

NATIONAL LIBRARY  
OTTAWA



BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE  
OTTAWA

8101

NAME OF AUTHOR.....*MARLENE... MARIE... MARIE...*  
TITLE OF THESIS...*THE ACCURACY OF FOX KNOWLEDGE*  
*CONCERNING... ALBERTA... INDIANS,*  
*UKRAINIANS AND HUTTERITES: AN AVAILABLE*  
*DATA STEREO TYPE VALIDATION TECHNIQUE.*  
UNIVERSITY.....*OF... ALBERTA.....*  
DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED....*P.H.D*.....  
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED.....*1971*.....

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY  
OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies  
of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and  
neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be  
printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's  
written permission.

(Signed)....*Marlene Marie Marie*

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

...*DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY,*  
...*UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY,*  
...*CALGARY, ALBERTA*

DATED.....*April 20*.....1971

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE ACCURACY OF FOLK KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING ALBERTA  
INDIANS, HUTTERITES, AND UKRAINIANS:  
AN AVAILABLE DATA STEREOTYPE  
VALIDATION TECHNIQUE

by



MARLENE MARIE MACKIE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1971

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA  
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read,  
and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for  
acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Accuracy of Folk  
Knowledge Concerning Alberta Indians, Hutterites, and  
Ukrainians: An Available Data Stereotype Validation  
Technique," submitted by Marlene Marie Mackie in partial  
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor  
of Philosophy.

*Guyon Nettler*.....  
Supervisor  
*William McLaughlin*.....  
*Gregory R. B. [unclear]*.....  
*Richard [unclear]*.....

*Melvin L. DeLeon*.....  
External Examiner

Date *20 April,*.....

## ABSTRACT

This study is a test of the accuracy of ethnic stereotypy. Stereotypes of the North American Indians, Hutterites, and Ukrainians (as well as seven other categories) have been measured by two instruments, a modified semantic differential and an open-ended questionnaire. A judgmental sample of 590 subjects was drawn from 25 organizations which were chosen to obtain coverage of selected demographic characteristics. The accuracy of the stereotypes was subsequently assessed against data provided by available public records and existing studies of the referent groups. Of the 40 traits examined, 31 traits proved to be accurate, 4 inaccurate, and 5 remain unverified. No empirical substantiation has been found for the inclusion of inaccuracy in the definition of stereotypes.

Several secondary objectives were incorporated. The study was also concerned with investigating the alleged equivalence between stereotypy and prejudice. Bogardus social distance scales were used to operationalize prejudice. The disposition to admit an ethnic group to close association was found to be related to richer cognitive imagery concerning that group. Greater social distance from an ethnic group was not consistently associated with either more frequent or more extreme assignment of unflattering traits. Further, the results established a positive relationship between education and stereotypy and a negative relationship between education and prejudice.

Finally, consideration is given to the metasociological implications of the substantive results. It is suggested that the liberal sympathies of social scientists discourage an empirical test of the proposition that popular impressions of ethnic categories are erroneous.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Gwynn Nettler for his generous contribution of thought, time, and encouragement throughout the course of this project. I am also indebted to Dr. Donald Larsen, who provided invaluable assistance in the beginning stages of study design and analysis, and to Professors Victor Matthews, William Meloff, and G. R. LeFrancois for their critical readings of the various drafts of the manuscript. I thank the sociology instructors at Mount Royal Junior College and the members of the Calgary Motorcycle Club for their help in pretesting the instruments. To the people in the Edmonton organizations who graciously provided the data for this study, I owe special thanks. Finally, I wish to acknowledge the Isaak Walton Killam Foundation for its financial support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Definitions of Stereotypy . . . . .	3
Basis for the Assumption of Stereotype Inaccuracy . . . . .	10
Lack of Personal Contact . . . . .	10
Equation of Stereotypy and Prejudice . . . . .	13
Stereotypy as Inferior Cognitive Process . . . . .	23
The Metasociology of Stereotype Investigation . . . . .	29
Conditions for the Recognition of Group Differences . . . . .	29
The Symbolic Interactionist Position on Group Differences . . . . .	34
Folk Knowledge and the "Facts" . . . . .	38
Conclusion . . . . .	44
2. THE EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF STEREOTYPE ACCURACY . . . . .	45
Introduction . . . . .	45
Ethnic Research Independent of Stereotype Measurement . . . . .	45
Indirect Tests of Stereotypes . . . . .	47
Direct Tests of Stereotypes . . . . .	50
Conclusion . . . . .	55
3. DESIGN OF THE INVESTIGATION . . . . .	57
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	57
Sample . . . . .	57
Stereotype Measurement Instruments . . . . .	62
Katz and Braly Checklists . . . . .	62

Chapter	Page
Open-Ended Questionnaire . . . . .	65
The Semantic Differential . . . . .	72
Social Distance Scale . . . . .	77
Procedure for Assessment of Stereotype Accuracy . . . . .	78
Definitions . . . . .	80
Stimulus Groups . . . . .	80
General Population . . . . .	81
Stereotype . . . . .	81
Accuracy . . . . .	81
Amount of Stereotypy . . . . .	82
Degree of Stereotypy . . . . .	82
Social Distance . . . . .	82
Amount of Education . . . . .	83
Hypotheses . . . . .	83
4. DESCRIPTION OF THE STEREOTYPES . . . . .	88
Introduction . . . . .	88
North American Indians . . . . .	88
Ukrainians . . . . .	94
Hutterites . . . . .	97
People Like Me . . . . .	104
Jews . . . . .	110
School Teachers . . . . .	114
Lawyers . . . . .	117
Lower Class People . . . . .	119
Women . . . . .	120



Chapter	Page
Old People . . . . .	122
5. AMOUNT AND DEGREE OF STEREOTYPY . . . . .	125
Amount of Stereotypy . . . . .	125
Measurement . . . . .	125
Total Samples . . . . .	129
Education . . . . .	131
Sex . . . . .	143
Age . . . . .	148
Socioeconomic Status . . . . .	152
Amount of Ethnic Stereotypy and Sample Bias . . . . .	157
Degree of Stereotypy . . . . .	159
Measurement . . . . .	159
Relationship Between Degree of Stereotypy and Education . . . . .	161
Conclusion . . . . .	164
6. PREJUDICE AND STEREOTYPY . . . . .	166
Introduction . . . . .	166
The Measurement of Social Distance . . . . .	166
Total Sample Social Distance Quotients . . . . .	168
Social Distance and Demographic Variables . . . . .	172
Sex . . . . .	172
Age . . . . .	174
Education . . . . .	178
Socioeconomic Status . . . . .	181
Stimulus Group Stereotypy and Prejudice . . . . .	184
Social Distance and Negative Trait Ascription . . . . .	195

Chapter	Page
Indians . . . . .	196
Jews . . . . .	200
Conclusion . . . . .	206
7. VALIDATION OF THE INDIAN STEREOTYPE . . . . .	207
Introduction . . . . .	207
Indian Stereotype Traits . . . . .	208
Rural . . . . .	208
Poor . . . . .	211
Frivolous with Money . . . . .	215
Not Materialistic . . . . .	219
Large Families . . . . .	223
Dirty . . . . .	225
Uneducated . . . . .	228
Believe University Education Unimportant . . . . .	232
Unambitious . . . . .	236
Lazy . . . . .	243
Old-Fashioned . . . . .	250
Often in Trouble with the Law . . . . .	257
Drunken . . . . .	262
Disliked by Others . . . . .	269
Oppressed by Others . . . . .	273
Conclusion . . . . .	278
8. VALIDATION OF THE UKRAINIAN STEREOTYPE . . . . .	280
Introduction . . . . .	280
Ukrainian Stereotype Traits . . . . .	281
Live According to a Different Culture . . . . .	281

Chapter	Page
Large Families . . . . .	288
Religious . . . . .	292
Hardworking . . . . .	296
Ambitious . . . . .	299
Conclusion . . . . .	310
9. VALIDATION OF THE HUTTERITE STEREOTYPE . . . . .	311
Introduction . . . . .	311
Hutterite Stereotype Traits . . . . .	311
Religious . . . . .	311
Rural . . . . .	318
Likely to Have Large Families . . . . .	320
Cliquish . . . . .	322
Believe University Education Unimportant . . . . .	326
Self-Sufficient . . . . .	328
Thrifty with Money . . . . .	338
Seldom in Trouble with the Law . . . . .	344
Sober . . . . .	347
Stable Marriages . . . . .	350
Sexually Moral . . . . .	351
Not Neglectful of Their Children's Needs . . . . .	353
Healthy . . . . .	357
Mentally Healthy . . . . .	360
Disliked by Other Groups . . . . .	363
Old-Fashioned . . . . .	369
Conclusion . . . . .	376

Chapter	Page
10. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	377
Introduction . . . . .	377
Results . . . . .	378
Accuracy of Stereotypy . . . . .	378
Stereotypy and Prejudice . . . . .	384
Amount and Degree of Stereotypy . . . . .	385
Substantive Conclusions . . . . .	388
Metasociological Implications . . . . .	389
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	395
APPENDIX A . . . . .	426
APPENDIX B . . . . .	444
APPENDIX C . . . . .	459

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
4.1	STEREOTYPE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290 . . . . .	89
4.2	STEREOTYPE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300 . . . . .	90
4.3	STEREOTYPE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	92
4.4	STEREOTYPE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 20% CRITERION LEVEL, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	93
4.5	STEREOTYPE OF THE UKRAINIANS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290 . . . . .	95
4.6	STEREOTYPE OF THE UKRAINIANS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300 . . . . .	95
4.7	STEREOTYPE OF THE UKRAINIANS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, UKRAINIAN SUBSAMPLE, N = 32 . . . . .	96
4.8	STEREOTYPE OF THE UKRAINIANS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	98
4.9	STEREOTYPE OF THE UKRAINIANS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	99
4.10	STEREOTYPE OF THE HUTTERITES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290 . . . . .	100
4.11	STEREOTYPE OF THE HUTTERITES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300 . . . . .	100
4.12	STEREOTYPE OF THE HUTTERITES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	102
4.13	STEREOTYPE OF THE HUTTERITES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	103
4.14	STEREOTYPE OF PEOPLE LIKE ME, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290 . . . . .	105
4.15	STEREOTYPE OF PEOPLE LIKE ME, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300 . . . . .	106

Table	Page
4.16 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STEREOTYPES OF PEOPLE LIKE ME AND ETHNIC CATEGORIES, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	107
4.17 STEREOTYPE OF THE JEWS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290 . . . . .	111
4.18 STEREOTYPE OF THE JEWS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300 . . . . .	111
4.19 COMPARISON OF JEWISH STEREOTYPE TRAITS WITH PREVIOUS STUDIES . . . . .	113
4.20 STEREOTYPE OF SCHOOL TEACHERS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290 . . . . .	115
4.21 STEREOTYPE OF SCHOOL TEACHERS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300 . . . . .	116
4.22 STEREOTYPE OF LAWYERS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290 . . . . .	118
4.23 STEREOTYPE OF LAWYERS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300 . . . . .	118
4.24 STEREOTYPE OF LOWER-CLASS PEOPLE, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290 . . . . .	119
4.25 STEREOTYPE OF LOWER-CLASS PEOPLE, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300 . . . . .	119
4.26 STEREOTYPE OF WOMEN, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290 . . . . .	121
4.27 STEREOTYPE OF WOMEN, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300 . . . . .	121
4.28 STEREOTYPE OF OLD PEOPLE, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290 . . . . .	123
4.29 STEREOTYPE OF OLD PEOPLE, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300 . . . . .	123
5.1 AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AND OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLES . . . . .	130
5.2 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL . . . . .	132
5.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 10% LEVEL . . . . .	133

Table	Page
5.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 20% LEVEL . . . . .	134
5.5 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE PREFERENCE . . . . .	138
5.6 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND MEDIAN NUMBER OF WORDS USED IN OPEN-ENDED DESCRIPTION . . . . .	139
5.7 REFUSAL TO DESCRIBE STIMULUS GROUPS, BY EDUCATION, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	140
5.8 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL . . . . .	144
5.9 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 10% LEVEL . . . . .	145
5.10 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 20% LEVEL . . . . .	146
5.11 % SEX DISTRIBUTION IN EDUCATION SUBSAMPLES, BY INSTRUMENT . . . . .	147
5.12 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL . . . . .	149
5.13 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 10% LEVEL . . . . .	150
5.14 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 20% LEVEL . . . . .	151
5.15 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL . . . . .	154
5.16 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 10% LEVEL . . . . .	155
5.17 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 20% LEVEL . . . . .	156

Table	Page
5.18 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND DEGREE OF STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL . . . . .	162
6.1 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AND OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLES . . . . .	169
6.2 COMPARISON OF 1961 AND 1968 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS FOR SELECTED ETHNIC GROUPS . . . . .	170
6.3 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS BY SEX SUBSAMPLES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AND OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	173
6.4 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS BY AGE SUBSAMPLES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL . . . . .	175
6.5 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS BY AGE SUBSAMPLES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	176
6.6 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS, BY EDUCATION SUBSAMPLES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL . . . . .	179
6.7 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS, BY EDUCATION SUBSAMPLES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	180
6.8 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS SUBSAMPLES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL . . . . .	182
6.9 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS SUBSAMPLES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	183
6.10 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY EXPRESSED TOWARD ETHNIC STIMULUS GROUPS BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL . . . . .	186
6.11 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY EXPRESSED TOWARD ETHNIC STIMULUS GROUPS BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 10% LEVEL . . . . .	187
6.12 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPE EXPRESSED TOWARD ETHNIC STIMULUS GROUPS BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 20% LEVEL . . . . .	188
6.13 SOCIAL DISTANCE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY RANKS FOR COMBINED STIMULUS GROUPS AND INSTRUMENTS, BY SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	190



Table	Page
6.14 SOCIAL DISTANCE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY RANKS FOR ETHNIC STIMULUS GROUPS, SUBSAMPLES AND INSTRUMENTS COMBINED . . . . .	192
6.15 SOCIAL DISTANCE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY RANKS, BY STEREOTYPE MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT . . . . .	193
6.16 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND DEGREE OF STEREOTYPY EXPRESSED TOWARD STIMULUS GROUPS, BY EDUCATION CATEGORIES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL . . . . .	194
6.17 INDIAN SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND SELECTED SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TRAITS, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	197
6.18 INDIAN SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND SELECTED OPEN-ENDED TRAITS, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	199
6.19 JEWISH SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND SELECTED SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TRAITS, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	201
6.20 JEWISH SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND SELECTED OPEN-ENDED TRAITS, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES . . . . .	203
7.1 URBAN, RURAL-FARM, AND RURAL NONFARM POPULATIONS, ALBERTA AND NATIVE PEOPLES, 1961 . . . . .	209
7.2 NUMBER OF CHILDREN BORN PER 1,000 ALBERTA WOMEN AND PRAIRIE PROVINCE INDIAN WOMEN EVER MARRIED, 1961 . . . . .	225
7.3 SANITATION FACILITIES IN HOUSEHOLDS, ALBERTA GENERAL POPULATION AND INDIAN RESERVES . . . . .	228
7.4 PERCENTAGES OF ALBERTA STUDENTS AND ALBERTA INDIANS ENROLLED AT VARIOUS GRADE LEVELS, 1964-65 . . . . .	229
7.5 PERCENTAGE ALBERTA INDIAN YOUTH ENROLLED IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, 1964-65 . . . . .	230
7.6 PERCENTAGE CANADIAN NATIVE AND CANADIAN TOTAL MALE LABOR FORCE IN OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES, 1961 . . . . .	232

Table	Page
7.7	JOB ASPIRATIONS OF LAC LA BICHE METIS, 1967 . . . . . 241
7.8	NUMBER OF NATIVE ADULTS IN SELECTED ALBERTA PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS ADMITTED DURING AUGUST, 1966 . . . . . 259
7.9	NUMBERS OF INDIANS AND METIS IN ALBERTA PRISONS OR TRAINING SCHOOLS, APRIL 1, 1966 TO MARCH 31, 1967 . . . . . 259
7.10	INDIAN-METIS ADMISSIONS TO ALBERTA CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS, APRIL 1, 1968 TO MARCH 31, 1969 . . . . . 260
7.11	INDIAN AND NON-INDIAN CONVICTIONS FOR INDICTABLE OFFENCES, ALBERTA, 1961 . . . . . 261
7.12	INDIAN AND WHITE RATES OF CONVICTION FOR INTOXICATION, CANADA AND ALBERTA, BY SEX, 1961 . . . . . 265
7.13	NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS MADE UNDER THE ALBERTA HUMAN RIGHTS ACT, BY ETHNIC GROUP, SEPTEMBER, 1966 TO APRIL, 1970 . . . . . 277
8.1	RETENTION OF ANCESTRAL LANGUAGE FOR UKRAINIANS AND SELECTED ETHNIC GROUPS. PERCENTAGE OF IMMIGRANTS AND OF THOSE WHOSE MOTHER TONGUE CORRESPONDS TO ETHNIC ORIGIN, CANADA, 1961 . . . . . 284
8.2	AGE SPECIFIC FERTILITY RATES, UKRAINIANS AND TOTAL POPULATION, CANADA, 1931-1961 . . . . . 289
8.3	POPULATION DISTRIBUTIONS FOR SELECTED AGE CATEGORIES, UKRAINIANS AND TOTAL POPULATION, ALBERTA, 1961 . . . . . 291
8.4	CHURCH ATTENDANCE, UKRAINIAN AND STUDY SAMPLES, BY PERCENT . . . . . 293
8.5	PROTESTANT ETHIC SCORES FOR ALBERTA UKRAINIAN, ITALIAN, AND ENGLISH SAMPLES . . . . . 298
8.6	PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPATIONS FOR NATIVE- AND FOREIGN-BORN UKRAINIAN AND TOTAL ALBERTA POPULATIONS, CURRENT EXPERIENCED LABOR FORCE, 1961 . . . . . 302

Table	Page	
8.7	EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF CANADIAN POPULATION 25 YEARS AND OVER, BY ETHNIC GROUPS, 1961 (PERCENT) . . . . .	303
8.8	EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF UKRAINIANS AND TOTAL POPULATION, 25 YEARS AND OVER, ALBERTA, 1961 . . . . .	304
8.9	INTERGENERATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY OF ALBERTA UKRAINIAN STUDY RESPONDENTS, BY PERCENT . . . . .	309
9.1	FREQUENCY OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE. COMBINED SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AND OPEN-ENDED SAMPLES . . . . .	317
10.1	THE ACCURACY OF THE INDIAN, UKRAINIAN, AND HUTTERITE STEREOTYPES . . . . .	379
A.1	AGE DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLES, COMPARED WITH 1966 CENSUS FOR EDMONTON AREA . . . . .	430
A.2	AGE DISTRIBUTION BY SEX CATEGORIES, COMPARED WITH 1966 CENSUS . . . . .	431
A.3	EDUCATION LEVEL OF SAMPLE, COMPARED WITH 1961 CENSUS FOR EDMONTON AREA . . . . .	432
A.4	OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE, COMPARED WITH 1961 CENSUS FOR EDMONTON AREA . . . . .	433
A.5	SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF SAMPLE, CLASSIFIED BY BLISHEN INDEX . . . . .	434
A.6	ETHNIC ORIGIN OF SAMPLE COMPARED WITH 1961 ALBERTA CENSUS DISTRIBUTION . . . . .	434
A.7	DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS, COMPARED WITH 1961 EDMONTON CENSUS . . . . .	435
A.8	VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP . . . . .	435
A.9	PLACE OF NATIVITY . . . . .	436
A.10	LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA . . . . .	436
A.11	LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN THE CITY OF EDMONTON . . . . .	436

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

This study is a test of the accuracy of ethnic stereotypy. Although social scientists claim to know that folk perception of ethnic categories is false, not one methodologically sound investigation of stereotype accuracy is to be found in the literature. Moreover, many studies concerned with the examination of various ethnic characteristics which are not unrelated to folk imagery indicate that folk cognition of ethnic groups is often informed by the "facts." The present research has both substantive and metasociological implications. An empirical answer is sought to the unresolved question of stereotype accuracy. In addition, this study considers why the "official" social scientific position denies validity to folk percepts of ethnic categories when evidence in support of this allegation is lacking. It appears that an inadequately grounded generalization has been transformed into truth by definition because this particular "truth" is congruent with the moral preferences of social scientists.

The following sections contain an explication of the meaning of the term "stereotype." Social psychology initially borrowed the concept from journalism and empirical work proceeded apace for some 30 years with little consideration of the questionable connotations carried by the term. Such larceny of language is, of course, not without precedent. Rose (1960) informs us that almost all of sociology's technical

vocabulary first belonged to the people. Schutz (1963:242) urges upon us the task of devising "constructs of constructs," of designing scientific constructs to supersede those of common-sense thought. What is noteworthy in the case of stereotypy is our disinclination to test the truth of allegations made by laymen concerning the characteristics of an important scientific concept.

Bierstedt (1969:125-6) distinguishes nominal definitions from real definitions. Nominal definitions function on the linguistic level as declarations of intention to use a word or phrase as a substitute for another word or phrase. Real definitions contain the precipitant of inquiry in the form of assertions regarding properties of the referent of the concept defined. An intensive survey of definitions and usages of the term stereotype reveals that a variety of real definitions has been given to this concept prematurely. Questionable hypotheses have therefore become accepted by definition and removed from critical scrutiny.

Of particular concern to this study is the prevalent assumption that folk images of ethnic groups are inaccurate. Therefore, intensive consideration is given to the various arguments offered by sociologists in support of this assumption. Stereotypes have been conceptualized as inaccurate for the following reasons: they often are not the product of personal experience with the object group; the image-holder is prejudiced against the group; stereotypy is an inferior (unscientific) cognitive process. Since the existing evidence

does not show the critical aspect of stereotypy to be error, the discussion turns to the metasociology of stereotype investigation. It is suggested that the liberal sympathies of social scientists discourage an empirical test of ethnic stereotype accuracy. Further, aside from stereotypy, sociologists have shown remarkably little interest in intergroup cognition. Although evidence from this and other studies suggests that stereotypes are the product of perfectly normal cognitive behavior, stereotypy has been studied as pathological behavior requiring special explanation. Prejudicial linguistic connotations have prevented stereotypy investigation from being integrated with existing knowledge of person perception, attitudes, and learning theory. Our understanding of how one group knows another has therefore been impeded.

#### Definitions of Stereotypy

The word "stereotype" originally referred to a metal plate used in printing. Its introduction to social scientists as a figurative term was provided by the journalist, Walter Lippmann in his book *Public Opinion* (1922). The pioneering work of Katz and Braly (1933) established a pattern for both conceptualization and measurement of stereotypes which has been emulated for more than three decades. The following is their reinterpretation of Lippmann's comments on the matter. (As we shall see further on, Lippmann made several additional observations which were omitted.)

We have learned responses of varying degrees of aversion or acceptance to racial names and where these tags can be readily applied to individuals, as they can in the case of the Negro because of his skin color, we respond to him not as a human being but as a personification of the symbol we have learned to look down upon. Walter Lippmann has called this type of belief a stereotype--by which is meant a fixed impression which conforms very little to the facts it pretends to represent and results from our defining first and observing second (Katz and Braly, 1958:41).

This equation of stereotype content and error has had widespread influence. Vinacke (1957:229) sets out the operational definition which scholars also adopted from Katz and Braly:

For experimental purposes, a stereotype has, in effect, been defined statistically as a collection of trait-names upon which a large percentage of people agree as appropriate for describing some class of individuals.

The attributes contained in the above definitions are found repeated in articles and textbooks on the subject. For instance:

Stereotyping has three characteristics: the categorization of persons, a consensus on attributed traits, and a discrepancy between attributed traits and actual traits (Secord and Backman, 1964:66).

Harding, et al. (1969:4, emphasis in original) in the revised edition of *The Handbook of Social Psychology* write that "a belief that is simple, inadequately grounded, at least partially inaccurate, and held with considerable assurance by many people is called a stereotype."

The examination of scores of definitions, both explicit and implicit, reveals that in its usage stereotype has the following referents:

(1) Folk knowledge rather than scientific judgment is involved.

(2) These beliefs concern categories of people. Although the literature reflects particular interest in beliefs about ethnic groups, there is agreement that any social category is an appropriate group referent, e.g., age, sex, occupation. The category may be broad (the Japanese), or narrow (young Indian females in the Lac La Biche area of Alberta).

(3) Since the stereotype referents are groups of people, descriptions of them take the form of a collection of trait-characteristics. The traits range on an evaluative continuum from favorable/flattering to unfavorable/derogatory. The language is such that the descriptive core of a trait is often buried in evaluative terminology.

(4) Stereotypes are undifferentiated. The variation in the extent to which characteristics apply to individual constituents of the category is underplayed. Tajfel, et al. (1964) have shown that judged differences between members of an ethnic group are smaller for traits that are part of their stereotype than for traits not relevant to that stereotype. However, the question of the degree of perceived within-group similarity required before a description becomes definitionally a stereotype is unsettled. Richter (1956:568), for example, says that a stereotype is a rigid proposition attributing characteristics to all members of a category. He further maintains that if "most" rather than "all" members are referred to, stereotyping is not involved. The majority of the empirical studies requested subjects to provide characteristics they thought "typical" of the group. Because they were



not specifically asked, the precise degree of within-category differentiation intended by the respondents is uncertain. Therefore, there are at present no grounds for definitional specification of this dimension of stereotypy.

(5) A consensus exists among the judges on both the delineation of the category and the traits which appropriately describe that category. Although it is recognized that an individual may have his own private, somewhat idiosyncratic impression of a group, it is the normative social image which concerns us.

If a stereotype is operationally defined as the collection of traits assigned to the members of a category, we may refer to a single individual's assignments as his personal stereotype and to the consensual assignments of a given population of judges as a social stereotype (Karlins, et al., 1969:3, emphasis in original).

Unfortunately, the precise order of agreement among the judges has not been specified. In practice, traits mentioned by as few as 4% of a sample have been included, which is a rather odd interpretation of consensuality.

(6) A few students maintain that the term ought to be restricted to those beliefs which reflect cognitive rigidity and emotionality of the stereotype-holder. Etymologically, the Greek work *stereos* means solid or firm. This connotation is found in definitions which view stereotypes as those ". . . beliefs in which the individual has a definite emotional stake and which are therefore rigid . . ." (Richter, 1956:569) and modifiable only by ". . . traumatic personal experience, intensive re-education or major social change" (Hartley and Hartley, 1952:695-6). Much of the stereotype literature

reports no information on the emotional commitment of subjects to their beliefs about out-groups. Furthermore, evidence that stereotypes do change and that other sorts of beliefs remain recalcitrant in the face of contradictory evidence has resulted in the characteristic of rigidity being dropped from most definitions.

(7) Stereotypes are inaccurate. The initial definition of stereotypes embodied the assumption of their invalidity. For a variety of reasons, to be subsequently discussed, social psychologists have found this notion sufficiently pleasing that they have construed it as the product of scientific investigation rather than an outcome of their own unsupported arguments. There are, of course, a variety of positions on this point. At one extreme, Sherif and Cantril (1947:69) regarded stereotypes as attitudes ". . . imposed bodily [sic] and uncritically without any basis in experience or knowledge." Klineberg (1950:93) said ethnic images are "usually oversimplified in content and relatively unresponsive to objective facts." Similarly, Hayakawa (1950:208) regarded them as "widely current misinformation" and "traditional nonsense." Karlins, et al. (1969:1), equate group images with ". . . caricatures of various ethnic groups." (*Webster's Dictionary* defines caricatures as "the deliberately distorted picturing or imitating of a person, literary style, etc. . . . a bad likeness; a poor imitation. . . .") A somewhat less dogmatic stance is taken by those (e.g., Buchanan and Cantril, 1953:96) who hypothesize a "kernel of truth" in

folk descriptions of other groups. Finally, there are students whose papers are seldom quoted, particularly not in textbooks, who argue that the question of accuracy is a problem to be investigated rather than decided by fiat (Campbell, 1967; Fishman, 1956; Zawadzki, 1948).

As men of good will, it seems that sociologists may have found this particular example of truth by definition congruent with their preferences. The "equalitarian dogma" holds that since everybody is really equal, everybody is alike. The man on the street who perceives differences is simply mistaken. Nettler (1961:280) points out that

. . . while as scientists, we protest our preference for truth over error, as culture-bound thinkers we may favor lies when their credentials are of the right sort.

Further, as scientists there is constraint to footnote our preferences. Thus, it is notable that the distinguished *Handbook of Social Psychology* can cite the

. . . low degree of correspondence between common stereotypes of various ethnic groups and the actual characteristics of these groups insofar as the latter are known through scientific research. We have discussed this problem in a previous section of this chapter (Harding, et al., 1954:1039).

But when one looks for this "scientific evidence" referred to earlier in the chapter, the citations are to three studies, one of which does not concern ethnic stereotypes, and the remaining two of which do not demonstrate "scientifically" the distortion alleged in stereotypy.

It is contended that, beyond the truism that all generalizations fail to reflect the minutiae of "reality," empirical data on this question are lacking. Retention of

statements pertaining to accuracy in definitions of stereotypy is therefore clearly inappropriate. If scientists wish, they may give the concept "stereotype" the nominal definition of "false image." However, even if it were desirable to restrict the term to misinformation, it would still be a pointless differentiae without evidence of which beliefs are true and which false. In other words, we still must look at the real world. By contrast, and as an antidote to the confusion of a nominal definition with reality, the following definition is proposed: A stereotype refers to those folk beliefs about the attributes characterizing a social category on which there is consensus.

It is suggested that all other connotations of this term be regarded as hypotheses with varying degrees of promise and support. To reify the concept as an ideal type, as those group images characterized by ego-supportive etiology, rigidity, lack of differentiation, or inaccuracy will not do. The extent of relationship among these dimensions has been insufficiently investigated.

Two important questions are suggested by this brief history of a concept, an empirical question and a metasociological one. The empirical question asks what is known about the accuracy of folk perception of groups. The metasociological question concerns the reluctance of sociologists to explore the issue. The remainder of this chapter will explore the latter question.

Basis for the Assumption of Stereotype Inaccuracy

A variety of arguments has been offered by social scientists to support the assumption that stereotypes are inaccurate.

Lack of Personal Contact

The following words of Lippmann (1953:61-2) are often quoted:

. . . for the most part we do not first see, and then define, we define first and then see. . . . .  
 . . . . .  
 Inevitably our opinions cover a bigger space, a longer reach of time, a greater number of things, than we can directly observe.

(In the same passages, he also pointed out that eye witnesses are often mistaken, and further,

Were there no practical uniformities in the environment, there would be no economy and only error in the human trait of accepting foresight for sight. But there are uniformities sufficiently accurate, and the need of economizing attention is so inevitable, that the abandonment of all stereotypes for a whole innocent approach to experience would impoverish human life (Lippmann, 1953:67).

These additional observations have not been adopted by students of stereotypy.)

Katz and Braly (1958:41) found stereotypes to be consistent for subjects with a wide range of opportunity for contact with the referent groups.<sup>1</sup> These authors, and others, reasoned that since ideas about peoples were quite similar

---

<sup>1</sup>This finding of consistency across all categories of familiarity has since been challenged by, *inter alia*, Schoenfeld (1942) and Vinacke (1956). The evidence indicates that the more familiar a group is, the more uniformity or consistency there is in its stereotype. However, contradictory findings do exist.

despite striking differences in opportunity for acquaintance, the properties of the stimulus groups could not account for their knowledge. Simpson and Yinger's textbook (1958:160) on race and ethnic relations illustrates this logic:

The pictures [of the 'musical Negro' etc. elicited by the Katz and Braly technique] can scarcely be a description of reality, for the students had had relatively little contact with some of these groups, and probably no contact with a few. This did not prevent them from 'knowing' what they were like, for they were heirs of a tradition that informed them.

Presumably, tradition is the folderol of old-wives' tales. Similarly, Hayakawa (1950:209) stated that utilization of stereotypes reflects the word-bound stance of those too slothful to examine phenomena for themselves.

Although it is beyond the scope of the present work, this argument is a testable proposition. Are the descriptions of near evaluators the more accurate ones? That is, how does accuracy of a stereotype vary with opportunity (and form) of acquaintance? Although the validation criteria employed are somewhat questionable, several studies do bear upon this question. Support for the hypothesis of a relationship of superior accuracy of knowledge with personal contact with a minority group is found in the work of Triandis and Vassiliou (1967). However, a negative relationship between accuracy of perception and increased opportunity for contact is reported by Oakes and Corsini (1961), Silkiner (1962), and Olmsted (1962). For example, Oakes and Corsini compared the accuracy with which students in an instructor's class could describe the instructor as he had described himself. The students did

moderately well after one class, and only slightly better after 36 hours.

Admittedly, stereotypes are found in folklore and in the mass media (e.g., Berelson and Salter, 1946; Shuey, et al., 1953). In their intensive study of children's development of stereotypes, Lambert and Klineberg (1967:31, 35, 48) discovered that the sources of information for North American children were television, movies, and particularly, school courses and textbooks. Personal contact with other peoples was a minor factor. Nevertheless, it seems unwise to assume that information that is not the product of first-hand experience is *ipso facto* invalid. Much of what we confidently believe to be "true" of the world did not proceed out of induction from personal experience. As Asch (1959:380) points out ". . . we accept the reports of others in lieu of direct experience only because we have at other times received the most direct proof of the validity of their reports. . . ." We are culture-bearing animals saved from the necessity of learning everything afresh whether we "stand on the shoulders of giants" or sit before the television set. Lack of personal experience with an ethnic group does not therefore, in itself, invalidate generalizations made about it.

Related to this criticism is the fact that stereotypes are often group-supported definitions of the situation (La Violette and Silvert, 1951; Diab, 1962; Fishman, 1956). As such, stereotypes serve the function of facilitating communication and symbolically expressing group identification.

We will subsequently argue that academics use their images of "no-difference" in ethnic groups and their views of characteristics of other categories in this fashion. Presumably, the desire to know the world also motivates both scientists and laymen. The existence of these images in the cultural and subcultural resources still requires explanation.

#### Equation of Stereotypy and Prejudice

A serious definitional problem is posed by those who regard stereotypes as the cognitive dimension of prejudice. The literal meaning of prejudice is dislike resulting from pre-judgment: ". . . thinking ill of others without sufficient warrant" (Allport, 1954:7, emphasis in original deleted). People dislike others because they have prematurely evaluated the group on the basis of inadequate knowledge. Since stereotypes have been defined as false images, the "insufficient" reasons for aversion have frequently been measured by subjects' acceptance of categorical descriptions of referent groups. The inference is that exposure of the hostile individual to personal experience (contact) or "correct" information, i.e., education, regarding the hated group, will result in diminution of his hate. Exposure to the "right" sort of propaganda generally fails (Cooper and Jahoda, 1947). Sometimes increased personal contact with another group produces the predicted result (Deutsch and Collins, 1951; Star, et al., 1965), if representatives of both groups meet as equals or if there is a superordinate goal toward which both groups are coacting. On the other hand, two groups



sometimes discover that intimate contact builds a more credible case for their antipathy. (Serl's 1964 description of Hutterite-non-Hutterite relations provides one example of the latter situation.) Moreover, Cooper and Michiels (1952) report that although subjects hostile towards a group overestimated their knowledge of it, objective knowledge existed in approximately equal amounts in those who liked the group and those who disliked the group.

In sum, prejudice is defined as aversion fueled by ignorance. The causal nexus is assumed to be from defective knowledge to dislike. However, a reverse effect is also postulated: prejudice produces defective beliefs. Motivational explanations for the allegedly faulty content of stereotypes are provided by theories which direct attention almost exclusively to the internal psychodynamics of prejudiced individuals. These projections and rationalizations, which fulfil the psychological needs of the prejudiced, are thought to feed upon and contribute to cultural definitions of the situation. The implication is that even with acquaintance, affect distorts cognition. Allport (1954:187, emphasis in original deleted), for example, writes that "whether favorable or unfavorable, a stereotype is an exaggerated belief associated with a category. Its function is to justify (rationalize) our conduct in relation to that category." Similarly, Myrdal (1944) held that the gulf between the Americans' democratic values and their actual treatment of Negroes was bridged by rationalizing stereotypes. Ichheiser

(1947) argued that the picture of a despised group was but a mirror image of the ascribing group's self-evaluation.

These notions are congruent with Bruner's (1958) findings that accuracy of perception is influenced by the wishes, values, and motivational states of the actor. Perception theorists such as Bruner do not, however, hold that perception is solely a product of the state of the perceiver. Perception is also a function of the properties of the stimulus, and the context in which the stimulus is judged. When discussion turns to the sensitive arena of ethnic relations, it tends to ignore the latter variables. The stimulus group becomes a "living inkblot" for prejudiced minds.

Do extreme attitudes reflect distortion of facts? An attitude measurement technique developed by Hammond (1948) begins with the assumption that the existence of an attitude can be detected by the respondent's biased judgment of related facts. Investigators utilizing equated content-loaded and neutral syllogisms have shown that a strong attitude reduces the subject's ability to reason logically within that area (Morgan and Morton, 1944; Lefford, 1946; Thistlethwaite, 1950). Hovland and coworkers (1957) have demonstrated that a subject's own extreme attitude functions as an internal anchor, affecting his judgment of the position of other's attitudes. Evidence for the operation of assimilation-contrast in the realm of ethnic person perception is provided by Clark and Campbell (1955) and by Kephart (1954). Clark and Campbell (1955) found that white students overestimated

the examination scores of their group and underestimated those of their Negro classmates. Similarly, Kephart showed that policemen exaggerate the proportion of crimes committed by blacks in their own precincts. However, Bieri, et al. (1966:239), in assessing the relationship of affective variables and judgment, point out that the postwar studies of need and perception, which have devoted the most attention to this problem, deal almost exclusively with subthreshold phenomena. They conclude that the evidence for those few scattered generalizations regarding suprathreshold stimuli is equivocal.

More specifically, does holding a highly positive or negative attitude towards an ethnic group correlate with inaccurate generalizations about that group? Direct evidence comparing the accuracy of stereotypes of prejudiced and tolerant subjects is virtually nonexistent. However, the following data bear tangentially on this problem.

In 1946, Allport and Kramer initiated a series of studies into the following question: Does the prejudiced individual perceive more accurately than the unprejudiced individual? More particularly, are anti-Semitic subjects able to identify photographs of Jews more accurately than unprejudiced subjects? Allport and Kramer reported that they could. Lindzey and Rogolsky (1950) supported this finding, interpreting it as the bigot's selective perception and vigilance for cues. However, the conclusion of a number of follow-up studies (Carter, 1948; Elliot and Wittenberg, 1955;

Scodel and Austrin, 1957; Himmelfarb, 1966) is that there is no significant difference in the perceptual accuracy of persons of opposed attitude, the anti-Semites' previously reported superior accuracy being a spurious result of their identification of more photographs as Jewish.

The simplistic stimulus used in the foregoing studies precludes a prediction of the relationship between subjects' negative or positive attitudes towards an ethnic group and the accuracy of their generalizations regarding its characteristics. Moreover, Nettler (1961) warns of the error of assuming that prejudiced people misperceive the world or that unprejudiced people are cognitively correct simply because academic values disapprove of the former and condone the latter sentiments. In support of this warning, Prentice (1957) reports that tolerant persons are not necessarily reasonable or logical.

In an important paper, Zawadzki (1948) discusses the pejorative connotations of stereotypy in terms of a polarization of the common man's "well deserved reputation" theory of prejudice versus the scapegoat theory of prejudice. The central assumption of the former "theory" is that the reputation of a hated group is reliably based upon the cumulative experience of its judges. By contrast, scapegoat theorists view prejudice as primarily a reaction to an internal process rather than an external stimulus. (A more sophisticated statement of the "well deserved reputation" position is found in the writings of "realistic conflict" theorists, such

as Coser and Boulding (Campbell and Levine, 1965). More recently, the authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950) have joined the "frustration-aggression-displacement" theorists in seeking the genesis of prejudice and the proclivity for stereotypy in the psychological aberrations of majority group members.)

Zawadzki (1948) argues that an adequate theory of prejudice must be dualistic, encompassing both the psychological needs of the individual, the objective characteristics of the stimulus minority group, and most importantly, their interaction. To this must be added the impact of cultural and subcultural norms upon beliefs. Pettigrew's (1958) discovery of lack of relationship between prejudice and authoritarianism in South Africa and the southern United States indicates that prejudice is not invariably associated with psychological imbalance. Adorno and colleagues (1950) state that those of their subjects who held a "Shylock" image of Jews were psychologically disturbed. Some of their interviewees were indeed psychologically abnormal, e.g., those who longed for Hitler's resurrection so that he might resolve the American Jewish problem by extermination. However, it is impractical to delve into the psychoanalytic motivations of people whose perceptions of Jewish characteristics at that time were widely shared throughout the United States. It is not parsimonious and, more, such inquiry evades the question of accuracy of perception. If "scapegoaters" describe Group X as avaricious, and are motivated by factors other than the

behavior of the external stimulus, one is not thereby informed whether or not Group X is more or less avaricious. As Gibson (1960:74-5) notes, ". . . to ask how a person comes to hold a belief is one thing and to ask whether there is sufficient evidence for it is another."

The conceptual confusion between stereotypy and prejudice is paralleled in their measurement. Prejudice refers to aversive feelings toward a social category, or toward an individual on the basis of his group membership, which rest on a faulty cognitive base, i.e., stereotypes (Allport, 1954: 10). In a pioneering study, Katz and Braly (1935) found a high positive rank order correlation between position of referent groups on Bogardus social distance scales and independent ratings of the favorability of traits applied to these groups. They therefore redefined prejudice as "a set of stereotypes." Contemporary attitude scales purporting to measure prejudice often include stereotyped statements.

However, the empirical evidence in support of the equivalence of stereotypy and aversion is meagre. There appear to be only three studies which have both measured a stereotype and determined whether reactions toward individual representatives of the referent group were influenced by that stereotype. Secord (1959) reported that when subjects identified photographs as Negro, ratings in terms of the stereotype increased significantly over the more differentiated assessments made in the case of photographs not so identified. Tajfel, et al. (1964), found that two individuals

from the same ethnic group were rated similarly on traits usually ascribed to that group but not on traits which were not contained in the stereotype. Moreover, subjects' ratings of the individuals paralleled their ratings of the ethnic group. These studies were interpreted by Brown (1965:179), *inter alia*, as a logical result of providing judges with only one piece of information, the ethnic identification. Gardner and Taylor (1968) attempted to answer this criticism by providing their subjects with neutral, prostereotype, and anti-stereotype messages from a French Canadian speaker in a Crutchfield conformity situation. The results demonstrated that the judges' ratings were influenced both by message content and social pressure although the stereotype was to some extent operative. These studies support one aspect of the alleged mechanics of prejudice: the image of the group affects perception of the individual group member. However, both variables are on the cognitive level.

The evidence for the relationship between disliking a group (affectivity) and stereotyping (cognition) is equivocal. Sherif and Sherif (1953) discovered that when experimenters instigated conflict between two groups of camp boys, the boys began to hurl epithets ("dirty bums") as well as crockery at one another. The Katz and Braly (1958) study referred to earlier asked one group to assign traits, a second group to rank ten referent groups on the basis of preference of association, and a third group to rate the source list of traits on the basis of desirability in friends and associates. Although

there were important discrepancies, the most preferred groups were perceived in terms of the most favorable traits, the least preferred in terms of the least favorable traits. Campbell (1947) found high correlations between social distance from five ethnic groups, affection for these groups, beliefs about their intelligence, and beliefs about their morality.

Support for independent variability of stereotypy and aversion is more convincing. In their study of the development of children's stereotypes, Blake and Dennis (1943) found the children to be consistently hostile towards Negroes through grades one to 11. However, children in the lower grades assigned exclusively negative traits to Negroes, while older children believed they had both "good" and "bad" characteristics. Katz and Braly (1958) reported that consensuality of stereotypes was not related to degree of prejudice, as measured by a social distance scale. Negroes and Turks were the most disliked groups. The subjects agreed most on the traits describing Negroes and least on those describing Turks. Karlins, et al. (1969:12-3), recently computed rank-order correlations between consensuality scores and favorableness scores of Princeton students, and found that greater stereotype consensuality is associated with the more favorable images, whereas low uniformity occurred for the less favorable stereotypes. They concluded that ". . . friendly observers develop standardized images just as do unfriendly observers." It will be recalled that consensuality is the keystone of stereotype definitions.



