis's method had the added advantage of being better able to control the extraneous effects due to response sets such as social desirability. Triandis (1964a & b) considered both Bogardus and his own earlier scales (1960) to be relatively unidimensional and useful for "very rough work" in the analysis of subjects' behaviour intentions towards stimulus persons. He felt that a more thorough analysis of the dimensionality of behaviour was in order. Thus, he factor analysed the intercorrelations among a variety of behaviours which subjects would be willing to undertake with a selection of stimulus persons. Triandis confirmed the multidimensionality of the behavioural component of attitudes" by describing five factors: respect (e.g., would admire ideas of, obey), friendship acceptance (e.g., would fall in love with, marry), social distance (e.g., would exclude from the neighbourhood), and superordinate-subordinate (e.g., would command). Evidence for the cross-cultural generality of the "behavioural-differential" factors was provided by Triandis et al., (1966c) and Triandis et al., (1966b).

(II) Social Distance Score Card Device

Hypes (1928) observed that the term "social distance"
signified a distribution or division of attitudes upon matters of social concern; also, by implication, it suggested a methodology of measuring the range of distribution or the width of diversion of these attitudes. In practice, individuals or groups disagreeing, recorded the magnitude of their disagreement by the extremities to which they would extend themselves in acts of conflict; such acts might vary all the way from very mild disapproval to the bitterest of warfare or other more subtle forms of conflict. However, when conflict was outwardly visible, the observer might infer rather accurately something of the "distance" that intervened between the attitudes of the contestants; but when conflict was more or less camouflaged by the amenities of life, attitudinal distances become more difficult to measure. Still further, most of the measuring devices adopted by scholars were only highly subjective in that the examiner was requested to cross out of a list of words, or the words that designated something that had worried him at sometime in the past, or he was asked to indicate in some designated manner his judgement, feelings, or beliefs regarding certain controversial matters presented in the test etc.

Therefore, Hypes (1928) developed a Social Distance Score Card, based upon suggestions received from many sources. This device was not like the weighted type of composite score card but merely a device for training through a number of fairly simple social situations or relationships upon a single social item or case-group combination of items. The social
relationships selected were twelve, descending in a fairly orderly sequence from the most intimate to the least intimate, and the items were to be traced through this array of social relationships were those representative of those racial fundamental to the integration and disintegration of social groupings and practices. The twelve relationships were:

1. To admit to close kinship by marriage.
2. To have as a chum.
3. To accept as an official of one's church or social club.
4. To admit as member of one's church or social club.
5. To have as a neighbour in the same apartment/house or in the same community.
6. To accept as an official in public office (civic).
7. To admit to membership in one's occupation in one's country.
8. To admit as a citizen of one's country.
9. To admit to membership in one's political party.
10. To deal with in business transactions.
11. To admit as a visitor to one's country.
12. To recognize as a casual acquaintance.

The score card contained these twelve relationships and in front of each of them were given degrees of social distance ranging from -10, -9, -8, .... to zero .... to +1, +2, +3, .... to +9.

(III) Likert Technique for Measuring Social Distance:

As part of a larger investigation on measuring social
attitudes undertaken by Gardner Murphy in 1929, Likert (1932) developed a technique for measuring attitudes which had been widely used for studying many issues, including quite broad topics like "internationalism", "morale", "conservatism", and "progressivism", "social distance". The following 4 items of the 18 statements were included in the "Negro Scale" in Likert's original study:

1. No Negro should be deprived of the franchise except for reasons which would also disfranchise a white man.
2. Negro boys should be segregated from those of white people.
3. If the same preparation is required, the Negro teacher should receive the same salary as the white.
4. All Negroes belong to one class and should be treated in about the same day.

The subject was asked to choose one alternative which ranged from strongly approve, approve, undecided, disapprove to strongly disapprove, for each statement. Thus, each item in the test was a rating device designed to reveal both the direction of the individual's stand on the issue and the intensity with which he held it.

Laumann (1965) also used Likert technique for measuring subjects' social distance vis-a-vis their urban occupational stratification. He scale had the following format: "I believe I would like to have a carpenter (or one of 16 other selected occupations)."
(a) as my son-in-law.
(b) as my father-in-law.
(c) as my closest personal friend.
(d) as a person I have...over for supper in my house.
(e) as a person I might often visit with....
(f) as a member of one of my social clubs, lodges, or informal social groups.
(g) as my next-door neighbour.

Response to all these statements were to range from strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, to strongly disagree.

Robin and Story (1964) also used an "Attitude Toward Minority Groups Scale" of the Likert type. The items were revised versions of items in instruments which had been used, in several other researches. (Ehrlich, 1962; Adorno, et al., 1950). The items referred to Negroes, Jews, "Spanish Americans", American Indians, "Italian Americans", "Chinese-Americans", "Japanese Americans", "Russian Americans" and those generally perceived as non-white".

