

CHAPTER II

METHOD AND PROCEDURE



The first half of this chapter will be devoted to the discussion of the assessment of identification, the assessment of values, and the justification of the method employed in this study. The second half will be the descriptions of the preparation of scales, selection of sample, and the procedure.

The Assessment of Identification

Studies of a person's identification have been done in many ways and with different techniques. As identification is a psychological construct which cannot be measured directly but must be inferred from other measurable variables, its assessment is necessarily indirect. One of the most frequently used techniques is the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). The theoretical background of this technique is mainly Freudian or psychoanalytical. The purpose of the TAT is to reveal the subjects' needs, motives, values, and basic attitudes. However, since the results from the TAT are given in qualitative rather than quantitative terms, it is difficult to give them an objective interpretation. Furthermore, the lack of well-trained TAT administrators in Thailand makes it impossible to use.

The Bogardus Social Distance Scale is also applicable

in the assessment of identification. Derbyshire and Brody¹ used a modified Bogardus Social Distance scale in their study of Negro college students. They found that these students perceived other ethnic groups as being significantly different from their own. The Negroes in this study generally appeared uncertain about what constituted the identity "Negro." The authors suggested that a revision of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale could be used as a tool for the assessment of a person's identification.

In this present study, a modified social distance scale will be used to assess the identification of the second-generation Chinese. Justification of this technique will be made later on.

The Assessment of Value



There are many techniques that have been used to study a person's values. Again, the TAT is one that is frequently used. The Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Value is another instrument widely employed. It was designed to measure Spranger's six value areas by asking the subjects to state their preferences among various choices that reflect certain kinds of values. Since it is a culture-bound tests, its application in Thailand is hardly possible.

¹R.L. Derbyshire and E. Brody, "Social Distance and Identity Conflict in Negro College students," Sociology and Social Research, 1964, 48, 301-314.

Another widely-used technique is the wish-for technique. The subjects are allowed to state freely their wishes and aspirations. Like the TAT, it yields qualitative data rather than quantitative and the data are quite unrealistic since they are the result of the subjects' fantasies.

Dennis² used children's human figure drawings in his study of children's values. His proposition is that "the child reveals in his drawings of people what he admires or wishes." Criticism of the TAT also applies to Dennis' technique.

Recently, Helper and Garfield³ used the semantic differential to compare values of American Indian and white adolescents. They found that response sets could vary in different cultural groups and could seriously affect the interpretation of questionnaire data. Semantic ratings of the value-oriented concepts were highly saturated with the evaluative factor. Another finding was that semantic ratings can provide evidence of both similarities and differences between a dominant culture and different subgroups of a minority population. They proposed that with appropriate precautions against response bias, the semantic differential is potentially useful in studying

²Wayne Dennis, "Values Expressed in Children's Drawings, in Wayne Dennis, (Ed.), Readings in Child Psychology, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963, pp. 265-271.

³Malcolm M. Helper and Sol L. Garfield, "Use of the Semantic Differential to Study Acculturation in American Indian Adolescents, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 817-822.

acculturation and attitude toward ethnic group membership.

In order to get more objective results----and to avoid using projective methods which often yield important results that, because they are obtained from subjective judgements, are often unreliable and difficult to replicate-- a rating scale similar to the semantic differential is adopted with some adaptation in this study. This scale is known as the behavioral differential.

The Behavioral Differential

Original Scale. The behavioral differential is a modified form of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale which was originally designed by Bogardus to measure attitudes toward different ethnic groups. The social distance scale was made up of a number of statements selected on an a priori basis, to elicit responses which are the indication of acceptance of any nationality group. The so-called social distance is the distance which the individual perceives to exist between himself and any other person. In the original scale there were seven statements of action tendency of a person toward an ethnic group. They are as follow:

1. To become close kins by marriage,
2. To belong to my club as personal chums,
3. To live on my street as neighbors,
4. To be employed in my occupation,
5. To be a citizen of my country,
6. To be a visitor in my country, and
7. Would exclude from my country.

Each of these items show the degree of acceptance of

the stimulus ethnic group ranging from most willingness to least willingness⁴.