Ehrlich and Tubergen (1967) found no relationship between stereotypy and social distance or between stereotypy and authoritarianism. Finally, Peabody (1968) has dissected the terminology of stereotypy into evaluative and descriptive components. Groups tended to disagree about the evaluation, but to agree on the descriptive characteristics of each other. For example, a group which pictures itself as thrifty is described by others as stingy.

In summary, a reasonable interpretation of the evidence is that stereotypy and prejudice are related, but not invariably coexistent, phenomena. There is no justification for viewing them as identical, either in conceptualization or in measurement. Equating the terms means that the images of those who are friendly or indifferent towards ethnic and non-ethnic categories cannot be labelled stereotypes. (Much of the stereotype literature then becomes irrelevant. Few studies inquire into their subjects' feelings about the groups they described.) Studying stereotypy within the context of prejudice reinforces the conviction that it is both immoral and incorrect to judge people on the basis of their category affiliation. A dimension of normal everyday behavior becomes aberrant. In addition, social psychologists are thus urged to channel their inquiry of stereotypy into the area of person perception.

Although Fishbein (1963) demurs, there is general agreement that attitudes may profitably be studied along three major dimensions: cognitive, affective, and conative.

Stereotypy might be conceptualized as a subtype under the cognitive-belief component of attitudes. Prejudice might be subsumed under the affective component as a like-dislike continuum. (Since its literal usage is operationally vapid, we would be well rid of the word "prejudice" altogether. Where can the line be drawn between "sufficient" and "insufficient" knowledge of a hated group?) Fear, envy, admiration, and other feelings toward categories might then receive independent attention. We have come to appreciate the complexity of the relationship between prejudiced "words" and discriminatory "deeds" (Deutscher, 1966). Why should we assume we will have an easier task sorting out beliefs and feelings?

#### Stereotypy as Inferior Cognitive Process

Stereotypy is often conceptualized as an inferior cognitive process and disparagingly contrasted with scientific typology construction. Because their thoughtways are primitive, the people are mistaken in their evaluation of others. The scientists, with sophisticated cognitive techniques at their disposal, are presumably accurate perceivers of the social world.

A common criticism is that stereotypes "categorize" and, hence, do not allow for cognition of the person as an individual. Such categorization is viewed as a necessary but unfortunate aspect of human cognition. Our limited sensory apparatus cannot encode the multiplicity of stimuli rushing at us *de novo* or in detail. We place relevant stimuli into

those categories designated important from previous personal or cultural experience and ignore the rest (Bruner, 1958).

The "official" social scientific position holds folk categories, particularly those about out-groups, to be defective constructs. As noted previously, stereotypes often do not emerge inductively from personal observation. They may, then, involve the "particularistic error," generalizing on the basis of a few, unrepresentative instances. Since trivial traits may be noticed and important characteristics overlooked, the impression of a group is apt to be superficial and incomplete. The stereotype-holder, it is argued, overgeneralizes his category. He expects every Jew to be liberal, highly educated, and ambitious. He exaggerates between-group differences. Further, he is convinced that he is right.

(Several writers have fixed on degree of critical skepticism as the key difference between stereotyping and sound judgment. The *Dictionary of Social Sciences* (Gould and Kolb, 1964:694) states that,

there is, however, one distinguishing element . . . a belief which is not held as an hypothesis buttressed by evidence but is rather mistaken in whole or in part for an established fact.)

Stereotypes are defined as influenced by emotion and as stubbornly adhered to in the face of contradictory new evidence.

In short, untutored perceptions of others are assumed to be incorrect because they are not based on scientific evidence or scientific canons of evidence. Bogardus (1950: 286, emphasis added) described stereotypes as ". . . the

unscientific and hence unreliable generalizations that people make about other people. . . ." The implication is that professional observers of social reality depict others accurately because they are cognizant of sampling techniques, overlapping normal curves, the tentative nature of their "facts," and the potentially distorting consequences of their values.

Acknowledging the possibility of the foregoing, Fishman (1956:32) nevertheless raises this query:

Must an inferior process (that is, a process that may not actualize the highest level of intellectual and judgmental activity of which *homo sapiens* is capable) necessarily lead to a mistaken conclusion?

He suggests that, particularly in the case of impressions upon first encounter, the substitution of cultural experience for individual analysis might result in an actual gain in accuracy. Evidence can be adduced to support his hypothesis. Although criticism might be made of the validation criteria employed, several studies (Stone, et al., 1957; Stelmachers and McHugh, 1964; Olmsted, 1962; Silkiner, 1962; Oakes and Corsini, 1961) report that judgments based on the categorical affiliations of stimuli persons are sometimes more accurate than those based on individualized information. For example, the folk notion that wearers of glasses are bookworms with little interest in sports is reported in Thornton's (1944) study and corroborated in 1968 by Douglas, et al. Similarly, the cliché that women tend to dislike other women and devalue their intellectual and professional competence has been borne out (Goldberg, 1968). (The folk view of athletes as unscholarly has, however,

been disproved (Schafer and Armer, 1968).) Moreover, in the area of person perception, Cronbach (1955), among others, has found that subjects are able to validly gauge the characteristics of a particular other from the norms of his group membership. This factor, which is a nuisance to those interested in evaluating the accuracy of perception of a unique individual, is of major concern to those studying stereotype accuracy.

It seems that social scientists have worked themselves into an inconsistent "world view" with respect to who best knows the world, and how. On the one hand, they would have us believe that folk perception is incorrect and that social science contributes a technique, "scientific method," that will augment visual acuity. However, when we come to assess the expert judgment of social scientists, "such scores as are available do not encourage faith in the more accurate perception of intellectuals as a class" (Nettler, 1968:204). Their scientific training does not assist social scientists in becoming superior judges of the other, and the *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* (Harding, 1968:260) says

A very widely held belief is that the stereotypes held by educated people are in general more accurate than those of the uneducated and that the concepts of social scientists are most accurate of all. It seems very reasonable; however, it has not been demonstrated.

On the other hand, most sociologists are believers in that kind of democracy that proposes a "wisdom of the people." For example, V. O. Key (1966) tells us that the people know what is correct. The amount of faith social scientists

profess in folk knowledge appears to depend on whether or not it is supportive of institutions which they approve. When it is felt that lay beliefs about ethnic categories function as the cognitive substructure for discrimination, the differences between folk knowledge and science are emphasized. Yet Boulding (1967:881) reminds us that,

the social sciences differ from the natural, even the biological sciences, in that there is a good deal of quite accurate folk knowledge about the system which they study. . . .

and further that,

. . . the method by which the scientific subculture discovers error is not different in essence from the method by which error is detected in the folk culture, that is, in the ordinary business of life (Boulding, 1967:881).

The relatively smooth functioning of everyday life depends upon a pragmatic test of ideas, in other words, the falsification of predictions.

We are not arguing that the people are invariably correct. Analysts of public opinion have marshalled a dismal array of evidence demonstrating that the public is poorly informed concerning matters on which it vocalizes opinions (Hyman and Sheatsley, 1954). A number of studies have found only a modest positive correlation between information and attitude (Nettler, 1946; Murphy and Likert, 1938; Hastings, 1954; Schonbar, 1949), or none at all (Cooper and Michiels, 1952; Deutsch and Proshansky, 1961). The point is that stereotypes are not false simply because they were not constructed by sociologists. Further, to rule folk categories out of hand as defective cognitions sometimes leads to a

fickle faith in "the people" as true perceivers of their world.

The conceptualization of stereotypy as an inferior cognitive process is of dubious utility. It fails to differentiate between stereotypes and folk beliefs in general. Stereotypy certainly cannot be distinguished from other modes of thought on the ground that it is categorical.<sup>2</sup> Most social psychologists recognize the futility of indicting the categorical generalizations inherent in human thought. The very structure of language is categorical. Rather, the issue is whether or not Newcomb (1950:214), among others, is correct when he states that categorical precepts ". . . have the virtues of efficiency but not of accuracy." As Asch (1952: 232) points out, merely to state that stereotypes are the shoddy product of inferior cognition ". . . is no more helpful than to call perceptual errors illusions."

One must conclude that none of the foregoing arguments (lack of personal contact, equation of stereotypy and prejudice, stereotypy as inferior cognitive process) provide scientific justification for the incorporation of inaccuracy into the definition of stereotypy. Therefore, an inquiry into the inaccuracy assumption's extrascientific sources of

---

<sup>2</sup>There is some evidence which suggests that categorical simplicity (operationalized as tendency to project own traits and overestimate the numbers of peers sharing own opinions) is slightly but significantly related to stereotypy (Koenig and King, 1964). Bieri (1955) found that cognitive complexity was significantly related to the accurate perception of differences between oneself and the other, but was not related to the accurate perception of similarities.

attraction is in order.

The Metasociology of Stereotype Investigation

Conditions for the Recognition of Group Difference

It is suggested that stereotypes have been accepted as inaccurate by definition because the ascription of differences to involuntary groupings offends social scientists' humanitarian ideology. Few deny that differences between ethnic groups do exist. Such a stance would be absurd in scholars whose business is the cultural and subcultural variation among mankind. Rather, their dispute is with those who persist in confusing difference with inequality, and environmental with genetic causation. Their sympathies are understandable. It is true that hostile imagery has had deleterious consequences for certain stigmatized groups. The allegedly lower intellectual potential of blacks has been used to justify school segregation. Undesirable Jewish characteristics provided the Nazis with rationalization for their "final solution." The out-group devaluation of differences can damage the hated group's self-esteem.

It is hypothesized that social scientists are not disturbed about between-group differences under the following conditions:

(1) When our professional categories are utilized, e.g., "modal personality," "authoritarian personality," "inner-directed men," and to a limited extent, social class.

(2) When the groups described are likely to remain ignorant of our descriptions. Bierstedt (1948:27) cynically



remarks that a consequence of anthropologists publishing national character descriptions of modern societies whose citizens can read and answer back has been ". . . to stimulate the growth of skepticism concerning the information which anthropologists have given us about non-literate peoples."

(3) When liberals do not feel protective towards the group. Sociologists have little reluctance in depicting the weakness of "top-dogs." Witness Goffman's (1961) pleasure in exposing the naiveté of mental hospital administrators, or Merton's (1957:428-9, 195-206) facility in finding unique characteristics that he denies to ethnic categories among "bureaucrats." In this vein, Lashuk (1970) argues that sociologists of the functionalist school have persistently advocated unequal treatment for women.

(4) When, in conjunction with (1), we talk about differences produced by socialization and environment (particularly the discriminatory actions of powerful groups within that environment) rather than by heredity. Compare the joyful reception accorded *Pygmalion in the Classroom* (1968) despite its methodological flaws, (Thorndike, 1968), with the critical scrutiny given the work of Coleman, et al. (1966) and Jensen (1969). The ethologists' (Lorenz, 1966) revelations concerning man have also been coolly received.

However well intended, this hushing-up of differences in the way of life of others amounts to ethnocentrism. Any deviations from the middle-class ethos appear somewhat shameful. Spokesmen for minority groups are proclaiming that

their characteristics are not optical illusions. Negroes tell us that "black is beautiful," that they have "soul." Black psychologists (*Science*, 1968), and female sociologists (Rossi, 1970) petition their professional associations to recognize their differences. Jewish intellectuals (Himmelfarb, 1966; Sklare, 1958), particularly, have pointed to the problem implicit in the assumption that stereotypy of ethnic groups must be largely false: namely, how can one have his "identity" and deny his "difference"? That is, if there are distinctive cultures, and if a culture's distinctive values and consequent "character" are worth defending, then there must be some difference perceptible to others. The rhetoric of stereotypy seems shared by both bigots and cultural integralists.

Sociologists speculating upon the "social functions of ignorance" are wary of the assumption that any increase in knowledge automatically brings with it an increase in benefits to mankind (Moore and Tumin, 1949; Schneider, 1962). As far as the laymen are concerned, it is sometimes held, "what they don't know may be good for them." But what about social scientists themselves? Science exists to find "truth." Sociologists relish their "debunking" motif, their caveat ". . . to unmask the pretensions and the propaganda by which men cloak their actions with each other" (Berger, 1963:38). Their function *vis-à-vis* the sociologically untutored then becomes the morally satisfying one of education in "right-thinking." But what happens when social scientists suspect

that public "myths" have been heretofore serving good liberal ends? Some find refuge in compartmentalization of scientist and citizen roles:

. . . the central burden of humanity to me, as scientist, is simply seeking for the truth. In the end, when I have found the truth, I must then, of course, take part in the task of persuading you to use it well rather than badly, but I must not now call a moratorium on what I might find because some one else might misuse it (Bronowski, 1968:11).

Others prefer that "unsafe" myths not be tampered with. Frazier (1964) reports that many reviewers of his book, *Black Bourgeoisie*, felt that he had been disloyal and cruel to reveal to middle-class Negroes the truth about their economic position. See also the letters in *Science* (Clark, 1968; Burgers, 1968; Meier, 1968) regarding the rioting threatened by academics over Shockley's proposed symposium topic of racial differences in intelligence. The author of a letter to the editors of *Social Forces* (Hopkins, 1967:108) congratulates the British government for not ". . . demeaning its minority subjects by providing others with discriminatory statistics over which they may gloat."

Another faction of social scientists seeks to prove its values by "facts" (Nettler, 1968). With the urgency to apply sociology (Boulding, 1967; Hault, 1968) there goes the assumption that this discipline is objective while positioned, scientific despite its partiality (Becker, 1967). Gouldner (1963) says that if we take sides, it is because we "have the facts." The sociologists' technical competence provides their warrant for making value judgments. But, as one sociologist

(Nettler, 1968:204) has recently argued, ". . . the behavioral scientists who have proposed reality as the underwriter of values and the legitimate ground of their 'help,' have diligently avoided looking at how things 'really are' . . ."

Those who claim that the guarantee against the man's values producing distorted results lies in his explicit admission of his values are quite wrong. (Cf. Harding, et al., 1969:2.)

Rather, the safeguards are in the self-corrective mechanisms of science as a social enterprise. When the majority of practitioners share the same ideology these mechanisms cease to function. Perhaps the case under consideration is less one of error than refusal to disclose what is known. It has been argued that a major problem for sociologists is "what to tell whom about what from among the things we 'know'" (Seeley, 1964:157). Certainly, somewhat different messages concerning the accuracy of stereotypes appear in learned journals, textbooks, and mass media. Moynihan (1968:36), writing from sad experience, speculates that unpopular facts about the downtrodden might be withheld from the public until social scientists drawn from those minority groups are available to carry the bad news. Be that as it may, some social scientists are selectively interpreting the stereotype literature as they would like it to be rather than as it is.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>See, for example, the previous reference to Harding, et al. (1954:1039). The authors (Harding, et al., 1969:4) of the revised chapter in the second edition of *The Handbook of Social Psychology* remark that stereotypes are ". . . at least partially inaccurate . . .," cite only the 1936 La Piere study, and ignore the literature supporting some degree of

The Symbolic Interactionist Position on Group Difference

Another perspective of group difference is provided by the symbolic interactionist who regards the question of stereotype accuracy as meaningless. He asks, "since the stereotyped group's behavior is determined by powerful groups' beliefs about it, how can one then speak of the accuracy of perception?" The differences (if any) are "traits of victimization." Description of difference reveals more about society at large than about the minority group in question. Merton (1957:423, emphasis in original) is cited to support this perspective:

The self-fulfilling prophecy is, in the beginning, a false definition of the situation evoking a new behavior which makes the originally false conception come true. The specious validity of the self-fulfilling prophecy perpetuates a reign of error.

There is a parallel between the denial of validity to folk perceptions of the ethnic other and the denial of difference in the deviant. Those who adopt the "labelling" approach to deviance also share Merton's fascination with Thomas' (1928: 572) dictum that "if people define situations as real, they are real in their consequences." One of its spokesmen writes

---

validity. Janowitz (1968) states that ". . . the secular trend in negative stereotypes toward the Negro from 1945 to 1965 has shown a dramatic decline." When requested to support this statement, the evidence provided by Janowitz in a personal communication rested upon the decline in public imputation of lesser innate intelligence. However, Harris poll results showed that in 1967, 47% of the U.S. adult population believed Negroes have less native intelligence, 58% that Negroes have looser morals, 70% that they have less ambition than whites (Erskine, 1968). These proportions all represent increases in "negative" stereotyping since 1963 polls.

From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an 'offender.' The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label (Becker, 1963:9, emphasis in original).

The labelling school is saying that "reality" is in the eye of the beholder and only tenuously (or not at all) related to what is out there. Sociologists therefore should investigate not the characteristics of the deviant, but the labelling process. Critics point out that, in addition to the central problems of deviance left unanswered by this theory (Gibbs, 1966), "the labelling process is not completely arbitrary and unrelated to the behavior of those detected and labelled" (Akers, 1968:464). Social life is affected by linguistic interpretations of it. However, Thomas' dictum has been used to deny that these "definitions of the situation" need be constrained to some degree by "what is out there." Both Thomas' observation and Merton's elaboration of it are aphorisms, albeit sagacious ones. Social scientists should test them rather than cite them as dogma.

The symbolic interactionist insistence that actors construct the meaning of their social environment is a reaction to the alleged diminution of the human being by behaviorist and functionalist schools. It is held that individuals, alone or collectively, take an active role in defining situations, rather than responding automatically to stimuli or to systemic requirements. There is explanatory power in this perspective. (Experimenters have been chagrined

to discover that their helpful subjects' unsolicited (but accurate) definitions of the outcome experimenters desired may invalidate the results of many studies (Rosenthal, 1966).) This does not, however, imply that these interpretations are autistic products, divorced from "reality." The situation is "out there" even if its meaning is not. Thomas granted that in most instances his definitions had already been constructed for the actor by his culture. These cultural definitions must, to some extent, have already received pragmatic test.

We are particularly concerned with Merton's (1957: 421-30) argument that the etiology of present out-group characteristics is reflexive to the perceptions dominant others have held about that group. At some point in the past, the dominant group convinces itself that the out-group has certain undesirable attributes. On the basis of this false assessment, it then discriminates against the out-group, thus producing the very traits initially predicted.

Buck (1968:438, emphases added) offers the following criticism of this argument:

(1) . . . any claim that a prediction is reflexive involves assessing what would have been the case had its dissemination status been different. Such assessment requires knowledge of the truth of counterfactual conditionals, . . . of conditionals whose antecedents are false. It requires that the empirical scientist claim to know something for which by the very description of the situation he cannot directly test.

(2) . . . while the dissemination status of a prediction must be a causal factor relative to what it predicts, we need not suppose that it is ever the only factor involved. The dissemination may be a causally necessary condition . . . but it need never be causally sufficient.

In some interpretations of Merton's analysis, the dominant group's definitions are viewed as directly producing out-group traits, without discrimination as an intervening variable. The argument then necessitates communication of the dominant group perception to the out-group. It also involves out-group's acceptance of this set of beliefs. However, representatives of separatist blacks and Indians advise us that "we" do not understand their values, and they reject "ours." Further, Goffman (1959) argues that people engage in "impression management." They do not simply act as mirrors but actively manipulate their image.

The "self-fulfilling prophecy" argument is even less convincing when one leaves the level of generalities to examine particular stereotype traits of specific groups. For instance, the Hutterites are consensually described as religious, prolific, and isolationist. To say that initially unfounded imputations of these and other traits produced these characteristics five centuries ago amounts to implying that all cultural and subcultural attributes of minority groups are shaped by hostile outsiders. If this conclusion is distasteful, one would have to assume that folk perception of groups is independent of the cultural differences anthropologists discover, that initially false predictions affected selected aspects of minority group behavior, and only these aspects are caught up in folk images. Further, Merton deals only with "disapproved" differences. Would he want to say that traits he approves of are also reflexively produced?



Are the Jews well-educated and politically liberal because the gentiles initially defined them as such?

Multiple causation is invariably found necessary to explain sociological phenomena. There is no reason to suppose national character is a less complex effect. The "self-fulfilling prophecy" may be one important causal factor. Its unstated moral premise is granted; none of the foregoing implies that the general community should be freed of its responsibility for ameliorating the conditions of downtrodden groups. The empirical statement, however, should be tested. What are the conditions under which predictions become "self-fulfilling" and under which they become, in Buck's (1968) terminology, "self-frustrating"? Since the lifetime of "deviant" individuals is shorter than that of "deviant" cultures, labelling theories provide a more convenient locus for examination.

The etiology of ethnic group differences is irrelevant to this research project. At a fixed point in time, the differences are there. The question is the extent to which these differences are observed accurately.

#### Folk Knowledge and the "Facts"

The social sciences have shown little curiosity in the extent to which folk behavior in general is predicated upon "factual" versus erroneous cognition. Perhaps the explanation for this indifference is to be found in their preoccupation with "sociological" validity and the psychodynamics of irrational motivation. Symbolic interactionists who

implicitly postulate a drive to seek meaning are unconcerned about the veridicality of this meaning. A spokesman (Ball, 1969:5) advises that

if an actor puts his head in a guillotine because he thinks he will get a haircut, the fact that he may lose his head instead is not strictly of interest from this standpoint [symbolic interactionism] . . .

Berger and Luckmann (1966:19) feel that sociology must take as given whatever passes for "knowledge" by a society and leave inquiry of its foundation to the discipline of philosophy. The sociology of knowledge has been concerned with understanding thought in terms of its social origins. The Gestalt theorists' preoccupation with good cognitive organization does not contradict the above statements. With the exception of Asch, field theorists have not addressed themselves to the question of the extent to which cognitive closure is provided by "facts" or by myths.

One would expect specialists in attitude research to be interested in the factual underpinnings of beliefs. However, the empirical research on attitude change has rarely considered the "truth" of the change medium as a variable. Instead, objectivity is equated with the perceived expertise and trustworthiness of the communicator or with the cogency of arguments. This assumes that McLuhan is correct, that the medium is the message. Similarly, the cognitive balance theories do not differentiate between consistent error and consistent "truth."

A reconciliation of rational and irrational models of man has been sought in the functions attitudes perform for

the personality. An explicit statement is given by Katz (1960) who conceives of attitudes as performing four major functions: the "instrumental," the "ego-defensive," the "value-expressive," and the "knowledge" function. The instrumental function, as described by Katz, is probably misnamed. For where "instrumental" usually refers to "serving as a means, helpful" (*Webster's Dictionary*), Katz translates this function into those attitudes which have been implanted by differential reward and punishment, in short those attitudes, learned through conditioning, which maximize rewards and minimize penalties. One can conceive of error (as well as accuracy) being rewarded (and rewarding), and the "instrumental function" becomes ambiguous in regard to the conditions under which attitudes bear some relationship to reality. The "knowledge" function describes people's need to understand the "events which impinge directly on their own life." Katz hypothesizes that this need is satisfied when a person experiences no inadequacies or inconsistencies in his attitudinal structure. It would seem that the "knowledge" function too is silent in regard to its impact upon reality-perception.

Smith, and his associates (1956:39-46), have proposed three types of motivational bases for attitudes: the "object appraisal" function which aids in understanding "reality" as culturally defined; the "social adjustment" function which facilitates identification or differentiation from reference groups; and the "externalization" function where beliefs

regarding public events are adopted in order to expiate inner anxieties. The "object appraisal" function is satisfactorily fulfilled when the individual's perceptual categories mirror those of his culture. Again, no provision is made for the relative adjustment value to the individual of correct or incorrect opinions.

The functionalist theory of attitudes thus diminishes a better sense of the utility of beliefs, namely, to derive a fairly accurate map of how the world (including its people) are, which map in turn, may be useful in the adjustive sense Katz proposes. Investigators have been selecting among these functions on the basis of preconception rather than proof. Notably, students have alleged an "ego-defensive," "value-expressive," or "externalization" function where they could, *post factum*, show error in belief. Unpleasant beliefs, in particular, have been charged with the service of functions other than reality-testing (cf. Adorno, et al., 1950; Bay, 1967). In this way, they are "explained." But, significantly, the invalidity of these unpleasant beliefs has been assumed, rather than tested. This study will test one such assumption.

The study of stereotypy can be subsumed under the specialty of person perception, an area which has had a traditional interest in the veridicality of "naive psychology." Such integration would benefit the specialty, for as Jones and Thibault (1958:151) argue,

The development of research and theory dealing with interpersonal perception has thus far been constrained by an overemphasis on perceiving the personality characteristics and behavior tendencies of a particular other.

It would encourage students of stereotypy to view group impressions as everyday behavior rather than as the preoccupation of pathological personalities. Person perception views judgment of the other as a transaction involving four sets of variables: (a) variables associated with the perceiver himself, (b) variables associated with the person being perceived, (c) variables associated with the relationship between perceiver and person judged, and (d) the situational context in which judgment is made (McDavid and Harari, 1968:185). Such an approach to stereotypy would caution against tendencies to examine (a) and (c) to the exclusion of (b).

The research to be reported focuses on ethnic stereotypes because controversy has devolved about this type of group image. However, the theoretical implications are broader than the degree of accuracy of the specific ethnic stereotypes investigated, or of ethnic stereotypes generally. For it may be useful to conceptualize initial impressions of others as a series of intersecting cognitive circles of categorical judgment. As interaction with a stranger begins, an actor notes cues relating to the other's sex, age, occupation, ethnicity (whichever categories are valued in his society), and gauges the approach suitable to such a person. Different predictions would be made for an elderly woman of white working-class background than for a young, black male, college student. Although with time individualizing details are added, the categorical framework remains. Since most people respond to requests to describe themselves (the human being

they know best?) in categorical terms (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954), it is not unreasonable to expect them to view others in this fashion.

In answer to those who denigrate stereotypes because they categorize, Asch (1952:238) wrote,

. . . it is wrong to assume that we can best achieve a correct view of a person by ignoring his group relations. . . . The issue is not whether to take into account or ignore group data, but rather whether our knowledge of group facts is adequate or not.

The *raison d'etre* of the social sciences rests upon the postulate that an adequate view of human behavior cannot be attained by ignoring group relations. How accurately does one group know another group? Which aspects of such a group are assessed correctly, which erroneously? What difference does it make to know the "facts" about another group? Are ethnic stereotypes more or less accurate than other sorts of categorical judgments of the other? These questions have been neglected in favor of the ancillary problem of how groups feel about one another.

Stereotypy marks one point where sociologists have confronted inter-group cognition. But stereotypy has been equated with prejudice. Prejudice offends the moral sense of humanity's essential oneness. Therefore, folk images, good and bad, have been assumed to be false.

The degree to which man uses his reason in his cognitive assessment of his group environment is more than a trivial intellectual puzzle. If we are to interpret our sociological role as a mandate to correct the error in folk

thought, it is imperative that we investigate, rather than assume, the extent of this error. While our existing knowledge does not predict isomorphism of stereotypes and object group behavior, neither does it rule out their validity.

### Conclusion

A critical examination of the various arguments offered by social scientists in support of the definitional assumption of stereotype inaccuracy revealed no scientific justification for this position. Rather, the evidence suggests that stereotypy is a multidimensional concept, with degree of accuracy one of several relatively unexplored variables. It appears that sociologists have been reluctant to challenge a dogma which accords with their humanitarian sympathies. The present study constitutes a test of the accuracy of categorical folk perception and a criticism of the objectivity of the social sciences.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF STEREOTYPE ACCURACY

#### Introduction

A proposal for the study of stereotypy accuracy requires a review of the investigations that have attempted to assess their truthfulness. Such a review will be especially concerned with the methodology utilized to resolve what has been termed ". . . the frightful problem of the criterion against which to assess veridicality . . ." (Taguiri, 1958:xv). The literature does not contain a methodologically sound test of more than one or two characteristics from any given stereotype. An adequate test involves two steps. First, the stereotype must be measured. (Several studies simply assume the stereotype's existence.) Second, the accuracy of the resulting traits must be assessed against external validation criteria. Many studies are, however, concerned with the examination of selected categorical characteristics which are not unrelated to folk images of these categories. Although the data from which to appraise degree of stereotype accuracy are scant indeed, the aforementioned research suggests that folk cognition of ethnic groups is, in some measure, informed by the "facts."

#### Ethnic Research Independent of Stereotype Measurement

Several studies have compared ethnic groups for piecemeal behavioral characteristics relevant to group impressions.



In general, the results substantiate the conclusion that while stereotypes may not "tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," neither are they divorced from "reality."

Perhaps because the situation of Jews in the non-Communist world is more one of preservation of identity rather than of discrimination, considerable attention has recently been given to distinctive Jewish attributes. Only a sample of the pertinent studies will be cited. The political liberalism of Jews has been documented by, *inter alia*, Fuchs (1956), Cohn (1958), and Lenski (1961). Jews have higher achievement values and higher actual achievement of material success than their gentile counterparts (Rosen, 1959; Verhoff, *et al.*, 1962; Mayer and Sharp, 1962; Porter, 1965:80). Much of their rapid socioeconomic mobility is presumably explained by the direction of their achievement orientation into academic channels. The overrepresentation of Jewish youth in institutions of higher learning has been documented (Porter, 1965:88; Shosteck, 1957). Clark (1949) analyzed the records of more than 6,000 liberal arts undergraduate students and found that Jewish students worked more nearly to the limit of their ability than did non-Jewish students. Jews are less likely to marry outside their faith (Glazer, 1950). However, grade school Jewish children are reported to be no more clan-nish than gentile children (Harris and Watson, 1946).

Aside from the extensive inquiry into Negro intelligence (Klineberg, 1944; Pettigrew, 1964; Shuey, 1958; Jensen,

1969), few studies have been directed toward other stereotype-relevant black differences. The idea that Negroes have a distinctive body odor has been refuted by one study (Morlan, 1950). Another stereotypic image of the Negro, that he has a proclivity to purchase expensive cars in comparison with other groups of like financial status, was validated for a lower-class black area in Seattle, but invalidated for a middle-class Negro neighborhood (Yoshino, 1959). A better-designed study by Akers (1968) gives evidence of the validity of this stereotype for Chicago.

Cameron and Storm (1965) employed a concept learning task and projective tests to measure the achievement motivation of Canadian Indian, white middle-class, and white working-class children. They report that middle-class children performed significantly better than both Indian and lower-class children in learning tasks under nonmaterial incentives and provided more achievement imagery stories.

#### Indirect Tests of Stereotypes

The studies reported above have not been directly concerned with the question of stereotype accuracy. Among students who have been concerned with the problem of validating stereotypes, several different types of reasoning have been advanced.

Both persistence of stereotypes over time (Gilbert, 1951) and their fluctuation with political-historical conditions (Dudycha, 1942; Meenes, 1943; Seago, 1947; Sinha and Upadhyaya, 1960) have been utilized as indicators of accuracy.

Obviously, this logic is faulty. Knowledge of stereotypes at two points in history, which is not accompanied by extensive data on both stereotyping and stereotyped groups and their interaction, throws no light whatsoever on their accuracy.

Some students suggest that cross-cultural similarity of stereotypes provides evidence for the "kernel of truth" hypothesis. It is argued that when samples which are widely dispersed geographically hold similar stereotypes for a given referent group that stereotype must contain some truth (Prothro, 1954a). However, the cross-cultural similarity could conceivably be a function of contact with information pertaining to the stereotype. In addition, differences between the stereotypes held by Groups A and B about Group C would not necessarily be evidence for inaccuracy. Complementarity represents one possibility (Duijker and Frijda, 1960:129). Further, unless stereotype characteristics are defined as inherent national character essences, even contradictions could reflect differing yet valid aspects of the interactions of Group C with A and B.

To avoid these difficulties, Prothro and Melikian (1955:4) propose what they term the longitudinal approach:

If the image of a national group changes as contacts with members of that group increase and other factors remain constant, then it can be asserted that the social stimulus value of the members of the group stereotyped produced the change.

These authors found that Near Eastern students' stereotype of Americans altered after a visit from United States troops. While their study did demonstrate a stereotype's sensitivity

to the "real world," it hardly provides evidence for its accuracy as a whole. An expansion of this logic would imply a protracted historical investigation of the impact of inter-actional episodes on the stereotypes of two groups. Although this validation technique would be impractical in the case of national stereotypes, it might prove to be workable with certain nonethnic stereotypes such as some occupational images.

Several students feel that agreement between autostereotypes and heterostereotypes attests to stereotype accuracy. An early study (Kusonoki, 1936), cited by Klineberg (1950: 105-6), compared judgments of the Japanese by members of that group and by members of a relatively unfriendly group, the Americans. Klineberg argued that the partial overlap provides evidence of a "kernel of truth."

Vinacke (1949) combined this line of thought with the cross-cultural argument referred to above. He determined how each of seven Hawaiian ethnic groups characterized themselves and each other. The inter-agreement of the stereotypes and of each autostereotype with the heterostereotypes was taken as indication of some measure of truth in the characterizations. Once again, the substantial amount of communication among the groups and possible acquaintance with the stereotypes *per se* vitiates the argument.

Abate and Berrien (1967) translated behavior orientations from the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule into descriptions. Japanese and American students of both sexes were asked to characterize their own and other groups in

terms of these categories. Samples from both Japanese and American groups took the test in its usual form. The results of the latter are seen as approximations of "real" characteristics and validation was sought in the convergence of these "vereotypes" and the stereotypes of the other national group. Only the American male vereotype as seen by the Japanese attained statistical significance. In view of the questionable appropriateness of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule as a stereotype measurement technique and validating criterion, the substantive significance of the results is somewhat unclear. Further, a "vereotype" is a self-rating and not necessarily accurate. Stereotypes have been traditionally defined as folk images of other groups. The relationship of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule descriptions to folk impressions is equivocal.

#### Direct Tests of Stereotypes

The discussion of the validity of stereotypes in the first edition of *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (Harding, et al., 1954:1025) contains the following statement:

While there is considerable evidence that some stereotypes may contain an element of truth (Rice, 1928), there are also a number of studies that indicate such belief systems may emerge without any objective basis (La Piere, 1936; Humphrey, 1945).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Rice (1928) used as stimuli nine photographs of men, including a labor leader, a Bolshevik, and a bootlegger. The photographs were labelled incorrectly or not labelled. The latter experimental group had to affix labels and both groups were required to draw inferences as to the traits of the nine men. While correctness of identification exceeded chance, agreement between subjects was greater than their accuracy. Rice therefore concluded that stereotypes existed concerning the appearance of various classes of people.

From this, one would draw the false conclusion that many methodologically adequate studies have essayed the question and proved stereotypes inaccurate. The revised edition of the handbook also rests its case for "at least partial inaccuracy" on La Piere's work (Harding, *et al.*, 1969:8).

La Piere's classic paper, "Type-Rationalizations of Group Antipathy" (1936), is regarded as the strongest piece of evidence in the literature adducing complete falsity of stereotypes. Moreover, his method of using available public data as criteria against which to assess accuracy has been replicated in the present study. For these reasons, his paper needs detailed discussion.

La Piere had 610 subjects fill out a social distance questionnaire and then give reasons for their antipathy toward the Armenian minority in Fresno County, California. According to La Piere, their "rationalizations" fell into three distinct stereotypes. The Armenians were regarded as "dishonest, lying, and deceitful," "parasitic" and a burden on county welfare and hospital services, and "always in trouble with the law." These charges were investigated through the use of available social statistics. An examination of a random sample of the records of a credit bureau showed the percentages of Armenians and non-Armenians classified as good and poor credit risks to be comparable. County hospital admission statistics disclosed that considering their population ratio, the Armenian demand upon this charity facility amounted to less than half that of the community as a whole. Welfare

bureau records did not reveal a disproportionate number of Armenian recipients. A consideration of arrests and of District Attorney, Civil Court and State Labor Bureau statistics resulted in negation of the third charge. La Piere (1936:232-33) therefore concluded that ". . . these stereotypes are in every instance devoid of factual basis."

However, an examination of the doctoral dissertation (La Piere, 1930), of which the published study was but a segment, showed that only a portion of the Armenian stereotype was in fact tested.

In answer to the question, "What are the principal characteristics of the Armenians, as a class?" (La Piere, 1930, Appendix:105), 30 traits, 17 negative and 13 positive, were listed. The type-rationalizations in the published paper involve (in some cases, very obliquely) 5 of these 30 traits. Moreover, numerous indications of the accuracy of the other stereotype traits are contained in the ethnographic sections of the dissertation (La Piere, 1930:172, 212, 260, 274, 389, 421, 429-51).

If, alternatively, the answers to La Piere's question, "What experiences do you recall having with Armenians which would illustrate the above statements or explain how you have come to feel as you do about them?" (La Piere, 1930, Appendix:100) was taken to be the stereotype, no evidence is offered as to its character and distribution. The reader is simply advised that these statements were obtained ". . . from some hundreds of the people interviewed," and only some

representative examples are included for illustrative purposes. They were not systematically analyzed. However, the 88 statements quoted refer to most of the 30 reported Armenian traits. The most frequent references are to the deceit, greed, and shady business practices of the Armenians.

In La Piere's public paper, the nuances of this image are reduced to criminal records and credit ratings, and it may be questioned whether such public records are measures relevant to the traits alleged by the stereotype. At the time of the study, the Armenians in Fresno were disproportionately petty entrepreneurs with a history of old-country bartering practices which, conceivably, could have been interpreted by the host population as "deceitful and crooked." It is doubtful that either credit ratings or criminal records adequately measure these attributions.

None of the statements in response to La Piere's more open question makes any reference to excessive use of welfare facilities. Out of 88 respondents, only 2 persons (both in occupations involving law enforcement) made mention of Armenians and the law. The first said they never have jail records, the second that they commit many traffic violations.

It would therefore appear that La Piere did not measure a stereotype nor did he subsequently invalidate a stereotype against evidence provided by observable public records.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Himmelfarb (1966) informally employs validation arguments similar to those of La Piere. Himmelfarb cites a



The second study which is widely cited as evidence of the faulty content of stereotypes is that of Humphrey (1945). The stereotype of Mexican-American youths as "zootsuiters" was juxtaposed with social types formulated from observation and case analysis of settlement house workers and other "knowledgeable" residents of Detroit. The "zootsuiter" was found to be only one of a variety of "types" of Mexican-American adolescents as conceived by Detroit social workers. It is not difficult to refute a stereotype that says all members of the minority group are characterized by a particular behavior. Rather, the focus should be on the relative frequencies of Mexican-American "zootsuiters" and "zootsuiters" in other ethnic groups or in the containing society, all considered in terms of proportional population representation. In addition, the existence of this particular stereotype and behavior was not measured. It was assumed that the Los Angeles "zootsuiter" riots crystallized and disseminated the stereotype of the average Mexican-American as a "zootsuiter." The absence of data indicating the distribution of the stereotype or the alleged behaviors, and the informal validation technique employed, makes this report at best suggestive.

Schuman (1966) carried out the first study in two

---

statement by Melvin Tumin, in which the latter denies the existence of an identifiable Jewish vote and asserts that contemporary Jews have left behind their concern for social justice, as well as their traditional respect for learning. Himmelfarb refutes these statements by inspection of Jewish voting behavior, proportional enrolment in universities, etc.

decades to directly confront the necessity for testing the assumption that stereotypes are fictitious. A nonrandom sample of 89 university students in East Pakistan was asked to choose from a list of 50 adjectives the 4 which best described the people belonging to each of 12 East Pakistani districts. From among the many characteristics ascribed to the 12 groups, Schuman chose to examine the validity of 2 traits ("piety" and "materialistic self-interest") which had been applied to the regional group, the Noakhali. The validation data came from a separate survey study of the effects of industrial experience on men from traditional backgrounds. An index of piety was constructed from the 12 interview questions which dealt with religious performance and values. A significant difference in the predicted direction was found between the Noakhali and each of the other three regional groups interviewed. Ten interview questions were used to test the hypothesis of materialistic self-interest. The results showed the Noakhali to be more interested in profit-making activity than the other three groups. These stereotype traits were found to be accurate descriptions of countrymen, but not of urban migrants from the Noakhali district. Although Schuman assessed only two traits, his findings do not support the assumption of stereotype invalidity.

#### Conclusion

Although the research cited above pertaining to isolated characteristics of ethnic groups assumes the existence of these traits in stereotypes, it does suggest that at least

some of the cultural differentiae caught up in folk perceptions are objectively there. On the other hand, most of the work which has deliberately addressed itself to the accuracy question is not particularly instructive. Certainly, it provides no empirical substantiation for the incorporation of inaccuracy into the definition of stereotypes. The "indirect tests" are logically faulty. With few exceptions, these "validation" studies draw samples from university student populations. All the investigators except La Piere (1936) employed verbal and reactive criteria of veridicality, rather than examining the behavior of the stereotyped groups. The classic La Piere work (invariably adduced as proof that stereotypes can be completely false), although the most impressive in its conceptualization, failed to execute its intent. The research herein reported attempts to amalgamate improved stereotype measurement procedures with La Piere's validation design.

## CHAPTER 3

### DESIGN OF THE INVESTIGATION

#### Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this study is to test the adequacy of the assumption that ethnic stereotypes are inaccurate. Stereotypes of the North American Indians, Hutterites, and Ukrainians (as well as seven other groups) have been measured by two instruments, a modified semantic differential and an open-ended questionnaire. Purposive samples were drawn from 25 Edmonton organizations chosen to obtain coverage of selected demographic characteristics. The accuracy of the stereotypes has been assessed against data provided by available public records and existing studies of the referent groups.

Several secondary objectives are incorporated. The study is also concerned with investigating the alleged equivalence between stereotypy and prejudice. Finally, the study undertakes an exploratory analysis of the demographic correlates of the stereotypy of both ethnic and nonethnic categories.

#### Sample

A serious deficiency of most investigations of stereotypy is the nature of the samples drawn. Stereotypes have been collected almost exclusively from university students. There is much evidence to show that prejudice and stereotypy

(since the latter is frequently utilized as an indicator of prejudice) are not randomly distributed in the population. It is therefore impossible to assume that a random sample of images will emerge under any selection design. Several studies (e.g., Weller, 1964; Prothro and Miles, 1952) indicate that the younger age groups are less prejudiced than their elders. Although the relationship between education and anti-Semitism remains somewhat unclear (Stember, 1961), an inverse correlation between prejudice and years of schooling is well substantiated for other groups (Harding, et al., 1969:28-9). Reigrotski and Anderson (1959:528) found that favorability of opinions toward national groups increases directly with amount of education. Simmons (1965:229) reports a strong inverse relationship between amount of education and tendency to stereotype deviants. While it is possible that this effect is produced by concomitant variables rather than by education *per se*, Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964:18) conclude that

On the basis of some 25 national sample surveys since 1945, the positive effect seems to be real, not spurious. The lower levels of prejudice among the better educated seem to involve the social experience of education specifically and not merely the sociological origins of the educated.

However, whether higher education is associated with more favorable attitudes toward minority groups or with inhibition against the expression of hostility remains a matter of conjecture. Nevertheless, it is obvious that much of our knowledge of adult stereotyping behavior is limited to that

of student populations.<sup>1</sup>

The one previous study (Buchanan and Cantril, 1953) which did draw probability samples measured stereotypes with foreshortened adjectival checklists, the deficiencies of which will be discussed shortly. The present study attempts to extend the scope beyond university samples and to use instruments which demand considerable time and attention from respondents. Limited financial resources have precluded probability sampling from any meaningful population and the individual administration of instruments.<sup>2</sup> Judgmental sampling of 25 Edmonton organizations was therefore employed. Since the required assumptions of randomness and independent sampling cannot be met, inferential statistics have not been used. The subsample comparisons of stereotyping behavior are offered as tentative findings.

Several previous studies have been criticized for using voluntary associations, on the grounds that people who belong to at least one formal organization are in many respects different from people who belong to none (Christie and Jahoda, 1954). Hausknecht's (1962) reanalysis of American national surveys found that membership in voluntary associations is

---

<sup>1</sup>A thorough investigation of children's stereotypes is described in Lambert and Klineberg (1967).

<sup>2</sup>Campbell (1957) estimates that a 50% selection loss would result from attempting to assemble groups away from their own homes. Further, he cautions ". . . that the greater the cooperation required, the more the respondent has to deviate from the normal course of daily events, the greater will be the possibility of nonrepresentative reactions" (Campbell, 1957:308).

limited to between 36% and 55% of adult Americans. As education and income increase, membership rises. The youngest and oldest age categories are least likely to belong.

Various measures were taken to prevent serious bias in the stereotypes elicited. Wherever possible, the groups chosen were the sort which adherents do not "join." Groups whose ideologies could conceivably be related to the research variables were excluded. For example, religious and other organizations with salient equalitarian-humanitarian values and associations with specific ethnic affiliation were avoided. Finally, the groups were selected to assure coverage of age, sex, education and socioeconomic status ranges. The comparison of the sample distribution with census distribution allows speculation of how the unrepresentativeness of the present sample in terms of several demographic variables relevant to the literature might affect the outcome. Nevertheless, the purpose was to achieve not representativeness but breadth of coverage. In general, this sample under-represents males, the older age categories, lower socioeconomic groups, and the less well educated as compared to the somewhat outdated 1961 census distributions. A detailed description of the sample is provided in Appendix A and a copy of the personal data questionnaire in Appendix B.