It was noteworthy that one of the major difficulties of the Likert-type scale was the problem of response set and the tendency of the people to make their discriminations within a characteristic "area" of the "strongly agree-strongly disagree" scale. Another difficulty was that one could not tell for a given person where a particular occupation stood with respect to the others in terms of relative social
distance. Finally, from the standpoint of statistical manipulation, it was often desirable to have distributions that were approximately normal.

(IV) **Method of Paired Comparisons**

Some scholars used the method of paired comparisons to measure social distance attitudes, originally developed by Thurston (1927, 1928). This method yielded for the whole group of subjects not only the ranking of the various objects but something in addition about the distance between any two objects on the scale. For example; Guilford (1931 and 1936) used this method in a study in which 15 nationalities groups were rated and their preferential order determined, a total of 105 separate comparisons had to be made by each version. The study was made on 1000 college students from seven institutions. Gurnee and Baker (1938) selected 11 social relationships as the items of a questionnaire. Each item was paired with every other, making in all fifty-five comparisons. Then, after the sample statements, followed the experimental pairings. The eleven items were:

1. Member of the family through marriage.
2. Person engaged in the same occupation.
3. Person having the same hobbies.
4. Members of the same fraternity, sorority or similar organization.
5. Person having the same political convictions.
6. Person living in the same neighbourhood.
7. Person of the same economic level.
8. Person associated with the same religion sect.
9. Member of the same nationality.
10. Citizen of the same country.
11. Member of the same race.

Here it may be observed that the supremacy of the familiar relationship accorded with the arrangement in the original Bogardus scale. The relative positions of neighbourhood and occupation, however, was just the reverse of his; citizenship was placed so definitely at the extreme distant end of the scale, that race and nationalities were found superior to it.

(V) **Semantic Differential Method**

Some scholars sought to find out social distances between various given categories of people by employing the *Semantic Differential Technique*. For example, Katz (1935) provided a list of 84 traits as the typical characteristics of the ten nationalities. A group of students was rated by another group of students on the basis of their desirability as associates. From these rating scores were assigned to the ten nationalities the relative weights of which agree closely with the preferential private and public rank order.

Nahue (1968) also used this technique in his study of stereotypes of college students in Hyderabad (Pakistan) towards

* The methodology of Semantic Differential had been suggested to be "...measuring the meaning of an object to an individual". Seltiz et al., (1967).
the ingroup and the outgroup during Indo-Pakistan war. Student respondents were given a list of 80 adjectives and were asked to assign five most suitable characteristics to Pakistan and Indians as national groups. Further, they were asked to assign the five most suitable characteristics to (a) Indian politicians and Pakistan politicians (b) Indian forces and Pakistani forces and (c) Indian Radio and Pakistan Radio.

Ames, Basu and Bettencourt (1973) also used the Semantic Differential Technique in seeking to establish relationship between symbolization and social distance. They put several semantic differentials to test. These were good-bad, strong-weak, clean-dirty, valuable-worthless, successful-non-successful, and beneficial-harmful.


(VI) Rank-Order Scale

Some scholars like Bealer, Willits and Bender (1963) used the Rank-Order Scale to measure social distance attitudes. In such a scale, in making comparisons of the relative negativity or positivity of attitude or opinion toward a set of similar objects, such as nationalities, the ranking method was employed in which the individual ranked the objects from most favoured or approved or accepted to least favoured or
approved or accepted. Healer et al. (1963) investigated religious social distance among a large sample of Pennsylvania rural youths. The various religious bodies comprising the contemporary American spectrum of affiliational categories were ranked, by theological experts, in terms of their presumed sect-or church-likeness as indexed by their degree of structural formulism.

Ames, Moriuchi and Basu (1966) used a factor analysis technique of the intercorrelation matrices of responses to the seven-point Bogardus S.D. Scale. Factors, representing clustering or patterning of responses, were extracted using the principal component method of factor analysis. Significant factors, assumed to be those having Eigen-values above unity, were rotated for ease of interpretation using the varimax criterion. The rank order of extraction was determined by the sum of squares rotated factor loadings.

(VII) Interview Technique

Pinkney (1963) collected data on social distance by means of interview schedules* from random samples of native white American adults. The principal item used in the study was part of a modified social distance test. Each respondent was asked a series of four questions about either actual or potential social relationships with American Indians, Chinese-Americans, Japanese-Americans, Jews, Mexican-Americans, and...

* Bogardus (1959) himself concluded in his review of racial distance changes in the use of S.D. Scales needed to be supplemented by depth interviews.
Negroes. The questions were: "Do you think you would ever find it a little distasteful: (1) to eat at the same table with.......? (2) to dance with a ........? (3) to go to a party and find that most of the people are ........? and (4) to have a ........person marry someone in your family? These four items formed a scale in the sense that when the scores of each individual were computed, they conformed to the Guttman Scale patterns.