Modified Scale. The most important modification of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale was done by H.C. Triandis and Liegh M. Triandis⁵. In their modification, many other statements indicating a person's behavioral intention toward other persons were added. This modified scale is known as the behavioral differential and the dependent variable obtained is called social distance⁶, behavior component of social attitudes⁷, behavioral intention⁸, and interpersonal attitudes⁹.

⁴David Krech and Richard S. Crutchfield, Theories and Problems of Social Psychology, Kōgakusha Company Ltd., Tokyo, 1958, pp. 221-222.

⁵Harry C. Triandis and Leigh M. Triandis, "Race, Social Class, Religion, and Nationality as Determinant of Social Distance," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 110-118; and

Harry C. Triandis and Leigh M. Triandis, "A Cross-Cultural Study of Social Distance," Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76(20, Whole no. 540).

⁶Ibid.

⁷Harry C. Triandis, "Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Behavioral Component of Social Attitudes," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 420-430.

⁸Harry C. Triandis and Earl E. Davis, "Race and Belief as Determinants of Behavioral Intentions," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 715-725.

⁹Harry C. Triandis, W.D. Loh, and Leslie A. Levin, "Race, Status, Quality of Spoken English, and Opinions About Civic Rights as Determinants of Interpersonal Attitudes," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 468-472.

Whatever this variable is called, it will be referred to as social distance throughout this study. This term has been used by many other researchers such as Rokeach¹⁰, Stein, Hardyck, and Smith¹¹ and Stein¹².

Dimensions of Social Distance. Factor analysis of the behavioral differential obtained five dimensions or factors. They were as follows:

Factor I. Formal Social Acceptance with Superordination versus Formal Social Rejection, defined by high loadings on items such as "I would admire the ideas of," "I would admire the character of," "I would obey," "I would cooperate in a political campaign with," etc.

Factor II. Marital Acceptance versus Marital Rejection defined by high loadings on "I would marry," "I would date," "I would fall in love with," etc.

Factor III. Friendship Acceptance versus Friendship Rejection defined by high loadings on "I would accept as an intimate friend," "I would eat with," "I would gossip with," etc.

Factor IV. Social Distance, defined by high loadings on "I would exclude from the neighborhood," "I would prohibit admission to my club," "I would not accept as a close kin by marriage," etc.

Factor V. Subordination, defined by high loadings on "I would obey," "I would not treat as a subordinate," "I would be commanded by," etc.¹³

Determinants of Social Distance. Triandis found that

¹⁰M. Rokeach, "Belief Versus Race as Determinant of Social Distance: Comment on Triandis' Paper," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 187-188.

¹¹Stein et al., loc. cit.

¹²D.D. Stein, "The Influence of Belief Systems on Interpersonal Preference: A Validation Study of Rokeach's Theory of Prejudice," Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80(8, Whole no. 616).

¹³Triandis (1964), loc. cit.

each of these factors had different sources of variance. For instance, occupation of the stimulus person was by far the most important determinant for Formal Social Rejection (Factor I) and for Subordination (Factor V). Incongruence of sex and age, followed by race and religion were the primary determinants of variance for Friendship Rejection (Factor III). For Social Distance (Factor IV), the variance was determined by race¹⁴.


However, when these five factors were considered as a whole, it was found that there were three sources of variance that determined the social distance which a person experienced toward another person. These were the culture of the perceiver, his personality, and the characteristics of the stimulus person¹⁵.

In their exploratory study of the influences of the perceiver's culture upon his social distance toward another person, Triandis et al.¹⁶ had their American, German, and Japanese students state separately in their own countries their social distance toward stimulus persons with different race, nationality, religion, and occupation. The results were: race, occupation, religion, and nationality of the stimulus person----in that order----were the important determinants of social distance in Illinois; occupation, religion, race, and nationality----in that order----in Germany; occupation, race, nationality and religion

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Triandis et al. (1965), loc. cit.



in Japan. In an earlier study, Triandis and Triandis¹⁷ found that with Greek subjects religion was the most powerful determinant.