Assurance was given to the sample organizations that their identities would not be divulged. The groups tested included a labor union, a motorcycle club, nursing and nursing aide students, the clerical employees of a

bureaucratic organization, a senior citizens' recreation club, the retired members of a profession, a Canadian Legion group, a women's lodge, and several men's service clubs. In order to find people who would not ordinarily belong to clubs, a great deal of energy was devoted to getting the cooperation of a number of community leagues. Five leagues were chosen according to census tract social rank scores based on an index of occupation and education which was made available by The University of Alberta Population Research Laboratory. Since these social rank scores vary between one and four, many census tracts received the same rank. One community league was randomly chosen for each social rank category from among those census tracts with ethnic composition roughly representative of that of the Edmonton metropolitan area. The actual groups tested were mothers' playschool associations. If the women wished their children to benefit from the city financed community league playschools, attendance at these meetings was obligatory.

Only two organizations which were approached, an association of elderly retired working class men and a hospital women's auxiliary, refused to cooperate. Of the captive subjects in actual attendance at organization meetings, 12 declined to participate. Three were openly hostile to the procedure, four felt their command of English was insufficient for the task, and five persons could not



remain after their regular meeting.<sup>3</sup> Of the 590 respondents, 345 were not "joiners" of voluntary associations in the usual sense of the term. Although the original plan was to test all groups within the shortest time span lest the results should be affected by external events, the actual mechanics of getting access to groups and scheduling the testing resulted in delays. Most of the data were collected between September and November, 1968. A preliminary tabulation revealed the underrepresentation of males and of the less well educated. In a not altogether successful attempt to rectify this problem, additional groups were approached in January 1969. Throughout this period, a file of newspaper stories involving all of the referent groups was collected to determine whether stereotypes might have been influenced by external events.

### Stereotype Measurement Instruments

#### Katz and Braly Checklists

Although newer techniques are gradually being adopted, students of stereotypes have relied primarily on the adjectival checklist introduced 37 years ago by Katz and Braly (1933). Katz and Braly asked 100 Princeton students to describe 10 ethnic groups by assigning appropriate traits from a prepared list of 84 adjectives. The subjects were then asked to check

---

<sup>3</sup>Because the instructions had been grossly misunderstood, 12 semantic differential questionnaires had to be subsequently eliminated.

from among the characteristics chosen those 5 which they felt to be most typical of each of the 10 referent groups. The stereotype of an ethnic group was implicitly defined as the 12 most frequently assigned traits.

Duijker and Frijda (1960:115, 118) point out that sociologists are primarily interested in the spontaneous stereotypes held and expressed in the course of ordinary interaction. The elicited stereotypes measured by available techniques may be considered "progressive approximations" of the former. Several critics (Eysenck and Crown, 1948; Ehrlich and Rinehart, 1965) assert that widespread use of the Katz and Braly checklist method has resulted in serious misconception of the nature and distribution of spontaneous stereotypes. There are several reasons for this evaluation. This method has elicited stereotypes for referent groups about which respondents were in total ignorance (Ehrlich and Rinehart, 1965). There is no way to differentiate between subjects' knowledge of and their personal convictions about stereotype attributes. This tool often employs descriptive language which is not salient in the respondents' vocabularies. In 1965, Ehrlich and Rinehart charged that much of the stereotypy literature was composed of studies which had employed the instrument in its original form. Therefore, the checklist traits were those incorporated by Katz and Braly from the open-ended responses of 25 college students in the year 1932. Further, respondents are given no opportunity to qualify their descriptions or to indicate their opinion of

the nature of the distribution of the trait in the referent group. The frame of reference for their comparisons is typically left ambiguous. Using the Katz and Braly method, Diab (1963) found that the stereotypes of national groups differ if the number and kind of referent groups is varied. The overriding cause for concern, however, is the almost exclusive reliance upon one technique devised more than 35 years ago.

Taking a realistic stand on the difficulty of devising an indicator which is perfectly congruent with theoretical conceptualization of such underlying dispositions as attitudes (or stereotypes), many methodologists (e.g., Webb, *et al.*, 1966; Cook and Selltiz, 1966; Lazarsfeld, 1959) have advocated "multiple operationalism." Several different measures are chosen, each of which differentially minimizes some identifiable influence on response other than the hypothesized characteristic in question (Cook and Selltiz, 1966:327). Accordingly, this study employed two indicators of a stereotype: a modified semantic differential and an open-ended questionnaire. The instruments were randomly distributed in such a way that half the respondents from each sample organization received each instrument. Their counterbalancing strengths and weaknesses should provide more adequate data than either used alone or than that available from the Katz and Braly method. In addition, both methods have satisfactory face validity in terms of the conceptual definition of a stereotype as those consensual beliefs concerning the

attributes of a social category.

### Open-Ended Questionnaire

The open-ended questionnaire required respondents to describe in their own words ten social categories which were also used in the semantic differential. Similar semiprojective procedures have previously been used by Kerr (1943); Shor (1946); Prothro (1954b); Ehrlich and Rinehart (1965); and Dworkin (1965). (Appendix B contains the instruments.) The categories were as follows: Hutterites, North American Indians, Ukrainians, Jews, Women, Lower-Class People, Old People, School Teachers, Lawyers, and People Like Me. The ethnic categories were preceded by the words, "In comparison with Albertans generally" in order to provide a stable frame of reference for their description. The nonethnic categories were presented as "Women etc. in general tend to be." This wording was chosen to elicit descriptions of women versus men, for example, rather than Alberta women *vis-à-vis* women located in other geographical areas.

The stereotypes of the Indians, Hutterites, and Ukrainians were subsequently assessed for accuracy. The first two groups were selected because they are relatively unassimilated. Respondents were thereby presented with more unitary, visible referents than would be the case with groups which are represented by both an indigenous population in another land and several generations in Canada. Further, existing public records dealing with Indians and Hutterites were thought to be plentiful. Hutterites and Indians are both

different from the general population and segregated from it. To avoid biasing the test of accuracy, a more integrated group, the Ukrainians, was included.<sup>4</sup> Since this group does not afford the advantages noted above, the validation task was more difficult. It should be pointed out that previous attempts to assess stereotype accuracy have been limited to two or three traits from one group.

Since the image of the Jews has been repeatedly measured, this group was included to provide a basis for comparison. The age, sex, social class, and occupational categories were selected in order to permit examination of different types of nonethnic stereotypy. Finally, "People Like Me" provides a baseline measure of how the sample and various subsamples perceive approved "people in general" so that there is a method for ascertaining whether their descriptions of other groups are in fact stereotypes, i.e., measures of assigned differences. If, for example, a certain socio-economic status subsample were to see itself as hardworking and ambitious and to assign all four ethnic groups the opposites of these characteristics, this would indicate not stereotypy but simply conglomerate Them-us descriptions. In this connection, Sullivan and Adelson (1954) suggest that one dimension of prejudice involves a general rejection of people in general (rather than designated groups) from the exclusive in-group of the self.

---

<sup>4</sup>This important suggestion was made to the author by Dr. C. W. Hobart.

The instrument consisted of a series of sheets of paper, each having one of the referent categories listed at the top, followed by space for description of that group. The order of presentation of categories was randomized.

Stereotypes with more salience for laymen should be elicited by this technique than from either adjectival checklists or from the second proposed measure. The criticism that the Katz and Braly tool results in the imposition of the investigator's cognitive frame of reference has its counterpart in person perception research generally. For instance, Hastorf, et al. (1958:55) recommend that "researchers should make more of an attempt to study the perceptual categories that are actually employed by, and thus relevant to, the perceiver under consideration." The open-ended instrument insures that the beliefs concerning referent group attributes are expressed in everyman's vocabulary with whatever qualifications he cares to introduce. Van den Berghe (1966:418-19) correctly points out that the sociologist must subsequently reduce the resulting mass of personal imagery to manageable proportions by classifying it into analytical categories. Nevertheless, the finding of substantial differences between results collected by projective and structured techniques reported by Ehrlich and Rinehart (1965) and by Van den Berghe himself (1966) suggests that different dimensions of stereotypy are tapped by each type of instrument.

Neither of the methods employed in this study rectifies a deficiency of the adjectival checklist, namely that it

fails to differentiate respondent's personal convictions from his knowledge of stereotypes. This is not particularly serious. Stereotypes are defined in terms of consensuality of beliefs, and the problem is to examine the accuracy of the cognitive norms of stereotyping groups. The precise degree of individual commitment to these cognitive norms is not presently at issue. However, another related problem presents itself. In a longitudinal analysis of American public opinion regarding the Jews, Stember, et al. (1966:64) found that in 1940 63% of the respondents said that Jews as a group had objectionable traits, whereas only 22% stated this belief in 1962. The reviewers (Solotaroff and Sklare, 1966: 10) wondered where all the anti-Semites had gone in less than a generation. In the present study, it is felt that response distortion through the operation of a social desirability factor has been reduced somewhat by the wide scope of the sample, guarantees of anonymity, disguise of the target referent groups and to a certain extent, the nature of the task itself, and appeals to be truthful for the sake of science. Nevertheless, the advantage of unstructured instruments such as this is ". . . one of freedom, rather than of disguise" (Campbell, 1950:19). With both tools, reliance had to be placed upon the respondents' cooperation. One advantage which the open-ended technique did afford was easy detection of "empty" stereotypes offered out of complete ignorance. While indirect measures often present a better case for face validity than direct measures (Campbell, 1950:30), the general

issue of validation of unstructured techniques remains problematic. The present study relies upon Ebel's (1961) argument that degree of meaningfulness of the measures of a construct is a better criterion of their utility than prediction to inappropriate behavior.

The 300 sets of free verbal descriptions were subsequently subjected to a content analysis. The coding categories for each referent group were devised from a sample of questionnaire responses. Liberal use was made of a thesaurus. Students in a graduate seminar provided some assistance in ascertaining which descriptions were synonymous and what trait labels appropriate. Wherever possible, the labels were selected to apply across all referent groups, although each group required some individualized categories for its description. To facilitate comparison with the structured instrument, the semantic differential attributes were included, even though, in some cases, the frequencies were very low. For these reasons, as well as the fact that the categories were traits rather than "factors," the total number of coding categories was large (58). In addition, provision was made for coding various sorts of explanations offered for declining to describe the referent groups, as well as for coding subject fluency in terms of numbers of traits and of words used in characterizing a given group. A copy of the coding categories and instructions to coders is attached as Appendix C. The content analysis was done by two coders. At the end of the training stage, during which the categories underwent further



revision, interrater agreement was .83.<sup>5</sup> The reliability calculated midway through the task was .89 and at the end, .79. A description of interrater reliability by categories is presented in Appendix C. Obviously, some error is introduced by judge variability. Nevertheless, in light of the complexity of the content analysis the results were considered satisfactory. (Beach and Wertheimer (1961:371) obtained a mean phi coefficient of .66 for interjudge reliability across 12 categories. This paper was the only one discovered which both dealt with a related problem and published details of the content analysis.)

Consensuality was defined in terms of the percentage of the sample and subsamples which mentioned each trait. Although stereotypes have been conceptualized since 1933 as frequently attributed group traits, the literature provides very little guidance on the precise amount of agreement which constitutes consensus. Katz and Braly (1933) and their admirers list the 12 traits most frequently assigned, with lower level frequencies of the order of 11% included. Vinacke (1949) presented in his tables all traits mentioned by 20% or more of his sample. These studies require subjects to recognize rather than recall adjectives. People employing projective instruments have used even lower frequency boundaries. In answer to their question, "In what ways are

---

<sup>5</sup> Interrater reliability was measured as the proportion of coding responses upon which the two raters agreed out of the total coding responses (agreement plus error). A base of 100 was used to standardize the measure.

Jews different?" Cahalan and Trager (1949:95) record "clannish" (12%), "love money" (11%), "smart naturally, well educated" (3%). Ehrlich and Rinehart (1965) include only those traits endorsed by 10 or more of their 85 subjects, or 11.8%. While these low cutoff points do not reflect a literal interpretation of the word "consensus" (general opinion), they are a pragmatic result of the difference between spontaneously producing a description and recognizing the appropriateness of one provided.

Simmons (1965) asked people to reply to the query, "What is deviant?" In attempting to account for low category frequencies, he makes the following observation:

We can more or less assume that the respondent means what he says, but we can assume nothing about what he happened not to say. For instance, we can assume that at least 47% of the subjects regard drug addiction as deviant, but it does not follow that the other 53% do not. Given a list, we would expect 80% or 90% of a sample to check drug addiction as deviant (Simmons, 1965:224, emphasis in original).

If consensus were literally defined as 51% agreement there would be few if any stereotype traits to analyze further. For the purposes of this study, those traits mentioned by 20% or more of the sample will be considered part of the stereotype of the respective referent groups. This limit represents a quite arbitrary compromise between the demands of the data and the nominal definition of stereotypy. Because interest focuses on a general image rather than those of specific subsamples, inspection has assured that the attribution reflects consensuality within the majority of demographic subgroups.

### The Semantic Differential

The second technique employed to measure stereotypes was a modified semantic differential.<sup>6</sup> In recent years, several stereotype studies have used this method (Stagner and Osgood, 1946; Prothro and Keehn, 1957; Triandis and Vassiliou, 1967; Gardner, Wonnacott and Taylor, 1968). The measure's correspondence to the conceptual definition of stereotypy is sufficiently clear to afford reasonable confidence in its face validity. The semantic differential requires respondents to rate concepts on a series of of seven-point bipolar adjectival scales. In this case, the concepts are the stereotype referents discussed previously. The adjectives or descriptive phrases chosen represent attributes to be assigned to the referents. Degree of consensus or strength of respondents' tendencies to apply attributes to referent groups is readily ascertainable. The format and instructions to subjects were adapted from those outlined by Osgood and his associates (1958). (A description of the questionnaire is contained in Appendix B.) At the top of each page is the "concept" to be judged. Below it are arranged the list of descriptive scales. For example:

---

<sup>6</sup>The semantic differential proper devised by Osgood, *et al.* (1958), is designed to have a minimum number of scales representing three identifiable dimensions of meaning--activity, evaluative, and potency. The present usage is "modified" in the sense that the scoring differs from that usually employed since there is no interest in plotting the meaning of the referent groups in semantic space.

In comparison with Albertans generally, most HUTTERITES tend to be:

(polar term X e.g., educated)	_ / _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / _	(polar term Y e.g., uneducated)
	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)	

(1) extremely X; (2) quite X; (3) slightly X;  
 (4) neither X nor Y; equally X and Y; (5) slightly Y;  
 (6) quite Y; (7) extremely Y.

The scale positions were subsequently labelled from "1" to "7," the first position in each case being that closest to the pole of the adjective which is generally regarded as the favorable or socially desirable alternative. This is merely a labelling convenience. The same set of 29 adjectival terms was used with each concept or referent group. The concepts were randomly presented to facilitate independence of judgment and to avoid fatigue effects. The direction of polarity of the scales was varied according to a randomly designed pattern to prevent formation of position preferences. The scales were chosen from previous stereotype studies, as well as descriptions of the referent groups in the ethnographic literature and the mass media. Since the literature dealing with Ukrainians was meagre and the pretest was carried out in an area geographically removed from major Ukrainian settlements, five northern Alberta high school teachers kindly arranged for 198 students to write their impressions of the Ukrainians. The scales were modified in terms of the pretest results. Fishbein (1963) and others, distinguish between "evaluative" beliefs and beliefs that are "purely descriptive" or reportorial. In order to make the assessment of accuracy

more manageable, the proportion of the latter type of traits was maximized.

The semantic differential has certain advantages in common with adjectival checklists but lacking in free-response methods: breadth of coverage of stereotype (amount of data available per time unit), ease of analysis, more direct comparability between respondents. In addition, the effect of verbal fluency is minimized. Compared to the Katz and Braly instrument's "all or nothing" characterizations of referent groups, the semantic differential permits respondents to indicate both direction and intensity of trait attribution.

Osgood, et al. (1958), report test-retest reliabilities ranging from .83 to .91. Heise's (1969:410) methodological review of semantic differential research up to 1969, suggests that while the originators of the technique may have overestimated the stability of individual ratings over time, test-retest correlations for group means are reasonably satisfactory. Stautland (1959), who used this method to measure stereotypes of high school students, obtained a test-retest reliability of over .90. Neither of the instruments used in the present study was subjected to reliability tests. It was difficult enough to get access to the sample organizations without suggesting a return visit. The question of validity was previously discussed in connection with the open-ended instrument. However, in addition to the problems of external validation criteria, social desirability, etc., the semantic differential involves an

additional source of biasing error. Osgood, et al. (1958: 226-27), noted marked differences in personal scale-checking styles between the better educated who used the intermediary positions (2,3,5 and 6) more frequently than the less well educated who disproportionately used the polar (1,7), and neutral (4) positions. (Several other correlates of this response style which are not related to the research variables under purview have been subsequently reported (Heise, 1968).) The extent of bias which a possible relationship between education and scale-checking style introduces into the findings will receive subsequent comment.

Descriptive measures of central tendency and dispersion were calculated, means, percentage distributions, and average deviations. The mean does involve the assumption of equality of scale intervals. However, Heise (1969:407-08) advises that

The information available suggests that the basic metric assumptions for the SD are not quite accurate, but also that violation of the assumptions are not serious enough to interfere with many present applications of the SD.

For this purely descriptive purpose, the average deviation is more appropriate than the standard deviation. Because the latter measure involves squaring deviations from the mean, it converts those scale choices immediately adjacent to the mean scale value when the mean is in an extreme category into a misleadingly large dispersion value. For example, if the mean category were 6.1 and many respondents chose 7, this would reflect stereotypy rather than undue dispersion. The average deviation does not exaggerate these extreme values. In

addition, the theoretical interpretation of the standard deviation in terms of the normal curve (its most important advantage) is herein irrelevant.

A stereotype is operationally defined as those attributes for which consensuality exists in extreme (nonneutral) scale positions. (Although agreement that a group does not differ from the enviroing society on a particular trait is in itself a useful, and verifiable datum, stereotypes in the past have focused on a group's differentiae from people in general.) This interpretation of stereotypy in terms of consensual deviation from the neutral (4) category is supported by Gardner, Wonnacott and Taylor (1968) and by Thielbar and Feldman (1969). More specifically, stereotypes are defined as those characteristics whose means fall between 1 to 2.5 and between 5.5 to 7, with a mean deviation less than 1.5 scale units, provided that 51% or more of the responses fall into the two extreme scale categories, i.e., "quite" and "extremely." This use of percentages is designed to introduce some comparability between instruments in the operationalization of consensus. However, confidence cannot be placed in percentage distributions alone since some subsamples number less than 50. These decisions are arbitrary attempts to do justice to the data. Little guidance is offered by the existent stereotype literature employing the semantic differential because the usual purpose is to extract factors rather than exclude scales. Previous researchers have therefore not calculated dispersion measures for this

purpose.

The stereotypes which were subsequently examined for accuracy were those attributes on which consensuality was found on either the open-ended questionnaire or the semantic differential. More confidence can be placed in traits which overlap both measures because the possibility is reduced that stereotype content has been confused with response style. Nevertheless, since two indicators were chosen to reflect differentially separate dimensions of stereotypes, within-method agreement on the appropriateness of a descriptive characteristic is sufficient for its inclusion in the operationally defined stereotype.

#### Social Distance Scale

Affective response toward the referent ethnic groups was measured by means of a Bogardus (1925) social distance scale, which is included in Appendix B. Although this is not the most elegant procedure available, its proven dependability and economy of time met the requirements of this study. A method was needed which measured respondents' feelings toward the same four ethnic groups for which they provided stereotype images. Since attitude scales do not exist for three of the groups (Ukrainians, Hutterites, Indians), and those available for Jews contain "stereotype" items, four new instruments would have had to be developed. It was feared that the resulting imposition on respondents' time and patience might jeopardize the main objective of the research. The reliability and validity of social distance scales are known to be



satisfactory (Oppenheim, 1966:125; Miller, 1964:143). Results available from previous use of this instrument in the Edmonton area (Hirabayashi, 1963a) provide a comparative base. Further, the willingness of subjects to admit groups to varying degrees of intimacy is a reasonable operationalization of feelings toward, as distinct from cognitive images of, referent groups.

As is customary, the social distance position for a given ethnic group was determined by the mean of the "nearest columns" (i.e., the closest relationship allowed by a respondent) checked for that group by the entire sample or subsamples. The resulting scores were used to order groups to avoid the dubious assumption of equality of intervals. It should be noted that these scores have probably been affected by the fact that respondents completed this instrument after they had filled out one or other of the stereotype measures. Priority had to be given to the most important objective, stereotype measurement.

A pretest of the instruments was carried out with 110 people from two junior college introductory sociology classes and a competitive racing motorcycle club located in Calgary. The instruments were revised in light of the results obtained.

#### Procedure for Assessment of Stereotype Accuracy

Comment has already been offered on the deficiencies of the methods used to evaluate the accuracy of stereotypes. However, it should be emphasized that, with few exceptions, previous students have relied upon reactive measures as validating criteria. Moreover, most of these criteria were

internal to the stereotype measurement instrument itself. As a first step toward the satisfactory assessment of the accuracy of stereotypes, it is necessary to desist from the tallying of opinions of stereotyping groups and to examine the behavior of the referent groups. Some stereotype characteristics could, of course, be validated by employing the experimental method. Unfortunately, the time and expenditure required to validate by experiment the attributes of even one referent group would be enormous.

This study used publicly available social data as the primary criterion against which to assess the accuracy of stereotypes. Stereotype traits were juxtaposed against a series of "indices" to determine whether differences in these traits do in fact exist between the referent groups and the general population. The material employed included census data, vital statistics, Royal Commission reports, and information from both federal and provincial government departments and other public agencies.

Webb, et al. (1966), have presented a strong case for the advantages presented by data collected for nonscholarly purposes. It is inexpensive and plentiful. When obtained from multiple sources, this material should in the aggregate be a nonreactive, valid<sup>7</sup> indication of referent group behavior in comparison with alternative techniques. Moreover, the

---

<sup>7</sup>Deutscher (1969:40) strenuously argues the position that the validity of sociological results cannot be ascertained unless different types of method are brought to bear on a given problem.

examination of many stereotype characteristics in one operation becomes feasible.

There are disadvantages. It requires a great deal of time. Careful attention must be given to the conditions under which these secondary data were collected. Not every attribute is amenable to validation by this technique. Nevertheless, a far greater proportion of the stereotypes were checked for accuracy than has been the case in existing published studies.

Supplementary information was derived from the existing literature on the referent groups. Wherever possible, reliance was placed primarily on observational field studies rather than questionnaire data. The purpose has been to search out and present an accumulation of pieces of evidence of different types apropos the impressions others hold of a group, rather than to formulate a neat mathematically phrased verdict on their perceptual acuity.

### Definitions

#### Stimulus Groups

Stimulus groups are those social categories for which stereotypes were measured. The ethnic stimulus groups in the present investigation are the North American Indians, Hutterites, Ukrainians and Jews. The nonethnic stimulus groups are Lawyers, Teachers, Women, Old People and Lower Class People.

### General Population

The general population is defined as the population of the province of Alberta, Canada.

### Stereotype

A stereotype refers to those folk beliefs about the attributes characterizing a stimulus group on which there is consensus. Operationally defined, a stereotype involves all the attributes of stimulus groups on which consensuality is found in either or both indicators (open-ended questionnaire and semantic differential). Specifically, consensuality was defined as follows: Any trait which was cited by 20% or more of the open-ended questionnaire sample is part of the stereotype of a given stimulus group. Semantic differential traits with mean scale values of between 1 and 2.5, and between 5.5 and 7 are defined as stereotype traits, provided that the average deviation is 1.5 or less, and that 51% of the sample frequencies fall into the two adjacent extreme scale positions.

### Accuracy

An accurate stereotype trait is defined as one for which a significant difference exists between the occurrence of that trait in stimulus group behavior and in the behavior of the general population. In those situations where qualitative validation criteria (field observational studies, etc.) were used, accuracy is a judgment that the weight of the evidence corroborates the stereotype. In the hypotheses

listed below, accuracy of stereotypes pertains only to the images of the stimulus groups of concern: Indians, Hutterites, and Ukrainians.

#### Amount of Stereotypy

For both stereotype measurement instruments, amount of stereotypy is a ratio of the number of stereotype traits (as operationally defined) to the total possible number of traits. In the case of the semantic differential, the amount of stereotypy for a given stimulus group is the number of traits ascribed to that group divided by 29 (the number of adjectival scales). For the open-ended questionnaire, the amount of stereotypy for one stimulus group is a ratio of number of traits to the base of the total content analysis categories relevant to that group.

#### Degree of Stereotypy

Degree of stereotypy is a composite measure of the extremity or polarity of a sample or subsample's usage of semantic differential scales to characterize a given stimulus group. The index for degree of stereotypy is the standard deviation of the 29 semantic differential scale means from the neutral value of (4).

#### Social Distance

Social distance is defined as the degree of acceptance of ethnic stimulus groups which subjects indicate on a Bogardus social distance scale. The social distance position

for a given stimulus group is the mean of the "nearest columns" (i.e., the most intimate relationship acceptable to a respondent) checked for that group by the entire sample, or subsamples.

#### Amount of Education

Amount of education is defined as the number of years of formal schooling completed by a respondent.

#### Hypotheses

- (1) Null hypothesis: For each trait in the stereotype of the stimulus group, there is no difference between the incidence of that behavior in the stimulus group and in the general population.

Research hypothesis: For each trait in the stereotype of the stimulus group, the incidence of that behavior will be greater in the stimulus group than in the general population.

This hypothesis is a test of the prevalent assumption that stereotypes are false. Both the theoretical propositions and empirical findings which can be brought to bear upon this question support the contention that out-group perception of ethnic categories, while not veridical in detail or in estimation of amount of between-group difference (Kephart, 1954; Clarke and Campbell, 1955), is more likely to be correct than incorrect.<sup>8</sup> Such a prediction rests on the postulate that people are motivated to accurately "know" their social

---

<sup>8</sup> Accuracy of perception is supported by the following studies which have been cited in previous sections: Akers (1968), Cameron and Storm (1965), Douglas, et al. (1968), Glazer (1950), Goldberg (1968), Oakes and Corsini (1961), Olmsted (1962), Schuman (1966), Silkiner (1962), Stelmachers and McHugh (1964), Stone, et al. (1957).

environment (Boulding, 1967:881; Asch, 1952). However, person perception studies have repeatedly demonstrated that the percept is a function of the characteristics of both judge and perceived (Bruner, 1958). The directionality of the research hypothesis receives further support from the work of Campbell (1967). His attempt to integrate learning theory with phenomenological social psychology has resulted in the following prediction:

The greater the real differences between groups on any particular custom, detail of physical appearance, or item of material culture, the more likely it is that that feature will appear in the stereotyped imagery each group has of the other (Campbell, 1967:821, emphasis in original deleted).

- (2) Null hypothesis: There will be no relationship between amount of education and amount of stereotypy of stimulus groups.

Research hypothesis: As amount of education increases, the amount of stereotypy of stimulus groups will decrease.

- (3) Null hypothesis: There will be no relationship between amount of education and degree of stereotypy of stimulus groups.

Research hypothesis: As amount of education increases, the degree of stereotypy of stimulus groups will decrease.

- (4) Null hypothesis: Within each educational level, there will be no difference between the amount of stereotypy of ethnic stimulus groups and the amount of stereotypy of nonethnic stimulus groups.

Research hypothesis: As amount of education increases, the within-category difference between amount of stereotypy of ethnic and nonethnic stimulus groups will increase, with stereotypy of ethnic groups decreasing and stereotypy of nonethnic groups increasing.

- (5) Null hypothesis: Within each educational level, there will be no difference between the degree of stereotypy of ethnic stimulus groups and the degree of stereotypy of nonethnic stimulus groups.

Research hypothesis: As amount of education increases, the within-category difference between degree of stereotypy of ethnic and nonethnic stimulus groups will increase, with stereotypy of ethnic groups decreasing and stereotypy of nonethnic groups increasing.

These four hypotheses predict that more formal education is associated with increasing disinclination to characterize groups as a whole. This position is supported by Reigrotski and Anderson (1959) and by Simmons (1965). However, it is likely that more education results in exposure to the liberal position that it is neither intelligent nor ethical to stereotype ethnic groups rather than to the eradication of categorical perceptions *per se*. (Simmons (1965:230) found a moderate inverse relationship between tendency to stereotype deviants and a liberalism scale.) Therefore, it is hypothesized that more highly educated people will indulge in more categorical statements with respect to the nonethnic stimulus groups. In other words, it is maintained that people do have at least rudimentary impressions of entire groups and that highly educated people will be more willing to reveal their images of those groups which have not come within the purview of "brotherhood" campaigns. Thielbar and Feldman (1969:69) report that they encountered much less resistance from a university student sample to stereotyping occupational groups than did one of the same investigators using a comparable sample and technique but racial and religious referent groups. It is predicted that the dominant pattern will be increasing education-decreasing stereotypy. However, as education increases, a greater proportion of stereotypy will be comprised



of stereotypy of nonethnic groups.

Although specific predictions have not been made, the stereotyping behavior of age, sex, and socioeconomic status subsamples will be explored.

- (6) Null hypothesis: There is no relationship between the social distance position of a stimulus group and the amount of stereotypy of that stimulus group.

Research hypothesis: As the social distance position of a stimulus group increases, the amount of stereotypy of that group will increase.

The examination of the relationship between prejudice and stereotypy should bear upon the definitional specification of these concepts.

The theoretical rationale for the research hypothesis is as follows: Sherif and Hovland (1961:183, 189) have found that an ego-involved subject's own position functions as an internal anchor in the judgment of the various characteristics of stimuli. Further, subjects with more extreme positions tend to have broader latitudes of rejection and narrower latitudes of acceptance. Extreme judges therefore tend to show greater contrast effects in judgment. Berkowitz and Goranson (1964) report less contrast effect in judging liked persons than in judging less well-liked persons. Within the context of stereotypy then, those subsamples which evince greater social distance from the four ethnic stimulus groups should view these groups as being quite different from the general population on more characteristics than should subsamples which demonstrate greater acceptance of these groups.

The relationship between favorability of traits and

social distance will be dealt with in an exploratory fashion.

The measures of association used for the tentative examination of subsample stereotyping behavior were chosen in terms of the level of measurement and the proportional-reduction-in-error interpretation advocated by Costner (1965).

## CHAPTER 4

### DESCRIPTION OF THE STEREOTYPES

#### Introduction

This chapter presents the stereotypes for the ten social categories which were measured by the semantic differential and the open-ended questionnaire. The stereotypes of the three stimulus groups are examined in order to assess the extent to which the images of demographic subsamples accord with those of the total samples. Finally, the total sample and subsample impressions of "People Like Me" are compared with the traits ascribed to the ethnic stimulus groups. Both the assignment of a large proportion of traits to out-groups which are not contiguous with self traits and the variation of traits between out-groups result in the conclusion that these percepts are in fact stereotypes, i.e., measures of assigned differences.

#### North American Indians

The North American Indians are one of three groups whose stereotypes will be subsequently assessed for accuracy. It will be recalled that operationally defined stereotype trait means fall between 1.0 and 2.5 and between 5.5 and 7.0 on the semantic differential, provided that at least 50% of the descriptions are located in the two adjacent extreme categories, and that the average deviation is less than 1.5. The required level of consensus for inclusion of open-ended traits in the stereotype is 20%. However, traits which exceed

the 10% level are listed in the tables. In the case of both instruments, it is the images of the total sample which constitutes definition for purposes of validation. Some of the trait labels employed in the tables have been abbreviated. Category numbers are therefore listed beside the traits to facilitate reference to Appendix B which contains more complete descriptions. In order that the results from the two instruments may be compared, those attributes which are part of the stereotype of both have been italicized, and the figures corresponding to the alternate measurement technique presented in parentheses.

Table 4.1 presents the semantic differential stereotype of the North American Indians. The perception of the Indians

TABLE 4.1. STEREOTYPE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS,  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290

Cat. No.	Traits	Mean	% N in Ext. Cats.	Av. Dev.	% Open Ended
1	not materialistic	2.4	69.3	1.4	( 3.7)
11	<i>poor</i>	6.3	84.8	0.8	(28.7)
14	large families	6.2	82.7	0.8	( 0.7)
22	<i>uneducated</i>	6.1	75.7	0.9	(29.3)
25	frivolous with money	5.8	70.9	1.1	( 6.0)
29	believe university unimportant	5.8	69.9	1.1	( 2.3)
9	disliked	5.8	64.2	1.0	(14.0)
5	rural	5.7	72.1	1.4	( 2.7)
6	<i>oppressed by others</i>	5.7	71.5	1.3	(20.0)
4	unambitious	5.6	64.6	1.2	(15.0)
3	old-fashioned	5.6	59.9	1.1	( 6.3)
20	often in trouble with the law	5.5	57.3	1.1	( 1.3)

which emerged from the semantic differential is an overwhelmingly negative image of an ostracized group that neither shares the work or success values of the enviroing society nor receives its material rewards. The spontaneous descriptions of the Indians shown in Table 4.2 also caught up the lack of commitment to striving, particularly in the occupational sphere, their poverty, low level of education, and

TABLE 4.2. STEREOTYPE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300

Cat. No.	Traits	% N	Semantic Diff. Mean
1	lazy	30.3	(5.4)
18	uneducated	29.3	(6.1)
12	poor	28.7	(6.3)
58	dirty	28.0	(5.3)
30	drunken	21.0	(5.4)
44	oppressed by others	20.0	(5.7)
6, 7	unambitious	15.0*	(5.6)
41	disliked by others	14.0*	(5.8)
52	shy, quiet	13.0*	( - )
2	incompetent work habits	12.7*	( - )
46	sad	11.4*	( - )

\*not part of stereotype

rejection by outsiders. As predicted, several characteristics which received a high level of endorsement on the structured instrument were not salient for respondents to the open-ended questionnaire. For example, when the idea was presented to them, 83% agreed that the Indians were quite or extremely likely to have large families. However, less than 1% voluntarily offered this observation. The open-ended respondents were somewhat more willing to make references to the Indians'

allegedly low hygienic standards and problems with alcohol. Perhaps the explanation lies in the subjects' perception of the instruments. While semantic differential respondents were unwilling to acquiesce to the stark adjectival scales, "drunken" and "dirty," the open-ended sample members did volunteer the same descriptive core surrounded with qualification and speculation concerning its etiology. The depiction of Indians as a reticent, unhappy people did not, of course, appear in the semantic differential sample results because respondents were not provided with these scales. Only 2% of the sample made reference to any physical characteristics which differentiate Indians from the rest of the population.

It is important that the traits included in those stereotypes to be examined for accuracy do not represent only a few subsamples. Tables 4.3 and 4.4 demonstrate that such is not the case. The subsample agreement with total sample Indian stereotype scales varies from 7 to 12 of the 12 groups. (Although only the semantic differential means are presented in the tables, the scales not followed by asterisks have also met the aforementioned criteria of consensuality.) Most of the variability in the structured instrument comes from low education and low socioeconomic status groups.<sup>1</sup> These groups

---

<sup>1</sup>Blishen's (1967) socioeconomic index was used to classify the occupation of the breadwinner in each respondent's family. An occupation's score is a function of the percentage distribution of education and income among its incumbents shown by 1961 census data. Scores of 60+ are regarded as upper-middle class, scores of 40-59 as lower-middle class, and scores of 39 and lower as working class. Farmers are dealt with as a separate subsample.

TABLE 4.3. STEREOTYPE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL,  
BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES

Traits	Subsample Means													Total Groups
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	
Not materialistic	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.8*	2.2	2.1	2.7*	2.5	1.9	2.8*	2.3	2.1	2.7*	8
Poor	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.1	6.5	6.2	6.0	6.3	6.6	6.1	6.3	6.6	6.0	12
Large families	6.2	6.0	6.3	6.2	6.3	5.9	6.1	6.2	6.1	6.1	6.3	6.2	6.0	12
Uneducated	6.1	6.1	6.0	5.8	6.3	6.0	5.8	6.0	6.4	5.8	6.1	6.3	5.6	12
Frivolous with money	5.8	5.9	5.7	5.6	6.0	5.8	5.3*	5.9	6.2	5.2*	6.0	6.1	5.8	10
University unimportant	5.8	5.6	5.9	5.9	5.7	5.4*	5.5	5.9	5.9	5.5	5.8	6.1	5.8	11
Disliked	5.8	5.6	5.8	5.9	5.7	5.3*	5.3*	5.9	5.8	5.5	5.9	5.8	5.5	10
Rural	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.8	5.4*	5.8	5.2*	5.8	6.0	5.3*	5.7	5.9	6.0	9
Oppressed by others	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.8	5.6	5.3*	5.0*	5.9	6.0	5.1*	5.8	6.3	5.6	9
Unambitious	5.6	5.7	5.6	5.5	5.7	5.8	5.2*	5.6	6.0	5.1*	5.7	5.9	5.3*	9
Old-fashioned	5.6	5.4*	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.5	5.4*	5.7	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.5	10
Often in trouble with the law	5.5	5.4*	5.5	5.5	5.4*	5.6	5.3*	5.5	5.5	5.3*	5.6	5.5	5.2*	7

\*Not part of stereotype.

- (1) Total Sample, N = 290
- (2) Males, N = 105
- (3) Females, N = 185
- (4) 15-24 years, N = 138
- (5) 25-49 years, N = 119
- (6) 50 years & over, N = 33
- (7) 2 years or less high school, N = 88
- (8) 3-5 years of high school, N = 132
- (9) 1 or more years university, N = 68
- (10) Blishen SES Score below 39.99, N = 64
- (11) Blishen SES Score 40-59.99, N = 104
- (12) Blishen SES Score 60+, N = 61
- (13) Farmers, N = 41

TABLE 4.4. STEREOTYPE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE,  
20% CRITERION LEVEL, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES

Traits	<u>Subsample Percentages</u>													Total Groups
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	
Lazy	30.3	32.5	29.0	26.7	34.1	30.3	29.2	30.6	31.7	28.7	29.6	28.6	36.1	12
Uneducated	29.3	27.4	30.6	31.3	28.9	24.2	12.4*	37.4	34.9	20.7	32.4	32.1	36.1	11
Poor	28.7	28.2	29.0	33.6	28.1	9.1*	21.3	33.3	28.6	29.9	24.1	41.1	25.0	11
Dirty	28.0	22.2	31.7	35.9	21.5	21.2	30.3	29.3	22.2	28.7	22.2	25.0	38.9	12
Drunken	21.0	23.1	19.7	26.7	16.3*	18.2*	24.7	19.0*	20.6	24.1	18.5*	19.6	22.2	8
Oppressed	20.0	20.5	19.7	22.1	19.3*	15.2	19.1*	19.7	22.2	18.4*	20.4	19.6	25.0	8

\*Not part of stereotype

- (1) Total sample, N = 300
- (2) Males, N = 117
- (3) Females, N = 183
- (4) 15-24 years, N = 131
- (5) 25-49 years, N = 135
- (6) 50 years and over, N = 33
- (7) 2 years or less high school, N = 89
- (8) 3-5 years high school, N = 147
- (9) 1 or more years university, N = 63
- (10) Blishen SES Score below 39.99, N = 87
- (11) Blishen SES Score 40-59.99, N = 108
- (12) Blishen SES Score 60+, N = 56
- (13) Farmers, N = 36



do not consider other traits as appropriate descriptions of Indians, but simply have a lower rate of stereotypy. In the case of the open-ended questionnaire, lack of agreement within any particular subsample is not so pronounced, in part because of the fewer number of traits involved. Respondents with two years or less high school again ascribe fewer traits than do those with a higher level of formal education. The lower level of agreement of the two older age categories in describing Indians as "drunken" or "oppressed by others" indicates that these characteristics reach the 20% criterion level in large measure because of the attribution of those 24 years and younger. In general, these two traits are clearly the least consensual. However, agreement by the 12 subgroups is never less than 15%. In view of the many studies discussed previously which adopted criterion levels of 10% or 11%, these traits will be retained within the operationally defined stereotype.

#### Ukrainians

The semantic differential and open-ended questionnaire stereotypes of the Ukrainians are shown in Tables 4.5 and 4.6, respectively.

The image of the Ukrainians derived from both instruments is an altogether different one from that of the downtrodden Indians. The stereotype is much more flattering. As expected, it is rather indefinite. The semantic differential means are very close to the cut-off points, and only two open-ended traits exceed the 20% criterion level. This

TABLE 4.5. STEREOTYPE OF THE UKRAINIANS,  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL,  
TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290

Cat. No.	Traits	Mean	% N in Ext. Cat.	Av. Dev.	% Open-Ended
2	religious	2.3	69.3	1.1	( 5.7)
10	not neglectful of children's needs	2.3	68.2	1.2	( 0.7)
18	<i>hardworking</i>	2.4	65.7	1.3	(29.0)
4	ambitious	2.4	65.2	1.3	( 9.7)
23	self-sufficient	2.4	63.7	1.1	( 0.0)
14	large families	5.5	55.0	1.1	( 1.3)

TABLE 4.6. STEREOTYPE OF THE UKRAINIANS, OPEN-ENDED  
QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300

Cat. No.	Traits	% N	Semantic Differential Mean
33	different culture	29.3	( - )
1	<i>hardworking</i>	29.0	(2-4)
37	cliquish	18.7*	(5.3)
54	uncouth	18.0*	( - )
38	warmth toward others	15.7*	( - )
31	old-fashioned	15.3*	(4.9)
46	happy	14.0*	( - )
10	thrifty	12.7*	(2.6)
21	strong family ties	12.0*	( - )
6,7	ambitious	9.7*	(2.4)

\*Not part of stereotype.

suggests that respondents had difficulty in differentiating this relatively assimilated group from the general population. Hardworking is the only overlapping trait. The Ukrainians are depicted as a contented people, clinging to some remnants of its European culture, and endeavoring to succeed in its

adopted country. There are overtones of the peasant imagery (uncouth, old-fashioned) which presumably made the Ukrainians the object of ridicule through the ethnic "humor" which circulated in the province several years ago. However, neither this nor any other ethnic group was described as stupid, the common denominator of the "Ukrainian jokes."

A description of the Ukrainian group by 32 respondents of Ukrainian descent is available for the open-ended questionnaire, and presented in Table 4.7. These people share the total sample's characterization of Ukrainians as a hardworking, old-fashioned group, with a different cultural background. They see themselves as honest, competent workers, and even more warm-hearted than outsiders do. Predictably, the adjectives cliquish (9.4%) and uncouth (0.0%) were not applied.

TABLE 4.7. STEREOTYPE OF THE UKRAINIANS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, UKRAINIAN SUBSAMPLE, N = 32

Cat. No.	Traits	% N
1	hardworking	43.8
33	different culture	31.3
38	warmth toward others	21.9
31	old-fashioned	15.6*
2	competent work habits	15.6*
27	honest	12.5*
52	talkative, extroverted	12.5*

\*Not part of stereotype.

Once again, the results from both instruments were scrutinized in order to determine the extent to which the stereotype for the total samples typifies those of the various

demographic subsamples. The subsample agreement on semantic differential traits ranges from 8 to 11 (Table 4.8). The youngest age category does not share 4 of the 6 traits. Therefore, the Ukrainian semantic differential stereotype is in fact the stereotype of those respondents 25 years of age and older. In the case of the open-ended questionnaire, the only failure of the 12 subsamples to unanimously ascribe the two traits comes again from the 15 to 24 age category, and from those with a rural background who fall, with a very few exceptions, into this same age group (Table 4.9). Hardworking, a trait which is least consensually assigned on the semantic differential, is in most instances well above the 20% level on the open-ended questionnaire. The description of the Ukrainians as prolific is the weakest of the 7 traits.

#### Hutterites

Table 4.10 presents the semantic differential Hutterite stereotype. The semantic differential stereotype of the Hutterites contains a very large number of traits with means quite divergent from the neutral "4," partly because this group is distinctly different in many respects from the containing population. The image is a positive one of a good-living, fundamentalist-religious people, who manage to practice to a significantly greater extent than most the generally approved values.