Brewer (1968) obtained responses to four social distance scale items through interviews with 50 members of each of the 30 tribes in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. Guttman Scale analyses of the social distance item responses revealed that the items were consistently highly scaleable, with a high degree of commonality in the rank order of S.D. steps across the 30 groups. Internal consistency of the 4 items and respondent reliability were also consistently high.

(VIII) Questionnaire Technique

Khatena (1970) in his study of social distance among high school and college students from three major cultural groups of Singapore used a brief questionnaire comprising eight questions designed to elicit responses that would indicate existing inter-cultural relations. The first six question dealt with the racial aspect and required students to name their best friend, to state the racial group to which they would like their spouse to belong to indicate if admission to club membership should be limited to any racial
group or open to all, to choose if they preferred to reside with those of their own groups or others, and to express a preference for allowing emigration on a racial or non-racial basis. The remaining two questions included the national aspect and required subjects to indicate if the learning of a common or national language was important or not, and if they would defend Singapore should it be attacked.

(IX) Interval Consistency Scale

Woodmanse and Cook (1967) developed an Internal Consistency Scale, after identifying 12 different item clusters that met their criterion of internal consistency. Ten or eleven of these also met the criterion group. The nature of their item clusters can be illustrated by citing six clusters which turned out to be most differentiate between members of Pro-Negro and anti-Negro organization.

1. **Private Rights**; e.g., "A hotel owner ought to have the right to decide for himself whether he is going to rent rooms to Negro guests".

2. **Derogatory Beliefs**; e.g., "Although social equality of the race may be democratic way, a good many Negros are not yet ready to practice the self-control that goes with it".

3. **Local Autonomy**; e.g., "Even though we all adopt racial integration sooner or later the people of each community should be allowed to decide when they are ready for it".
4. **Gradualism** :- e.g., "Gradual desegregation is a mistake because it just gives people a chance to cause further delay".

5. **Acceptance in Close Personal Relationship** :- e.g., "I would not take a Negro to eat with me in a restaurant where I well known".

6. **Ease in Interracial Contact** :- e.g., "I would probably feel somewhat self-conscious dancing with a Negro in a public place.

The findings of Woodmance and Cook did not contradict those of Campbell and other investigators (1959) who argued for the importance of general factor of favourability - unfavourability toward members of a particular ethnic group. The inter-correlations of their different sub scales were not marked by lower than the inter-correlations of Campbell's 5 subscales dealing with Negros. Actually, this work demonstrated a conclusion very similar to the one that emerged from controversy between Spearman and Thurstone over the nature of intelligence. It was possible to analyse the same set of inter correlations in terms of a single general factor with subordinate group factors and specifies) of in terms of multiple group factors. It seemed to us that the usefulness of the Woodmanse and Cook analysis would be tested mainly by the ability of their sub-scales to make differential predictions about different types of intergroup behaviour.
Evaluation

Of all the attempts to measure social distance described above, it appeared that Bogardus type of social distance scale had a number of advantages over the other conventional attitude tests that were used. This scale was easy to administer, easy to score, meaningful to the respondent, made little demands on his time, was "intrinsically scaleable", (Stouffer, 1949, II: 13) yielded high coefficients of reproducibility (Lever and Wagner, 1968b), and its reliability, although difficult to compute by split-half methods, was satisfactory. It was the only attitude test that permitted cross-national comparisons. There remained only the question of its validity. MacCrone (1965) validated this social distance test by correlating scores on the test with scores on his "scale of Attitude Towards the Native". Further evidence of validity was provided by the fact that Thurston's paired comparison method yielded a similar set of ethnic preferences (MacCrone, 1938) to that obtained by the administration of a social distance test (Lever, 1968: 67-68) MacCrone's factor analysis of the social distance test provided further evidence that it was measuring what it should be measuring (MacCrone, 1937).

Hartley and Hartley (1952) reported that "The original Bogardus scale had proved highly reliable as a measure of general social distance", and that "split-half reliability coefficients of .90 and higher had repeatedly been obtained". They also stated that the Scale had been "the most widely
used instrument of its kind and had yielded illuminating results". Similar findings had been reported by Newcomb (1950: 166), Sheriff (1948: 648), Sartain and Bell (1949) and DuVall (1937).

It may be added that although projective technique was not used toward measuring social distance, Sheriff (1948) and Hill (1953) suggested the use of this technique. Sheriff felt that the most dynamic nature of social distance would be best measured by adapting standard projective methods. Similarly, Hill presented arguments in favour of the usage of interviews and projective techniques for the determination of prejudice rather than objective indices of social distance such as the Bogardus Scale.