These findings show the influences of the perceivers' cultures upon their perception. Triandis et al.¹⁸ also suggested that the norms of behavior toward members of different out groups differ from culture to culture. For example, in the United States and Japan, exclusion from the neighborhood appear as a fairly prevalent norm for non-preferred stimulus persons but in Greece and Germany, this is not the case. The most frequent social distance indicated by Germans and Greeks is a refusal to be more than an acquaintance of the person.

Triandis et al. report also that subjects of differing personality types show differing degree of social distance: higher social distance scorers are conforming and uncritical of the values imparted to them by their culture, conservative, and intolerant of ambiguity.

What characteristics of the stimulus person determine social distance is now a topic of active debate among psychologists.

Triandis et al., in the study just cited, hold that race, occupation, religion, and nationality of the stimulus person are important determinants of social distance toward him.

In another study, Triandis and his collaborators,

¹⁷Triandis and Triandis (1962), loc. cit.

¹⁸Triandis et al. (1965), loc. cit.

Loh and Levin¹⁹, showed slides of either a Negro or a white young man, who was well dressed or poorly dressed. While looking at the stimulus person, the subjects simultaneously heard a tape-recorded statement which was either in favor or opposed to integrated housing. These statements were spoken either in excellent or in ungrammatical English. The subjects were to rate each person on fifteen behavioral differential and two semantic differential scales. The results indicated that quality of speech was the most important determinant and belief regarding integrated housing the next in the social acceptance factor of the behavioral differential and the evaluative factor of the semantic differential. The important determinants of the judgements in the social distance factor were race and quality of speech. But for the friendship factor, quality of speech, race, and dress, in that order, were important determinants.

Nevertheless, these findings are contradictory to those of Rokeach, Smith, and Evans²⁰. In their Negro-white study, Rokeach et al. asked white college students to indicate their degree of preference for white and Negro stimulus persons holding beliefs similar to or opposed to their own. The ends of the scales were defined by the statements "I can't see myself being friends with such a person," and "I can very easily see myself being friends with such a person." The major finding in all samples was that prejudice occurs primarily on the basis of

¹⁹Triandis et al. loc. cit.

²⁰Rokeach et al., loc. cit.

belief congruence rather than on the basis of racial congruence.

Triandis²¹ accepted Rokeach et al.'s finding only on the friendship factor, but argued that prejudice involved more than nonacceptance as a friend; it involved negative behavior as well. Triandis asked his subjects to indicate their responses toward persons whose philosophy of life coincided with their own most preferred and least preferred ways of life. The stimulus persons were also varied in race, religion, and occupational status. Triandis obtained a race effect that accounted for about four times as much variance as any of the other effects singly. Although the belief effect was also significant, he felt that race, rather than belief, was the critical determinant.

Rokeach²² replied to Triandis with the objection that Triandis' manipulation of similarity of philosophy of life was based on complex and diffused paragraphs that were too vague and not sufficiently salient for the subjects.

Stein, Hardyck, and Smith²³, in their attempt to reconcile these differences, asked white ninth-graders to complete a teen-age social distance scale in which the subjects were to respond to both a measure of friendly feelings and a social distance scale. The stimulus persons were white and Negro

²¹Harry C. Triandis, "A Note on Rokeach's Theory of Prejudice," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 184-186.

²²Rokeach, loc. cit.

²³Stein et al. loc. cit.

teenagers who were like or unlike themselves in values. The subject had indicated their own values two months earlier. Stein et al.'s findings were as follows. Firstly belief accounted for much more variance than race, although both effects were significant; secondly, strong race effects were obtained on sensitive items in the social distance scale because of strong societal pressures; and thirdly, subjects responded to a Negro stimulus person presented as unlike them in values in much the same way as they had previously responded to an otherwise unspecified Negro about whom they had no other information. Stein et al. interpreted the last finding to mean that in the absence of other information, the subjects assumed that Negroes were unlike themselves in values.