Table 4.11 shows the open-ended Hutterite stereotype. The number of traits that reach the 20% criterion level on the open-ended instrument is much smaller. All traits over

TABLE 4.8. STEREOTYPE OF THE UKRAINIANS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL,  
BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES

Traits	<u>Subsample Means</u>													Total Groups
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	
Religious	2.3	2.1	2.4	2.5	2.3	1.6	2.5	2.3	2.0	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.7*	11
Not neglect children	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.6*	2.1	1.9	2.3	2.4	2.0	2.5	2.4	2.0	2.2	11
Hardworking	2.4	2.2	2.5	2.9*	2.0	1.7	2.2	2.7*	2.2	2.6*	2.6*	2.2	2.5	8
Ambitious	2.4	2.3	2.5	3.0*	2.1	1.7	2.2	2.7*	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.2	2.7*	9
Self- sufficient	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.6*	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.4	11
Large families	5.5	5.5	5.4*	5.6	5.3*	5.5	5.3*	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.3*	5.5	5.5	8

\*Not part of stereotype

- (1) Total sample, N = 290
- (2) Males, N = 105
- (3) Females, N = 185
- (4) 15-24 years, N = 138
- (5) 25-49 years, N = 119
- (6) 50 years and over, N = 33
- (7) 2 years or less high school, N = 88
- (8) 3-5 years high school, N = 132
- (9) 1 or more years university, N = 68
- (10) Blishen SES Score below 39.99, N = 64
- (11) Blishen SES Score 40-59.99, N = 104
- (12) Blishen SES Score 60+, N = 61
- (13) Farmers, N = 41

TABLE 4.9. STEREOTYPE OF THE UKRAINIANS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE,  
BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES

Traits	<u>Subsample Percentages</u>													Total Groups
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	
Different culture	29.3	23.1	33.3	35.9	21.5	36.4	20.2	32.0	36.5	23.0	30.6	26.8	44.4	12
Hardworking	29.0	33.3	26.2	19.1*	36.3	39.4	33.7	25.2	31.7	27.6	32.4	32.1	13.9*	10

\*Not part of stereotype

- (1) Total Sample, N = 300
- (2) Males, N = 117
- (3) Females, N = 183
- (4) 15-24 years, N = 131
- (5) 25-49 years, N = 135
- (6) 50 years and over, N = 33
- (7) 2 years or less high school, N = 89
- (8) 3-5 years high school, N = 147
- (9) 1 or more years university, N = 63
- (10) Blishen SES Score below 39.99, N = 87
- (11) Blishen SES Score 40-59.99, N = 108
- (12) Blishen SES Score 60+, N = 56
- (13) Farmers, N = 36

TABLE 4.10. STEREOTYPE OF THE HUTTERITES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290

Cat. No.	Traits	Mean	% N in Ext. Cats.	Av. Dev.	% Open-Ended
2	<i>religious</i>	1.3	94.4	0.5	(23.7)
23	<i>self-sufficient</i>	1.5	89.1	0.7	( 8.3)
18	<i>hardworking</i>	1.7	87.7	0.8	(20.7)
12	<i>sober</i>	1.7	81.4	0.9	( 1.3)
25	<i>thrifty</i>	1.8	84.6	1.1	( 9.0)
20	<i>seldom in trouble with the law</i>	1.8	82.8	0.9	( 0.3)
28	<i>stable marriages</i>	1.8	82.1	0.9	( 0.0)
27	<i>seldom involved in fights</i>	2.0	76.7	1.1	( 1.3)
19	<i>healthy</i>	2.0	73.7	0.9	( 2.3)
15	<i>sexually moral</i>	2.1	74.6	1.1	( 4.7)
16	<i>mentally healthy</i>	2.3	65.6	1.1	( 0.3)
10	<i>not neglectful of children</i>	2.4	68.8	1.5	( 2.0)
5	<i>rural</i>	6.6	92.3	0.7	(13.3)
3	<i>old-fashioned</i>	6.5	90.2	0.8	(22.3)
14	<i>large families</i>	6.3	83.1	0.9	( 2.3)
21	<i>cliquish</i>	6.3	82.4	1.1	(42.3)
29	<i>believe university unimportant</i>	6.0	74.0	1.2	( 3.0)
9	<i>disliked</i>	5.6	58.2	1.1	( 3.7)

TABLE 4.11. STEREOTYPE OF THE HUTTERITES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300

Cat. No.	Traits	% N	Semantic Differential Mean
37	<i>cliquish</i>	42.3	(6.3)
36	<i>religious</i>	23.7	(1.3)
31	<i>old-fashioned</i>	22.3	(6.5)
1	<i>hardworking</i>	20.7	(1.6)
5	<i>communal social organization</i>	18.7*	( - )
52	<i>shy, quiet</i>	16.7*	( - )
3	<i>rural</i>	13.3*	(6.6)
32	<i>peculiar dress</i>	13.3*	( - )
33	<i>different culture</i>	12.7*	( - )
2	<i>competent work habits</i>	10.7*	( - )
20	<i>exclusive concern personal problems</i>	9.7*	( - )

\*Not part of stereotype.

20% also appear in the semantic differential stereotype. Some 19% of the open-ended subjects mentioned the Hutterites' communal social organization. "Cooperative" was included as a semantic differential scale to tap this dimension. However, since the respondents correctly recognized that "cooperative" and "competitive" are not logical opposites, the results were negative. The use of the term "pacifistic" was a second error that remained undetected until after the study was well underway. Respondents repeatedly asked for its definition. Once again, completely scattered responses resulted in a neutral mean. In fact, only those with a university education and Blisshen Socioeconomic Status scores above 60 applied "pacifistic" to the Hutterites. However, other subsamples agreed that the Hutterites are seldom involved in physical fights.

The lack of congruence between instruments appears to be an instance of respondents recognizing the appropriateness of adjectival scales which were provided, but unable to volunteer detailed information about the group. Some 14% of the open-ended sample left the Hutterite section blank. It is more probable to suppose that this segment was ignorant, rather than reluctant to offer their impressions of the Hutterites.

Tables 4.12 and 4.13 are included in order to examine the extent of subsample agreement with the total sample stereotypes of the Hutterites. Consensus on the semantic differential traits is very high. Only 2 of the 18 scales



TABLE 4.12. STEREOTYPE OF THE HUTTERITES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL,  
BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES

Traits	Subsample Means													Total Groups	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)		
Religious	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.2	12
Self-sufficient	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.7	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.3	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.7	12
Hardworking	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.9	1.6	1.4	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.8	12
Sober	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.9	12
Thrifty	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.5	2.3	1.7	1.3	2.3	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.8	12
Seldom trouble with law	1.8	1.5	1.9	2.0	1.5	1.4	1.9	1.8	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.4	1.4	2.3	12
Stable marriages	1.8	2.0	1.7	1.9	1.6	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.5	1.5	2.0	12
Seldom fight	2.0	1.6	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.6	2.2	1.9	1.8	2.1	1.9	1.7	1.7	2.4	12
Healthy	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.2	1.8	1.7	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.2	2.0	1.9	1.9	2.1	12
Sexually moral	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.3	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.1	12
Mentally healthy	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.5	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.2	12
Not neglect children	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.7*	2.4	2.1	3.1*	2.3	2.3	2.3	1.9	10
Rural	6.6	6.6	6.5	6.6	6.4	6.6	6.2	6.7	6.8	6.3	6.5	6.9	6.9	6.6	12
Old-fashioned	6.5	6.1	6.7	6.6	6.4	6.2	6.5	6.4	6.5	6.3	6.6	6.4	6.4	6.6	12
Large families	6.3	6.0	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.0	6.1	6.3	6.3	6.0	6.3	6.4	6.4	6.2	12
Cliquish	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.1	6.3	6.9	6.1	6.3	6.5	6.0	6.5	6.5	6.5	5.9	12
University unimportant	6.0	5.9	6.0	5.9	6.2	5.7	5.9	6.0	6.1	6.0	5.9	6.3	6.3	5.6	12
Disliked	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.5	5.6	5.2*	5.7	5.9	5.3*	5.6	5.8	5.8	5.4*	9

\*Not part of stereotype

N = 56

- (1) Total sample, N = 290
- (2) Males, N = 105
- (3) Females, N = 185
- (4) 15-24 years, N = 138
- (5) 25-49 years, N = 119
- (6) 50 years and over, N = 33
- (7) 2 years or less high school, N = 88
- (8) 3-5 years high school, N = 132
- (9) 1 or more years university, N = 68
- (10) Blishen SES Score below 39.99, N = 64
- (11) Blishen SES Score 40-59.99, N = 104
- (12) Blishen SES Score 60+, N = 61
- (13) Farmers, N = 41

TABLE 4.13. STEREOTYPE OF THE HUTTERITES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE,  
BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES

Traits	Subsample Percentages													Total Groups
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	
Cliquish	42.3	40.2	43.7	48.1	36.3	42.4	39.3	46.9	36.5	39.1	49.1	32.1	50.0	12
Religious	23.7	17.1*	27.9	30.5	17.0*	24.2	16.9*	25.2	30.2	19.5	15.7*	39.3	33.3	8
Old-fashioned	22.3	15.4*	26.8	30.5	14.8*	18.2*	14.6*	25.9	25.4	28.7	19.5	19.7	25.0	8
Hardworking	20.7	17.9*	22.4	13.0*	25.9	30.3	11.2*	20.4	34.9	17.2*	20.4	32.1	11.1*	7

\*Not part of stereotype

- (1) Total sample, N = 300  
 (2) Males, N = 117  
 (3) Females, N = 183  
 (4) 15-24 years, N = 131  
 (5) 25-49 years, N = 135  
 (6) 50 years and over, N = 33  
 (7) 2 years or less high school, N = 89  
 (8) 3-5 years high school, N = 147  
 (9) 1 or more years university, N = 63  
 (10) Blishen SES Score below 39.99, N = 87  
 (11) Blishen SES Score 40-59.99, N = 108  
 (12) Blishen SES Score 60+, N = 56  
 (13) Farmers, N = 36

("disliked," "not neglectful of the needs of their children") did not receive complete subsample assent. In both instances, the deviant categories are again those lowest in education and socioeconomic status. Although the mean is very close to the cut-off point, those with a rural background do not regard the Hutterites as being disliked by outsiders. Open-ended subsample agreement is less satisfactory. The descriptions of Hutterites by males and the least educated exclude three of the four total sample traits. However, the three traits are part of the semantic differential stereotype for these same subsamples.

#### People Like Me

The last section of both stereotype measurement instruments required respondents to describe "People Like Me." The order of presentation was not randomized because it was felt that some respondents resentful of this intrusion might abandon the task altogether. Approximately 7% of the open-ended respondents did refuse to describe themselves.

Table 4.14 gives the semantic differential stereotype of "People Like Me." Understandably enough, the semantic differential traits are all flattering. In fact, the results may reflect less a candid self-portrait than the social desirability factor run rampant. Even if the scales indicate traits respondents approve rather than possess, the continuing viability of the Protestant Ethic and Judeo-Christian morality is interesting. Such self-description characterizes even

TABLE 4.14. STEREOTYPE OF PEOPLE LIKE ME, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290

Cat. No.	Traits	Mean	% N in Ext. Cats.	Av. Dev.
26	clean	1.5	91.3	0.6
20	seldom in trouble with law	1.5	88.9	0.7
27	seldom involved in fights	1.6	86.4	0.8
16	mentally healthy	1.8	84.4	0.8
19	healthy	1.8	82.7	0.8
10	not neglectful of children	2.0	78.5	1.0
4	ambitious	2.1	71.6	0.8
29	believe university important	2.2	75.0	1.4
22	educated	2.2	73.9	0.8
23	self-sufficient	2.2	71.7	1.1
3	up-to-date	2.2	71.1	1.0
18	hardworking	2.2	70.1	0.8
15	sexually moral	2.2	68.9	1.2
12	sober	2.2	66.7	1.1
28	stable marriages	2.4	64.9	1.4
5	urban	2.5	65.5	1.6

young people, who are supposed to have rejected the traditional values.

Table 4.15 presents the open-ended questionnaire sample's perception of "People Like Me." Although the open-ended descriptions do make provision for ambition and hard work, the major emphasis is upon the relatedness of self to others. Nearly half the subjects made it clear that they were good to their fellow man. The preoccupation with happiness and with introversion-extroversion mitigates the traditional ethos.

The primary purpose in asking people to describe themselves was to provide a comparative baseline for their description of other groups. If respondents had simply ascribed their own (or approved) traits to liked groups and

TABLE 4.15. STEREOTYPE OF PEOPLE LIKE ME, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300

Cat. No.	Trait	% N
38	warmth toward others	43.3
46	happy	21.3
52	shy, quiet	17.0*
50	high emotionality	16.7*
6,7	ambitious	15.0*
20	intellectual interests	13.3*
2	competent work habits	12.3*
52	extroverted, talkative	11.7*
55	physically active	11.7*
51	humble	10.7*
21	strong family ties	10.7*
1	hardworking	10.3*

\*Not part of stereotype.

the opposite of these traits to disliked groups, this would constitute solipsism rather than stereotypy. It is a matter of some importance that the perceptions of the three stimulus groups differentiate these groups from people in general and from one another. Accordingly, the extent of the commonality between subsample self traits and stereotypes was calculated.

Table 4.16 shows that the measured stereotypes are not simply conglomerate *we-them* descriptions. Own characteristics provide some points of reference for the formation of impressions of other groups. However, with the exception of the Hutterites, this factor accounts for little more than a quarter of the traits. A higher percentage of overlap between self and other characteristics occurs with the semantic differential than with the open-ended questionnaire. Some degree of commonality is inevitable in view of the small pool

TABLE 4.16. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STEREOTYPES OF PEOPLE LIKE ME  
AND ETHNIC CATEGORIES, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES

Sample	Semantic Differential											
	Indians				Ukrainians				Hutterites			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Total sample	6	0	10	6	0	4	12	2	3	10	3	5
Males	8	0	7	7	0	6	9	4	3	8	4	8
Females	5	0	10	8	0	4	11	1	2	10	3	6
15-24 years	5	0	9	6	0	3	11	1	2	9	3	7
25-49 years	8	0	10	7	0	8	10	2	3	10	5	5
50 years and over	7	0	12	4	0	8	11	4	2	11	6	7
2 years or less HS	1	0	14	3	0	3	12	2	2	10	3	5
3-5 years high school	5	0	10	8	0	2	13	2	2	10	3	6
1 or more yrs. univ.	11	0	6	8	0	3	14	3	3	10	4	7
Farmers	2	0	13	7	0	4	11	3	1	11	3	6
Blishen below 39.99	3	0	13	3	0	4	12	3	2	10	4	5
Blishen 40-59.99	9	0	7	9	0	3	13	1	3	10	3	5
Blishen 60+	8	0	9	8	0	6	11	3	3	11	3	6
Total	78	0	130	84	0	58	150	31	31	130	47	78
Per cent	26.7	0	44.5	28.8	0	24.3	62.8	12.9	10.8	45.5	16.4	27.3

TABLE 4.16 (continued)

Sample	Open-Ended Questionnaire											
	Indians				Ukrainians				Hutterites			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Total sample	4	1	6	6	0	5	6	5	1	3	7	8
Males	3	0	3	7	0	3	3	6	0	2	4	10
Females	5	2	6	7	3	5	5	8	1	3	9	10
15-24 years	4	3	6	8	1	3	9	9	1	5	7	11
25-49 years	5	1	3	8	0	4	5	6	1	3	5	10
50 years and over	3	2	7	7	1	4	7	7	1	3	8	8
2 years or less HS	3	0	5	7	0	4	4	4	1	1	6	7
3-5 years high schl.	4	3	5	9	1	4	7	10	2	3	7	11
1 or more yrs. univ.	5	1	12	10	2	5	11	7	5	5	8	8
Farmers	3	1	8	12	2	5	5	7	1	6	5	13
Blishen below 39.99	2	3	4	7	0	2	7	8	0	2	7	8
Blishen 40-59.99	5	2	5	6	1	5	6	6	1	2	9	9
Blishen 60+	4	1	9	8	3	5	6	7	2	5	7	10
Total	50	20	79	102	14	54	81	90	17	43	89	123
Per cent	19.9	8.0	31.5	40.6	5.9	22.6	33.9	37.7	6.3	15.8	32.7	45.2

- (1) Traits assigned to ethnic group the opposite of traits assigned to People Like Me.
- (2) Traits assigned to ethnic group the same as traits assigned to People Like Me.
- (3) Traits assigned to People Like Me that are not assigned to ethnic group.
- (4) Traits assigned to ethnic group that are not assigned to People Like Me.

of traits provided by the structured instrument. Neither the Indians nor the Hutterites are accorded intimate acceptance on the social distance scales. Most of the antonyms of self traits ascribed to the Indians occur within the area of work behavior. The characteristics shared with the Hutterites fall into the sphere of approved moral-ethical behavior. The opposites of these traits are not assigned to the Indians. Further, approximately 70% of the stereotype traits are different from those utilized in self description. Clearly, out-group stereotyping is more complex than the assignment of same self characteristics to liked groups and their opposites to disliked groups.

If different traits and different combinations of traits are used to describe the three stimulus groups rather than the same traits assigned across the board to all out-groups, this provides further evidence of differentiation. In other words, the content of a given stereotype should be reasonably selective. The semantic differential stereotypes of the Indians, Ukrainians and Hutterites include a total of 36 traits. Only one trait (large families) is assigned to all three groups. Eight traits are jointly applied to two groups, and 17 to only one group. The open-ended questionnaire resulted in a total of 12 traits above the 20% criterion level for all three groups. The only trait ascribed to more than one group is "hardworking" to the Hutterites and Ukrainians, and its opposite, "lazy," to the Indians.

Both the assignment of a large proportion of traits to



stimulus groups which are not contiguous with self traits and the variation of traits between groups results in the conclusion that these percepts are in fact stereotypes, i.e., measures of assigned difference.

The stereotypes of the Indians, Ukrainians and Hutterites will be tested for accuracy. Since the remaining categories are essentially "filler groups," only their operationally defined stereotypes will be presented in the body of this chapter. Subsample amount and degree of stereotypy will receive some attention in Chapter 5.

#### Jews

The stereotype literature contains only one reference to the Indians (Snider, 1962)<sup>2</sup> and none to the Ukrainians or Hutterites. Since the image of the Jews has often been measured, this ethnic group was included for validation purposes. Table 4.17 presents the semantic differential Jewish stereotype and Table 4.18 presents the open-ended Jewish stereotype.

Open-ended respondents showed more reluctance to describe the Jews than any other group. Some 20% refused to do so. (By comparison, only 4% did not describe the Indians.) Similarities exist between the Jewish and Ukrainian stereotypes. Both are viewed as hardworking, ambitious, exclusive

---

<sup>2</sup>Snider (1962) employed semantic differential scales to measure the stereotypes of a sample of ninth-grade Alberta pupils. The Indians were evaluated near the neutral "4" position on the ten adjectival scales, including the two scales common to the present study ("hardworking" and "clean").

TABLE 4.17. STEREOTYPE OF THE JEWS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290

Cat. No.	Traits	Mean	% N in Ext. Cats.	Av. Dev.
2	religious	1.7	87.6	0.8
4	ambitious	1.7	86.1	0.9
23	self-sufficient	1.8	82.7	0.8
7	shrewd in dealing with other groups	1.9	78.9	1.1
10	not neglectful of children's needs	1.9	78.5	1.0
5	urban	2.0	78.2	1.2
18	hardworking	2.0	76.4	0.9
25	thrifty with money	2.2	74.6	1.1
22	well educated	2.2	71.3	1.0
26	clean	2.2	71.3	1.0
11	<i>rich</i>	2.3	68.9	1.0
8	contributing to country	2.4	67.8	1.2
16	mentally healthy	2.4	59.8	1.0
29	believe university important	2.5	68.5	1.4
21	<i>cliquish</i>	6.1	77.7	1.0
17	competitive	5.9	73.7	1.2
1	materialistic	5.9	73.6	1.2

TABLE 4.18. STEREOTYPE OF THE JEWS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300

Cat. No.	Traits	% N
12	<i>rich</i>	30.3
37	<i>cliquish</i>	26.7
4	businessmen	22.0
36	religious	19.3*
10	thrifty	12.7*
33	different culture	12.3*
2	competent work habits	11.7*
28	shrewd in dealing with others	11.3*
43	dominates others	10.0*
38	warmth toward others	9.7*

\*Not part of stereotype.

groups. However, the Jews have already attained success, while the Ukrainians are still attempting to succeed. The overlap between instruments at the 20% level is two traits, and at the 10% level, five traits.

Table 4.19 juxtaposes the above results with the fairly recent studies of Karlins, et al. (1969) and Ehrlich and Rinehart (1965). The first paper employed the checklist method to compare the content of Princeton student stereotypes in 1967 with those collected by Gilbert (1951) and Katz and Braly (1933). (To save space, only the 1933 and 1967 results have been herein employed.) The work of Ehrlich and Rinehart (1965) is of particular interest in this context since they used both checklist and open-ended instruments. However, the comparative utility of both studies is limited by the fact that university student samples were used. It should also be emphasized that this ethnic group is being described within the framework of different geographical areas and varying Jewish population densities. Table 4.19 lists the Jewish open-ended traits above the 10% level to facilitate comparison with the lower consensual criteria adopted by these researchers. Similarly, semantic differential traits are discussed in terms of percentage agreement in the two extreme categories adjacent to the mean, rather than the means themselves. This device is reasonably close to the usual method of checklist scoring.

Common to all the studies is the "Shylock" image of the Jews--their concern with accumulating wealth through both

TABLE 4.19. COMPARISON OF JEWISH STEREOTYPE TRAITS WITH PREVIOUS STUDIES,  
& SAMPLE AGREEMENT

Traits	Present Study		Ehrlich and Rinehart*		Karlins, et al.**	
	Semantic Differential	Open-Ended	Checklist	Open-Ended	Checklist	Checklist
Religious	86.7	19.3	44.7	20.0	12.0	7.0
Ambitious	86.1	-	50.6	-	21.0	48.0
Self-sufficient	82.7	-	-	-	-	-
Shrewd	78.9	11.3	61.2	15.3	79.0	30.0
Not neglectful of children	78.5	-	57.6	23.5	15.0	19.0
Urban	78.2	-	-	-	-	-
Hardworking	76.4	-	68.2	42.4	48.0	33.0
Thrifty	74.6	12.7	20.0	15.3	49.0	15.0
Well-educated	71.3	-	-	-	-	-
Clean	71.3	-	-	-	-	-
Rich	68.9	30.3	-	28.2	-	-
Contributing to country	67.8	-	-	-	-	-
Mentally healthy	59.8	-	-	-	-	-
Believe university important	68.5	-	-	-	-	-
Cliquish	77.7	26.7	57.6	23.5	15.0	19.0
Competitive	73.7	-	16.5	-	34.0	17.0
Materialistic	73.6	-	41.2	-	-	46.0
Businessmen	-	22.0	-	-	-	-
Different culture	-	12.3	42.4	-	-	-
Competent work habits	-	11.7	-	-	-	-
Dominates others	-	10.0	37.6	-	12.0	23.0
Warmth toward others	-	9.7	18.8	11.8	-	-

\*Ehrlich and Rinehart (1965:570, Table 2)

\*\*Karlins, et al. (1969:5, Table 1)

assiduity and guile. Their alleged ethnocentrism is expressed through stressing both their family solidarity and exclusion of outsiders. The results of checklists are, of course, partially dependent on the choices given to respondents and all three studies made available somewhat different options. For instance, none of the others agree with the present finding of Jewish interest in, and achievement through education. However, they do report characterizations of Jews as intelligent. Sufficient congruence exists between the stereotypes of Jews as measured in this and previous research to lend reasonable confidence to the results.

#### School Teachers

Although the stereotype literature has devolved about ethnic categories, the master status of occupation plays an equally important role in everyday interaction. Very often people are more interested in discovering the work a man does than his ethnicity or his name. This piece of information allows prediction of the other's life-style, income and probable interests. Sociologists have shown much more concern with the relative status of occupations than with the cognitive substrata of their evaluation. However, the incumbents of various occupations have attempted to ascertain and engineer the images held by laymen.

A recurring theme in the professional journals of school teachers has been their failure to "properly" present themselves to consumers of education. Foff (1958:118), for example, ponders the admixture of status and cognitive image:

Are [teachers] esteemed by society as learned and devoted workers in the great tradition of Buddha, Socrates, and Aristotle? Or are they despised as rag-ends and tag-ends of the failure belt of unsalable males and unmarried females? Henry Adams eloquently wrote that 'A parent gives life, but as parent, gives no more. A murderer takes life, but his deed stops there. A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops.' The disgruntled sixth grader simply says, 'Teachers stink.'

Foff's (1958) content analysis of 62 American novels found that school teachers were depicted as unattractive, sexless, and mediocre citizens. The stereotype results of the present study (shown in Tables 4.20 and 4.21) were much kinder, perhaps because Canadians do not share the American anti-intellectual tradition.

TABLE 4.20. STEREOTYPE OF SCHOOL TEACHERS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290

Cat. No.	Traits	Mean	% N in Ext. Cats.	Av. Dev.
22	educated	1.6	92.4	0.7
29	believe university important	1.6	90.7	0.9
26	clean	1.7	89.3	0.7
23	self-sufficient	1.9	81.7	0.9
20	seldom in trouble with the law	1.9	80.3	0.8
27	seldom involved in fights	2.0	77.5	1.1
8	contributing to country	2.1	73.1	1.1
16	mentally healthy	2.2	74.7	0.9
19	healthy	2.2	71.6	0.9
10	not neglectful of children's needs	2.3	68.6	1.2
18	hardworking	2.4	60.9	1.0
4	ambitious	2.5	62.7	1.2

The image of teachers which emerges from the semantic differential is of a well-behaved middle-class group, which is interested in education. Apparently, they are still

TABLE 4.21. STEREOTYPE OF SCHOOL TEACHERS, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300

Cat. No.	Traits	% N
38	warmth toward others	37.3
43	dominates others	26.3
2	competent work habits	17.7*
51	proud	12.3*
18	educated	12.0*
16	intelligent	11.7*
20	intellectual interests	11.7*
38	coldness toward others	11.7*
1	hardworking	10.7*

\*Not part of stereotype.

expected to set an example for the rest of the community. For some reason, all 12 subsamples differentially applied the scale, "mentally healthy." Only two traits ("educated," "hardworking") recur between instruments at the 10% level. None overlap at the 20% level. In view of the fact that the semantic differential scales were tailored especially for ethnic groups, this finding is not unexpected. Although the spontaneous descriptions do make provision for teachers' intellectual proclivities, many respondents reacted to the task as an opportunity for ventilating their feelings about teacher-student relationships. The emotional tone is quite ambivalent. Nearly 40% mention the compassion and dedication of teachers toward those in their charge. Another large segment viewed them as cold, arrogant types who relish their power over helpless subordinates.

### Lawyers

In public at least, lawyers do not worry about their image to nearly the same extent as do the less professionalized educators. A recent study in the area of mass communications indicates that lawyers have little basis for complaint either about their popularity or depiction as television characters. De Fleur (1964) did a content analysis of televised portrayals of occupations for a random sample of 250 half-hour time periods. Occupations relating to the law comprised 128 out of 436 categories. (This included detectives, sheriffs, etc., as well as lawyers.) The next largest group was 43 (De Fleur, 1964:63). Lawyers were pictured as very clever, well-dressed, socially skilled, handsome, and "legally unorthodox" (De Fleur, 1964:71). The folk impressions measured in this study and presented in Tables 4.22 and 4.23, have much in common with those of script-writers. De Fleur and De Fleur (1967:789) state that because television conveys occupational stereotypes, it is guilty of adding to children's storehouse of faulty information. The degree of accuracy of occupational stereotypes could, of course, be put to empirical test.

Both instruments produced a detailed stereotype of a sophisticated, successful, if somewhat shady, group. Although "rich" is the only common trait at the 20% level, six characteristics overlap at the 10% level. The similarity between impressions of lawyers and Jews is marked. Both categories are viewed as excessively concerned with money and as



TABLE 4.22. STEREOTYPE OF LAWYERS, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL,  
TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290

Cat. No.	Traits	Mean	% N in Ext. Cats.	Av. Dev.
22	educated	1.2	97.6	0.3
29	believe university important	1.5	92.4	0.8
26	clean	1.5	91.3	0.6
11	<i>rich</i>	1.6	91.4	0.6
4	ambitious	1.6	90.7	0.7
23	self-sufficient	1.6	88.6	0.8
7	shrewd in dealing with others	1.8	85.5	1.0
5	urban	1.8	85.1	1.0
27	seldom involved in fights	1.8	80.4	1.0
3	up-to-date	1.9	80.3	0.8
20	seldom in trouble with the law	1.9	79.7	1.0
16	mentally healthy	2.0	77.5	0.8
18	hardworking	2.0	76.9	0.8
8	contributing to country	2.2	74.0	1.3
19	healthy	2.2	68.9	1.0
10	not neglectful of children's needs	2.4	68.1	1.3
1	materialistic	6.1	78.9	1.0
17	competitive	5.5	67.9	1.6

TABLE 4.23. STEREOTYPE OF LAWYERS, OPEN-ENDED  
QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300

Cat. No.	Traits	% N
12	<i>rich</i>	45.3
16	intelligent	24.0
18	well educated	18.0*
2	competent work habits	17.3*
38	warmth in dealing with others	17.3*
51	proud	16.7*
28	shrewd in dealing with others	15.3*
6,7	ambitious	13.4*
43	dominates others	12.3*
9	materialistic	12.0*
53	well-spoken	12.0*
13	contributing to community	11.7*
27	dishonest	10.7*
37	cliquish	10.3*
15	interested in politics	10.0*

\*Not part of stereotype.

effective manipulators of others.

Lower-Class People

Semantic differential and open-ended questionnaire stereotypes of "lower-class people" are shown in Tables 4.24 and 4.25, respectively. The category "lower-class people," which was left undefined, conveyed various connotations to the respondents. The two modal stimuli were respectable working-class people and skid-row types. The existence of the group as a meaningful category for description was denied by 1.3% of the open-ended sample.

TABLE 4.24. STEREOTYPE OF LOWER-CLASS PEOPLE,  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290

Cat. No.	Traits	Mean	% N in Ext. Cats.	Av. Dev.
14	large families	5.9	72.5	0.8
11	poor	5.9	66.9	0.8
22	uneducated	5.7	63.5	1.0

TABLE 4.25. STEREOTYPE OF LOWER-CLASS PEOPLE, OPEN-ENDED  
QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300

Cat. No.	Traits	% N
18	uneducated	34.0
12	poor	28.6
6,7	unambitious	20.2
38	warmth toward others	17.8*
58	dirty	17.2*
46	happy	16.2*
46	sad	13.1*
30	drunken	12.1*
54	uncouth	11.1*
24	large families	10.1*
25,26	immoral	9.8*

\*Not part of stereotype.

Only three semantic differential traits emerged, the smallest number produced for all ten categories. The content analysis of the free descriptions revealed two separate sorts of embroidery upon the basic fact of economic disadvantage. Some respondents pictured the lower class as an unfortunate people whose distress is caused by their own lack of moral backbone. Others held a romanticized image of a carefree people who possess little material wealth, but do not really want it anyhow. In general, the most highly educated and upper-middle-class subjects (Blishen Socioeconomic Status score 60+) tended to see failure within the people themselves. The less well educated and lower-middle-class respondents (Blishen Socioeconomic Status score 40-59.99) located the source of the lower-class plight in external situations beyond their control.

#### Women

A basic supposition of this study is that smooth interaction with an unfamiliar person is dependent on predictions made from perceived intersecting categorical identities. Sex is one such important datum. One would expect that the label "women" would remain somewhat ambiguous without further role specification: mothers, mothers-in-law, wives, objects of sexual pursuit, career women, and so on. Nonetheless, the respondents to this study expressed little reservation about the task of delineating the character of woman. Only 2% of the open-ended sample left this category undescribed. Tables 4.26 and 4.27 give the semantic differential and open-ended

stereotypes of "women in general."

TABLE 4.26. STEREOTYPE OF WOMEN, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL,  
TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290

Cat. No.	Traits	Mean	% N in Ext. Cats.	Av. Dev.
27	seldom involved in fights	1.6	87.2	0.8
26	clean	1.8	84.7	0.8
10	not neglectful of children's needs	2.1	79.6	1.1
20	seldom in trouble with the law	2.2	66.1	0.9
3	up-to-date	2.4	66.6	1.2
9	liked	2.5	61.8	1.3
4	ambitious	2.5	60.8	1.2
1	materialistic	5.5	74.3	1.3

TABLE 4.27. STEREOTYPE OF WOMEN, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE,  
TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300

Cat. No.	Traits	% N
38	warmth toward others	29.0
52	extroverted/talkative	27.9
50	high emotionality	25.6
32	fashion conscious	24.2
21	close family ties	22.9
6,7	ambitious	17.2*
59	attractive, sexy	16.2*
23	not neglectful of children's needs	14.8*
43	dominates others	13.5*
38	cold toward others	13.1*
2	competent work habits	11.8*
45	submission to others	9.8*

\*Not part of stereotype.

The semantic differential scales designed primarily for ethnic groups appear to have constrained subjects' presentation of their impression of this nonethnic category. However, the prominence given by the sample members to the female's lack of overt aggressiveness is congruent with the findings

of at least one other recent study (Horner, 1969).

Although the tendency is more obvious in the case of the open-ended questionnaire, both instruments describe traditional women, whose identity revolves about the relationship with men. They are either guardians of an established family or heeding the dictates of the fashion world in order to attract a man. Capricious emotionality is a trait often noted in the popular literature. The most frequently chosen open-ended image of women as socioemotional experts has its opposite in their depiction as feline operators. Female respondents were slightly more likely to dwell upon women's manipulation of others. In general, the image measured is very similar to Klein's (1950:8) nonempirical speculation on the stereotype of femininity.

#### Old People

The last stereotype to be discussed is that of the age category, elderly people. Tables 4.28 and 4.29 give the semantic differential and open-ended stereotypes of this group. Open-ended respondents, in particular, revealed the youth culture's pessimistic outlook on old age.

Both instruments produced the trait "old-fashioned." According to the semantic differential responses, the elderly are an upright, straitlaced lot. The open-ended image is a sad one of an unwanted group, which is physically and mentally impaired and living in the past. Those subjects 15 to 24 years of age were much more negative than were subjects in the older age groups. Nearly 31% of the youngest respondents

TABLE 4.28. STEREOTYPE OF OLD PEOPLE, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 290

Cat. No.	Traits	Mean	% N in Ext. Cats.	Av. Dev.
27	seldom involved in fights	1.6	87.2	0.8
20	seldom in trouble with the law	1.8	83.8	0.8
2	religious	1.9	84.2	0.9
15	sexually moral	2.3	69.8	1.2
28	stable marriages	2.3	65.5	1.2
10	not neglectful of children's needs	2.4	67.1	1.2
25	thrifty with money	2.5	63.1	1.2
12	sober	2.5	59.2	1.1
3	old-fashioned	6.0	74.7	0.9

TABLE 4.29. STEREOTYPE OF OLD PEOPLE, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLE, N = 300

Cat. No.	Traits	% N
38	warmth toward others	33.0
31	old-fashioned	31.7
17	impaired mental functioning	21.0
57	opinionated, stubborn	17.7*
56	physically ill	17.3*
55	physically inactive	16.0*
47	lonely	15.3*
34	"past" time orientation	15.3*
46	sad	15.0*
42	ignored by others	13.3*
45	preserves autonomy	13.0*
52	talkative	11.7*
17	wise	11.7*

\*Not part of stereotype.

described the elderly as senile, compared with 14% of those 25 to 49 years, and less than 10% of those 50 years and over. Similarly, 26% of the young respondents viewed the elderly as stubborn and opinionated, versus 10% in the middle age group, and 15% of those 50 and over.

Some support for the validity of the spontaneous

impressions is provided by the similar results reported by Drake (1957) for the traits "sick," "old-fashioned," "lonely," "opinionated," and "garrulous."

## CHAPTER 5

### AMOUNT AND DEGREE OF STEREOTYPY

This chapter will discuss the measurement and application of two indices of stereotyping behavior: the amount and degree of stereotypy. Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, and 5, which consider the relationship between education and stereotypy, will be tested. The comparative amounts of stereotypy exhibited by sex, age and socioeconomic subsamples are dealt with in an exploratory fashion. Finally, an attempt is made to determine some effects which the study sample's known departures from representativeness have on the nature of those stereotypes to be subsequently tested for accuracy.

#### Amount of Stereotypy

A method was required to compare the relative size of stimulus group stereotypes, i.e., the number of descriptive dimensions differentially ascribed to the nine social categories. Such a measure would make possible comparison of both the number of traits assigned to the various categories by the same sample, and number of traits assigned to the same categories by different samples. These purposes are served by an index termed "amount of stereotypy."

#### Measurement

Amount of stereotypy is a standardized measure of the number of traits consensually assigned by the total sample or subsamples to a given stimulus group, or to combinations of



stimulus groups. For both instruments, this variable is expressed in terms of the proportion of operationally defined stereotype traits to the total number of coded traits. In order to have been included in a particular stereotype (and in the numerator of this measure), a trait has met the previously discussed criteria of consensuality. The denominator is the total pool of characteristics available for differential assignment to a stimulus group, or groups. Because the bases differ, amount of stereotypy necessarily had to be calculated separately for the two stereotype measurement instruments.

In the case of the semantic differential, the numerator is composed of those adjectival scales with means equal to or less than 2.5, or equal to or greater than 5.5, average deviations equal to or less than 1.5, and 50% of the responses located in the two extreme categories adjacent to the mean, i.e., "1" and "2" or "6" and "7." Because the semantic differential presented respondents with 29 scales with which to describe each stimulus group, the denominator is 29 (or a multiple of 29).

The amount of stereotypy for semantic differential samples was calculated as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Amount of stereotypy for} \\ \text{one stimulus group} \end{array} = \frac{\text{Number of Traits}}{29}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Amount of ethnic} \\ \text{stereotypy} \end{array} = \frac{\text{Total Traits Assigned to} \\ \text{Indians, Ukrainians,} \\ \text{Hutterites and Jews}}{29 \times 4}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Amount of nonethnic} \\ \text{stereotypy} \end{array} = \begin{array}{l} \text{Total Traits Assigned to} \\ \text{Lawyers, Teachers,} \\ \text{Lower Class, Women and} \\ \text{Old People} \\ \hline 29 \times 5 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Overall amount of} \\ \text{stereotypy} \end{array} = \begin{array}{l} \text{Total Traits Assigned to 9} \\ \text{Groups} \\ \hline 29 \times 9 \end{array}$$

The derivation of amount of stereotypy from the open-ended questionnaire data presented a more complex problem. The fact that the traits resulted from a content analysis rather than a set of scales made the determination of size of the descriptive pool more difficult. Further, in order to explore adequately the stereotype content, two levels of consensus (10% and 20%) required separate consideration. The amount of stereotypy for a given stimulus group is the proportion of the number of stereotype traits which exceeded the 20% level of consensus (or the 10% level of consensus), to the base of the total coded attribute categories relevant to that group. For two reasons, the base varies slightly from one group to another. First, a small number of descriptive categories were included and coded exclusively for a single group. For example, "communal social organization" and "senile" have unique application to the Hutterites and Old People, respectively. Second, both alternatives of several traits were assigned sufficiently often to certain groups to be included as two possibilities in the base totals for those groups. For example, all groups were described to some degree as both "warm toward others" and "cold toward others."

The combined open-ended measures of amount of stereotypy parallel the above described semantic differential measures:

Amount of ethnic stereotypy	=	$\frac{\text{Total Traits Assigned to 4 Ethnic Categories}}{51 + 52 + 53 + 52}$
Amount of nonethnic stereotypy	=	$\frac{\text{Total Traits Assigned to 5 Nonethnic Categories}}{53 + 52 + 52 + 51 + 57}$
Overall amount of stereotypy	=	$\frac{\text{Total Traits Assigned to 9 Groups}}{473}$

Both chi-square and measures of association were employed to examine the relationships between amount of stereotypy and the various demographic variables. A statistically significant chi-square indicates only that a relationship exists between the variables. The relationship itself is not necessarily strong or theoretically important. Measures of association gauge the strength of the relationship. Gamma was chosen as that measure appropriate for ordinal data which lends itself to a proportional-reduction-in-error interpretation (Costner, 1965).

Costner interprets gamma as follows:

$$\gamma = \frac{n_s - n_d}{n_s + n_d}$$

where  $n_s$  is the probability that a pair of units randomly drawn from the cross-classification fall in the same order on both variables, i.e., the probability of a concordant pair,

and  $n_d$  is the probability that a pair of events randomly drawn from the cross-classification fall in opposite orders on the two variables, i.e., the probability of a discordant pair (Costner, 1965:346).

The value of gamma represents the proportional reduction in variance made possible by the existence of the relationship. More specifically, the gamma-value indicates the proportion by which error in estimating the order of pairs of units can be reduced by substituting the estimation rules outlined above for random prediction (Costner, 1965:347).

The utility of this particular measure of association is limited by the fact that gamma cannot take tied rankings into consideration. Where many ties existed, gamma could not be computed. Further, it must be emphasized that the relatively small cell frequencies call for caution in the interpretation of absolute gamma values.

### Total Samples

Table 5.1, which presents the amount of stereotypy exhibited by the total samples, is included primarily as a point of reference for the subsample comparisons to be discussed below. However, several general observations are in order. The size of a particular stereotype is a function of *inter alia* both the clarity of the perceived differences between that group and the containing population, and the instrument with which it was measured. For example, the relatively high rate of stereotypy for lawyers and the relatively low rate for Ukrainians across instruments indicates something of the degree of elaborateness of the images

TABLE 5.1. AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL  
AND OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, TOTAL SAMPLES

Stimulus Groups	Instruments		
	Semantic Differential N = 290	Open-Ended 20% Level N = 300	Open-Ended 10% Level N = 300
Indians	.414	.118	.216
Ukrainians	.207	.038	.192
Hutterites	.621	.075	.226
Jews	.586	.058	.192
Teachers	.414	.038	.170
Lawyers	.621	.038	.289
Lower Class	.103	.058	.212
Women	.276	.098	.235
Old People	.310	.053	.246
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.395	.063	.220
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.457	.072	.207
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.345	.057	.230

of these *vis-à-vis* other stimulus groups. However, the fact that the semantic differential rate of ethnic stereotypy is considerably higher than the rate of nonethnic stereotypy partially reflects an artifact of this technique. Since the primary purpose was to gather ethnic stereotypes, priorities were such that an insufficient variety of adjectival scales were apparently provided for nonethnic group description. The category of Old People is a good illustration of the emergence of a more detailed stereotype under the freedom afforded by the open-ended questionnaire.

The proportions for the open-ended instrument are much smaller than the comparable semantic differential figures. The fact that the amount of stereotypy is generally higher in the case of the semantic differential has little significance because of the different nature of the two instruments and the

divergencies in their analyses. An important reason for the relatively small open-ended rates is the large denominators which resulted from the decision to exclude very little from the initial content analysis. Therefore, comparison of subsample stereotypy rates are meaningful within but not between instruments.

### Education

The relationship between education and amount of stereotypy is reported in Tables 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that as the amount of formal education increased, the amount of stereotypy of stimulus groups would decrease. This expectation is not supported by the findings. In fact, just the opposite relationship emerged: as the amount of education increased, the amount of stereotypy increased. The chi-square relationship on the open-ended questionnaire at both 10% (Table 5.3) and 20% (Table 5.4) criterion levels is significant at the .001 level. The association detected by chi-square is a strong one ( $\gamma = -.94$ , and  $-.80$  for 10% and 20% cut-off points respectively). Although the semantic differential relationship is in the same direction as the open-ended results, it does not reach significance until the .10 level. A large number of tied rankings ruled out the computation of gamma for the three semantic differential education subsamples. However, the relationship between amount of education and the two extreme education subsamples is very strong ( $\gamma = -.96$ , Table 5.2). Thus, null hypothesis 2 of no relationship between education

TABLE 5.2. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Stimulus Groups	Educational Level		
	(1) 2 Years or Less High School N = 88	(2) 3-5 Years High School N = 132	(3) 1 or More Years University N = 68
Indians	.138	.448	.655
Ukrainians	.241	.138	.310
Hutterites	.586	.621	.689
Jews	.621	.586	.759
Teachers	.586	.414	.414
Lawyers	.586	.655	.655
Lower Class	.103	.103	.138
Women	.310	.276	.310
Old People	.276	.276	.310
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.383	.391	.471 <sup>a</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.397	.448	.603 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.372	.345	.366 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .10$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .01$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .90$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1, 2, 3, high proportion ties.

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.80$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3, high proportion ties.

Gamma, total categories, columns 1 and 3 =  $-.96$ .

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-1.00$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-.80$ .

TABLE 5.3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 10% LEVEL

Stimulus Groups	Educational Level		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	2 Years or Less High School N = 89	3-5 Years High School N = 147	1 or More Years University N = 63
Indians	.196	.294	.294
Ukrainians	.154	.269	.308
Hutterites	.170	.283	.302
Jews	.115	.231	.250
Teachers	.094	.226	.283
Lawyers	.212	.385	.365
Lower Class	.173	.269	.250
Women	.235	.294	.314
Old People	.193	.316	.316
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.171	.285	.298 <sup>a</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.159	.269	.288 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.181	.298	.306 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Chi-square,  $p < .001$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>b</sup> Chi-Square,  $p < .01$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.94$ .

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-1.00$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.80$ .

Gamma, total categories, columns 1 and 3 =  $-1.00$ .

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-1.00$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-1.00$ .



TABLE 5.4. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 20% LEVEL

Stimulus Groups	Educational Level		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	2 Years or Less High School N = 89	3-5 Years High School N = 147	1 or More Years University N = 63
Indians	.078	.098	.196
Ukrainians	.038	.096	.058
Hutterites	.019	.094	.113
Jews	.000	.077	.058
Teachers	.038	.038	.038
Lawyers	.019	.096	.096
Lower Class	.038	.058	.077
Women	.039	.118	.118
Old People	.035	.088	.053
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.034	.085	.093 <sup>a</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.034	.091	.106 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.034	.080	.075 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .001$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .02$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .10$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.80$ .

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.80$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = high proportion ties.

Gamma, total categories, columns 1 and 3 =  $-1.00$ .

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-1.00$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-1.00$ .

and amount of stereotypy is rejected.

Research hypothesis 4 was stated as follows:

As amount of education increases, the within-category difference between amount of stereotypy of ethnic and nonethnic stimulus groups will increase, with stereotypy of ethnic groups decreasing and stereotypy of nonethnic groups increasing.

It was expected that within the general pattern of low education-high stereotypy (since disconfirmed), those with more formal education would exhibit a greater amount of nonethnic stereotypy, and a lesser amount of ethnic stereotypy than would their less well educated counterparts. The within-category difference between rates of ethnic and nonethnic stereotypy does indeed increase as education level increases for the semantic differential and open-ended (20% level) samples. However, the relationships between education and amount of ethnic/nonethnic stereotypy were not those predicted. Semantic differential rates of nonethnic stereotypy remain stable across education subsamples, while amount of ethnic stereotypy increases with years of formal schooling (Table 5.2). The 20% level open-ended rates of ethnic stereotypy also rise with increasing education (Table 5.4). The amount of nonethnic stereotypy shows a jump from the low (.034) to middle education category (.080), and then a slight drop for those with one or more years of university (.075). The between-category differences in the amount of ethnic and nonethnic stereotypy does not increase across education levels in the case of the 10% level open-ended results, since both ethnic and nonethnic stereotypy rates are positively

related to amount of education (Table 5.3).

The most important result is the unexpected positive relationship between amount of ethnic stereotypy and amount of education. This relationship is statistically significant at better than the .05 level for all three measures. Further, the measures of association, which range between  $-.80$  and  $-1.00$ , indicate that the relationship detected by chi-square is an almost perfect one. When the amount of ethnic stereotypy of those with two years or less high school is compared with that of university graduates, chi-square is significant at .01 level for the semantic differential data, and at the .001 level for open-ended data at both 10% and 20% cut-off points. The respective gamma values are  $-1.00$ ,  $-1.00$  and  $-.95$ . (These data for university graduates are not shown on the tables.)

It was initially predicted that more highly educated people would exhibit a higher rate of stereotypy toward non-ethnic groups since this type of categorization has seldom been a sensitive issue. The results are mixed. The semantic differential relationship was clearly nonsignificant. However, a positive relationship between amount of nonethnic stereotypy and amount of education reached significance at the .01 level for open-ended (10%) data, and .10 level for open-ended (20%) data. Because of the large number of ties, gamma across the three education subsamples could be computed only for the open-ended (10%) data. However, when amount of non-ethnic stereotypy was considered in relation to those with

two years or less high school and those with one or more years of university, a strong positive ordinal association was discovered in all three sets of data. When the lowest education subsample is compared with university graduates, the gamma value is stable at  $-.80$  for the semantic differential, and  $-1.00$  for both open-ended criterion levels.

In summary, amount of ethnic stereotypy increases with education on both instruments. A positive relationship between education and amount of nonethnic stereotypy was found with both sets of open-ended data. The semantic differential results show no significant difference between education subsamples in the amount of nonethnic stereotypy. However, when ordinality rather than frequencies is considered between education extremes, those with high education demonstrate more nonethnic stereotypy.

The interpretation of the foregoing semantic differential results is clarified by the examination of the scale checking response style of the education subsamples. Osgood, *et al.* (1958:226-27) reported that the better educated used the intermediary scale positions (2, 3, 5 and 6) relatively more frequently than the polar (1,7) or neutral (4) positions. The less well educated demonstrated the opposite response styles.

The relationship between education and scale preferences is given in Table 5.5.

Since all three relationships attained significance at the  $.001$  level, the results of the present study confirm the

TABLE 5.5. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE PREFERENCE

Scales	Education Categories					
	(1) 2 Years or Less High School N = 88		(2) 3-5 Years High School N = 132		(3) 1 or More Years University N = 68	
	#	%	#	%	#	% <sup>a</sup>
1 + 7	10,301	40.5	11,391	29.8	6,683	34.1 <sup>a</sup>
4	4,027	15.8	6,904	18.1	2,684	13.7 <sup>a</sup>
2,3,5,6	11,129	43.7	19,891	52.1	10,240	52.2 <sup>a</sup>
Total	25,457	100.0	38,186	100.0	19,607	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .001$ , one-tailed, d.f. = 1 (columns 1 & 3).

observation of Osgood and his coworkers. Semantic differential scales were operationally defined as part of a stereotype when the means deviated from the neutral "4" position. The scale-checking response style of the less well educated operates in the direction of producing a greater amount of stereotypy. Thus, the positive relationship between amount of ethnic stereotypy and educational level resulted despite this effect.

On the other hand, one would expect some association between amount of stereotypy and level of education to emerge from the advantage presented by the open-ended questionnaire to those more accustomed to expressing their thoughts in written form. Although the instructions requested respondents to list ten characteristics for each stimulus group, there was a difference between education subsamples in sheer output

of words. Table 5.6 reports the median number of words employed by education subsamples in their description of each category. (The median was chosen rather than the mean because extreme values introduce distortion in the latter.)

TABLE 5.6. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND MEDIAN NUMBER OF WORDS USED IN OPEN-ENDED DESCRIPTION

Stimulus Groups	Education Categories		
	(1) 2 Years or Less High School N = 89	(2) 3-5 Years High School N = 147	(3) 1 or More Years University N = 63
Indians	11.00	11.00	12.00
Ukrainians	10.00	11.00	11.00
Hutterites	7.00	11.00	11.00
Jews	5.00	9.00	11.00
Teachers	10.00	11.00	12.00
Lawyers	6.00	8.00	11.00
Lower Class	11.00	11.00	11.00
Women	9.00	11.00	12.00
Old People	11.00	12.00	12.00

Gamma, columns 1 and 3, = 1.00

An inspection of this table indicates that fluency does increase with years of formal education. (The gamma value for the 3 X 3 table was not computed because there were five tied ranks.) This factor has some bearing on the finding that amounts of both ethnic and nonethnic stereotyping increase with years of schooling.

The data presented in Table 5.7 are closely related to those in Table 5.6. Table 5.7 shows the percentage of education subsamples that declined to describe each stimulus group on the open-ended questionnaire. The recorded percentages

TABLE 5.7. REFUSAL TO DESCRIBE STIMULUS GROUPS,  
BY EDUCATION, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

Stimulus Groups	Education Category					
	(1) 2 Years or Less High School N = 88 %		(2) 3-5 Years High School N = 147 %		(3) 1 or More Years University N = 63 %	
Indians	6.7	(0.0)	3.4	(0.0)	0.0	(0.0)
Ukrainians	13.4	(0.0)	10.9	(4.8)	4.8	(1.6)
Hutterites	13.4	(0.0)	12.2	(0.0)	17.4	(0.0)
Jews	22.5	(7.9)	22.4	(5.4)	11.1	(7.9)
Teachers	5.6	(1.1)	3.5	(1.4)	6.4	(1.6)
Lawyers	6.7	(0.0)	8.9	(4.8)	1.6	(0.0)
Lower Class	7.7	(3.3)	3.5	(1.4)	1.6	(1.6)
Women	3.3	(1.1)	1.4	(0.7)	3.2	(1.6)
Old People	1.1	(1.1)	0.0	(0.0)	3.2	(3.2)

Gamma, total groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = -.50.  
 Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = -.74.  
 Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = -.26.  
 Gamma, total groups, columns 1 and 3 = -.60.  
 Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 = -.80.  
 Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 = -.38.

combine those who left the space completely blank, along with those who offered some explanation for their noncompliance (e.g., "no comment," "the group is no different from Albertans generally," etc.). The proportion who held that a given stimulus group could not be differentiated from the general population was extracted from the total percentage and placed in parentheses.

An average of 14.0% of those with two years or less high school declined to describe the ethnic groups. The corresponding figure for nonethnic groups was 4.9%. In the case of the intermediate education subsample, an average 12.2% did

not provide nonethnic characterizations. For those with some university education, these averages dropped to 8.3% and 1.6% respectively. The association between high refusal and low education is quite strong for ethnic categories and slight for nonethnic categories.

Any interpretation of the data given in Table 5.7 is speculative. Presumably, the people who did not provide personal stereotypes include a mixture of those who were unmotivated toward or uncomprehending of the research task, those ignorant about certain stimulus categories, along with those who were unable or unwilling to give written expression to their opinions. It is reasonable to assume these factors to be associated with low education. The only exception might be reluctance to admit to beliefs concerning ethnic groups. (About 8% of both least and most highly educated subsamples took the trouble to indicate their belief that Jewish people are no different from Albertans generally.)

In summary, the nature of the open-ended instrument itself encouraged a higher amount of stereotyping from respondents with more years of formal schooling. Nevertheless, amount of ethnic stereotyping was found to be strongly related to higher education when instrument error worked both for it in the case of the semiprojective technique and against it in the case of the semantic differential. One may therefore conclude that the result has some validity.

The initial hypotheses held that the more highly educated would be least likely to stereotype ethnic groups.



Just the opposite was found to be true. Because the statement of directionality emerged from a sociology of knowledge argument rather than from a clearly formulated theory, the explanation of the empirical finding is problematic. Perhaps, categorical descriptions are gaining acceptability in a social environment of groups striving to preserve their cultural identities. Alternatively, an answer may be found in the proposition that the more educated are simply more accustomed to thinking in terms of abstract generalizations. An extension of such thought patterns to ethnic phenomena appears more likely when the pejorative label "stereotype" is not implicated. (The nature of the research appears to have been successfully disguised. Not one person volunteered the word "stereotype" in the many discussions that took place after the questionnaires had been completed.) Most important, however, is the contrast between the present finding and the repeatedly observed relationship between high education and low prejudice. The equation of stereotypy and prejudice becomes untenable. Further discussion of this point is offered in the following chapter.

The amount of stereotypy exhibited by sex, age, and socioeconomic status subsamples will be dealt with on a descriptive basis. Since previous research has not addressed itself to the issue, an exploratory treatment of comparative stereotypy should prove worthwhile. However, the utility of the following data is somewhat limited by the fact that only one variable is dealt with at a time. Because so little work

has been done in this area, it was impossible to forecast which variables needed to be controlled. The cumbersome nature of the raw data precluded rampant experimentation. Nonetheless, the analysis should suffice to indicate some probable effects which the study sample's known departures from representativeness have upon those stereotypes to be tested for accuracy.

### Sex

Tables 5.8 through 5.10 present the relationship between amount of stereotypy and sex.

In terms of frequencies, there is no significant difference between semantic differential sex subsamples in the amount of stereotypy exhibited (Table 5.8). When ordinality alone is considered, the overall gamma value of .60 indicates a modest association between males and amount of stereotypy. The male rate of ethnic stereotypy was higher in every case (gamma = 1.00). Three of the five nonethnic stereotypy rates were tied, with females high on the remainder.

Although females demonstrated a significantly greater amount of overall stereotypy on the open-ended (10%) questionnaire, the relationships between sex and both ethnic and nonethnic breakdowns are not statistically significant (Table 5.9). However, the ordinal measures of association between femaleness and amounts of ethnic and nonethnic stereotypy are perfect.

Table 5.10 indicates that the only relationship significant at the .05 level is that between nonethnic stereotypy

TABLE 5.8. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX AND AMOUNT OF  
STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Stimulus Groups	Sex Categories	
	Male N = 105	Female N = 185
Indians	.483	.448
Ukrainians	.345	.172
Hutterites	.655	.621
Jews	.759	.655
Teachers	.345	.448
Lawyers	.621	.621
Lower Class	.103	.103
Women	.207	.276
Old People	.310	.310
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.425	.406 <sup>a</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.560	.474 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.317	.352 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .70$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 1.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .30$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 1.

Gamma, total groups, = .60

Gamma, ethnic groups, = 1.00.

Gamma, nonethnic groups = high proportion ties.

TABLE 5.9. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY,  
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 10% LEVEL

Stimulus Groups	Sex Categories	
	Male N = 117	Female N = 183
Indians	.196	.275
Ukrainians	.173	.308
Hutterites	.226	.264
Jews	.173	.192
Teachers	.151	.208
Lawyers	.288	.288
Lower Class	.173	.231
Women	.216	.275
Old People	.158	.298 <sup>a</sup>
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.195	.260 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.192	.260 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.196	.260 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .02$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 1.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .20$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 1.

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .10$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 1.

Gamma, total groups = -1.00.

Gamma, ethnic groups = -1.00.

Gamma, nonethnic groups = -1.00.

TABLE 5.10. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 20% LEVEL

Stimulus Groups	Sex Categories	
	Male N = 117	Female N = 183
Indians	.118	.118
Ukrainians	.058	.058
Hutterites	.019	.094
Jews	.058	.058
Teachers	.019	.057
Lawyers	.038	.077
Lower Class	.058	.077
Women	.059	.118
Old People	.035	.088 <sup>a</sup>
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.051	.082 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.062	.082 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Non-ethnic Stereotypy	.042	.083 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .10$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 1.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .50$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 1.

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .05$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 1.

Gamma, total groups = -1.00.

Gamma, ethnic groups = high proportion ties.

Gamma, nonethnic groups = -1.00.

and the female category. The gamma values confirm these findings. The sexes tied on three of the four ethnic rates. Once again, a perfect relationship exists between femaleness and nonethnic stereotypy.

The important generalization to be drawn from the foregoing is the nonsignificant sex difference in amount of ethnic stereotypy. Although the gamma values indicate a strong relationship between amount of ethnic stereotypy and males on the semantic differential, and between amount of ethnic stereotypy and females on the open-ended (10%), these ordinal results mask small frequency differences.

Table 5.11 shows that these gamma values could possibly be the product of slightly different distributions of sexes in educational levels between the two instruments. In other words, more males with some university background completed the semantic differential. The percentage of females

TABLE 5.11. % SEX DISTRIBUTION IN EDUCATION  
SUBSAMPLES, BY INSTRUMENT

Education Category	Males		Females	
	Semantic Differential N = 105	Open- Ended N = 116	Semantic Differential N = 185	Open- Ended N = 182
2 yrs. or less HS	26.7	30.2	33.0	29.1
3-5 yrs. HS	29.5	37.1	55.1	57.2
1 or more yrs. university	43.8	32.7	11.9	13.7
Totals	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

who completed three to five years high school, or one or more years university is higher in the open-ended sample than in the semantic differential sample. Amount of ethnic stereotypy was positively associated with education on both instruments.

### Age

Tables 5.12, 5.13 and 5.14 present the relationships between age and amount of stereotypy.

The only significant relationship which emerges from the semantic differential sample (Table 5.12) is that between age and amount of ethnic stereotypy. The youngest age group exhibited a lower rate of ethnic stereotypy than did the two older subsamples whose rates are nearly identical. Because of the large proportion of tied rankings, the measure of association was not computed among the three age categories. However, when the stereotypy rates of those 15 to 24 years are compared with those 50 years and over, a perfect association between youth and stereotypy is found for both ethnic and nonethnic groups.

In comparison with the above noted semantic differential results, the open-ended questionnaire data disclose significant relationships between age and overall amount of stereotypy, and age and amount of nonethnic stereotypy (Table 5.13). The ethnic stereotypy chi-square does not attain significance until the .70 level. Moreover, the young age category exhibits the higher rate of stereotypy. As Table 5.14 indicates, the results for open-ended questionnaire data

TABLE 5.12. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Stimulus Groups	Age Categories		
	(1) 15-24 Years N = 138	(2) 25-49 Years N = 119	(3) 50 Years & Over N = 33
Indians	.379	.517	.379
Ukrainians	.069	.345	.414
Hutterites	.621	.621	.689
Jews	.483	.793	.759
Teachers	.483	.414	.621
Lawyers	.586	.655	.586
Lower Class	.103	.103	.103
Women	.276	.276	.310
Old People	.276	.310	.310
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.364	.448	.464 <sup>a</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.388	.569	.560 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.345	.352	.386 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .10$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .01$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .80$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = high proportion ties.

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = high proportion ties.

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = high proportion ties.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1 and 3 = -1.00.

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 = -1.00.

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 = -1.00.



TABLE 5.13. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 10% LEVEL

Stimulus Groups	Age Categories		
	(1) 15-24 Years N = 131	(2) 25-49 Years N = 135	(3) 50 Years & Over N = 33
Indians	.275	.255	.216
Ukrainians	.231	.192	.231
Hutterites	.302	.245	.208
Jews	.192	.154	.231
Teachers	.208	.113	.170
Lawyers	.346	.269	.212
Lower Class	.288	.212	.173
Women	.314	.294	.255
Old People	.333	.228	.228 <sup>a</sup>
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.277	.218	.214 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.250	.212	.221 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.298	.223	.208 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .05$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .70$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = .83.

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = .62.

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = .95.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1 and 3 = .96.

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 = .60.

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 = 1.00.

TABLE 5.14. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 20% LEVEL

Stimulus Groups	Age Categories		
	(1) 15-24 Years N = 131	(2) 25-49 Years N = 135	(3) 50 Years & Over N = 33
Indians	.137	.078	.059
Ukrainians	.058	.058	.077
Hutterites	.094	.038	.057
Jews	.038	.058	.038
Teachers	.038	.019	.075
Lawyers	.096	.019	.058
Lower Class	.096	.058	.038
Women	.118	.039	.078
Old People	.123	.035	.053
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.089	.044	.059 <sup>a</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.082	.058	.058 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.094	.038	.060 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .05$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .70$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .02$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = .52.

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = high proportion ties.

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 = .40.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1 and 3 = .80.

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 = .60.

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 = .88.

at the 20% criterion level are essentially the same as those found for the open-ended data at the 10% level.

In summary, the semantic differential table shows a significant positive relationship between amount of ethnic stereotypy and age; the young stereotype less. On the other hand, no difference in ethnic stereotypy was found in the open-ended data. In terms of ordinality, however, the youngest age category exhibits the highest amount of both ethnic and nonethnic stereotypy.

#### Socioeconomic Status

Tables 5.15 through 5.17 present the relationship between amount of stereotypy and socioeconomic status, as measured by the Blishen (1967) socioeconomic index for Canadian occupations. The category Socioeconomic Status score 60+ is equivalent to the upper-middle class, 40-59.99 to the lower-middle class, and below 39.99 to the working class.

Semantic differential relationships between socioeconomic status and overall amount of stereotypy, and amount ethnic stereotypy are statistically significant (Table 5.15). The relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of nonethnic stereotypy does not reach significance until the .70 level. However, all of the corresponding measures of association indicate very strong relationships between socioeconomic status and all stereotypy indices, with high stereotypy being consistently associated with high socioeconomic status.

As Table 5.16 shows, the open-ended results at the 10%

cut-off point are very similar to those in Table 5.15. Although the relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of ethnic stereotypy is not significant at the .05 level, the gamma values are close to 1.00. Both overall and ethnic stereotypy are directly related to high socioeconomic status. Amount of nonethnic stereotypy is once again statistically nonsignificant. The measure of association shows a weak relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of nonethnic stereotypy.

The open-ended questionnaire (20% level) relationships are somewhat at variance with the above noted findings (Table 5.17). In this case, the relationship between socioeconomic status and amount of ethnic stereotypy is not statistically significant, while that between socioeconomic status and amount of nonethnic stereotypy is significant at the .05 level. The raw frequencies are arranged in an interesting pattern. The working class and lower-middle class frequencies are identical. The upper-middle class frequency is considerably higher on all counts. Gammas computed across the three socioeconomic status groups reveal fairly strong relationships in the direction of high socioeconomic status, high stereotypy. These relationships are, of course, strengthened when only the extreme subsamples are taken into account.

The Blishen (1967) socioeconomic index establishes an occupation's social standing by means of the education and income distribution among incumbents. Therefore, the remarks made earlier concerning the relationship between education and

TABLE 5.15. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Stimulus Groups	Blishen SES Scale Scores		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	60+ N = 61	40-59.99 N = 104	Below 39.99 N = 64
Indians	.586	.621	.207
Ukrainians	.345	.172	.241
Hutterites	.689	.621	.586
Jews	.759	.689	.552
Teachers	.414	.414	.448
Lawyers	.655	.621	.586
Lower Class	.103	.103	.103
Women	.310	.276	.241
Old People	.310	.345	.172
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.464	.429	.349 <sup>a</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.595	.526	.397 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.359	.352	.310 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .05$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .01$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .70$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.91$ .

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.89$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.91$ .

Gamma, total groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-.96$ .

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-1.00$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-.80$ .

TABLE 5.16. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND  
AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE,  
10% LEVEL

Stimulus Groups	Blishen SES Scale Scores		
	(1) 60+ N = 56	(2) 40-59.99 N = 108	(3) Below 39.99 N = 87
Indians	.255	.216	.235
Ukrainians	.269	.212	.192
Hutterites	.321	.208	.189
Jews	.250	.212	.135
Teachers	.208	.132	.113
Lawyers	.346	.308	.212
Lower Class	.288	.231	.192
Women	.275	.235	.314
Old People	.228	.263	.263 <sup>a</sup>
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.271	.224	.205 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.274	.212	.187 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.268	.234	.219 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .05$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .10$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .50$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.86$ .

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.95$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.57$ .

Gamma, total groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-.85$ .

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-1.00$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-.39$ .

TABLE 5.17. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND  
AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE,  
20% LEVEL

Stimulus Groups	Blishen SES Scale Scores		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	60+ N = 56	40-59.99 N = 108	Below 39.99 N = 87
Indians	.157	.098	.098
Ukrainians	.058	.038	.077
Hutterites	.094	.075	.038
Jews	.096	.058	.038
Teachers	.075	.057	.038
Lawyers	.135	.038	.077
Lower Class	.115	.058	.058
Women	.098	.118	.078
Old People	.140	.035	.053
Overall Amount Stereotypy	.108	.063	.061 <sup>a</sup>
Amount Ethnic Stereotypy	.101	.067	.062 <sup>b</sup>
Amount Nonethnic Stereotypy	.113	.060	.060 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .02$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .30$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .05$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

Gamma, total groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.70$ .

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.62$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.72$ .

Gamma, total groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-.97$ .

Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-.80$ .

Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-1.00$ .

both fluency on the semiprojective instrument and semantic differential scale checking response styles are relevant in this context. Since the amount of ethnic stereotypy-high socioeconomic status association emerged from two techniques with opposing sorts of instrument error, the result appears to be valid. Further, confidence in this interpretation is strengthened by the nonsignificant relationship between socioeconomic status and nonethnic stereotypy across instruments.

#### Amount of Ethnic Stereotypy and Sample Bias

The following section will serve two purposes: first, to summarize the findings regarding the comparative amounts of ethnic stereotypy shown by demographic subsamples; and second, to infer from these relationships the effects that the study sample's known departures from representativeness have on the size of those stereotypes to be subsequently assessed for accuracy. Since only those open-ended stereotype traits above the 20% level will be examined for accuracy, stereotypy at the lower consensual level will be omitted from the present discussion.

Education. The more educated exhibited a significantly greater amount of ethnic stereotypy on both instruments. Since the test sample is more highly educated than the general Alberta population (Appendix A, Table 3), it may be inferred that the amount of stereotypy herein reported is overstated. This statement is based on the assumption that stereotypy is linearly distributed at the lower educational echelons.

Sex. No sex difference in the amount of ethnic



stereotypy was found on either instrument. The measure of association for open-ended questionnaire subsamples corroborates this result. However, an ordinal relationship was found in the case of semantic differential males. The test sample has too many females (Appendix A, Table 2), but this should make very little difference in the generalizability of the open-ended questionnaire stereotypes. Semantic differential stereotypes may be slightly understated.

Age. The semantic differential respondents between 15 and 24 years demonstrated a significantly lower rate of ethnic stereotypy than did the older age categories. Any open-ended age differences were nonsignificant. The test sample is a young sample compared with the Alberta population (Appendix A, Table 1). Although this suggests that the amount of stereotypy is understated in comparison with hypothetical results from a random sample, the distortion may not be too serious. Those people over the age of 50 who completed the semantic differential were highly educated (57.6% had some university training) and education is positively related to amount of ethnic stereotypy. Older people with little formal education could not cope with the complexity of the instrument. When the IBM cards for those 4 people more than 50 years old with socioeconomic status scale score below 39.99 were extracted, the number of ethnic traits was quite low. The inference to be cautiously extrapolated from the foregoing comments is as follows: if a proper proportion of the less well educated had been included, the semantic differential

age difference would likely have not resulted.

Socioeconomic status. With reference to the semantic differential, high socioeconomic status is associated with a greater amount of ethnic stereotypy. Although the open-ended chi-square was not significant, a modest ordinal association between high socioeconomic status and high ethnic stereotypy was detected. The test sample overrepresents people at higher socioeconomic levels (Appendix A, Tables 4 and 5). Therefore, the effect is to overstate the amount of stereotypy.

These four subsample breakdowns suggest that the test sample overstates the amount of ethnic stereotypy, compared with what might be expected from a representative sample. The assessment of stereotype validity should be less seriously affected than if the study sample had exhibited less stereotypy than the general population. Nevertheless, these remarks must be taken cautiously. Although the demographic variables selected are fundamental to sociological analysis, variables of unknown import have been left uncontrolled.

### Degree of Stereotypy

#### Measurement

Degree of stereotypy is a measure of the extremity or certainty with which semantic differential traits are assigned to stimulus groups. A comparable measure cannot be constructed for the open-ended questionnaire data. Degree of stereotypy, then, is an index of the polarity of a sample or

subsample's usage of semantic differential scales to characterize a given category, or combinations of ethnic and non-ethnic groups. Two subsamples might demonstrate the same amount of stereotypy towards a group, but differ in the extent to which the consensually chosen traits deviate from the neutral point on the semantic differential scale.

In order to avoid contaminating the polarity of ascription by number of traits, the basis for measurement of degree of stereotypy is the total number of adjectival scales contained in the instrument, rather than those which met the requirements for inclusion in the operationally defined stereotype. The standard deviation was the model used for the conceptualization of this index.

The following procedure was employed to measure the degree of stereotypy demonstrated by the total sample (or subsample) towards one stimulus group:

- (1) The group means for each of the 29 semantic differential scales were listed.
- (2) The deviation of each of the 29 means was taken from the neutral 4.00 value.
- (3) Each difference was squared and the 29 squared deviations summed.
- (4) The sum of the squared deviations was divided by the number of cases (29).
- (5) The square root of the  $\epsilon d^2/N$  is the mathematical expression of degree of stereotypy.

To measure the combined degree of ethnic stereotypy, the respective  $\epsilon d^2$  for the Indians, Ukrainians, Hutterites, and Jews was totalled, divided by 116 (29X4), and the square root

derived. The combined degree of nonethnic stereotypy was calculated in a similar fashion.

Although this measure has more general application, the present discussion is restricted to the test of hypotheses formulated regarding the degree of stereotypy exhibited by education subsamples.

#### Relationship between Degree of Stereotypy and Education

Table 5.18 presents the relationship between education and degree of stereotypy.

Research hypothesis 3 predicted that as amount of education increased, the degree of stereotypy of stimulus groups would decrease. As Table 5.18 shows, the opposite effect occurred: as amount of education increases, the degree of stereotypy of stimulus groups increases. The value of the measure of association calculated across the three education subsamples is  $-.74$ . When people with two years or less high school are compared with those with some university training, this relationship is strengthened ( $\text{gamma} = -.85$ ).

Research hypothesis 5 was stated as follows:

As amount of education increases, the within-category difference between degree of stereotypy of ethnic and nonethnic groups will increase, with stereotypy of ethnic groups decreasing and stereotypy of nonethnic groups increasing.

The amount of within-category difference between degree of stereotypy of ethnic and nonethnic groups increases as predicted as one moves from the lowest to the highest education subsample ( $-0.1459, 0.1425, 0.3284$ ). However, the degree of stereotypy components did not behave as expected. Degree of

TABLE 5.18. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND DEGREE OF STEREOTYPY, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Stimulus Groups	Education Categories		
	(1) 2 Years or Less High School N = 88	(2) 3-5 Years High School N = 132	(3) 1 or More Years University N = 68
Indians	1.1760	1.4061	1.5982
Ukrainians	1.1105	0.9896	1.2120
Hutterites	1.6754	1.7886	1.9820
Jews	1.5606	1.6366	1.8782
Teachers	1.6626	1.4157	1.4339
Lawyers	1.7982	1.8025	1.8123
Lower Class	0.7061	0.8263	0.8649
Women	1.3229	1.2626	1.2656
Old People	1.1566	1.2223	1.2774
Degree of Ethnic Stereotypy	1.2385	1.4859	1.6940
Degree of Nonethnic Stereotype	1.3844	1.3434	1.3656

Gamma, total groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.74$ .  
 Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.95$ .  
 Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1, 2, 3 =  $-.51$ .  
 Gamma, total groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-.85$ .  
 Gamma, ethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-1.00$ .  
 Gamma, nonethnic groups, columns 1 and 3 =  $-.39$ .

ethnic stereotypy increased, rather than decreased, with education. Further, although the lowest education subsample exhibited the highest degree of nonethnic stereotypy, the rate remains rather stable across education categories.

An examination of the ordinal pattern of degree of stereotypy bears out these generalizations. The gamma value among three education subsamples is  $-.95$  for degree of ethnic stereotypy, and  $-.51$  for degree of nonethnic stereotypy. These relationships become more pronounced when gammas are computed between subsamples with two years or less education and one or more years of university. The gamma value for ethnic stereotypy reaches  $-1.00$  and for nonethnic stereotypy declines to  $-.39$ . Further, when the university graduate subsample ( $N = 24$ ) is extracted from those with some university training, and compared with those with two years or less high school, the positive relationship between degree of ethnic stereotypy and amount of education remains stable (gamma =  $-.95$ ). However, the corresponding gamma value for degree of nonethnic stereotypy drops to  $+.47$ . (These data are not shown on Table 5.18.)

The relationship between education and degree of stereotypy follows the same unanticipated pattern found in the case of amount of stereotypy. A weak relationship was found between amount of nonethnic stereotypy and education (nonsignificant chi-square). Similarly, there was very little difference in degree of nonethnic stereotypy exhibited by education subsamples. As previously noted, the ethnic

stereotypes of the well educated contained a significantly greater number of traits. Moreover, these traits were assigned with more certainty by the well educated. In other words, the well educated were collectively more willing than the less well educated to describe stimulus groups as being extremely, or quite different from the containing population on more dimensions. Again, it should be emphasized that the foregoing stereotyping behavior resulted despite the tendency of the uneducated to employ extreme semantic differential scale positions relatively more often, and graduated scale positions less often than the educated. Since semantic differential stereotype traits were operationally defined in terms of consensual deviation from the neutral "4," degree of stereotypy is obviously not unrelated to amount of stereotypy. Therefore, it can be inferred that, assuming continuation of a linear distribution of stereotypy to very low educational levels, the stereotypes to be tested for accuracy contain more traits than would emerge from a representative sample.

#### Conclusion

The stereotyping behavior of education, sex, age, and socioeconomic subsamples was discussed in terms of the amount of stereotypy exhibited. This comparative analysis supports the possibility that the ethnic stereotypes to be assessed for accuracy overstate the stereotypes that could be expected to emerge from a representative sample. In general, the data indicate that both amount and degree of stereotypy are directly related to education. Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, and 5 were

therefore disconfirmed. The implication of these findings upon the traditional conceptualization of stereotypy and prejudice will be considered in the following chapter.



## CHAPTER 6

### PREJUDICE AND STEREOTYPY

#### Introduction

Chapter 6 presents a descriptive analysis of the social distance expressed by the sample towards 24 ethnic groups. Hypothesis 6, which predicted that as the social distance position of a stimulus group increases, the amount of stereotypy exhibited towards that group will increase, is tested. The relationship between prejudice and derogatory imagery is then examined. Some consideration is given to the implications of these findings for the conceptualization of stereotypy and prejudice.

#### The Measurement of Social Distance

Affective response toward stimulus ethnic groups was measured by a Bogardus social distance scale (Bogardus, 1925). A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix B. Respondents were presented with an alphabetized list of 24 ethnic groups which was derived from a previous Alberta study (Hirabayashi, 1963a). Embedded in the list were the four stimulus groups for which the subjects had provided stereotypes: the Indians, Ukrainians, Hutterites, and Jews. Respondents were asked to indicate to which of the following types of social contact they would admit the average member of each group:

1. To close kinship by marriage.
2. To my club as personal chums.

3. To my street as neighbors.
4. To employment in my occupation.
5. To citizenship in my country.
6. As visitors only to my country.
7. Would exclude from my country.

The customary method of scoring was adopted (Miller, 1964: 143). The social distance quotient for a given ethnic group was determined by computing the arithmetic means of the number beside the most intimate relationship permitted by a respondent. Small means denote low social distance. This scoring technique rests on the assumption that the scale is a cumulative one. If a respondent is willing to accept members of a particular group into his family, the probability is high that he will also accept them as friends, neighbors, fellow employees, and so on. The seven items are not assumed to be equidistant along a continuum. Therefore, the numerical scores are simply used to rank ethnic groups in terms of their degree of acceptability to the study samples or subsamples.

In order to effect more precise comparison between social distance and stereotypy, the social distance scale data were also computed separately for the semantic differential and open-ended questionnaire samples. Spearman's rank correlations between instrument samples and subsamples vary between .88 and .98.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Spearman's rank correlations between semantic differential and open-ended questionnaire samples were as follows: total samples, .97; males, .93; females, .95; age 15-24 years, .98; age 25-49 years, .95; age 50 years and over, .90; 2 years or less high school, .90; 3-5 years high school, .97; 1 or more years university, .95; Blishen SES 60+, .97; SES 40-59.99, .93; SES 39.99 and below, .88.

### Total Sample Social Distance Quotients

The social distance quotients for semantic differential and open-ended total samples are presented in Table 6.1. Each group's relative position is placed in parentheses after its social distance quotient. As usual, the membership nationality group received the top ranking. With the exception of the Ukrainians and Poles, the first 11 positions were accorded to western European groups. Groups of non-Caucasian racial origin occupy the bottom one-third of the positions. It will be noted that less social distance was expressed toward Negroes than toward the oriental or Canadian Indian groups. The Hutterites occupy the last rank.

This particular list of ethnic groups was adopted in order to compare the results with those of a previous study conducted in the same city in 1961 (Hirabayashi, 1963a). Although Hirabayashi employed a random sample of university undergraduates and some seven years elapsed between the studies, the patterning of the ethnic group positions he reported is quite similar to those found in the present investigation. Spearman's rank correlations between Hirabayashi's results and both the semantic differential and open-ended total sample findings are .94. Comparative data for those ethnic groups for which stereotypes were gathered, along with the Negroes, are given in Table 6.2. Subsample results for respondents with some university training are also included, despite the fact that these groups presumably contain a much broader age range than was the case in the

TABLE 6.1. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS, SEMANTIC  
DIFFERENTIAL AND OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE,  
TOTAL SAMPLES

Ethnic Group	Semantic Differential		Open-Ended	
	S.D.Q.	Av. Dev.	S.D.Q.	Av. Dev.
Canadians	1.10 (1)	0.19	1.07 (1)	0.13
British	1.30 (2)	0.52	1.33 (2)	0.57
Americans	1.39 (3)	0.66	1.43 (5)	0.71
Dutch	1.41 (4)	0.62	1.46 (6)	0.71
Norwegians	1.42 (5)	0.64	1.37 (4)	0.60
Swedes	1.43 (6)	0.68	1.34 (3)	0.55
Germans	1.59 (7)	0.85	1.72 (10)	1.01
French Canadians	1.67 (8)	0.95	1.76 (11)	1.07
Ukrainians	1.67 (9)	0.90	1.67 (7)	0.93
Poles	1.71 (10)	0.90	1.72 (9)	1.01
French	1.74 (11)	1.04	1.71 (8)	1.01
Hungarians	1.84 (12)	0.96	1.89 (12)	1.11
Italians	2.07 (13)	1.12	2.18 (15)	1.30
Negroes	2.21 (14)	0.86	2.17 (14)	0.86
Jews	2.22 (15)	1.13	2.08 (13)	0.98
Russians	2.28 (16)	1.45	2.28 (17)	1.50
Chinese	2.32 (17)	0.92	2.34 (18)	0.98
Japanese	2.34 (18)	1.05	2.37 (19)	1.11
West Indians	2.34 (19)	1.06	2.27 (16)	1.02
Eskimos	2.40 (20)	0.99	2.40 (20)	0.99
Indians (India)	2.46 (21)	1.13	2.47 (21)	1.19
N.A. Indians	2.50 (22)	1.22	2.52 (23)	1.24
Metis	2.63 (23)	1.28	2.48 (22)	1.21
Hutterites	3.68 (24)	1.68	3.69 (24)	1.91
	Median = 1.96		Median = 1.99	
	Range = 2.58		Range = 2.62	

TABLE 6.2. COMPARISON OF 1961 AND 1968 SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS  
FOR SELECTED ETHNIC GROUPS

Ethnic Group	Hirabayashi*	Social Distance Quotients			
		Semantic Differential		Open-Ended	
		Total Sample	Total Sample	Total Sample	Total Sample
North American Indians	3.03 (22)	2.50 (22)	2.52 (23)	2.50 (20)	2.39 (22)
Ukrainians	2.03 (9)	1.67 (9)	1.67 (7)	1.52 (10)	1.48 (7)
Hutterites	3.48 (24)**	3.68 (24)	3.69 (24)	3.58 (24)	3.48 (24)
Jews	2.13 (13)	2.22 (15)	2.08 (13)	2.09 (16)	1.81 (13)
Negroes	2.56 (18)	2.21 (14)	2.17 (14)	2.23 (17)	2.23 (17)

\*Hirabayashi (1963:361, Table 12.2).

\*\*Hirabayashi did not ascertain the social distance position of the Hutterites. However, he cites the above result from a 1961 study of youth 13 to 16 years also conducted in the Edmonton area (de Cocq, 1962).

previous study.

The ordinal position of the four stimulus groups has altered very little in seven years. In general, however, the numerical values of the social distance quotients for the groups shown in Table 6.2, as well as the remaining 19 groups, show substantial reduction. The greater degree of intimacy accorded the Negroes in terms of both ranking and social distance quotient is of particular interest. Only the Hutterites failed to gain in acceptability. The social distance expressed toward the Hutterites undoubtedly reflects respondents' compliance with that group's desire to remain apart from the rest of society. The difference between social distance quotients for highest and lowest groups reported by Hirabayashi is 1.95. When the Hutterites are excluded, the semantic differential and open-ended ranges are 1.53 and 1.45, respectively. These results are especially noteworthy in view of the fact that the present study total samples are considerably less well educated than the 1961 sample. Tables 6.7 and 6.8 *infra* show that the well educated tend to express greater acceptance of other groups. The willingness to admit out-groups to more intimate relationships may well be a product of the favorable impact of historical events in the intervening years upon the expression of ethnocentrism. It seems reasonable to assume that the extensively publicized activities of the American civil rights movement have had something to do with the improvement in the blacks' position. However, the present results have likely been

affected to some extent by the fact that respondents completed the social distance scales after the stereotype measurement instruments. The consistency in ranking patterns over time nonetheless indicates that these results are sufficiently adequate to serve their subsidiary purpose in this study.

#### Social Distance and Demographic Variables

This section briefly considers the comparative social distance expressed by sex, age, education, and socioeconomic status categories toward the entire list of 24 ethnic groups. Next, these findings are related to the subsample rates of amount and degree of ethnic stereotypy reported in Chapter 5. The following analysis is intended to provide a general vantage point for the subsequent discussion of the relationship between stereotypy and prejudice exhibited toward the four ethnic stimulus groups.

#### Sex

The social distance quotients for both semantic differential and open-ended sex subsamples are given in Table 6.3. In terms of social distance quotient ordinality, the males exhibited more social distance than did the females on both instruments (gamma, semantic differential = .96, gamma, open-ended = .99). Perhaps, it is worth noting that the three ethnic groups for which semantic differential female sample means were the higher have in the past been designated national enemies or proto-enemies. Hirabayashi (1963a:364), who reports the same sex relationship, suggests that it may

TABLE 6.3. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS BY SEX SUBSAMPLES,  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AND OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

Ethnic Group	Semantic Differential				Open-Ended	
	(1) Males	(2) Females	(3) Males	(4) Females	(5) Males	(6) Females
Americans	1.54 (7)	1.30 (3)	1.67 (5)	1.29 (5)		
British	1.45 (2)	1.22 (2)	1.60 (4)	1.16 (2)		
Canadians	1.11 (1)	1.10 (1)	1.07 (1)	1.07 (1)		
Chinese	2.44 (19)	2.25 (16)	2.61 (20)	2.18 (18)		
Dutch	1.49 (5)	1.36 (4)	1.71 (6)	1.31 (6)		
Eskimo	2.58 (21)	2.30 (17)	2.56 (19)	2.30 (22)		
French	1.80 (10)	1.71 (11)	1.97 (10.5)	1.55 (7)		
French Canadians	1.90 (12)	1.55 (7)	1.91 (8)	1.67 (11)		
Germans	1.47 (3.5)	1.66 (8.5)	1.97 (10.5)	1.56 (8)		
Hungarians	1.89 (11)	1.81 (12)	2.14 (13)	1.74 (12)		
Hutterites	3.99 (24)	3.51 (24)	4.20 (24)	3.39 (24)		
Indians (India)	2.61 (22)	2.38 (20)	2.86 (23)	2.23 (19)		
N.A. Indians	2.53 (20)	2.48 (22)	2.73 (21)	2.39 (23)		
Italians	2.27 (14)	1.97 (13)	2.41 (15)	2.05 (13)		
Japanese	2.29 (15.5)	2.36 (19)	2.52 (17.5)	2.29 (21)		
Jews	2.39 (18)	2.12 (14)	2.02 (12)	2.12 (15.5)		
Metis	2.87 (23)	2.50 (23)	2.81 (22)	2.27 (20)		
Negroes	2.29 (15.5)	2.17 (15)	2.30 (14)	2.10 (14)		
Norwegians	1.47 (3.5)	1.39 (5.5)	1.59 (3)	1.24 (3)		
Poles	1.75 (9)	1.69 (10)	1.93 (9)	1.59 (10)		
Russians	1.97 (13)	2.45 (21)	2.47 (16)	2.17 (17)		
Swedes	1.50 (6)	1.39 (5.5)	1.43 (2)	1.28 (4)		
Ukrainians	1.69 (8)	1.66 (8.5)	1.83 (7)	1.57 (9)		
West Indians	2.36 (17)	2.34 (18)	2.52 (17.5)	2.12 (15.5)		
	Median = 1.94 Range = 2.88	Median = 1.89 Range = 2.41	Median = 2.08 Range = 3.13	Median = 1.90 Range = 2.32		

Gamma, columns 1 and 2 = .96.