Triandis and Davis²⁴ criticized Stein et al.'s social distance scale in that it was limited to positive items only and that Triandis' criticism of Rokeach's theory applies equally to them. Triandis and Davis had their subjects respond to eight stimulus persons on twelve semantic and fifteen behavioral differential scales. These persons were generated by all possible combinations of the characteristics Negro-white, male-female, and pro- or con-civil-rights legislation. They found that some subjects were extremely sensitive to the race component of the stimulus persons while other subjects showed a greater sensitivity to the beliefs of the stimulus persons. Another finding showed that the relative importance of the race

²⁴Triandis and Davis, loc. cit.

and belief components varied systematically with the degree of intimacy of behavioral intentions. Triandis and Davis concluded that the more intimate the behavior, the more is the weight given to the race component. But in the case of nonintimate behavior, Rokeach's argument appears correct. In the case of behavior intermediate in intimacy, both race and belief are important.

Stein²⁵ undertook another research to replicate his original one (1965). The results strongly support Rokeach's theory. When information about a stimulus person's beliefs in the area of personal values is made available, similarity or dissimilarity in beliefs is the primary determinant of social distance. Only secondarily does racial or religious affiliation or socioeconomic status have an influence. Yet, in the absence of information about the stimulus person's beliefs, there are still strong race and religion effects.

Anderson and Cote²⁶ in their study of disaffection between French- and English speaking Canadians, gave further support to the validity of Rokeach's theory. They found that French-speaking Canadians, who are predominantly Catholic, evaluated English-speaking Canadians, who are predominantly non-Catholic, in terms of belief congruence but not in terms of ethnicity.

²⁵Stein, loc. cit.

²⁶C.C. Anderson and A.D.J. Cote, "Belief Dissonance as a Source of Disaffection Between Ethnic Groups," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 447-453.

From the foregoing arguments, it can be seen that psychologists have different positions with regard to the weight of race and belief as determinants of social distance. However, all recognize the influences of these two variables. It is likely that in the absence of either one of these cues, the other one would be the important determinant. Thus, when race alone is varied, different amounts of social distance will be the result of different racial characteristics. Likewise, when value alone is varied, different degrees of social distance will be the result of different values.

Application. On the basis of reference group theory, a person's social distance toward an ethnic group would be the degree of identification the person has with the ethnic group. And on the basis of interpersonal attraction theory, attraction is determined by perceived similarity or dissimilarity of self-descriptions. The more similar is the stimulus person, the more that person is liked and the less is the social distance.

With the foregoing theoretical framework, the present investigator would like to propose that by providing as stimuli persons of various ethnic affiliation, the social distance obtained could be used as a measure of the subject's identification with the ethnic group. Similarly, by providing as stimuli persons with differing values, the social distance obtained could be the measure of the subject's value systems.

²⁷W.B. Griffitt, "Interpersonal Attraction as a Function of Self-Concept and Personality Similarity-Dissimilarity," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 581-585.

For instance, those who show less social distance toward a stimulus person who values wealth more than anything else would be likely for themselves to value wealth. On the other hand, those who show great social distance toward this stimulus person would be likely to devalue wealth.

Hence, in addition to its traditional use as a device for the measurement of ethnic attitudes, a modified behavioral differential scale could be used as a tool to assess a person's identification and value systems.

Preparation of Scales

Having the foregoing rationale in mind, two forms of the behavioral differential were prepared to assess the two variables involved in the present hypothesis, i.e., identification and values.

Selection of Stimulus Persons and Items. In the first form, Form A, which was designed for the assessment of identification, four stimulus persons were presented: one Thai, one Chinese, one Thai who likes the Chinese and would like to have the Chinese in Thailand, and the last one, a Thai who dislikes the Chinese and would not like to have them in Thailand. Underneath each stimulus person, there were fifteen behavioral differential items each of which was accompanied by a seven-point rating continuum ranging from "would" to "would not." They are as follows:

1. Have lunch with this person.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
2. Play games with this person.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
3. Go out with this person.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
4. Often invite this person to my house.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
5. Consider this person useless.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
6. Avoid speaking with this person.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
7. Work with this person.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
8. Admire the ideas of this person.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
9. Give help to this person.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
10. Ask this person for help.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
11. Reject the advice of this person.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
12. Sit next to this person in class.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not
13. Like to have this person as a neighbor.
would ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ would not

14. Encourage my siblings to marry this person.
 would ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ would not

15. Like to have a kin relationship with this person.
 would ____:____:____:____:____:____:____ would not

Items no. 1, 4, 7, 12, 13, and 14 were taken from Stein's social distance scale for teenagers²⁸. Items no. 4, 7, 13, and 14 were moderately adapted so as to suit the subjects in the present study. Item no. 8 was taken from the scale developed by Triandis and Triandis²⁹ while item no. 15 was taken from Bogardus' original scale. The criteria for selecting these items were that these items are applicable for teenagers and that they represent three of the five factors of the behavioral differential isolated by Triandis³⁰. The factors are formal social rejection, friendship rejection, and social distance. In these three factors, both race and value dissimilarity between the respondent and the stimulus person were found to account for significant variance³¹.

Considered as a whole, four factors are included in this form: the first six items represent the friendship rejection factor; the next five items represent the formal social rejection factor; the next two items represent the social distance

²⁸Stein, loc. cit.

²⁹Triandis and Triandis (1962), loc. cit.

³⁰Triandis (1964), loc. cit.

³¹Triandis and Davis, loc. cit.

factor; and the last two items represent the marital rejection factor.

In the second form, Form B, sixteen stimulus persons were presented. Each of these stimulus persons had one combination of the following characteristics: desiring an excessive amount of wealth (A_1) or a moderate amount of wealth (A_2), seeking fame and prestige (B_1) or ignoring fame and prestige (B_2), considering education as important and as a means to upward mobility (C_1) or as unimportant and as no means to upward mobility (C_2), and being benevolent (D_1) or not benevolent (D_2).

Underneath each of these stimulus persons, there were also fifteen behavioral differential items accompanied by seven-point rating continua. All the items except items no. 1, 2, and 3 of Form A were included in Form B. Three semantic differential items representing the evaluative factor (good-bad, wise-foolish, and respectable-unrespectable)³² were added. This factor was included because value dissimilarity was found to account for almost all of its variance³³.

In both Form A and Form B, the stimulus persons and the behavioral differential items were arranged in random orders to avoid carry-over effects.

Scoring Procedure. For each of the behavioral differential items, the most positive response, which is indicated by

³² Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1957.

³³ Triandis et al., loc. cit.

a rating at the positive end ("would"), is given a score of 1. The score increases as the positiveness of the subjects' response decreases. A score of 4 indicates neutral feeling. The score increases from 4 to 7 as the negativeness of the response increases to the other end of the continuum ("would not"). For the negative items of the behavioral differential, the scoring procedure is in the inverse fashion. For the three semantic differential items, the same scoring principle is followed. The positive ends (those ended with good, wise, and respectable) are designated as 1, and the negative ends (those ended with bad, foolish, and unrespectable) are designated as 7. The social distance score of a subject towards any stimulus person is obtained by summing the scores of the fifteen items underneath that stimulus person. The possible range of scores is from 15 to 105.

Item Analysis. In order to secure the discrimination power of the items, Form B was administered to 70 Thai and second-generation Chinese adolescents who were in Matayomsuksa 3 of a secondary coeducational school. Each of these adolescents rated sixteen stimulus persons, and hence each had sixteen social distance scores. Disregarding the respondents and the stimulus persons, these scores----1120 scores altogether---- were then ranked from the highest to the lowest. The twenty seven percent highest scores, designated as Group H, and the twenty seven percent lowest scores, designated as Group L, were isolated. For each of these fifteen items, the mean score of Group H and that of Group L were compared by using the t-technique.

The obtained t-statistics ranged between 3.70 and 49.66 (see Appendix D); all were significant at the .001 level. The three lowest t-values were of the three negative items of the behavioral differential, i.e., consider this person useless, avoid speaking with this person, and reject the advice of this person. However, on the assumption that if more time had been allowed for the subjects to respond and if the subjects had been motivated to respond as carefully and accurately as possible, the low t-values would not have occurred, these three items were retained.