Gamma, columns 3 and 4 = .99.



be the product of ". . . male concern for the females of their own group . . . that develops conservative, protective attitudes."

Table 5.8 showed the amount of ethnic stereotypy by semantic differential sex subsamples. Although the chi-square was nonsignificant, the ordinal association between these variables is the same as that found for social distance (gamma = 1.00). However, when the open-ended<sup>2</sup> results are considered (Table 5.9), the parallel between social distance and stereotypy fails to hold. Females exhibit high ethnic stereotypy (gamma = 1.00), but low social distance.

### Age

When the ordinal relationship among the three semantic differential age groups is examined, the gamma value of .67 indicates a fairly strong positive association between age and social distance (Table 6.4). The comparison of the two extreme age groups reveals an even stronger relationship (gamma = .92). However, when the young and intermediate groups are compared, no difference is found. Those 50 years and over express considerably more social distance toward ethnic groups than do the two younger categories.

In the case of the open-ended questionnaire data (Table 6.5), the youngest age group once again demonstrates

---

<sup>2</sup>In order to simplify the presentation, the amount of stereotypy for open-ended samples is given for only the 10% cut-off point. Less differentiation emerged when the 20% criterion level was employed.

TABLE 6.4. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS BY AGE  
SUBSAMPLES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Ethnic Groups	Age Categories					
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	15-24 Years		25-49 Years		50 Years & Over	
Americans	1.31	(3)	1.46	(6)	1.48	(6)
British	1.25	(2)	1.33	(2)	1.43	(3)
Canadians	1.05	(1)	1.18	(1)	1.03	(1)
Chinese	2.36	(19)	2.16	(15)	2.72	(16)
Dutch	1.42	(5.5)	1.37	(3)	1.46	(4.5)
Eskimo	2.29	(17)	2.43	(21)	2.82	(17.5)
French	1.58	(7)	1.87	(12)	2.03	(10)
French Canadians	1.59	(8)	1.75	(11)	1.76	(9)
Germans	1.62	(9)	1.62	(7)	1.38	(2)
Hungarians	1.94	(12)	1.63	(8.5)	2.10	(11)
Hutterites	3.77	(24)	3.58	(24)	3.67	(24)
Indians (India)	2.42	(22)	2.41	(20)	2.85	(19.5)
N.A. Indians	2.39	(21)	2.53	(22)	2.89	(21)
Italians	2.07	(14)	1.98	(13)	2.44	(13)
Japanese	2.37	(20)	2.21	(17)	2.67	(15)
Jews	2.30	(18)	2.04	(14)	2.54	(14)
Metis	2.53	(23)	2.68	(23)	2.93	(22.5)
Negroes	2.02	(13)	2.29	(18)	2.82	(17.5)
Norwegians	1.42	(5.5)	1.41	(4)	1.46	(4.5)
Poles	1.68	(10)	1.64	(10)	2.19	(12)
Russians	2.24	(16)	2.17	(16)	2.93	(22.5)
Swedes	1.39	(4)	1.43	(5)	1.59	(8)
Ukrainians	1.74	(11)	1.63	(8.5)	1.50	(7)
West Indians	2.21	(15)	2.39	(19)	2.85	(19.5)
	Median = 1.98		Median = 1.93		Median = 2.32	
	Range = 2.72		Range = 2.40		Range = 2.64	

Gamma, columns 1, 2, 3 = -.67.

Gamma, columns 1 and 3 = -.92.

Gamma, columns 1 and 2 = +.09.

Gamma, columns 2 and 3 = -.96.

TABLE 6.5. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS BY AGE  
SUBSAMPLES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

Ethnic Groups	Age Categories					
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	15-24 Years		25-49 Years		50 Years & Over	
Americans	1.29	(5)	1.59	(5)	1.36	(5)
British	1.12	(2)	1.52	(4)	1.37	(6)
Canadians	1.04	(1)	1.10	(1)	1.06	(1)
Chinese	2.21	(19)	2.48	(17.5)	2.33	(16)
Dutch	1.33	(6)	1.65	(6)	1.18	(3)
Eskimo	2.18	(18)	2.50	(19)	2.88	(21)
French	1.52	(8)	1.89	(9)	1.71	(11)
French Canadians	1.63	(10)	1.91	(10)	1.62	(10)
Germans	1.46	(7)	2.00	(11)	1.57	(8)
Hungarians	1.77	(12)	2.04	(12)	1.78	(12)
Hutterites	3.48	(24)	3.86	(24)	3.88	(24)
Indians (India)	2.23	(20)	2.64	(22.5)	2.82	(19)
N.A. Indians	2.25	(22)	2.64	(22.5)	3.21	(23)
Italians	1.99	(15)	2.37	(14.5)	2.00	(14.5)
Japanese	2.30	(23)	2.37	(14.5)	2.73	(18)
Jews	1.98	(14)	2.18	(13)	2.00	(14.5)
Metis	2.24	(21)	2.61	(21)	3.04	(22)
Negroes	1.80	(13)	2.48	(17.5)	2.58	(17)
Norwegians	1.25	(4)	1.49	(3)	1.25	(4)
Poles	1.62	(9)	1.83	(8)	1.56	(7)
Russians	2.10	(17)	2.52	(20)	1.89	(13)
Swedes	1.22	(3)	1.47	(2)	1.14	(2)
Ukrainians	1.65	(11)	1.70	(7)	1.59	(9)
West Indians	2.02	(16)	2.38	(16)	2.85	(20)
	Median = 1.79		Median = 2.11		Median = 1.84	
	Range = 2.44		Range = 2.76		Range = 2.82	

Gamma, columns 1, 2, 3 = -.48.  
Gamma, columns 1 and 3 = -.78.  
Gamma, columns 1 and 2 = -1.00.  
Gamma, columns 2 and 3 = +.60.

the least social distance. But a disparity does exist between the ordinal patterning of social distance quotients for people 15 to 24 years and 25 to 49 years, those of the former category being lower in every instance. Moreover, the oldest age group showed less social distance than the intermediate group ( $\gamma = -.60$ ). However, those 50 years and over exhibited consistently less intimacy toward the racially divergent groups on both instruments. (The narrow age range of Hirabayashi's (1963a) student sample precludes any comparative remarks.)

Semantic differential data regarding amount of ethnic stereotypy are found in Table 5.12. A statistically significant positive relationship exists between age and amount of ethnic stereotypy. The oldest age category, then, exhibits highest amounts of both social distance and ethnic stereotypy. However, the pattern of those 50 and over expressing high social distance compared to the nearly identical degree of prejudice shown by the two younger age categories was not found for amount of stereotypy. In the latter instance, the youngest group exhibits more stereotypy than did the 25 to 49 sample ( $\gamma = 1.00$ ), and no difference at all was found between the intermediate and oldest age categories.

As Table 5.13 shows, the differences in amounts of ethnic stereotypy expressed by the open-ended age samples are not statistically significant. In terms of ordinality, however, the 15 to 24 group exhibited more stereotypy than the two older groups ( $\gamma = .62$ ), but no difference exists

between the latter age groups ( $\gamma = 0$ ). These results are at variance with the aforementioned age distributions of social distance. It is becoming obvious that the relationship between prejudice and stereotypy is much more complex than simple equivalence.

### Education

The social distance quotients for the semantic differential education categories are presented in Table 6.6. Comparison of the first three columns indicates that low education is associated with high social distance ( $\gamma = .80$ ). When the sample with two years or less high school is related to that with some university training, the gamma value increases to .99. However, comparison of people with three to five years high school and those with one or more years of university produces only a very slight relationship in the expected direction. If university graduates are extracted from the latter subsample, and gamma computed across columns (1), (2), and (4), a nearly perfect association is found between low education-high prejudice. When the three to five year high school group is compared with university graduates, this relationship is maintained ( $\gamma = .99$ ). The overall pattern, then, is low education-high social distance. This association is one of the most dependable findings in the ethnic relations literature (Harding, et al., 1969:28-29).

With one exception, the open-ended data results (Table 6.7) are the same as those described above. When respondents with three to five years high school are compared with those

TABLE 6.6. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS, BY EDUCATION SUBSAMPLES,  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Ethnic Groups	Education Categories			
	(1) 2 Years or Less High School	(2) 3-5 Years High School	(3) 1 or More Years University	(4) University Graduates
Americans	1.67 (4)	1.23 (4)	1.37 (7)	1.04 (2.5)
British	1.49 (2)	1.18 (2)	1.31 (5)	1.04 (2.5)
Canadians	1.26 (1)	1.05 (1)	1.01 (1)	1.00 (1)
Chinese	2.31 (13.5)	2.36 (20)	2.25 (18)	1.96 (17.5)
Dutch	1.60 (3)	1.34 (6)	1.31 (5)	1.13 (8)
Eskimo	2.51 (16)	2.27 (17.5)	2.52 (22)	2.20 (21)
French	2.10 (12)	1.65 (10)	1.51 (9)	1.08 (5.5)
French Canadians	2.01 (10)	1.58 (7)	1.46 (8)	1.08 (5.5)
Germans	1.86 (6.5)	1.60 (8)	1.26 (3)	1.25 (10)
Hungarians	2.03 (11)	1.76 (12)	1.78 (13)	1.50 (13.5)
Hutterites	4.00 (24)	3.58 (24)	3.53 (24)	2.74 (24)
Indians (India)	2.53 (18)	2.40 (22)	2.51 (21)	1.96 (17.5)
N.A. Indians	2.70 (20)	2.38 (21)	2.50 (20)	2.25 (22)
Italians	2.31 (13.5)	1.98 (13)	1.99 (15)	1.58 (15)
Japanese	2.78 (21)	2.27 (17.5)	1.97 (14)	1.63 (16)
Jews	2.48 (15)	2.14 (15)	2.09 (16)	1.50 (13.5)
Metis	2.88 (23)	2.45 (23)	2.72 (23)	2.33 (23)
Negroes	2.52 (17)	2.03 (14)	2.23 (17)	2.04 (19)
Norwegians	1.84 (5)	1.22 (3)	1.31 (5)	1.08 (5.5)
Poles	1.91 (9)	1.69 (11)	1.53 (11)	1.46 (12)
Russians	2.80 (22)	2.31 (19)	1.64 (12)	1.42 (11)
Swedes	1.88 (8)	1.27 (5)	1.24 (2)	1.08 (5.5)
Ukrainians	1.86 (6.5)	1.64 (9)	1.52 (10)	1.21 (9)
West Indians	2.58 (19)	2.24 (16)	2.29 (19)	2.13 (20)
	Median = 2.21 Range = 2.74	Median = 1.87 Range = 2.53	Median = 1.71 Range = 2.52	Median = 1.48 Range = 1.74

Gamma, cols. 1,2,3 = .80; 1&3 = .99; 1&2 = .99; 2&3 = -.16; 1,2,4 = .99; 2&4 = .99.

TABLE 6.7. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS, BY EDUCATION SUBSAMPLES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

Ethnic Groups	Education Categories			
	(1) 2 Years or Less High School	(2) 3-5 Years High School	(3) 1 or More Years University	(4) University Graduates
Americans	1.74 (5)	1.28 (6)	1.37 (5)	1.11 (5)
British	1.55 (2)	1.27 (5)	1.18 (2)	1.04 (2)
Canadians	1.09 (1)	1.08 (1)	1.05 (1)	1.00 (1)
Chinese	2.74 (18.5)	2.16 (18)	2.22 (16)	1.93 (18)
Dutch	1.83 (6)	1.26 (4)	1.40 (6)	1.11 (6)
Eskimo	2.77 (21)	2.19 (19)	2.37 (21)	2.27 (22)
French	2.26 (10)	1.41 (7)	1.64 (11)	1.56 (11.5)
French Canadians	2.18 (9)	1.57 (10)	1.61 (10)	1.39 (9)
Germans	2.38 (12.5)	1.42 (8)	1.52 (8)	1.56 (11.5)
Hungarians	2.38 (12.5)	1.68 (12)	1.74 (12)	1.63 (13)
Hutterites	4.29 (24)	3.48 (24)	3.48 (24)	3.33 (24)
Indians (India)	2.82 (23)	2.32 (21.5)	2.34 (20)	2.20 (20.5)
N.A. Indians	2.75 (20)	2.43 (23)	2.39 (22)	2.20 (20.5)
Italians	2.72 (16)	1.91 (13.5)	2.07 (14.5)	1.64 (14)
Japanese	2.73 (17)	2.21 (20)	2.26 (19)	1.88 (16)
Jews	2.57 (14)	1.91 (13.5)	1.81 (13)	1.44 (10)
Metis	2.80 (22)	2.32 (21.5)	2.46 (23)	2.28 (23)
Negroes	2.32 (11)	2.05 (15)	2.23 (17)	2.00 (19)
Norwegians	1.65 (3.5)	1.21 (3)	1.35 (4)	1.08 (3)
Poles	2.04 (8)	1.60 (11)	1.55 (9)	1.20 (7.5)
Russians	2.74 (18.5)	2.10 (16.5)	2.07 (14.5)	1.68 (15)
Swedes	1.65 (3.50)	1.16 (2)	1.29 (3)	1.08 (4)
Ukrainians	2.03 (7)	1.52 (9)	1.48 (7)	1.20 (7.5)
West Indians	2.59 (15)	2.10 (16.5)	2.24 (18)	1.92 (17)
	Median = 2.38 Range = 3.20	Median = 1.80 Range = 2.45	Median = 1.78 Range = 2.43	Median = 1.60 Range = 2.33

Gamma, cols. 1,2,3 = .58; 1&3 = 1.00; 1&2 = 1.00; 2&3 = -.78; 1,2,4 = .99; 2&4 = .96.

with some university, a negative association emerges. The latter category expresses more social distance.

The relationship between education and amount of ethnic stereotypy is easily summarized. As amount of education increases, amount of stereotypy increases. Chi-squares for both instruments were significant at the .01 level. The measures of association approach unity (Tables 5.2, 5.3). Education is also directly related to degree of ethnic stereotypy (Table 5.18).

#### Socioeconomic Status

Since socioeconomic status and education are positively correlated, the expression of more social distance by the lower classes reported in Tables 6.8 and 6.9 is congruent with the findings reported in the previous section. The one inconsistent result is the lack of disparity between the social distance quotients of the lower-middle and working class open-ended samples (Table 6.9). Chapter 5 showed that high socioeconomic status is strongly associated with the expression of more ethnic stereotypy on both instruments (Tables 5.15, 5.16).

To summarize, then, the relationships between sex and stereotypy and between sex and social distance covary for the semantic differential, and operate in opposite directions for the open-ended data. The same holds true for the age samples. Both education and socioeconomic categories reveal a completely reversed pattern of stereotypy and prejudice in both instruments.



TABLE 6.8. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS SUBSAMPLES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Ethnic Group	Blishen SES Scale Scores					
	(1) 60+		(2) 40-59.99		(3) Below 39.99	
Americans	1.29	(5)	1.29	(3)	1.56	(3)
British	1.23	(4)	1.30	(4)	1.30	(2)
Canadians	1.02	(1)	1.10	(1)	1.16	(1)
Chinese	2.35	(20)	2.16	(14)	2.29	(13)
Dutch	1.30	(6)	1.29	(2)	1.61	(5)
Eskimo	2.38	(21)	2.31	(20)	2.40	(15.5)
French	1.60	(11)	1.64	(9)	2.21	(12)
French Canadians	1.39	(8)	1.59	(7)	2.29	(14)
Germans	1.40	(9)	1.61	(8)	1.71	(7)
Hungarians	1.84	(13)	1.79	(11)	2.00	(10)
Hutterites	3.26	(24)	3.75	(24)	3.81	(24)
Indians (India)	2.33	(19)	2.36	(22)	2.46	(18)
N.A. Indians	2.40	(22)	2.36	(21)	2.70	(22)
Italians	2.02	(17)	1.94	(13)	2.11	(11)
Japanese	1.92	(15)	2.26	(19)	2.53	(20)
Jews	1.79	(12)	2.21	(17)	2.40	(15.5)
Metis	2.40	(23)	2.52	(23)	2.74	(23)
Negroes	1.93	(16)	2.17	(15)	2.43	(17)
Norwegians	1.18	(3)	1.37	(5)	1.68	(6)
Poles	1.57	(10)	1.74	(10)	1.57	(4)
Russians	1.89	(14)	2.25	(18)	2.50	(19)
Swedes	1.16	(2)	1.37	(6)	1.73	(8)
Ukrainians	1.38	(7)	1.83	(12)	1.86	(9)
West Indians	2.27	(18)	2.20	(16)	2.65	(21)
	Median = 1.82		Median = 1.89		Median = 2.25	
	Range = 2.24		Range = 2.65		Range = 2.65	

Gamma, columns 1, 2, 3 = -.90.  
 Gamma, columns 1 and 3 = -.99.  
 Gamma, columns 1 and 2 = -.71.  
 Gamma, columns 2 and 3 = -.98.

TABLE 6.9. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS SUBSAMPLES, OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

Ethnic Group	Blishen SES Scale Scores					
	(1) 60+		(2) 40-59.99		(3) Below 39.99	
Americans	1.25	(5)	1.50	(5)	1.64	(6)
British	1.04	(1)	1.42	(3)	1.48	(2.5)
Canadians	1.06	(2)	1.07	(1)	1.12	(1)
Chinese	2.11	(18)	2.53	(18)	2.33	(18)
Dutch	1.26	(6)	1.53	(6)	1.60	(5)
Eskimo	2.49	(22)	2.53	(18)	2.27	(14)
French	1.80	(12)	1.73	(7)	1.84	(10)
French Canadians	1.67	(10.5)	1.77	(8.5)	1.83	(9)
Germans	1.49	(7)	2.02	(12)	1.74	(7)
Hungarians	1.67	(10.5)	2.16	(13)	1.85	(11)
Hutterites	3.31	(24)	3.87	(24)	3.95	(24)
Indians (India)	2.28	(20)	2.68	(23)	2.45	(21.5)
N.A. Indians	2.43	(21)	2.66	(22)	2.48	(23)
Italians	1.81	(13)	2.53	(18)	2.28	(16)
Japanese	2.08	(17)	2.57	(20)	2.40	(20)
Jews	1.89	(14)	2.01	(11)	2.28	(16)
Metis	2.54	(23)	2.64	(21)	2.28	(16)
Negroes	2.07	(16)	2.29	(14)	2.14	(13)
Norwegians	1.24	(4)	1.45	(4)	1.48	(2.5)
Poles	1.63	(8.5)	1.82	(10)	1.86	(12)
Russians	2.04	(15)	2.48	(16)	2.45	(21.5)
Swedes	1.20	(3)	1.37	(2)	1.51	(4)
Ukrainians	1.63	(8.5)	1.77	(8.5)	1.76	(8)
West Indians	2.25	(19)	2.31	(15)	2.35	(19)
	Median = 1.81		Median = 2.09		Median = 2.00	
	Range = 2.27		Range = 2.80		Range = 2.83	

Gamma, columns 1, 2, 3 = -.74.

Gamma, columns 1 and 3 = -.98.

Gamma, columns 1 and 2 = -.99.

Gamma, columns 2 and 3 = 0.

### Stimulus Group Stereotypy and Prejudice

Research hypothesis 6 predicted that as the social distance position of a stimulus group increases, the amount of stereotypy of that group will increase. The directionality of this hypothesis follows from the assumption of covariance between stereotypy and prejudice<sup>3</sup> prevalent in both theoretical discussions and measurement of these variables (see Chapter 1). More specifically, assimilation-contrast theory (Sherif and Hovland, 1961) would predict that people who place greater social distance between themselves and an ethnic group should perceive that group as quite different from the general population on more characteristics than should those who demonstrate greater acceptance of the group. Unfortunately, this investigator is placed in the position of being "on the wrong end" of the null hypothesis. Chapter 1 recommended that until there are cogent reasons for doing otherwise, the cognitive and affective dimensions of ethnic attitudes ought to be conceptually separated. The conflicting empirical evidence cited which bears upon the relationship between prejudice and stereotypy suggests that both concepts require definitional specification. The previous section showed that stereotypy and prejudice are not coacting variables.

---

<sup>3</sup>In the measurement of prejudice (as well as other concepts), social scientists gauge how people respond when they are asked different kinds of questions. The referents of these questions-answers are called "prejudice," "stereotypy," etc. Although, for stylistic reasons, prejudice has not been placed in quotation marks in the body of this report, the measurement and the concept have not been confounded.

Tables 6.10 through 6.12 consolidate the data concerning the amount of stereotypy and social distance expressed toward the four stimulus groups by the various demographic subsamples. Although the variables are generally associated in the manner outlined in the previous section, more detailed inquiry is required to test the hypothesis. If stereotypy and prejudice are in fact synonymous and research hypothesis 6 is correct, the following relationships should preponderate: low social distance associated with low stereotypy; high social distance associated with high stereotypy. Samples which exhibit low social distance should not express high amounts of stereotypy. Neither the reverse, nor mixed variable combinations should occur very frequently.

Tables 6.10 through 6.12 list for each demographic category the social distance quotients and amount of ethnic stereotypy expressed towards the Indians, Ukrainians, Hutterites and Jews. In order to test hypothesis 6, these data were treated in the following manner. The social distance quotients for a particular ethnic group were ranked within each demographic category. For example, semantic differential males expressed high social distance and semantic differential females low social distance toward the Indians. When the corresponding stereotypy rates are ranked, males also demonstrated a higher order of stereotypy toward the Indians than did the females. The patterns, then, are those predicted by the hypothesis: high social distance-high stereotypy, low social distance-low stereotypy. Two rank orderings emerge.

TABLE 6.10. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY EXPRESSED  
TOWARD ETHNIC STIMULUS GROUPS BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES,  
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Samples	Indians		Ukrainians		Hutterites		Jews	
	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.
Total sample	2.50	.414	1.67	.207	3.68	.621	2.22	.586
Males	2.53	.483	1.69	.345	3.99	.655	2.39	.759
Females	2.48	.448	1.66	.172	3.51	.621	2.12	.655
15-24 years	2.39	.379	1.74	.069	3.77	.621	2.30	.483
25-49 years	2.53	.517	1.63	.345	3.58	.621	2.04	.793
50 years & over	2.89	.379	1.50	.414	3.67	.689	2.54	.759
2 yrs. or less HS	2.70	.138	1.86	.241	4.00	.586	2.48	.621
3-5 yrs. HS	2.38	.448	1.64	.138	3.58	.621	2.14	.586
1 or more yrs. univ.	2.50	.655	1.52	.310	3.53	.689	2.09	.759
Univ. graduates	2.25	.483	1.21	.345	2.74	.759	1.50	.724
SES below 39.99	2.70	.207	1.86	.241	3.81	.586	2.40	.552
SES 40-59.99	2.36	.621	1.83	.172	3.75	.621	2.21	.689
SES 60+	2.40	.586	1.38	.345	3.26	.689	1.79	.759

TABLE 6.11. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY EXPRESSED  
TOWARD ETHNIC STIMULUS GROUPS BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES,  
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 10% LEVEL

Samples	Indians		Ukrainians		Hutterites		Jews	
	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.
Total sample	2.52	.216	1.67	.192	3.69	.226	2.08	.192
Males	2.73	.196	1.83	.173	4.20	.226	2.02	.173
Females	2.39	.275	1.57	.308	3.39	.264	2.12	.192
15-24 years	2.25	.275	1.65	.231	3.48	.302	1.98	.192
25-49 years	2.64	.255	1.70	.192	3.86	.245	2.18	.154
50 years & over	3.21	.216	1.59	.231	3.88	.208	2.00	.231
2 yrs. or less HS	2.75	.196	2.03	.154	4.29	.170	2.57	.115
3-5 yrs. HS	2.43	.294	1.52	.269	3.48	.283	1.91	.231
1 or more yrs. univ.	2.39	.294	1.48	.308	3.48	.302	1.81	.250
Univ. graduates	2.20	.392	1.20	.308	3.33	.358	1.44	.327
SES below 39.99	2.48	.235	1.76	.192	3.95	.189	2.28	.135
SES 40-59.99	2.66	.216	1.77	.212	3.87	.208	2.01	.212
SES 60+	2.43	.255	1.63	.269	3.31	.321	1.89	.250

TABLE 6.12. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY EXPRESSED  
TOWARD ETHNIC STIMULUS GROUPS BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES,  
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE, 20% LEVEL

Samples	Indians		Ukrainians		Hutterites		Jews	
	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Amt. Ster.
Total sample	2.52	.118	1.67	.038	3.69	.075	2.08	.058
Males	2.73	.118	1.83	.058	4.20	.019	2.02	.058
Females	2.39	.118	1.57	.058	3.39	.094	2.12	.058
15-24 years	2.25	.137	1.65	.058	3.48	.094	1.98	.038
25-49 years	2.64	.078	1.70	.058	3.86	.038	2.18	.058
50 years & over	3.21	.059	1.59	.077	3.88	.057	2.00	.038
2 yrs. or less HS	2.75	.078	2.03	.038	4.29	.019	2.57	.000
3-5 yrs. HS	2.43	.098	1.52	.096	3.48	.094	1.91	.077
1 or more yrs. univ.	2.39	.196	1.48	.058	3.48	.113	1.81	.058
Univ. graduates	2.20	.196	1.20	.077	3.33	.170	1.44	.154
SES below 39.99	2.48	.098	1.76	.077	3.95	.038	2.28	.038
SES 40-59.99	2.66	.098	1.77	.038	3.87	.075	2.01	.058
SES 60+	2.43	.157	1.63	.058	3.31	.094	1.89	.096

Since four groups were described on three instruments (the open-ended questionnaire criterion levels being considered separate for this purpose), there are 24 ordinal rankings for the sex subsample (2 X 4 X 3). Age, education and socioeconomic status variables were handled in the same fashion. In those cases where a demographic sample had three divisions, for example, socioeconomic status, the high and low social distance ranks were considered and the intermediate rank ignored.

Table 6.13 shows that only 14.5% of the combined rankings are in the predicted direction of covariance between stereotypy and social distance. In 66.7% of the cases, the ordering is the opposite of that predicted: demographic subcategories which ranked highest on social distance expressed the least stereotypy, or vice versa. Some 19% of the rankings are mixed. Categories which ranked highest or lowest in social distance were intermediate in the amount of ethnic stereotypy expressed. These demographic distributions are similar to those found in the last section which examined the relationship between overall ethnic stereotypy rates and social distance toward all 24 groups. The most support for the research hypothesis comes from the sex subsample, the least from the socioeconomic status and education subsamples. When university graduates rather than people with some university training are considered, the assumption of equivalence of stereotypy and prejudice is further undermined. None of the 24 orderings fall in the predicted direction.



TABLE 6.13. SOCIAL DISTANCE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY RANKS FOR COMBINED STIMULUS GROUPS AND INSTRUMENTS, BY SUBSAMPLES

Variable Combinations	Demographic Categories						Total
	Sex	Age	Education*	S.E.S.	#	%	
Low Soc. Dist., Low Ster.	5	3	0	0	8	8.3	
High Soc. Dist., High Ster.	5	1	0	0	6	6.2	
Low Soc. Dist., High Ster.	4	8	8	11	31	32.3	
High Soc. Dist., Low Ster.	4	9	10	10	33	34.4	
Low Soc. Dist., Medium Ster.	3	1	4	1	9	9.4	
High Soc. Dist., Medium Ster.	3	2	2	2	9	9.4	
TOTAL	24	24	24	24	96	100.0	

\*2 yrs. or less HS, 3-5 yrs. HS, 1 or more yrs. university.

Twenty-one follow the opposite direction, and three are mixed. One may conservatively conclude that, given the limitations of the instruments and level of measurement employed, prejudice and stereotypy are variables which operate with a sizable measure of independence.<sup>4</sup>

Perhaps, "stereotypy" and "prejudice," as measured, are more apt to covary for particular ethnic groups. The data contained in Table 6.13 were rearranged to show the social distance-amount of stereotypy combinations for the four stimulus groups. Since the demographic patterns described above do not differ across ethnic groups, they are not identified in Table 6.14. An inspection of this table shows that frequencies in the direction predicted by hypothesis 6 are somewhat higher for the Jews. Frequencies the opposite of those predicted are slightly higher for the Hutterites and lower for the Jews. However, none of the relationships between stereotypy-social distance combinations and stimulus groups attained statistical significance.

Finally, the data in Table 6.13 were reassembled according to stereotype measurement instrument.

Table 6.15 shows that congruent rankings of social

---

<sup>4</sup>Cahalan and Trager (1949) report that the tendency to label Jews as "different" from Americans generally on characteristics other than religion and to specify such differences is not closely related to anti-Semitism as measured by an 11 item scale. The degree of association ("T") between open-ended responses and affective scale items varied between .12 and .19. The following are examples of the attitude scale items employed: "Would you object to working for a Jewish employer?"; "Would you have any objection to living in the same neighborhood with Jews?"

TABLE 6.14. SOCIAL DISTANCE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY RANKS FOR ETHNIC  
STIMULUS GROUPS, SUBSAMPLES AND INSTRUMENTS COMBINED

Variable Combinations	Stimulus Groups					Total
	Indians	Ukrainians	Hutterites	Jews		
Low Soc. Dist., Low Ster.	2	1	2	3	8	14 <sup>a</sup>
High Soc. Dist., High Ster.	1	1	1	3	6	6
Low Soc. Dist., High Ster.	8	8	9	6	31	64 <sup>b</sup>
High Soc. Dist., Low Ster.	10	7	10	6	33	33
Low Soc. Dist., Medium Ster.	2	3	1	3	9	18 <sup>c</sup>
High Soc. Dist., Medium Ster.	1	4	1	3	9	9
TOTAL	24	24	24	24	96	96

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .50$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 3.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .20$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 3.

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square,  $p < .20$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 3.

TABLE 6.15. SOCIAL DISTANCE AND AMOUNT OF STEREOTYPY RANKS, BY STEREOTYPE MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT

Variable Combinations	Measurement Instruments			Total
	Semantic Differential	Open-Ended 10%	Open-Ended 20%	
Predicted combinations	10	2	2	14 <sup>a</sup>
Opposite combinations	17	27	20	64 <sup>b</sup>
Mixed combinations	5	3	10	18 <sup>c</sup>
Total	32	32	32	96

<sup>a</sup>Chi-square,  $p. < .01$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square,  $p. < .05$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

<sup>c</sup>Chi-square,  $p. < .10$ , two-tailed, d.f. = 2.

distance and amount of stereotypy occurred most often when stereotypes were measured with the semantic differential. Incongruent rank orders occurred more frequently in the case of the open-ended descriptions. Both relationships are statistically significant. The large number of tied stereotypy rankings which appear in the third column resulted from the uniformity in numbers of traits across subsample categories with the application of the 20% criterion. It appears that amount of cognitive imagery and degree of acceptance of a group are less likely to be directly related when people are free to characterize the group in their own words. Nonetheless, it must be emphasized that less than one-third of the semantic differential rank orders are in the predicted direction. Further, eight of the ten, two for each ethnic group, derived from the sex subsamples.

Table 6.16 gives the social distance quotients and

TABLE 6.16. SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND DEGREE OF STEREOTYPY EXPRESSED TOWARD STIMULUS GROUPS, BY EDUCATION CATEGORIES, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Education Categories	Indians		Ukrainians		Hutterites		Jews	
	S.D.Q.	Deg. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Deg. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Deg. Ster.	S.D.Q.	Deg. Ster.
2 yrs. or less HS	2.70	1.18	1.86	1.11	4.00	1.68	2.48	1.56
3-5 yrs. HS	2.38	1.41	1.64	0.99	3.58	1.79	2.14	1.64
1 or more yrs. univ.	2.50	1.60	1.52	1.21	3.53	1.98	2.09	1.88
Univ. grads.	2.25	1.53	1.21	1.28	2.74	2.07	1.50	1.90

degree of stereotypy for the semantic differential education categories. The foregoing analysis demonstrated that subsamples which evince greatest social distance from the stimulus groups do not regard these groups as deviating from the general population on more characteristics than do subsamples which express greater acceptance of these groups. Possibly the contrast effect for subjects holding negative attitudinal positions operates by producing object group trait ascriptions which sharply diverge from their perception of people in general. The amount of stereotypy index does involve extremity of judgment by virtue of the operationalization of semantic differential stereotype traits. However, degree of stereotypy directly measures extremity of semantic differential scale response. It will be recalled that the latter index incorporates the deviation of all 29 adjectival scales from the neutral "4" position.

The social distance quotients and degree of stereotypy rates were ranked and the two resulting orders compared.

When the first three education samples listed in Table 6.16 were examined, six of the eight variable combinations were opposite to the direction predicted by hypothesis 6. Two were mixed. No support whatsoever emerged for the covariance of stereotypy and prejudice. Substitution of university graduates for respondents with some university education produced one mixed ordering and seven orderings of opposed directionality. At least for the education categories, antipathy toward a group is not directly associated with extremity of trait ascription.

#### Social Distance and Negative Trait Ascription

The foregoing results imply that the relationship between prejudice and stereotypy is neither independent as stated by the null hypothesis, nor direct as predicted by the research hypothesis. Rather, disposition to admit an ethnic group to close association was found to be related to richer cognitive imagery concerning that group.

So far, stereotypy has been considered primarily in terms of number of characteristics assigned to stimulus groups. On the other hand, students of prejudice (e.g., Adorno, et al., 1950; Allport, 1954) expect bigots to be receptive to deprecatory description of despised groups. The erroneous equation of stereotypy and prejudice derives precisely from this failure to appreciate the fact that categorical percepts also encompass flattering and neutral traits. Since this analysis has focussed on sheer quantity of descriptive imagery, complimentary or impartial "facts"

about a people may well be associated with admiration for that group. (Whether "knowledge" produces approval, or approval "knowledge" is beyond the scope of the present discussion.) Perhaps, those hostile toward the stimulus groups produced a small number of negative traits which were not applied by friendlier respondents.

In the following section, consideration will be given to the relationship between social distance and unflattering trait assignment. Because the unit of analysis is the demographic group and the level of measurement is ordinal, the analysis should be regarded as an exploratory adjunct. Decidedly negative traits were selected from the Indian and Jewish stereotypes. (With one exception, the overwhelmingly positive Ukrainian and Hutterite stereotypes have been disregarded for this purpose.) The question is whether those samples which expressed more social distance from Indians or Jews also showed higher frequency of assignment of negative traits to these groups.

### Indians

Table 6.17 examines the ordinal association between social distance quotients and selected negative semantic differential traits assigned to the Indians by the various demographic samples. Gammas were computed for each subcategory to see to what extent the order of social distance quotients facilitated prediction of the deviation rankings of the eight adjectival scales from the neutral "4" value. As the measures of association listed at the bottom of the table

TABLE 6.17. INDIAN SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND SELECTED SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TRAITS, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES

Samples	S.D.Q.	Semantic Differential Means								
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	
Females	2.48	5.6	5.3	5.3	5.5	4.7	4.6	5.3	5.4	a
Males	2.53	5.7	5.5	5.5	5.4	4.6	4.6	5.3	5.4	
15-24 years	2.39	5.5	5.3	5.3	5.5	4.6	4.5	5.2	5.3	
25-49 years	2.53	5.7	5.5	5.4	5.4	5.0	4.6	5.4	5.5	b
50 years & over	2.89	5.8	5.5	5.4	5.6	4.4	4.8	5.0	5.3	
Univ. graduates	2.25	5.9	5.3	5.0	5.5	4.4	4.8	5.2	5.3	
3-5 yrs. HS	2.38	5.6	5.2	5.4	5.5	4.6	4.7	5.3	5.4	c
1 or more yrs. univ.	2.50	6.0	5.7	5.5	5.5	4.9	4.9	5.5	5.3	
2 yrs. or less HS	2.70	5.2	5.4	5.2	5.3	4.7	4.3	5.1	5.4	
SES 40-59.99	2.36	5.7	5.4	5.6	5.6	4.6	4.7	5.5	5.6	
SES 60+	2.40	5.9	5.5	5.3	5.5	4.9	4.8	5.3	5.2	d
SES below 39.99	2.70	5.1	5.3	5.1	5.3	4.8	4.3	5.2	5.3	

(1) unambitious

(2) drunken

(3) lazy

(4) often in trouble with law

(5) neglectful of children

(6) sexually immoral

(7) dirty

(8) often involved in fights

<sup>a</sup>Gamma = .39.

<sup>b</sup>Gamma, 3x3 = .38.

Gamma, 15-24 & 50 yrs. & over = .72.

<sup>c</sup>Gamma, 3-5 yrs. HS, 1 or more yrs. univ.

& 2 yrs. or less HS = -.13.

Gamma, 3-5 yrs. HS & 2 yrs. or less HS = -.72.

<sup>d</sup>Gamma, 2 yrs. or less HS & univ. grads. = 0.

Gamma, 3x3 = -.68.

Gamma, 40-59.99 & below 39.99 = -.96.



show, the situation is not straightforward. For sex and age categories, some 40% of the variance in negative trait attribution is explained when social distance order is employed as the independent variable. On the other hand, strong negative associations between social distance quotients and trait assignment resulted for the education and socioeconomic status samples. This implies that those groups which are more willing to admit Indians to intimate relationships are also more likely to perceive them as different from the environing population on more socially disapproved traits.

Further, Table 6.17 shows that no individual trait is invariably associated with negative social distance positioning. "Drunken" occurs in the predicted order for three of the four subsamples. "Unambitious," "lazy," and "neglectful of children's needs" occur in the orders predicted for half the subsamples. "Sexually immoral" and "often in trouble with the law" are predictive for one-quarter of the subsamples. No differentiation whatsoever was found for the traits, "dirty" or "often involved in fights."

Table 6.18 presents the relationship between social distance quotients and the most uncomplimentary open-ended traits applied to the Indians. Only the sex category relationship between high social distance and negative trait ascription proved to be positive. Once again, the predominant tendency is for a high percentage of samples with low social distance quotients to describe the Indians in unflattering terms. Of the four traits considered in Table 6.18, "lazy"

TABLE 6.18. INDIAN SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND  
SELECTED OPEN-ENDED TRAITS, BY DEMOGRAPHIC  
SUBSAMPLES

Samples	% Open-Ended Traits				
	S.D.Q.	Lazy	Drunken	Dirty	Unambitious
Females	2.39	29.0	19.7	31.7	15.8
Males	2.73	32.5	23.1	22.2	16.2 <sup>a</sup>
15-24 years	2.25	26.7	26.7	35.9	15.2
25-49 years	2.64	34.1	16.3	21.5	17.7 <sup>b</sup>
50 years & over	3.21	30.3	18.2	21.2	12.1
University grads.	2.20	39.3	17.9	28.6	21.4
1 or more yrs. univ.	2.39	31.7	20.6	22.2	20.6
3-5 yrs. HS	2.43	30.6	19.0	29.3	17.0 <sup>c</sup>
2 yrs. or less HS	2.75	29.2	24.7	30.3	11.2
SES 60+	2.43	28.6	19.6	25.0	19.6
SES below 39.99	2.48	28.7	24.1	28.7	16.1 <sup>d</sup>
SES 40-59.99	2.66	29.6	18.5	22.2	18.5

<sup>a</sup>Gamma = .80.

<sup>b</sup>Gamma, 3X3 = -.47.

Gamma, 15-24 yrs. & 50 yrs. & over = -.80.

<sup>c</sup>Gamma, 2 yrs. or less HS, 3-5 yrs. HS, 1 or more yrs. univ. = -.17.

Gamma, 1 or more yrs. univ. & 2 yrs. or less HS = 0.

Gamma, univ. grads. & 2 yrs. or less HS = 0.

<sup>d</sup>Gamma, 3X3 = -.28.

Gamma, 60+ & 40-59.99 = -.80.

is the best predictor. This characteristic was applied in the expected fashion by three of the four demographic categories. "Drunken" was mentioned less frequently by those sex and education subsamples which also had low social distance quotients. "Dirty" and "unambitious" each occurred in the order expected for one demographic category. Chi-square was calculated for those trait frequencies which occurred in the expected order. None were statistically significant. Finally, the pattern of application to the Indians of that highly derogatory term "stupid" was examined. Dexter (1964:41) suggested that more repugnance is shown ". . . toward stupidity than toward anything else except dirtiness." Few epithets are used more frequently to register disapproval of other human beings. There was no significant relationship between the demographic affiliation and social distance rank of the 13 people who volunteered the term.

### Jews

The relationship between Jewish social distance quotients and selected negative semantic differential traits is given in Table 6.19. Within the context of the Canadian culture, the Jewish traits chosen are less derogatory than the extreme Indian characteristics. They do, however, take on deprecatory coloration when they become part of the Jewish stereotype. Again, a strong ordinal association emerged for the sex category. No relationship was found for the age category. Education and socioeconomic status groups demonstrated an almost perfect negative relationship between

TABLE 6.19. JEWISH SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND  
SELECTED SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TRAITS, BY  
DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES

Samples	Semantic Differential Means							
	S.D.Q.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Females	2.12	5.9	2.0	5.7	6.1	2.3	1.7	4.8
Males	2.39	5.8	1.7	6.1	6.0	1.9	1.6	5.2 <sup>a</sup>
25-49 years	2.04	6.1	1.7	5.9	6.3	2.0	1.5	5.0
15-24 years	2.30	5.7	2.2	5.7	5.8	2.4	1.9	5.1 <sup>b</sup>
50 yrs. & over	2.54	5.7	1.8	6.4	6.3	1.4	1.4	4.4
Univ. grads. 1 or more	1.50	6.1	1.5	6.3	6.3	1.9	1.3	4.7
yrs. univ.	2.09	6.3	1.6	6.2	6.3	1.7	1.4	5.0
3-5 yrs. HS	2.14	5.9	1.9	6.0	6.1	2.3	1.6	5.0 <sup>c</sup>
2 yrs. or less HS	2.48	5.5	2.2	5.4	5.9	2.2	2.1	5.0
SES 60+	1.79	6.3	1.5	6.2	6.4	1.9	1.3	4.7
SES 40-59.99	2.21	6.1	1.7	6.2	6.3	2.1	1.6	5.0 <sup>d</sup>
SES below 39.99	2.40	5.5	2.5	5.3	6.0	2.2	2.1	5.1

- (1) materialistic  
(2) shrewd  
(3) competitive  
(4) cliquish  
(5) thrifty  
(6) ambitious  
(7) greedy

<sup>a</sup>Gamma = .72.

<sup>b</sup>Gamma, 3X3 = .07.

Gamma, 25-49 yrs. & 50 yrs. & over = 0.

<sup>c</sup>Gamma, 2 yrs. or less HS, 3-5 yrs. HS, 1 or more yrs. univ. = -.98.

Gamma, 2 yrs. or less HS & 1 or more yrs. univ. = -1.00.

Gamma, 2 yrs. or less HS & univ. grads. = -.92.

<sup>d</sup>Gamma, 3X3 = -.73.

Gamma, 60+ & below 39.99 = -.95.

acceptance and uncomplimentary trait ascription. None of the seven traits occurred in the order predicted for more than two subsamples. "Competitive," "thrifty," "ambitious," and even "greedy" were ranked as anticipated by only half the samples. "Shrewd" occurred in the predicted order for the sex subsample. Both "materialistic" and "cliquish" received more divergent means from all four low social distance categories.

Table 6.20 gives the relationship for demographic samples between the social distance quotients and five open-ended traits assigned to the Jews. Gamma values vary between +.80 for extreme age groups to -.80 for extreme education and socioeconomic status groups. "Thrifty" or its synonyms was applied to the Jews more frequently by high social distance quotient subcategories in three out of four cases. "Shrewd" differentiated half the categories. The characteristics, "cliquish" and "dominates others," both occurred as predicted only with the age groups. Frequency differences in the assignment of "thrifty" were examined for statistical significance. The single relationship to reach the .05 level was that for the socioeconomic status category.<sup>5</sup>

The foregoing results indicate that greater social distance from an ethnic group is not consistently associated with either more frequent or more extreme assignment of

---

<sup>5</sup> Similar negative findings emerged from the analysis of the relationship between assignment of the open-ended trait "uncouth" to the Ukrainians and demographic sample social distance quotients.