Final Forms. Realizing that Form B was relatively too long to be filled out during one classroom period, this form was divided into two halves, Form B-1 and Form B-2. There were eight stimulus persons in each of these two forms. They are as follows:

Form B-1: stimulus persons $A_1B_1C_1D_1$, $A_1B_1C_2D_2$, $A_1B_2C_1D_2$, $A_1B_2C_2D_1$, $A_2B_1C_1D_1$, $A_2B_1C_2D_2$, $A_2B_2C_1D_2$, and $A_2B_2C_2D_1$, in random orders.

Form B-2: stimulus persons $A_1B_1C_1D_2$, $A_1B_1C_2D_1$, $A_1B_2C_1D_1$, $A_1B_2C_2D_2$, $A_2B_1C_1D_2$, $A_2B_1C_2D_1$, $A_2B_2C_1D_1$, and $A_2B_2C_2D_2$, in random orders.

Form B-1 was accompanied by a short questionnaire asking about the subjects' personal information. Form B-2 was combined with Form A and stimulus person $A_1B_2C_1D_2$, which was already assigned to Form B-1, was included in this form. This latter stimulus person was repeated here to check the consistency of the subjects' responses, and, partly, the reliability of the scale.

All the stimulus persons in all forms were rearranged in random orders.

Sample

The sample consisted of 210 adolescents: 120 second-generation Chinese and 90 Thais. They were chosen from three secondary schools situated in the same district in Bangkok. The first school, from which 68 boys and 52 girls were chosen, was coeducational. Most of the boys and girls in this school are second-generation Chinese. The other two schools, one boy's school and one girl's school, were chosen because most of the boys and girls are Thais. From these two schools, 46 boys and 44 girls were chosen. The criterion for choosing the second-generation Chinese subjects was that their parents and grand-parents had been born in China. Similarly, the criterion for choosing Thai subjects was that their parents and grand-parents had been born in Thailand. Age and level of education of the subjects were controlled, i.e., the subjects were in the age range of 14 to 18 years old and all of them were in Matayomsuksa 3 during the time of study.

Procedure

All subjects received Form B-1 with the supplementary questionnaire in one day and Form B-2 together with Form A in the following day. Twenty-three second-generation Chinese and twenty Thai subjects were discarded because their responses

were inconsistent. This was checked by comparing the two social distance scores expressed toward the repeated stimulus person. A difference of more than fifteen points was considered inconsistent.

The product-moment correlation coefficient between the two social distance scores expressed toward the same stimulus person by the remaining subjects was .77 . This value of r is a satisfactory reliability coefficient for a scale of this type. In one of Triandis' studies, the reliabilities for the various factors of the behavioral differential ranged between .59 and .85³⁴.

For each of the second-generation Chinese subjects, a difference between the social distance expressed toward the Thai and that expressed toward the Chinese was obtained by subtraction (social distance toward the Thai minus social distance toward the Chinese). This difference, designated as D-score, was used as a criterion for determining the ethnic identification of the subjects. These D-scores ranged between -30 and 85. A high D-score was taken as an indication of a high degree of identification with the Chinese whereas a low D-score was taken as an indication of a high degree of identification with the Thai. These D-scores were roughly trimodally distributed; hence the second-generation Chinese subjects were divided into three groups according to their D-scores. The first group, the low Chinese, had D-scores from -30 to 4; the second group,

³⁴Triandis et al. (1966), loc. cit.

the medium Chinese, had D-scores from 5 to 26; and the third group, the high Chinese, had D-scores from 27 to 85. There were thirty, forty-one and twenty-six subjects in each of these three groups respectively.

Here, a D-score was used instead of the actual social distance score expressed toward the Thai in order to minimize the effects of the subjects' response styles.

To obtain a check on this manipulation, the mean social distance scores expressed by these three groups toward the Thai who dislikes the Chinese and would not like to have the Chinese in Thailand were compared. It was found that the mean of the high Chinese was significantly greater than that of the medium Chinese ($t = 3.07, p < .01$) and the mean of the medium Chinese was moderately greater than that of the low Chinese ($t = 1.05, p < .15$). This is consistent with Schumrum's³⁵ finding that the more Thainess a second-generation Chinese has, the less will be his social distance toward the Thai and the extreme Thai.

The results of this study will now be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

³⁵Schumrum, loc. cit.