TABLE 6.20. JEWISH SOCIAL DISTANCE QUOTIENTS AND SELECTED OPEN-ENDED TRAITS, BY DEMOGRAPHIC SUBSAMPLES

Samples	% Open-Ended Traits				Dominates Others
	S.D.Q.	Thrifty	Shrewd	Cliquish	
Males	2.02	10.2	10.3	37.6	12.8
Females	2.12	14.2	12.0	19.7	8.2 <sup>a</sup>
15-24 years	1.98	18.3	9.2	15.3	7.6
50 yrs. & over	2.00	12.1	6.1	42.4	21.2 <sup>b</sup>
25-49 years	2.18	6.7	14.8	34.1	9.6
Univ. grads. 1 or more yrs. univ.	1.44	3.6	28.6	50.0	10.7
3-5 yrs. HS	1.81	7.9	15.9	41.3	14.3
2 yrs. or less HS	1.91	15.6	13.6	24.5	12.2 <sup>c</sup>
	2.57	11.2	4.5	19.1	3.4
SES 60+	1.89	7.1	19.6	37.5	12.5
SES 40-59.99	2.01	8.3	11.1	35.2	14.8 <sup>d</sup>
SES below 39.99	2.28	17.2	5.7	19.5	5.7

<sup>a</sup>Gamma = 0.

<sup>b</sup>Gamma 3X3 = .15.

Gamma, 15-24 yrs. & 25-49 yrs. = .80.

<sup>c</sup>Gamma, 2 yrs. or less HS, 3-5 yrs. HS, 1 or more yrs. univ. = -.74.

Gamma, 1 or more yrs. univ. & 2 yrs. or less HS = -.80.

Gamma, univ. grads. & 2 yrs. or less HS = -.80.

<sup>d</sup>Gamma, 3X3 = -.46.

Gamma, 60+ & below 39.99 = -.80.

negative traits. Had the unit of analysis been individuals rather than statistical categories, the outcome might have been somewhat different. Although the demographic groups could not be differentiated with reference to, for example, the labelling of Jews as dirty or Indians as stupid, it is not unreasonable to suppose that a correlation exists between high individual social distance quotients and the assignment of these adjectives. The childish chant, "stick and stones will break my bones," reflects recognition of a possibly universal affinity for calling enemies by "bad" names. Some epithets express both aversion and behavioral description. Nevertheless, the data indicate that the application of even the most derogatory traits to a group is not coterminous with extreme social distance from that group. For example, 18 respondents from the open-ended sample would permit Jewish people in Canada as visitors only, or would exclude them altogether from this country. However, only three people described Jews as dirty. Thirty-six made reference to the alleged avarice of that group. Although 15 people expressed extreme social distance from the Indians, 84 accused them of low hygienic standards.

Further, even if a prejudiced person dwells upon the negative attributes of a hated group, his stereotype is not *ipso facto* false. The question is empirical rather than logical. As a result of the social-psychological conceptualization of stereotypy as a symptomatic product of in-group antipathy, very little attention has been given to the

relationship between favorability and accuracy of stereotype traits. In this preoccupation with negative imagery, the fact that stereotypes do contain positive traits has been overlooked. The most well-known statement in this area, the "mirror image" hypothesis which argues that people attribute approved traits to admired groups and disapproved traits to disliked groups, does not address itself to the question of the accuracy of attribution (Bronfenbrenner, 1961; Berrien, 1969). Schuman (1966:440) has hypothesized that the positive characterizations in a stereotype are more accurate than the negative traits in the same stereotype:

. . . there is a general tendency to describe other ethnic groups in negative terms, at least relative to one's own group, a finding consistent with the mutual suspicion often found between ethnic groups. With this initial negative bias operating, a favorable stereotype probably requires stronger evidence than an unfavorable one before winning wide acceptance.

Conflict theorists, on the other hand, view the "true" behavior of the out-group as the cause of ethnocentrism (in the sense that groups have incompatible goals and compete for scarce resources), and negative traits as relatively accurate evaluations of out-group behavior (Campbell and Levine, 1965:31). Extrapolating from this position, one might expect that positive out-group traits would receive more casual appraisal from the stereotyping group. Such a proposition is congruent with the notion of "perceptual vigilance" and with the finding of Richey, et al. (1967), that in an impression formation task, negative behavior was viewed by subjects as more salient and intrinsically more



genuine than positive behavior. These conflicting predictions will be explored in the final chapter.

### Conclusion

The results from the Bogardus social distance scale were described. Hypothesis 6, which predicted that social distance would be positively related to greater amount of stereotypy, was tested and disconfirmed. When the various demographic categories were examined, high social distance was not found to be consistently related to unflattering trait ascription. The unit of analysis, however, is probably too gross to refute the "mirror image" hypothesis. The data are sufficiently adequate to support the conclusion that other factors besides affection or antipathy for a group influence impressions of that group. It is herein contended that stereotypes are also the product of the need to structure cognitively the group environment. The validity of these "cognitive maps" will be analyzed in the ensuing chapters.

## CHAPTER 7

### VALIDATION OF THE INDIAN STEREOTYPE

#### Introduction

This chapter is the first of three to empirically examine the assumption that ethnic stereotypes are inaccurate. The stereotype traits of the North American Indians, described in Chapter 4, are juxtaposed against a series of indices derived from public records and existing studies of the referent group to determine whether differences in these traits do exist between native people and the general Alberta population. Although many types of data have been used, particular reliance has been placed on two validation sources. The first, a massive government sponsored study of the contemporary situation of Canadian Indians directed by Dr. Harry Hawthorn (1966 and 1967), had at its disposal the talents of some 40 scholars and the complete records of the Indian Affairs Branch. Ethnographic reports from the Community Opportunity Assessment studies (Hobart, 1967b; Hatt, 1967; Newman, 1967) undertaken for the Alberta Human Resources Research Council provided a second important source of information concerning Alberta Indians and Metis.<sup>1</sup> In

---

<sup>1</sup>The legal definition of the terms "Indians" and "Metis" is an extremely complex matter. The 1961 census figure of 28,469 Alberta Indians includes all persons claiming native ancestry. Indian Affairs Branch reports concern only Indians subject to the Indian Act and 20,931 Alberta treaty Indians were recorded in 1961. Although the Metis (people of mixed Indian-white ancestry) have not been specifically identified since the 1941 census, they are thought

general, the available data indicate that the stereotype traits are essentially accurate descriptions of the native ancestry people.

It must be emphasized that the purpose of this study is to test the validity of ethnic imagery. Such a test does not commit the investigator to an explanation of the etiology of the stereotype or the observed differences in ethnic group behavior. Although some discussion of the probable source of native differences has been incorporated in the body of this chapter, a clear distinction must be maintained between such commentary and the test of the hypotheses.

### Indian Stereotype Traits

#### Rural

The description of the Indians as a rural people compared with the Alberta population generally emerged from the semantic differential, where the total sample mean was 5.7 and the average deviation 1.4. The "6" or "7" positions on the adjectival scale, i.e., "extremely" or "quite" rural, were checked by 72% of the sample.

Table 7.1 presents the 1961 census classification of Alberta and native populations according to rural and urban residence. All cities, towns, and villages of 1,000 or more population were defined as urban. For census purposes, a

---

to constitute approximately one-third of the Alberta native population. Whenever possible, data concerning both treaty Indians and Metis are considered in relation to the stereotype traits.

TABLE 7.1. URBAN, RURAL-FARM, AND RURAL NONFARM POPULATIONS,  
ALBERTA AND NATIVE PEOPLES, 1961

	Urban		Rural Farm		Rural Non-Farm		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Alberta	843,211	63.3	285,823	21.5	202,910	15.2	1,331,944	100.0
Native Indians, Eskimos*	2,507	8.8	5,098	17.8	20,949	73.4	28,554	100.0

Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961: catalogue 1.3-2, table 82).

\*The 1961 Alberta Eskimo population was negligible.

farm is regarded as an agricultural holding of one or more acres with sales of agricultural products of \$50 or more in the previous year. Table 7.1 shows that in 1961 91% of the native people were rural residents, compared to 37% of the Alberta population as a whole. The 1911 Alberta population was five times as urbanized as was the 1961 native population.

By 1966, the Alberta population was 69% urban (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1968a:194). Unfortunately, the 1966 census did not include questions on ethnic origin. However, the information available from other sources indicates that despite some movement into urban communities, the majority of Alberta native people remain in their rural settlements. The Department of Indian Affairs (1970:1) reported that in 1969-1970, 22,219 of the 27,467 Alberta band population were resident on the rural reserves. Even if one assumes that all 5,248 band members who were located off the reserve migrated to cities rather than other rural locations, nearly 81% of Alberta treaty Indians live in nonurban areas. Some 2,500 Alberta Metis live in rural colonies (Alberta Department of Agriculture, 1968:324). Only rough approximations are available concerning the numbers and location of the large majority of Metis who do not live in colonies. However, it can be inferred that most are rural from the fact that the Metis Study Tour (Metis Association of Alberta, 1969), which visited all the principal Metis settlements in the province, concentrated its activities in small northern

villages.

The stereotype trait "rural" accurately describes the Indian ancestry people of Alberta.

### Poor

The ascription of the trait "poor" to the Indians exceeded the criterion levels for both instruments. Eighty-five percent of the semantic differential sample described the Indians as either extremely or quite poor. The corresponding mean and average deviation were 6.3 and 0.8, respectively. Twenty-nine percent of the open-ended questionnaire sample spoke of the impoverished circumstances of native people compared to Albertans generally. The evidence available confirms the stereotype. A series of indicators of economic well-being--relative income, dependence on social assistance, mortality rates, housing conditions, access to amenities available to most Canadians--clearly documents the disprivileged status of the Indian people.

An intensive study of the economic, educational, and social circumstances of the Canadian Indians, which was commissioned by the federal Department of Citizenship and Immigration and edited by Hawthorn (and hereinafter referred to as the "Hawthorn report"), concluded that ". . . the majority of the Indian population constitutes a group economically depressed in terms of the standards that have become widely accepted in Canada" (Hawthorn, 1966:21). Hawthorn (1966:45) reports that in 1964, the total earnings

from gainful employment for a representative sample of 35 bands amounted to approximately \$300 per capita, compared to the Canadian average of \$1,400.

In 1965, the Indian Affairs Branch estimated that 78.5% of Indian households had incomes of less than \$3,000 a year, 54.5% less than \$2,000, and 28.2% less than \$1,000 (Economic Council of Canada, 1968:121). Comparable figures for the distribution of income among Alberta families in 1966 were published by the Department of National Revenue (1968). Some 42.8% earned less than \$3,000, 27.5% less than \$2,000, and 12.5% less than \$1,000. Information on income for Alberta Saddle Lake Reserve Indians and Lac La Biche Metis is provided by the Community Opportunity Assessment studies (Hobart, 1967b:80). Some 22% of the men in these samples earned no income, an additional 47% earned \$1,000 or less, 21% earned between \$1,000 and \$3,000, and 10% earned over \$3,000. After defining poverty as the expenditure of 70% or more of income for food, shelter and clothing, the Economic Council (1968:108, 109) defined the lines between poverty and economic well-being at \$2,500 or less for families of two persons, at \$3,000, \$3,500 and \$4,000 for families of three, four, and five or more persons respectively. It is estimated that a quarter of Canadian nonfarm families exist below these levels (Economic Council of Canada, 1968:109). (Unfortunately, information for rural families was not provided.) Since 78.5% of Canadian Indian households earned less than \$3,000 in 1965, and very few are three-person

families, one may conservatively conclude that a much larger proportion of Indians than Canadian generally exist in poverty.

The Hawthorn report states that on the average, 36% of the Canadian Indian population requires social allowance, compared to approximately 3.5% of non-Indian Canadians (1966:345). The per capita cost of social assistance for Indians is 22 times greater than that paid for non-Indians (Hawthorn, 1967:24). According to the Indian Affairs Branch, in fiscal year 1969-1970, 19,703 Alberta Indians were on permanent assistance, and 57,971 received temporary assistance (1970:7). In the same year, \$2,624,856 was expended for food and clothing, and \$522,026 for children in care (Indian Affairs Branch, 1970:7). The social assistance expenditure for food and clothing alone amounts to \$96 per capita for the Alberta band population. In 1965-66, the per capita expenditure for all provincial welfare to Alberta non-Indians was \$24 (Alberta Department of Agriculture, 1968:245).

The implications of poverty extend beyond shortage of money. Poverty involves ill-health, a foreshortened life, wretched living conditions. The Royal Commission on Health Services noted that ". . . the measurement of mortality has continued to be the most reliable single indicator of health conditions . . ." (Kohn, 1965:110). Infant mortality for Indians is three times higher and infant mortality for pre-school children four times higher than the non-Indian



Canadian rates (Hawthorn, 1967:25). According to the Indian Affairs Branch,

The average age of death in 1963 for Indian males was 33.31 years and for Indian females 34.71 years. However, if the deaths occurring in the first 12 months of life are excluded, the average age of death rises in the case of males to over 46 years and to just under 48 years for females. The national average ages of death in 1963 were 60.5 years for males and 64.1 years for females (Department of Citizenship, 1965:8).

The Community Opportunity Assessment studies (Hobart, 1967b:152) found the housing of Indian and Metis families to be grossly inferior to that of their white sample. While the average Alberta dwelling housed .7 persons per room in 1961 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961:Bulletin 93-529), only 16% of the Indian ancestry homes had no more than one person per room and 30% had more than three persons per room (Hobart, 1965b:155). Thirty percent of Alberta reserve homes consist of only one or two rooms (Indian Affairs Branch, 1970:5). The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reported that 99% of Canadian homes had electricity, and 92% had telephones (Elkin, 1964:196). In 1969-70, the comparable figures for Alberta treaty Indian homes were 77% and 4%, respectively (Indian Affairs Branch, 1970:5). A nonstatistical commentary on substandard housing conditions and dependency on welfare in principal Metis centres is contained in the Metis Study Tour Report (Metis Association of Alberta, 1968).

Although a thorough analysis of the economic situation faced by the Indians is beyond the scope of the present study, a few comments, drawn primarily from the Hawthorn

report (1967:24), are worth making. For nearly a century, the Indians have been isolated either on reserves or in remote rural areas where, cut off from the economic development of the environing society, they carried on their traditional pursuits of hunting, fishing, and trapping. With the disappearance of game, these activities no longer provide minimal subsistence. In 1969-1970, the average Alberta trapper earned \$195, the average fisherman, \$524 (Indian Affairs Branch, 1970:3). When their plight finally became obvious to the federal authorities, the government responded with direct cash aid rather than with realistic plans for development of Indian human or property resources. Today, less than a third of the reserves can support their burgeoning populations (Economic Council of Canada, 1968:122). The Indians, burdened with both unfriendly attitudes of the whites and the habit of dependency on paternalistic government, trapped in the familiar poverty cycle, are culturally and vocationally unprepared to compete for wages on the industrial market. In short, the sample members accurately described the native people as poor.

#### Frivolous with Money

The semantic differential sample considered Indians unwise compared to Albertans generally in their expenditure of the financial resources at their disposal. Seventy-one percent noted that Indians tend to be either extremely or quite frivolous with money, resulting in a mean of 5.8 and an average deviation of 1.1. Statements such as that quoted

below are often made to fieldworkers by local non-Indians:

The funniest thing about Indians (Metis) the first thing they do is get their cheque cashed. Then they buy enough for dinner. After that they start drinking. They're broke in two days or pay a fine, and beg for food . . . Some family allowance cheques are for \$50 to \$75. But here it all goes for beer. We used to give credit on Family Allowance but its [sic] no use. Its [sic] just a big drunk . . . On F.A. day ten to fifteen women sit in the cafe waiting for the bar to open at 11 a.m. (Card, 1963a:165).

Such evidence as is available suggests that Indian spending practices do depart from standards considered prudent by middle-class monetary and health experts.

In conjunction with an inquiry into the incidence of tuberculosis among Metis, Card (1963a) analyzed consumer behavior in northern Alberta Improvement District 124, which was approximately 50% Metis and treaty Indian in 1960, the year the fieldwork was conducted. From observation and interviews, he concluded that only a small minority of the Indian ancestry population demonstrated acculturated consumption habits which make a ". . . limited income cover essential needs in ways considered adequate and respectable in the larger society" (Card, 1963a:165). Most native people were characterized by "conspicuous" consumer behavior, both in terms of type of goods bought in preference to those considered more important by medium and high income whites, and careless treatment of their property (Card, 1963a:165-6). The following quotation illustrates the latter pattern:

Teenagers and adults with no work and no regular income, spend money for tailor-made cigarettes. Children, who get money, spend it immediately for pop or chocolate bars . . . The purchase by a mother or householder of expensive fresh fruit, of fancy biscuits or canned

goods instead of more basic food-stuffs is another aspect of conspicuous spending. However, it is spending or exchanging for beer that dominates conspicuous spending in this consumer category . . . (Card, 1963a:165).

The same author notes that while estimated per capita income was half the Alberta average, the money spent on beer in Improvement District 124 was double the Alberta per capita beer expenditure (Card, 1963a:168, 177). However, observation of expenditures in 169 households revealed that only 9% were without minimal necessities because of "irresponsible consumer behavior" (Card, 1963a:171).

Spaulding (1967:96), who spent the summers of 1961, 1962, and 1965 among the Metis at the Ile-à-la-Crosse settlement in northern Saskatchewan, observes that the Metis ". . . are not prone to exercise caution in their purchases." He notes that the choice of expensive food items, luxury clothing, cosmetics, and bootleg liquor (delivered by truck two or three times a week) results in a yearly deficit for at least 95% of the settlement families (Spaulding, 1967:96).

A study of the attitudes of Edmonton, Alberta landlords toward their native tenants asked whether native people generally pay their rent on time. Forty percent answered negatively. Fifty percent of the landlords contended that native tenants failed to keep the property in good condition. The owners of property in poor condition were more likely to encounter these problems (Alberta Human Rights Association, 1969:3). Unfortunately, the landlords did not relate their experience with non-Indian tenants.

The Hawthorn report quotes the observations of a

journalist who studied Indian graduates from residential schools:

In the economic sphere I found them equally ill-fitted to face the outside world. . . . They had absolutely no sense of the value of money, spending it like water when it came to calling cabs, making phone calls, buying clothes, transistor radios or electric guitars. True they had very little money to start with, but inevitably any bus fares or pocket money allotted them each month was gone in the first few days (Hawthorn, 1967:95).

On the other hand, Hatt's (1967:123-4) field experience with the Metis people in the Lac La Biche area led him to conclude that their alleged inability to spend money wisely is a myth. Observation of some 25 Metis shopping expeditions showed ". . . that most of the money was spent for food and clothing and that impulsive buying involved only small amounts. Wild spending due to personal problems was most infrequent . . ." (Hatt, 1967:124). He does acknowledge that Metis experience in financial matters is "very weak." Since the government also believes the Metis to be incapable of handling cash, all social assistance is given in the form of merchandise vouchers, thereby depriving them of experience in handling money.

Most of the above studies hypothesized a relationship between native financial irresponsibility and lack of acculturation. In this connection, Sauve (1969:11) describes a study where a positive correlation was obtained between acculturation of Saskatchewan Indians and deferred gratification patterns in finances, work, child-rearing, etc. Certainly, it is reasonable to suppose that if Indian people are to spend money according to middle-class standards they

must first learn these standards. Nevertheless, the behavior pejoratively described by middle-class whites as "spending like Indians" may simply be "spending like people at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder." The results of Cameron and Storm (1965:459-63) support this interpretation. After completing a concept learning task, middle-class, working-class, and Indian children were offered either a 10¢ chocolate bar immediately or a 25¢ bar in a week. Delayed gratification was displayed by a significantly greater number of middle-class whites than lower-class whites or Indian children. Differences between the latter two groups were not significant.

Although far from abundant, the data available suggest that from a middle-class point of view, many Indians do not exercise prudence in handling the small amount of cash at their disposal. The material to be presented in a later section concerning Indians and alcohol reinforces the conclusion that the Indians have been accurately stereotyped.

#### Not Materialistic

The trait "not materialistic" was applied by a sufficient proportion of the semantic differential sample to be included in the Indian stereotype. Sixty-nine percent checked the two adjacent extreme scale positions, producing a mean of 2.4 and an average deviation of 1.4. Although this characteristic did not meet the open-ended questionnaire criterion level, those references which were offered suggest that the sample members' interpretation of

nonmaterialism was similar to its dictionary definition: the tendency to be more concerned with spiritual than with material goals. It is not a simple matter to document the relative importance to an ethnic group of one set of values against another. However, the data available indicate that despite a probable basis in the plains and northern Indian cultural past for this percept, the attribution of nonmaterialism to contemporary native people has become quite inappropriate.

According to the Hawthorn report (1966:56-7), the historical experience of those Indians dependent on hunting, fishing, or trapping did not encourage acquisition of goods. A nomadic existence made the accumulation of surplus possessions unfeasible. The necessity for those with resources to share with their less fortunate relatives further discouraged avidity. In addition, Zentner (1967:72) says that these people traditionally had no notion of ownership, individual or collective, of their natural surroundings. Indians from this particular background have had to learn that in the modern world prestige and status partially devolve about possession of durable goods. The absence of this incentive combined with subsistence level expectations have resulted in employers complaining that Indian workers remain on the job only long enough to get money for their immediate needs (Hawthorn, 1966:57). Nevertheless, caution must be exercised in speculating about any relationship between the native cultural past and their present economic motivations.

Field investigations indicate that native people very much want the standard of living they see demonstrated by whichever level of white society is available as a model.

Dunning (1962:226) speaks of ". . . the universal acceptance of consumer goods by Indian status persons . . ."

Buckley, et al. (1963:26), attribute to the northern Saskatchewan Indian and Metis

. . . a general desire to have better houses, diets, clothes, and the like. Their concept of 'better' is coming to resemble the Southerner's more and more. Indians wish to increase and vary the foodstuffs they may set on their tables, they want to own and use such appurtenances of modern technology as washing machines, automobiles and refrigerators . . .

Hatt (1967:24) reports that the Lac La Biche Metis feel badly about living in primitive cabins. When asked which aspect of a job was most important, amount of pay, type of work, working companions, or prestige of the job, these people viewed the amount of pay as the important factor (Hatt, 1967:108). The Hawthorn report found that although durable consumer goods do not operate as economically motivating forces for Indians in contact with the urban poor (1966:108), in general, Indians do aspire to white standards of housing, nutrition, clothing, furniture, cars, and the like (1967:165).

The materialistic concerns of Alberta Indian leaders have received wide press coverage in the last few years. Their demands that the treaties be honored and compensation paid in the form of land, money, and professional services have been expressed most forceably by Harold Cardinal,



president of the Indian Association of Alberta (1969). However, the minutes of the 1968 Edmonton consultation meetings between government and spokesmen from most Alberta bands show that Cardinal's views are those of the Indian tribal leaders (Department of Indian Affairs, 1968). In 1969, the Alberta Metis Settlement Association brought an unsuccessful action against the province to recover six million dollars from the sale of petroleum rights on their colonies. Along with a strong interest in preserving their culture, the incipient native social movement has demonstrated a hard-headed determination to share in Canada's material benefits. In the context of a description of cargo cults as an aberrant product of the gap between the needs stimulated in non-industrial peoples and restricted opportunities for their satisfaction, Van Baal (1960:109) notes that "desire breeds envy and envy plays a disturbing role in race relations everywhere in the world." As Indian exposure to the white standard of living escalates through travel and the mass media, their deprivation will become that much more chafing.

The evidence indicates that the Indians are far from indifferent to materialistic values. Although respondents may have been influenced by some knowledge of relevant native cultural traditions and/or Indian spending practices on immediately consumable rather than durable goods, the open-ended references show that another, rather curious factor, was at work. Many sample members romanticized the condition of both the Indians and the lower class. They regarded these

groups which possess very little as quite content with their lot. A superior sort of satisfaction from interpersonal relations was attributed to the poor who voluntarily remain aloof from the contest for material impedimenta. However, the source of the perception is not at issue. Rather, the important point is that the stereotype trait is inaccurate.

### Large Families

The semantic differential sample regarded the Indians as more likely than the general Alberta population to have large families. Eighty-three percent of the responses were in the two adjacent extreme scale positions, producing a mean of 6.2 and an average deviation of 0.8. All the comparative demographic data available confirm the validity of this stereotype trait.

In 1964, the Indian Affairs Branch described the Indians as "the fastest growing ethnic group in Canada" (Department of Citizenship and Immigration, 1964:3). According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Canada's Indian population is increasing at the rate of 4% per year, while the general Canadian population is increasing at about 3% per year (Hawthorn, 1967:88). In 1967, the Indian Affairs Branch reported that Alberta treaty Indians are increasing at the rate of 4.42% per year (cited by Department of Agriculture, 1968:281). Because of the many native ancestry people in Alberta who do not come within the purview of the federal government, native birth rates remain approximations. However, in 1968 the crude birth rate for Alberta treaty

Indians was 55.1 (Department of Health, 1970). The general Alberta birth rate for 1967 was 20.6 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1967c:14). In 1967, the Indians who constituted approximately 3% of the population contributed 7% of the total birth registered (Department of Health, 1967:7).

The 1961 census asked women to state the number of live children they had borne. Figures for Alberta women and prairie province native Indians in the childbearing years are shown in Table 7.2. The greater number of children produced by Indians, combined with a death rate which in recent years has slowly approached that of Canadians generally, has resulted in a larger proportion of the native population in the younger age categories. In 1965, 53% of Alberta registered Indians were 15 years of age and under. About 3.5% were 65 and over (Department of Citizenship, 1967:4). In 1966, only 35% of the Alberta population was under 15 years of age and 7% were 65 and over (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1966:Catalogue 92-611, table 25). Statistics on the Indian population by ethnicity (rather than legal status) have not been made available since 1961. However, in that year 34% of the Canadian population and 47% of the native population were less than 15 years old (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961:Catalogue 1.3-2). Finally, the average number of children per Alberta family in 1966 was 1.9 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1966:Catalogue 93-609, table 52). The median number of children in the Lac La Biche and Saddle Lake Reserve sample families was five.

TABLE 7.2. NUMBER OF CHILDREN BORN PER 1,000 ALBERTA  
WOMEN AND PRAIRIE PROVINCE INDIAN WOMEN  
EVER MARRIED, 1961

Age Categories	Alberta Women Generally*	Prairie Province Indian Women**
15-19	708	1,272
20-24	1,395	2,471
25-29	2,246	3,964
30-34	2,781	5,594
35-39	3,038	6,831
40-44	3,072	7,304

\*Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961:Catalogue 98-508, table H-1).

\*\*Source; Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961:Catalogue 98-508, table H-4).

One-third had seven or more children (Hobart, 1957b:155).

Two percent of Alberta families have seven or more children (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1966:Catalogue 93-609).

The semantic differential sample's perception of the Indians as more prolific than the general population is accurate.

### Dirty

Twenty-eight percent of the open-ended questionnaire sample made reference to the Indians' comparatively low hygienic standards. The data presented below corroborate this allegation.

One of the recommendations of the Hawthorn report (1967:13) reads as follows:

School complaints about the standard of personal hygiene of Indian children are numerous. Many Indian homes lack adequate bathroom and laundry facilities. In most schools there are other children whose homes also lack facilities and it is recommended that schools make arrangements so that students may use gymnasium and Home Economics laundry equipment. The practice of sending children home because they are dirty cannot remedy their situation and negates their education.

Further reference to the effect of Indian pupils' lack of personal cleanliness on student-teacher relationships appear throughout the second volume of this report (Hawthorn, 1967: 14, 70, 109, 111, 120, 137, 140, 143). Apparently, health personnel found it troublesome to cope with Indian students ". . . who have lice, scabies and who are just generally dirty" (Hawthorn, 1967:146). Such conditions were attributed to absence of sanitation facilities and, to some extent, ". . . the lack of time, effort and understanding of parents whose children suffer from filth diseases, chronic infections and malnutrition" (Hawthorn, 1967:146). Such statements were not, of course, intended to describe all Indian children. The authors note that non-Indian slum children also diverge from the education system's high valuation of cleanliness (Hawthorn, 1967:109).

Dental and medical examinations of Metis and white samples were conducted in conjunction with the study of tuberculosis incidence in Alberta's Improvement District 124 referred to above (Greenhill and Ruether, 1963). Four or more large dental caries and poor dental hygiene were found in 46% of the Metis children and 13% of the white children (Greenhill and Ruether, 1963:298). The doctor who examined

the adults reported that the Metis tended ". . . to be less clean in their habits and persons . . ." (Greenhill and Ruether, 1963:300). The Lac La Biche Metis study (Hatt, 1967:31-2) cites statements from local doctors and hospital staff indicating that scabies and impetigo, which had a higher prevalence among Metis than whites, could be attributed to unsanitary, crowded living quarters.

A paper published by a Saskatchewan public health inspector whose job involves teaching hygiene to the residents of Indian reserves implies that the problem reflects lack of acculturation (Freestone, 1968). However, an equally fundamental explanation is the fact that many Alberta native ancestry people are without bathrooms, running water, and very often, a dependable water supply of any sort. Hobart (1967b:267) observes that almost one-half the Saddle Lake Reserve residents and Lac La Biche Metis live more than a quarter of a mile from water. Those without transportation must pay a dollar a barrel for their water. Representatives of 11 separate Alberta Metis settlements communicated their urgent need for water to the Study Tour (Metis Association of Alberta, 1969).

Table 7.3 shows the sanitation facilities possessed by Albertans generally and residents of Alberta Indian reserves. Southern Alberta reserves are more likely than northern reserves to have sewer and water. The percentage of reserve homes with water shown on the following table is high since the figure includes homes with sewer and/or water.

TABLE 7.3. SANITATION FACILITIES IN HOUSEHOLDS, ALBERTA  
GENERAL POPULATION AND INDIAN RESERVES

	Alberta 1968*	Indian Reserves 1969-70**
Bathrooms	87.8%	9.7%
Piped Water	90.7%	11.2%

\*Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1968b:17).

\*\*Source: Department of Indian Affairs (1970:5).

When water is a precious commodity which must be paid for in time, energy, and/or cash, it is not difficult to understand why middle-class urban standards of cleanliness are not being met. However this may be, the stereotype is accurate.

#### Uneducated

The Indians were described as uneducated compared to Albertans generally by both instrument samples. Twenty-nine percent of the open-ended questionnaire respondents made spontaneous reference to Indian lack of schooling. Seventy-six percent of the semantic differential sample indicated that natives were extremely or quite uneducated, resulting in a mean of 6.1 and an average deviation of 0.9. According to the statistical data on comparative grade enrolment and levels of attainment, this stereotype trait is accurate.

Table 7.4 shows the percentages of Alberta students generally and Alberta treaty Indians who are in school by grade level. A low proportion of Indian students is enrolled in the secondary grades. (The percentage of both populations between 15 and 19 years is very similar.) Hughes'

TABLE 7.4. PERCENTAGES OF ALBERTA STUDENTS AND ALBERTA INDIANS ENROLLED AT VARIOUS GRADE LEVELS, 1964-65

Grade Levels	Alberta Students Generally*	Alberta Treaty Indian Students**
Grades 1-4	40	50
Grades 5-8	35	38
Grades 9-12	25	12
	100	100

\*Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1967a:356, table 5).

\*\*Source: Fisher (1966:259, table 2).

(1968:75) study of Alberta high school dropouts indicates that over 90% of native ancestry students leave school as soon as they are legally permitted to do so. In the 1965-66 school year, 6.7% of Alberta students generally who reached age 15 dropped out from ninth grade and high school (Hughes, 1968:xliv, Appendix D). The Canadian situation is similar. At approximately 14 years of age nearly 90% of Canadian students who began grade one together enter high school (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1968a:357). Only 13% of Canadian Indians who started grade one in 1951 enrolled in the ninth grade, and only 4% entered the 12th grade with their age cohorts. Although both grade repetition and dropouts are combined, the Hawthorn report interprets these data as a 94% loss of the Indian school population between grades 1 and 12, compared to the national dropout rate for non-Indian students of 12% (Hawthorn, 1967:130). As a result, only 3% of Alberta Indian adults have a grade 10 education



or better, compared with 36.5% of Alberta adults (unpublished data made available by Indian Affairs Branch to Department of Agriculture, 1968:285).

Table 7.5 shows the percentages by agency of Alberta Indian youth aged 15 to 19 and 20 to 24 which are enrolled in secondary and tertiary educational institutions. These data were tabulated by Fisher (1966:262, table iv) from information provided by the Indian Affairs Branch, Edmonton.

TABLE 7.5. PERCENTAGE ALBERTA INDIAN YOUTH ENROLLED IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, 1964-65

Agency	% 15-19 Grades 9-12	% 20-24 College/Technical
Edmonton	67	9
Blood	37	4
Lesser Slave	37	0
Blackfoot	36	0
Peigan	27	0.8
Hobbema	22	0.9
Saddle Lake	23	0.7
Stony-Sarcee	16	2
Athabasca	17	0

The mean percentage for the agencies of 15- to 19-year-olds attending grades 9 to 12 is 31.3%. Unfortunately, the most recent information on the education level of the general population by age categories is nearly 10 years old. However, in 1961, 54.9% of Albertans between 15 and 19 were enrolled in grades 9 to 12. A further 2.6% of this age group were in university (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961:Bulletin 1.3-6, table 99). Since the annual reports of the Alberta Department of Education show the retention rate

to be increasing, it can be assumed that in 1964-65 the gap between Indian and general enrolment was in fact greater.

This discrepancy widens when university enrolment is examined. In the year 1966-67, 0.04% of the Alberta Indian population and 1.2% of the Alberta population were in university (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1968a:216, 376). By 1969-70, the proportion of Alberta registered Indian population in university had increased to 0.15% (Department of Indian Affairs, 1970:4). In 1967-68, 16% of Albertans between 18 and 24 years were enrolled in postsecondary institutions (Economic Council of Canada, 1969:128, table 8.4). Although the age category is not exactly that shown in the second column of Table 7.5, the disparity is evident. The Lac La Biche study (Hobart, 1967b:51, 280) found the Metis level of educational attainment to be low. Almost half of the adult men interviewed had no formal education, 19% had over six years, and 5% more than nine years of schooling. The women had slightly more education.

Few Indians are involved in high status occupations. Table 7.6 compares the proportions of Indians and Eskimo in various occupational categories with those of the Canadian male labor force. The paucity of Indian professionals is further documented by information made available to Fisher (1966:263) by the Indian Affairs Branch:

Of the 23,714 individuals who made up Alberta's Indian population on the last day of 1964, six are qualified teachers, five are nurses, and four more are medical or laboratory technicians. No persons of Alberta Indian ancestry are medical doctors, professional scientists or engineers, and there are no Alberta Indian dentists.

TABLE 7.6. PERCENTAGE CANADIAN NATIVE AND CANADIAN TOTAL  
MALE LABOR FORCE IN OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES, 1961

Occupational Category	Canadian Male Labor Force	Indians and Eskimo
Professional and financial	8.6	1.1
Clerical	6.9	1.0
Personal service	4.3	5.6
Primary and unskilled	10.0	44.7
Agriculture	12.2	19.1
All others	58.0	28.5
	100.0	100.0

Source: Porter (1965:564, table 5).

In short, the perception of Indians as uneducated is quite accurate. Much of the second volume of the Hawthorn report (1967) discusses the limited educational achievement of Canadian Indians along with reasons for and possible solutions of this state of affairs. Further analyses are provided by Fisher (1966) and Hobart (1970).

#### Believe University Education Unimportant

Indian devaluation of university education is a semantic differential stereotype trait which received 70% response in the two adjacent extreme scale positions. The mean and average deviation were 5.8 and 1.1, respectively. When this attitudinal dimension was originally included in the instrument, the researcher had in mind the Hutterites' deliberate rejection of advanced training. At first blush, its application to the Indian people, so recently introduced to grade school education, seems somewhat superficial.

However, if the scale is liberally interpreted as the value Indians place on white education generally, inquiry into its validity becomes quite significant, even for those who remain unconvinced that education is the salvation for Canada's disadvantaged peoples. Although some controversy exists, most sociologists believe that the native people are, perhaps with good reason, indifferent or hostile to the education offered them by white society.

The Hawthorn report contains extensive interview data on the attitudes of Indians across Canada toward education (1967:115-19, 137-39). Among Indian parents, the major trend found was conflict between verbalization of the need for education and behavior which disconfirmed this belief. They said "education is good because it helps you get jobs" but could think of no one who enjoyed an easier life because he was educated. Rather, from the examples which were given by Indian adults education clearly had proved to be an unpleasant experience which did not lead to employment. As a result, these parents were nonsupportive in their behavior toward their children's education, providing them with negative stories of their own schooling, permitting or demanding that their children remain home from school for spurious reasons, etc. (Hawthorn, 1967:137-38). According to the authors of the Hawthorn report, at best Indian parents are neutral toward education. This group was not embittered by their own experiences, but offered no objections if their children dropped out of school (Hawthorn,

1967:137). Finally, a faction of parents question the value of education at all. The adult generation remembers their own unhappy experiences at school. Moreover, the prospect of a better educated younger generation threatens the status of their elders. Communities are often disrupted when education instils new ideas and/or material aspirations which cannot be satisfied (Hawthorn, 1967:119).

Although young Indian children usually enter school with a measure of optimism, negative attitudes toward education predominate among the older Indian students (Hawthorn, 1967:115, 139).

The student has little conception of what he is gaining by attending school; he recognizes that he is failing academically and that he is socially isolated. . . . His evaluations are made in the light of his immediate life to which education seemingly has little relevance. He cannot relate the education he is receiving to his life and the lives of his friends and relatives (Hawthorn, 1967:139).

While most students interviewed said they would like to finish high school, few planned to go beyond the 10th grade. "Very few" mentioned university (Hawthorn, 1967:117). Hatt (1967:209) also reports that Lac La Biche Metis adolescents felt school had little meaning to the future they anticipated. Moreover, in some Indian communities, sanctions are brought to bear against those adolescents who differentiate themselves by remaining in school (Hawthorn, 1967:118). In general, the Hawthorn report (1967:108) found that since Indian children lacked professional models, they aspired to unskilled vocations. Education was especially devalued where the native culture was stable and aboriginal pursuits

remained both feasible and valued.

A contrary opinion on Indian valuation of education is contained in Hobart's (1967b) summary of the Lac La Biche and Saddle Lake studies. Sample members were asked how far in school children should go. Ninety-eight percent felt boys should complete the 12th grade, and 25% felt boys should go beyond the 12th grade. The comparable responses for girls were 92% and 25% (Hobart, 1967b:156). Ninety-eight percent wished they themselves had had more schooling (Hobart, 1967b:157). Hobart concluded that "the value placed on education by subjects interviewed was clearly very high" (1967b:157). Perhaps, the Indians' verbal endorsement of education should be interpreted in the context of the Hawthorn analysis.

Fisher (1969) argues that the disillusionment of Indians with education is well founded. According to his data, the average unemployment rate of the "better" educated young Indians is considerably higher than that of all Alberta Indians (Fisher, 1969:29). Most of a stratified sample of Alberta Blood Indian youth preferred occupations which could be learned on the reserve (Fisher, 1969:32). The formal training offered in schools was simply irrelevant to their experience. Even more serious is Fisher's charge that the education institution imposes an alien culture, thereby producing young people who are unequipped for white or Indian life (1966:265). In his words, the education offered to the Alberta Indian ". . . is not of his culture, not of

his language, not of his past, not of his present" (Fisher, 1966:266).

Cardinal, the spokesman for the native movement, views the present education system as a government tool for forced assimilation. Education will be esteemed when authority and curriculum are transferred to Indian hands (Cardinal, 1969:51-61). A sit-in launched at the Blue Quill School near St. Paul, Alberta during the summer of 1970 was designed to achieve this purpose. White educators too have begun to catalog the many changes required to render education meaningful to the native people (Hobart, 1970). Meanwhile, the literature does indicate that Indians view the white education system as unimportant in their lives. The stereotype is accurate.

### Unambitious

Sixty-five percent of the semantic differential sample described the Indians as quite or extremely unambitious in comparison with Albertans generally. The mean was 5.6 and the average deviation 1.2. Despite its consensual application to native people, the charge of lack of ambition is not easily defined. Any attempt to do so necessarily takes on ethnocentric overtones. *Webster's Dictionary* defines ambition as the "strong desire to succeed or to achieve something, as fame, power, wealth, etc." The majority group prescribes both the goals worth striving for and the proper mechanisms for attaining them. As the preceding section on materialism argued, many Indians do want white standards of

nutrition, housing, and expensive durable possessions. Whether or not these newly stimulated needs (or the desire for achievement *per se*) act as incentives for long-term productive effort is the problem to be considered. According to middle-class lights, the approved mechanisms for attaining "success" include hard work, planning, and above all, education. The native verdict on the white education system has already been discussed; the following section deals with native attitudes toward work. In general, the stereotype trait presently under purview requires evaluation of the strength of the Indians' desire to achieve improvement of their lot through effort.

Several investigators have measured the achievement motivation in Indian children. Cameron and Storm (1965) administered thematic apperception tests to groups of 22 British Columbia Indian, white working-class, and white middle-class elementary school children. The stories of 16 middle-class, 6 lower-class, and 6 Indian children contained achievement imagery. These results were interpreted as reflections of socioeconomic background rather than ethnicity.

French (1967) found both socioeconomic status and ethnicity to be significantly related to achievement scores. His instrument, developed by Rosen (1956) and extensively used in the United States, measured activism-passivism, willingness to plan ahead, and individualism. Samples included white, Metis and Indian adolescents from Alberta urban, rural, and residential schools. Children whose



fathers had high-ranking occupations displayed significantly greater achievement scores than those with fathers in low-ranking occupations. Whites scored higher than both the Indians and Metis, whose results were not significantly different. French (1967:155) concluded that ". . . both Indians and Metis lack the implementary values necessary to achievement."

Contrary results have been reported by Sydiaha and Rempel (1964). Thematic apperception tests were given to Indian and non-Indian northern Saskatchewan students and white urban working-class and middle-class children. The median age was 14 years. No difference in achievement aspiration was found between Indians, northern whites or urban lower-class whites. Although the abstract of Sydiaha and Rempel's paper implies higher scores for urban middle-class whites, the results were not provided in the body of the paper. Sydiaha and Rempel argue that Metis-Indian children lose their high aspirations only after they have left school and been thwarted in their attempts to achieve their goals. In opposition to this view, the authors of the Hawthorn report found that Indian children are disillusioned much sooner:

Pilot studies undertaken during the course of this project appear to indicate that the motivation of Indian students is as high as that of non-Indians and higher in some instances. Nevertheless, the study also indicates a sharp drop in motivation for achievement after a few years in school (Hawthorn, 1967:129).

White children on the other hand show an increasing need for achievement with each year in school. As the Indian child

experiences repeated failure at school, his lofty aspirations are abandoned. The Economic Council of Canada (1969: 111) summarizes the situation: ". . . the desire [of the poor] to participate in a productive way in our society is more often frustrated than lacking."

In general, the Hawthorn report (1967:143) found that Indian youth do internalize middle-class goals. However, personal experience has taught them that few opportunities exist within the white community. When asked, "What would you like to do?" Indian students often indicate they wish to be doctors or lawyers, but have little conception of what is involved. Chances for fulfilment of white school system goals are minimal because behavior patterns are acquired from Indian models (Hawthorn, 1967:123). The closure of white society against them prevents identification with white models. When students were asked, "What will you do?" they answer with occupations they see Indians actually doing: semi-skilled or unskilled labor in primary industries. Apparently, both Indian Affairs and school personnel encourage these choices, providing neither information nor encouragement to think about alternatives to "Indian occupations (Hawthorn, 1967:124). In connection with the study described above, French (1967) asked his subjects to name all the occupations they could think of in five minutes. Indians were able to name more high-ranking occupations than Metis, but both groups did less well than whites (French, 1967:144). Class rather than ethnicity was the more

important variable. White and Indian children whose fathers had low-ranking occupations were as unaware as the Metis of the existence of high- or middle-ranking vocations (French, 1967:151). Since the Metis children's white contacts were limited to poor rather than middle-class whites, the only practical method learned to improve life-style is appeal to welfare (French, 1967:131).

The Hawthorn study (1967:125, 126) found the lowest levels of aspiration among native youth from disorganized communities characterized by mass unemployment. Attracted by money and all it can buy, aware that work made the good things available, convinced that such employment was out of reach for Indians, these young people simply remain immobilized. They could not imagine ". . . any possibilities of doing or being anything other than they were now" (Hawthorn, 1967:125). Discrimination, failure in school (for many, the first and only sustained contact with middle-class society), a circumscribed perspective on the world all conspire to deprive Indian children of hope for a better future.

What of the older generation? Hatt (1967:109) inquired into the job aspirations of Lac La Biche Metis men for themselves and their children. As Table 7.7 shows, the respondents who were rural seasonal workers when employed hoped for a slightly better job level for themselves and a considerably improved level for their sons. A study by French (1967:161-62) is related to the foregoing. He administered to a small sample of northern Alberta women a test

TABLE 7.7. JOB ASPIRATIONS OF  
LAC LA BICHE METIS, 1967

Job Category	Aspirations for Selves		Aspirations for Sons	
	#	%	#	%
Rural seasonal	0	0.0	0	0.0
Rural steady	11	22.4	9	20.0
Blue collar	27	55.2	17	37.8
White collar	11	22.4	19	42.2
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	49	100.0	45	100.0

Source: Hatt (1967:109, tables 23 and 24).

designed to discover the lowest level jobs mothers will accept for their sons. The test assumes that mothers who reject low-status jobs for their children will assist them in attaining jobs with more prestige. A list consisting of ten occupations ranging from lawyers to bus drivers is read aloud in descending order and the mother indicates whether each occupation is satisfactory for her sons. The lower the score, the higher her aspiration for her children. The mean score for the Indians and Metis was 9.2. French reports the following data for American groups: Jews 3.51, Protestants 5.28. Negroes 6.95. Although the aspirations revealed by both studies appear modest from the middle-class point of view, adult ambitions for their children nevertheless represent an advancement over their own position. However, these verbal responses, which probably overstate parental expectations, are not necessarily accompanied by the supportive behavior required to propel children into an improved status.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the effect that a century of wardship status has had upon Indian initiative. As Hawthorn (1967:116) notes, "The Indians have become accustomed to having decisions made for them and are loathe to reclaim their decision-making prerogatives." One very concrete impediment should be mentioned. Section 88 (1) of the Indian Act exempts from seizure by non-Indians all personal property on a reserve. As a result, treaty Indians cannot provide collateral for loans and credit for anything beyond grocery store transactions is beyond reach. Consider what would happen to their standard of living if all Canadians were forced to expend only income in hand! In his overview of both Lac La Biche and Saddle Lake Reserve studies, Hobart (1967b:264-65) remarks that most sample members had few plans for the future because the resources needed for their implementation were controlled by capricious government authorities.

Although the evidence available is not as extensive as one might wish, it does suggest that Indians generally have adopted neither the value of individual achievement for its own sake nor the mechanisms required to ameliorate their situation. Many students are convinced that Indian indifference to behavior which could advance them in white society results from economic pressures shared with the lower class and/or acculturation into nonmiddle-class white folkways (French, 1967; Cameron and Storm, 1965). Others (Honnigman, 1969) object to analysis utilizing the notion of

proletarianization on the grounds that such a viewpoint devalues unique qualities of native culture. Instead, these scholars stress aspects of Indian traditions which discourage individualistic striving: a present rather than future orientation, an ethos of adapting to rather than changing the environment, emphasis on "being" rather than "doing," sharing and cooperation rather than competition with tribesmen, and so on (Hirabayashi, 1963b:380). Probably, economic and cultural factors are mutually reinforcing, and further intensified by discrimination.

Any discussion of contemporary Indian aspiration should not overlook the endeavors of the embryonic native social movement. Perhaps the improvement which individuals have failed to achieve can be brought about through collective action. The Waxes (1968:165) point out that social scientists who themselves find formal education congenial, are apt to underrate the efficacy of political and military power in the contest for minority group equality.

### Lazy

Thirty percent of the open-ended questionnaire sample stereotyped Indians as lazy (not eager or willing to work). Attitudes toward work and education are related to ambition in that both are approved means for gaining the material appurtenances and intangible rewards valued by white society, i.e., success. Although poor Canadians generally, particularly those on welfare, are charged with slothfulness, the work habits of the Indians have received a disproportionate

amount of adverse white comment. It is alleged that Indians prefer to lie about on the proceeds of social assistance rather than work. And, further, it is held that when an Indian does get a job, he shortly abandons it without cause. These assertions will be examined in the light of the Hawthorn report which was particularly concerned with unravelling the causes of native economic retardation. Relevant ethnographic reports will also be considered.

Few problems exist in establishing that considerably fewer Indians than whites are gainfully occupied, or that a higher proportion receive social assistance of various sorts. Obviously, these facts do not prove that native ancestry people voluntarily opted for dependency. The following Economic Council observation is applicable to the Indians:

The real sources of poverty among the potentially employable poor are generally to be found among such factors as a high incidence of inadequate skills and education, a lack of knowledge about how to seek out and exploit job opportunities, sickness, and a repeated thwarting of employment aspirations (Economic Council of Canada, 1969:111).

Further, it notes that "most of the poor are ready to seize appropriate job opportunities when these are available" (Economic Council of Canada, 1969:111). Various data suggest that many Indians do not consider "appropriate" the development of the agricultural resources at their disposal. For instance, northern Alberta reserves and Metis colonies contain 273,165 acres of potential grain land but only 27,675 acres are cultivated (Sauve, 1969:1). The red tape involved in obtaining the required capital, machinery, etc.,

from federal authorities discourages some potential farmers. As Hobart (1967b:78) suggests, however, many Indians simply lack interest in farming. Braroe (1965:170), who conducted field research among southern Saskatchewan nontreaty Indians, mentions that the Indian Affairs Branch supplied the reserve with about 70 cows. Six years later only 24 remained. The rest ". . . have been sold (illegally), eaten and allowed to starve or freeze to death."

The Hawthorn report, to be discussed presently, treats the reasons why many Indians consider both rural and urban job opportunities "inappropriate." First, pertinent statements of social scientists who have done fieldwork among native people will be briefly noted. In the paper just cited, Braroe (1965:167) reports that the southern Saskatchewan Indians studied ". . . ridicule white ideas about the dignity of work . . . ." A field study of northern Saskatchewan native people by Buckley, *et al.* (1963:29), stated that ". . . moral attitudes enforcing perseverance and 'work for work's sake' are common among Euro-Canadians, but not among Indians and Metis." Spaulding's (1967:92) ethnographic study of Saskatchewan Metis notes that, "After twenty years of coaching, prodding, and cajoling by local Whites there are but few Metis who place any great value on hard work, ambition, or the accumulation of savings." Finally, northern Alberta Metis are described by Hirabayashi (1963b:381) as follows:



It would appear that the definition of hard work and steady work is different for the Metis as compared to the urban middle-class. They may work hard and long hours in occupations such as trapping or fishing, but wage work does not result in the same types of response.

Findings from the Community Opportunity Assessment studies of Alberta Indians and Metis suggest that native attitudes toward work devolve about the issue of perceived suitability or meaningfulness of employment available to them. Questionnaire data showed that the native respondents prefer "steady, well-paying, outdoor work" (Hobart, 1967b: 118) and dislike indoor blue-collar work (Hobart, 1967b: 120). The jobs they dislike most are precisely those available to them: picking roots and rocks, washing dishes, logging, work on highway crews, and in sugar beet fields (Hobart, 1967b:120). They believe steady work to be available in the city, but 79% unconditionally stated that they would not consider such a move (Hobart, 1967b:120).

An incident reported by Newman (1967:54) illustrates that Saddle Lake Reserve Indians did not choose welfare to meaningful work at equivalent rates of pay. In 1964, 80% of the men voluntarily participated in an Indian Affairs program to clear brush from reserve lands. Reserve members were resentful that the program was not repeated the next year. The material presented thus far will be interpreted in the context of the findings of the government sponsored inquiry into the Indians' economic situation.

The Hawthorn report (1966:63) identifies native attitudes toward work as a major factor explaining why only a

minority are successful participants in the urban industrial economy. The following points are made. Many of the jobs available in an industrialized society lack intrinsic interest for the worker. Those who have undergone a long period of indoctrination find the incentive to endure monotony and discipline in the status and satisfying life outside work which their income buys. Many Indians, on the other hand, find these compensations rather meaningless (Hawthorn, 1966: 56). Having become accustomed to a subsistence level existence, many are unwilling to discipline themselves for long periods of time. Work away from their communities (where most opportunities exist) threatens the security derived from primary relations. According to the Hawthorn report authors, "This is often the governing factor that accounts for the failure of many Indians to 'stay at the job' and their penchant to 'quit without notice, for no apparent reason'" (1966:57). Moreover, the claims of kinsmen against the income of those more fortunate further dampens incentive for steady work (Hawthorn, 1966:57). Many native people object to the weekly cycle of the white industrial economy, preferring the traditional seasonal cycles of strenuous effort and relaxation at hunting or festivals (Hawthorn, 1966:58). As a consequence, jobs are often abandoned. Finally, Indian job preferences are not designed to achieve success in white terms. They prefer outdoor to indoor jobs, rural to urban location, risk and excitement to security. Many choose self-employment in primary industries to avoid

accepting rigid schedules and authority over their work behavior (Hawthorn, 1966:58). Similar observations have been made concerning the Alberta Metis (Hirabayashi, 1963b:381) and Saskatchewan Indians and Metis (Buckley, *et al.*, 1963:29). The negativism evoked in whites by the Indians' different orientation toward work tends to further impede acculturation.

A report by the Family Service Association of Edmonton (undated:9), which has been providing counselling services for many years to Indians attempting to locate in that city, documents the inconsistent employment patterns discussed above in general terms. Of a study sample of 34 young men, 15 had held 10 or more jobs, and 17 averaged 1 to 3 months on a job. A large number ". . . punctuated spasmodic employment with numerous returns to the reserve." The counselling personnel felt that many of their charges were simply unable to ". . . identify work with any sense of permanence."

The Hawthorn report (1966:30) agrees with many critics of the Indian Affairs Branch that provision of welfare benefits to Indians ought to have been accompanied by vigorous programs of economic development. Despite expectations, the availability of relief encouraged permanent idleness in those people for whom the alternative is unpleasant, risky, low-paid pursuits. The economics of the situation make welfare a reasonable short-run choice. A young Alberta Indian chief holds a similar viewpoint:

When they offered us welfare, it was as if they had cut our throats. Only a man who was crazy would go out to work or trap and face the hardships of making a living when all he had to do was sit at home and receive the food, and all he needed to live. . . . During those years, our minds went to sleep, for we did not have to use them in order to survive (Cardinal, 1969:62).

Duke Redbird, an Indian humorist, provides a lighter note:

"For centuries the Indian adapted to nature. Then the government came along and replaced nature with the welfare cheque. So the Indian adapted to government," (Rasky, 1970: 29). Adaptation to welfare has been most common in the depressed bands across northern Canada and in the Prairies and the Maritimes (Hawthorn, 1966:112-13). Related to this is the deterrent effect on steady employment produced by cash distributions from the capital resources of the wealthier Indian agencies. In this connection, the Hawthorn report (1966:25, 117) singles out the Alberta Blackfoot, Sarcee, and Sampson bands.

One may conclude that a consensus exists among experts that many native ancestry people are characterized by work attitudes and behavior divergent from those of the containing society. They are not committed to work for work's sake or the Protestant Ethic. Their traditional pursuits which demanded considerable exertion have become economically unfeasible or impossible as technological development encroaches upon gaming ranges. Many place a low value on the type of white employment open to those who lack education and experience. Different work orientations can be attributed to the Indian culture, to government provision of

liberal welfare benefits, to white intolerance. Nevertheless, it is understandable that the majority group, thoroughly socialized to believe work is necessary, if not intrinsically worthwhile, should make reference to disparate work attitudes in its stereotype of the Indians. This stereotype trait is a valid description of Indian-white differences.

### Old-Fashioned

Sixty percent of the semantic differential sample regarded the Indians as extremely or quite old-fashioned in comparison with the Alberta population generally. The mean and average deviation were 5.6 and 1.1, respectively. Validation of this stereotype characteristic involves examination of the following questions: Are the native ancestry peoples divorced from the life-patterns and values of the modern urban-industrial world? To what extent have they been caught up in the "logic of industrialism"? (Kerr, et al., 1964). In order to answer these questions, the situation of the Indians will be considered analogous to that of the underdeveloped nations and the various canons of traditionalism versus modernism commonly employed by sociologists applied. Previous students (Hawthorn, 1966; Fisher, 1966) have analyzed Indian development in a similar fashion. Nonetheless, the circumstances of the native people are not entirely comparable with those of the "Third World." Indians constitute scattered enclaves within Canada not an independent nation-state. Although colonialism was not

uncommon, the treaty Indians' experience with benevolent federal guardianship had rather unique disruptive consequences both for their traditional culture and their mode of transition to modernism. Finally, Indian communities do, of course, differ in degree of acculturation.

Since the inception of their discipline, sociologists have occupied themselves with isolating the structural and ideological characteristics of modern versus traditional societies. Although the criteria of modernism employed in this discussion were adopted from Kerr, et al. (1964:25-29) and Etzioni and Etzioni (1964:181-86), most sociologists consider them appropriate.

The following are some of the structural changes involved in the transition from traditional to modern society: (1) decline in birth and death rates; (2) movement from rural to urban settlement patterns; (3) reduction in the size, authority and functions of the family; (4) intensive development of an education system open to the masses, which equips people with the skills demanded by a technological economy; (5) decline in the influence of religion; (6) the emergence of industrialization and with it, a skilled/professional labor force occupied with secondary and tertiary rather than primary level tasks (Etzioni and Etzioni, 1964: 181).

According to Kerr, et al. (1964:25-29), all industrialized peoples throughout the world share certain common values, both derivative and supportive of the aforementioned

societal structures. These values are briefly summarized. Traditional conservatism gives way to positive evaluation of progress and active mastery of the environment. The relatively open stratification system based on achieved rather than ascribed status reduces traditional loyalties to family. Industrialism demands geographic as well as social mobility, which further weakens the extended kinship groups. Scientific and technical knowledge are esteemed. Education is valued as the instrumentality for job preparation and vertical mobility. Life is secularized. The values associated with work behavior are particularly important. To quote Kerr, *et al.* (1964:26), industrialism demands a ". . . work force dedicated to hard work, a high pace of work, and a keen sense of individual responsibility for performance of assigned norms and tasks." An ethic of some sort, usually based on self-interested pursuit of goods and services, provides incentive for disciplined job performance. These (and other) interrelated values reinforce one another.

The foregoing constitutes an ideal-typical yardstick against which to assess the development of the native ancestry people. Since much of the analysis involves points already made in previous sections, the discussion will be brief.

Until World War II the demographic characteristics of the Indian population were those typical of traditional societies. Uncontrolled birth and death rates resulted in a

stable, and in some cases, declining population, as disease, accidents, etc., took their toll of a people living at the margin of subsistence. Since the last war, the Indians have experienced the high rate of population increase typical of the early stages of industrialization. Their birth rate continues to be nearly double the general Canadian rate. Due to the improved medical facilities and health standards made possible by outside developments, their mortality rate has dropped to approximately the level for Canadian generally. The natural rate of increase is nearly double that of the population as a whole (Hawthorn, 1966:97). Obviously, the native people have not yet taken the vital second step in the demographic transition from traditionalism to modernism.

Table 7.1 showed that in 1961 63% of the Alberta population and 9% of the native population were urban. Although more recent figures are unavailable, the evidence suggests that the Indians are still a predominantly rural people. Hobart (1967b:123) observed that the Alberta native ancestry study sample realized that the best job opportunities were available in the city, ". . . but they also see this as the most dangerous place to live, and so they are not interested in moving there."

Some aspects of the Indian family are modern, some traditional. Although many functions were given up (often involuntarily) to outside agencies, the extended kinship group continues to be a pervasive force. The federally



financed school system assumed control of education; residential schools usurped most parental responsibilities. Tribal political authority was replaced by that of the Department of Indian Affairs' agents. The former institutions of social control were displaced by white law, police, and courts (Hawthorn, 1966:10). Ethnographic reports indicate that despite loss of these and other traditional functions, the extended family continues to be of sufficient consequence to inhibit geographic and social mobility. For example, Hobart (1967b:282-83) concluded that the middle-class values least internalized by Indians included those emphasizing "freedom from inhibiting relationships with friends and relatives" and "strength of attachments to home community." Similar observations were made by Hatt (1967:42) and Spaulding (1967:107). After pointing out that it would be difficult to establish empirically the effect which kinship obligation has had upon Indian economic development, the Hawthorn report (1966:122) hypothesized that persistence of kinship ties is ". . . a result, rather than a cause, of poverty."

To avoid repetition, comment on the education of the Indians will be brief. The native people have not had to face the necessity of developing their own formal education system. However, the fact that many native people consider white man's education irrelevant or destructive to their culture suggests the operation of traditionalism, among other factors. Indeed, Indian activists wish to institute

and control a more congenial education system whose proposed curriculum would emphasize aboriginal history, language, and traditions.

Authoritative evidence regarding the influence of religion among contemporary Alberta Indians is unavailable. This topic has not been treated in field reports; the statistics of church affiliation reveal nothing of strength of attachment to organized religious bodies. Nonetheless, one may reasonably conclude that native communities are not sacred societies in the premodern sense of the term. The very fact that ethnographic reports make little mention of religion is significant. Further, the established churches very nearly succeeded in destroying aboriginal religion, by proselytizing, by teaching the children the old ways were worthless, and by outlawing rituals such as the sun dance. It is impossible at the present time to evaluate the support behind either white religion or the revival of traditional beliefs and ceremonies currently being advocated by native activists. However, it is obvious that native life does not revolve about sacred concerns.

Many Indians have not yet come to terms with industrialization, described by Etzioni and Etzioni (1964:255) as "the most crucial aspect of modernization." The majority exist outside the industrial labor force. There are very few Indian professionals or technicians. Most of those employed continue to work in traditional, primary fields of employment (Hawthorn, 1966:53). Previous sections dealt

with lack of native acculturation to the attitudes demanded of an industrial work force. The desire for the material benefits of industrialism does not yet suffice as incentive for disciplined work behavior. Traditional motives such as kinship obligations, demand for meaningful work, etc., are stronger.

Many sociologists (Hirabayashi, 1963a; Zentner, 1967) believe that crucial aspects of the urban-industrial ethos continue to be meaningless to the native people. According to Zentner (1967:81), native culture emphasizes passive adjustment to the environment rather than active mastery and control; "feeling, intuition, mysticism and fate as against observation, measurement, planning, foresight, and reason." Notions of progress, efficiency and practicality continue to be absent (Zentner, 1967:80). The Hawthorn report (1967: 162) notes that "the distant past is regarded as a golden age and the present is looked upon as a period of crisis and decadence." This attitude is significantly premodern.

The foregoing analysis has shown that the Indians may be correctly described as more old-fashioned than the environing population. Their demographic, kinship, economic, educational, and geographic settlement patterns differ from those which characterize urban-industrial societies. These remarks are not intended to imply that contact with the dominant society has left traditional Indian cultures unchanged. Indeed, much of Indian culture is lost and recollection of the traditional elements is "often vague and

even contradictory" (Hawthorn, 1967:162). Contemporary Indians are certainly not the painted relics from the past on parade at rodeos and stampedes. Rather, they are a marginal people, ill at ease in the urban-industrial world and unable to return to the ways of their ancestors.

#### Often in Trouble with the Law

The semantic differential sample perceived the Indians to be in trouble with the law more often than Albertans generally. Fifty-seven percent of the responses were placed in the two adjacent extreme categories, producing a mean of 5.5 and an average deviation of 1.1.

The disproportionate entanglement of Alberta native people with law enforcement agencies has been documented by a survey conducted by the Canadian Corrections Association (1967) for the Department of Indian Affairs, McGrath's (1968) study of correctional institutions sponsored by the government of Alberta, and the reports of the Alberta Royal Commission on Juvenile Delinquency (1967a, 1967b). According to the evidence presented in these reports, the stereotype is accurate. Nevertheless, this conclusion should be interpreted in the context of the following qualifications. Since the comparative statistics are subject to discrepancy in ethnic classification in addition to all the usual types of measurement error which plague crime statistics (McDonald, 1969), the figures cited should be considered indices of gross patterns rather than precise description. Further, these data simply support the

contention that Indians more frequently come into conflict with the law, not that they are a serious criminal element in Canadian society. Indeed, many native offenders are indicted for infractions of the liquor provisions of the Indian Act, which do not constitute offences for the white population (Canadian Corrections Association, 1967:29). Finally, ignorance of legal rights, inability to pay fines, and perhaps discrimination contribute to the disproportionate incidence of native incarceration in Alberta penal institutions.

An inquiry into the extent of Indian difficulties with the law concluded that in the western provinces ". . . the incidence of Indian involvement with the law is alarming and is clearly out of proportion to their numbers" (Canadian Corrections Association, 1967:22). The project's Alberta field staff reported as follows:

The magnitude of the Indian problem is obvious--at a minimum, seven times the committal rate of non-Indians. The pattern of offences shows little variety (i.e., mostly liquor infractions) (Canadian Corrections Association, 1967:25).

Tables 7.8 through 7.10 document this conclusion.

Table 7.8 shows the numbers of native people admitted to Alberta provincial correctional institutions as a percentage of total admissions during the month of August 1966. The *Report of the Alberta Penology Study* (McGrath, 1968) documents the disproportionate numbers of Indians and Metis incarcerated in Alberta penal institutions for the year ending March 31, 1967. These data are shown in Table 7.9.

TABLE 7.8. NUMBER OF NATIVE ADULTS IN SELECTED  
ALBERTA PROVINCIAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS  
ADMITTED DURING AUGUST, 1966

Institution	Total Admitted	Indian, Metis & Eskimos Admitted	Native Admissions as % Total Admissions
Fort Sask. (males)	648	181	28
(females)	109	81	74
Lethbridge	318	208	66
Calgary	563	88	16

Source: Canadian Corrections Association (1967:45,  
table 7).

TABLE 7.9. NUMBERS OF INDIANS AND METIS IN ALBERTA  
PRISONS OR TRAINING SCHOOLS, APRIL 1, 1966  
TO MARCH 31, 1967

	Indians	Metis	% Total Admissions
Men	4,036	1,406	44
Women	481	211	80
Boys	6	26	31
Girls	17	26	75

Source: McGrath (1968:93, table 7).

According to the Annual Report of the Alberta Attorney General's Department, Indians and Metis continued through the year ending March 31, 1969 to constitute a high percentage of the institutional population. These data are presented in Table 7.10.

The field staff associated with the Department of Indian Affairs investigation into Indian difficulties with

TABLE 7.10. INDIAN-METIS ADMISSIONS TO ALBERTA  
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS, APRIL 1, 1968  
TO MARCH 31, 1969

Institution	Prisoners Admitted During Year	Indians Admitted	Metis Admitted	Indian-Metis as % Total Admissions
Calgary Gaol	7,460	1,588	64	22.1
Lethbridge Gaol	3,768	2,155	258	64.0
Fort Saskatchewan (Males)	6,489	714	540	19.3
(Females)	1,085	564	124	63.4
Peace River Cor- rectional Inst.	507	158	160	62.7
Belmont Rehabili- tation Centre	502	91	77	33.5
Bowden Institution	314	32	24	17.8
Nordegg Forestry Camp	233	52	24	32.6

Source: Department of the Attorney General (1969:un-  
paginated).

the law noted that the number of Indian people appearing in the courts was ". . . noticeably higher than their numbers in the general population warranted" (Canadian Corrections Association, 1967:39). The Alberta Royal Commission on Juvenile Delinquency (1967b:9) remarked upon the large number of Indian and Metis youth in the institutions for juveniles. In 1965, 29% of the boys in Bowden were of Indian or Metis origin. In November 1966, native girls represented 63% of the population of the Alberta Institute for Girls.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures showing Indian and non-Indian convictions for indictable offences are given in Table 7.11. (Ethnic breakdowns for summary offences, under which Indian Act and other liquor infractions fall,

are not issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.) In

TABLE 7.11. INDIAN AND NON-INDIAN CONVICTIONS  
FOR INDICTABLE OFFENCES, ALBERTA, 1961

Ethnic Group	Number Convicted	Number in General Population	Percentage of Offenders
Indian	363	28,469	1.28
Non-Indian	3,400	1,289,758	0.26

Source: Canadian Corrections Association (1967:66,  
table XIX).

1967, 4,735 indictable offences were recorded for the province of Alberta. Nearly 14% were attributed to people of Indian origin (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1967b:29). Although, for the reasons outlined above, these figures should be treated with caution, they do show that even when offences unrelated to alcohol infractions are considered, Indians are indicted in disproportionate numbers. A similar situation exists in the United States. Stewart (1964) asserts that American local, state, and national law enforcement agencies report Indian criminality at rates considerably higher than national averages and higher than those for other minority groups.

While a thorough discussion of the reasons for excessive native conflict with the law is beyond the scope of this report, some of the relevant factors will be briefly noted. The Canadian Corrections Association (1967:29) asserted that the problem would be substantially resolved if



the liquor provisions of the Indian Act were deleted and native people became subject to the terms of provincial liquor legislation. It further recommended reduction in use of jail sentences for alcohol offences (Canadian Corrections Association, 1967:29). Native people are more likely to end up in jail because they lack resources for fines as well as knowledge of their legal rights and court procedure (Canadian Corrections Association, 1967:39). A "red power" organization places the blame on law enforcement personnel:

In this country, Indian and Metis represent 3% of the population, yet we constitute approximately 60% of the inmates in prisons and jails. Therefore, we want an immediate end to the unjust arrests and harrassment of our people by the racist police (Native Alliance for Red Power, 1970:64).

This charge is difficult to verify. However, the Canadian Corrections Association (1967:39, 36) found that although magistrates tend to be more lenient with Indians than with non-Indians, relations in the prairie provinces between native ancestry people and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are strained. Moreover, it suggested that the Indians' conspicuous presence in urban slum areas invites police attention. For these and other reasons, more Indian than white Albertans find themselves in trouble with the law.

### Drunken

Twenty-one percent of the open-ended questionnaire sample made reference to excessive drinking engaged in by Indians. Two types of data will be employed to assess the accuracy of this stereotype trait: anthropological field

reports which consider the incidence and patterns of native alcohol usage, and comparative statistics for liquor offences. These data establish first, that Indian drinking is more conspicuous than white drinking, and second, that alcohol results in more problems for Indians than whites. Whether or not a higher proportion of Indians than non-Indians drink to excess remains conjectural.

Excessive use or misuse of alcohol by native people has received considerable attention from authors of ethnographic field reports. Drinking as one aspect of social disintegration in far northern communities has been discussed by Honigmann (1965). Particularly sensitive analyses of the subject are contained in the Hawthorn, *et al.* ((1958: 379-83) study of British Columbia Indians and in the Centre for Community Studies monograph on the native people of northern Saskatchewan (Buckley, *et al.*, 1963:30). Spaulding (1967:92) reports that although the incidence of technical alcoholism is low among Ile-à-la-Crosse Metis,

. . . consumption of liquor is high and drinking parties many and frequent. Money and supply of wine permitting, parties are customarily held once or twice during the week with a grand finale on the weekend.

Indeed, Spaulding (1967:94) contends that the integration of this community rests on a "fun morality" of drinking and sexual promiscuity. Card (1963b:264-65) also comments on the important recreational function of drinking for native people and lower-class whites in Improvement District 124, an area characterized by double the Alberta per capita beer expenditure (Card, 1963a:177). Children are thoroughly

socialized into perceiving drinking as the "supreme type of 'fun'" through innumerable hours of "drinker watching" (Card, 1963b:264). According to the Community Opportunity Assessment study, the Saddle Lake Reserve ". . . has a high rate of heavy drinkers," which is attributed to their inability to secure meaningful employment (Newman, 1967:33, 99). The Hawthorn report (1966:391) comments upon ". . . the disproportionate incidence of alcoholism . . ." among Canadian Indians.

Since very few Indians who are experiencing drinking problems consult agencies such as the provincial Division of Alcoholism (Department of Health, 1970), the only comparative data available consist of relative incidence of conviction for liquor-related offences in native and white populations. As previously noted, the Canadian Corrections Association report (1967:24) found drinking to be an underlying cause of most native problems with the law. Further, institutional personnel "universally reported" that a higher proportion of Indians than non-Indians serve jail sentences for liquor offences (Canadian Corrections Association, 1967:27).

In 1964, the Alcoholism Foundation of Alberta (now the Division of Alcoholism, Department of Health) prepared a paper on the Indian alcoholic (Sharplin, 1964). This report stated that although the incidence of Indian alcoholism is unknown, ". . . the rates of Indian convictions, compared to whites, may well show drinking sufficiently conspicuous to

earn such a small ethnic minority (2%) a reputation for drunkenness" (Sharplin, 1964:8, 3). Data from the Indian Affairs Branch and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics were used to calculate Indian and white rates of conviction for liquor offences. These comparative rates, which Sharplin believes to be conservative estimates, are presented in Table 7.12. In 1961, the rate of conviction for Alberta Indian males was 13 times the white rate.

TABLE 7.12. INDIAN AND WHITE RATES OF CONVICTION FOR INTOXICATION, CANADA AND ALBERTA, BY SEX, 1961

		<u>Rate per 100,000</u>		Ratio Indian/White
		Indian	White	
Canada	Males	7,100	1,000	7
	Females	1,500	100	15
Alberta	Males	15,900	1,200	13
	Females	2,200	140	15

Source: Sharplin (1964:4, table 1).

Both the Alcoholism Foundation and the Canadian Corrections Association reports clearly document the considerably greater incidence of Indian conviction for alcohol-related offences. However, these data do not in themselves necessarily imply that more Indians than whites drink to excess. Several factors which make Indians more vulnerable to arrest and conviction were noted in the preceding section. Indian drinking may simply be more conspicuous. In addition, it is impossible to identify what fraction of Indian convictions resulted from offences which apply to Indians

alone. Until 1965, Alberta Indians were forbidden by law to drink in public establishments or make purchases from the liquor vendors. Although Indian bands may now decide by referenda to have liquor privileges on their reserves, only a minority of Alberta bands have so far done so. As a result of these provisions, many Indians learned to patronize bootleggers and later to do their drinking in public places. Until November 1969, when the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that Section 94 of the Indian Act violated the Canadian Bill of Rights, Indians were liable to fine and imprisonment for being intoxicated anywhere except a reserve--even in their own homes if they were located outside reserves. Convictions under discriminatory sections of the Indian Act undoubtedly reduce the utility of comparative statistics. However, studies of Indian drinking in the United States, where prohibitions against alcohol use were removed in 1953, support the contention of excessive use of alcohol as suggested by the foregoing ethnographic evidence. Stewart (1964:61) reports that drunkenness accounted for 71% of all Indian arrests in 1960, the rate being 12 times the American national average, and 5 times the Negro rate. Moreover, the urban rate of American Indian arrests for alcohol related offences was 37 times the white rate (Stewart, 1964:62). Among the explanatory factors considered by a report of the Government Research Bureau of the State University of South Dakota (Farmer, et al., 1957) and cited by Stewart (1964:66), was the fact that ". . . a larger proportion of Indians than

non-Indians drink to excess."

Although this report is concerned with the validity and not the source of the stereotype traits, brief consideration will be given to that portion of the literature which speculates upon the etiology of the Indians' alcohol problem. Various disparities in native experience and values relating to alcohol use combine to encourage drinking patterns which, from the middle-class point of view, are aberrant. Perhaps the most thoroughgoing attempt to explain these differences is provided in the study of British Columbia Indians by Hawthorn and his colleagues (1958). These authors state that although they believe there are as many Indians as white abstainers, ". . . obvious drinking as distinct from unnoticed drinking is often commoner among Indians than among Whites" (Hawthorn, et al., 1958:379). Since until recently the law forbade Indians to drink in their homes, their drinking was done in public beer parlors, where the objective was to consume as much as possible in the short time available (Hawthorn, et al., 1958:379). A substantial proportion deliberately set out to get intoxicated. They have not had the opportunity to learn moderate social drinking as part of home life. Concentrated drinking bouts and rowdiness are further encouraged by the facts that for many cash is available at irregular intervals and the isolated location of many settlements makes the trip to town an important expedition. (These drinking patterns are shared with those classes of whites who accept Indians on

equal terms (Hawthorn, et al., 1958:380).) As mentioned earlier, drinking is a valued form of recreation in many native communities. Although some Indians do share local white concern over drinking problems in their communities, social control mechanisms do not act to inhibit excessive drinking or arouse indignation over arrests for intoxication. Indeed, heavy drinking provides enhancement of manly status as well as escape from unpleasant realities (Canadian Corrections Association, 1967:27). A Saddle Lake Indian said that "the only time I can feel like a man is when I am drinking" (Newman, 1967:99). Finally, many Indians have not learned to conceal the after-effects of excessive alcohol usage. Their proclivity for "sleeping it off in public places" makes their drinking highly conspicuous (Hawthorn, et al., 1958:381).

Many observers interpret native problems with alcohol as a symptom of their depressed minority group status. However, the Hawthorn report (1966:128) found heavy drinkers distributed among economically developed bands as well as among the poverty stricken. Moreover, Stewart (1964:66) argues that the general social conditions (poor housing, poverty, discrimination, lack of education) of Indians are not sufficiently dissimilar from those of Negroes, Spanish Americans, and Puerto Ricans to account for the Indians' significantly higher incidence of alcohol-related problems. Rather, he hypothesizes that the answer will be found in the unusual conditions to which Indians have been subjected.

They are the only people who have been selectively denied access to alcohol. Certainly, they alone have been led to believe themselves biologically incapable of handling liquor.

Two points have been established by the validation data. First, despite references to the integration function performed by the "fun morality," drinking does present a greater problem for Indian than for white communities. Second, Indian drinking is more often conspicuous. While it is true that not all Indians drink, both the ethnographic observations and the high conviction rates cited earlier suggest that "visible drinking" is not confined to a tiny minority which gives the group an unsavory reputation. The evidence corroborates the stereotype.

#### Disliked by Others

The scale "disliked by others" was attributed to the North American Indians by the semantic differential sample. Sixty-four percent of the responses were placed in the adjacent extreme categories. The mean and average deviation were 5.8 and 1.0, respectively. "Disliked" has been literally interpreted as a low evaluation of the native group by the containing population. ("Oppression," to be considered in the next section, refers to the differential treatment accorded to that minority group.) All the indices used, social distance scale results from this and a previous study, ethnographic accounts, self-reports of native people, endogamy rates, verify the accuracy of this scale.

Only Hirabayashi (1963a) and the present investigator



appear to have formally measured the degree of acceptance shown native people by Alberta samples. Both studies employed Bogardus social distance scales. Hirabayashi (1963a: 360, 361) reported that his 1961 university student sample accorded the lowest of the 23 positions to the Canadian Indians and Metis, the social distance quotients being 3.03 and 3.14 respectively. The social distance scale results of the present study, which were discussed in detail in Chapter 6, confirm the unwillingness of Albertans to admit native people into intimate relationships. Although the numerical value of the social distance quotients has decreased during the intervening years, the total samples placed the Indians and Metis in the 22nd or 23rd positions, the bottom position being given to the Hutterites who have deliberately sought exclusion. Tables 6.4 through 6.9 show that the various demographic subsamples consistently placed the native peoples in the lowest 5th of the scale rankings. The Indian and Metis social distance quotients, which ranged from 2.25 to 3.21, and 2.24 to 3.04 respectively, indicate that the samples do not afford native ancestry peoples admission to kinship or friendship. Obviously, the semantic differential sample's perception of Indians as disliked by others may be simply a candid statement of its own attitude. Even though the open-ended sample accorded equally low social distance positions to native peoples, internal validation criteria should not be given too much weight. Nevertheless, ethnographic field reports do corroborate the findings of

Hirabayashi (1963a) and the present investigator.

According to the field staff's observations of diverse social situations and interviews with representatives of both ethnic groups, the dominant pattern in the Lesser Slave Lake area of Alberta was the ". . . tendency, among a significant number of whites, to view persons of Indian ancestry as inferior or of low quality" (Card, 1963c:198, emphasis in original omitted). Card (1963c:201) further observed that there was no white visiting in Metis or Indian homes, that drinking was segregated in beer parlors, and separate seating arrangements prevailed in movie audiences and Home and School meetings.

Northern Saskatchewan society was described as a "caste structure" by Buckley and her colleagues (1963:28):

In most communities, Metis and Indians seldom visit in white homes, white females have very little contact with Metis or Indians of either sex; white males associate with Metis and Indians chiefly for business purposes, except for transient or young unmarried white males who are expected by both whites and non-whites to prey upon non-white females.

In the Saskatchewan Metis settlement studied by Spaulding (1967:93), "whites allocate to themselves a higher social value" and communicate with native people in terms of social inequality. Finally, Braroe (1965:169) reports that the white townsmen of a southern Saskatchewan community consider Indians to be "worthless," either circumstantially or as human beings. In this town, Indians occupy the ". . . lowest category of a rigidly hierarchical status system" (Braroe, 1965:167).

Sociologists have found white antipathy to be an important factor in explaining the ineffectiveness of the education system for native children. After reviewing the literature on the attitudes of teachers toward native pupils, Hobart (1970:54-55) concludes:

There is much evidence to suggest that teachers in schools for Indian and Eskimo children in North America tend to be parochial, compulsively conventional, prejudiced against the pupils in their classrooms, shockingly unaware of the differences between the cultures of themselves and their students, and lacking in respect and appreciation for the culture of the children they teach.

Similar sentiments are also found scattered throughout the second volume of the Hawthorn report (1967). The latter publication also found that ridicule and ostracism by white pupils discouraged Indian children from attending school (Hawthorn, 1967:136).

The Indian ancestry people themselves have commented upon the low evaluation placed upon them by whites. Complaints made to the Alberta Metis Study Tour (Metis Association of Alberta, 1969) included intolerance of pupils and teachers in the communities of Edson, Marlboro, and Edmonton; hostility of law officers at Fort Chipewyan, Edson, Marlboro, and Faust; nonacceptance by Calgarians living outside the downtown core; the lack of welcome in Hinton churches. The Family Service Association of Edmonton (undated:9-10) questioned Indians who had attempted to locate in that city about the attitudes displayed by non-Indians. Eighty-three percent admitted that Indians are disliked. However, few related it to personal experience.

The above self-reports are presented not as veridical statements but rather as native commentary on the situation discussed thus far. Although the Metis may have perceived prejudice where none existed and exaggerated the situation to the native Study Tour personnel, various students (Hatt, 1967:103) have observed that Indians are reluctant to reveal the extent of white enmity to white interviewers.

Lastly, the amount of exogamy of ethnic minority group members throws some light on the degree of their acceptance by the majority group. In 1961, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961:Bulletin 7.1-6, table xvi) reported that 91.8% of married native Indian and Eskimo males are married to females from the same ethnic group. This figure represents the highest degree of endogamy recorded. Although geographic isolation and minority group preferences are undoubtedly important factors, the lack of intermarriage also suggests the native people are not admitted to intimate relationships with non-Indian Canadians.

Ethnographic, questionnaire, and available data all serve to verify the truth of the stereotype trait under discussion. Unlike the cognitive imagery previously considered, this trait describes both the Indian position at the bottom of the social hierarchy and non-Indian attitudes. A second "relational" characteristic will be dealt with in the next section.

#### Oppressed by Others

Both instrument samples described the Indians as

subject to more oppression<sup>2</sup> by others than Albertans generally. The semantic differential mean and average deviation were 5.7 and 1.3, 72% of the respondents having checked the two extreme adjacent scale positions. Some 20% of the open-ended questionnaire sample made reference to various types of differential treatment experienced by the Indians.

The previous section dealt with the belief entertained by whites that native people are not their equals. Unequal treatment is the subject presently under consideration. On the basis of the evidence presented in this and the preceding section, it is contended that the Indian people have been the object of both differential attitudes and behavior.

The Indian Act and related federal statutes, recently described as "discriminatory legislation" by the Minister of Indian Affairs (Department of Indian Affairs, 1969:8), have denied the Indian people equal status before the law and in the eyes of their fellow Canadians. Canadian courts have

---

<sup>2</sup>The original choice of wording for the semantic differential scale was ill-advised in that "oppression" implies differential treatment that is unfair or unjust. According to Zawadzki (1948), an out-group may be subjected to unequal treatment for two reasons. Because of its "well-deserved reputation," a group may merit unequal treatment and hence such treatment is not discriminatory. On the other hand, an out-group may be the undeserving victim of the psychological aberrations (or cultural norms) of majority group members. To resolve this question, comparative data would be required on the treatment experienced by a group of whites with most of the relevant native characteristics except race. Since such evidence is unavailable, this section will simply catalog the ways in which Indians are not dealt with in the same fashion as non-Indians without attempting to establish whether or not such treatment is justified.

ruled that several provisions of the Act infringe the universal rights and freedoms guaranteed under the Bill of Rights. A government-sponsored inquiry charges that the protective legislation intended as compensation for the Indians' aboriginal title has been ". . . used as a justification for depriving them of services of a quality and quantity equal to those received by non-Indians" (Hawthorn, 1966:396).

While it is true that remedial provisions are under advisement, many examples can be cited of Indian "oppression by law." Sections 94 (a) and (b) of the Indian Act, which relate to possession of alcohol and intoxication, have resulted in the conviction of native people for behavior that does not constitute an offence for non-Indians (Canadian Corrections Association, 1967:29). Before 1950, the federal franchise was granted only to Indians who had served in the armed forces. The federal franchise was not granted to all Indians until 1960 (Hawthorn, 1966:256): Full provincial franchise rights were not extended to Alberta Indians until 1965 (Hawthorn, 1966:262). The authority of the Minister of Indian Affairs and his representatives is so pervasive that Indian political control of their affairs at the local level is minimal (Hawthorn, 1966:263). Moreover, the fact that reserves are not legally defined as municipalities excludes Indians from the benefits and services made available to municipalities through provincial legislation (Hawthorn, 1966:392). Social services have been provided through the

Indian Affairs Branch rather than local and provincial agencies. According to the Hawthorn report (1966:315), the Indians ". . . have consistently received different and in most cases inferior welfare services to those provided to non-Indians." In a position paper presented to the Alberta Human Resources Symposium on Social Opportunity in Alberta, the Alberta Medical and Pharmaceutical Associations (1969) charged that a significant number of Indians are "second class citizens" in the area of health care.

Constitutional provisions resulted in a segregated educational system, much of which was turned over to the churches. The Indian people are extremely bitter about the disruption of their families caused by enforced placement of children in residential schools. In fact, the Canadian Corrections Association report (1967:18) makes this statement: "The legal rights of parents concerning their own children appeared to be regarded too casually by the Indian Affairs Branch and by other agencies." Education authorities found the academic standards of residential and segregated day schools to be far below those of the public school systems (Hawthorn, 1967:93, 133). According to the Hawthorn report (1966), separate legal status and separate facilities transformed the Indians into "citizens minus."

Some indication of the differential treatment accorded Alberta native people is conveyed by the records of the Human Rights Branch of the Alberta Department of Labour, the government agency responsible for enforcing the Alberta Human

Rights Act. Table 7.13 shows the complaints registered with this agency from its inception in September 1966 to April 1970. The table indicates that nearly 60% of the complaints came from native ancestry peoples. However, several factors reduce the utility of these data as a quantitative index of maltreatment. An unknown number of these complaints are instances of suspected rather than actual abuse. Further,

TABLE 7.13. NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS MADE UNDER THE ALBERTA HUMAN RIGHTS ACT, BY ETHNIC GROUP, SEPTEMBER, 1966 TO APRIL, 1970

Area of Complaint	Ethnic Group				Total
	Native	Negro	Oriental	Other	
Employment	12	10	2	14	38
Nonpublic Accommodation (Apts., etc.)	13	13	3	2	31
Hotel/Motel Accommodation	12	0	1	0	13
Restaurant service	10	1	0	0	11
Beer parlors	8	0	0	0	8
Other Public Services (Stores, Transportation, etc.)	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	62	24	6	16	108

Source: Department of Labour (1970).

many Indians are reluctant to complain. Indeed, in a personal communication to the writer, the Alberta Ombudsman remarked upon "their lack of aggressiveness in respect to their own injuries." A great many are ignorant of the Human Rights Branch's existence and/or distrustful of government agencies. Nonetheless, Alberta ethnographic reports support the contention that whites act differently toward natives



than toward nonnatives.

In his overview of the Saddle Lake Reserve and Lac La Biche Metis studies, Hobart (1965b:231) notes that 20% of the combined samples said they had been refused jobs because they were Indian, and another 12% were acquainted with others to whom this had happened. Nearly 18% reported that they themselves had been asked to leave businesses and restaurants. Another 17% were acquainted with others who had been asked to leave such premises. In addition, the Saddle Lake Indians complained of discrimination by local police (Newman, 1967:68). Moreover, three native interviewers for the Saddle Lake Study were refused service in the town's beauty parlor (Newman, 1967:69). Finally, the Metis Study Tour (Metis Association of Alberta, 1969) catalogs accounts of ill-treatment throughout Alberta by law officers, welfare workers, employers, bartenders, and hotel and store personnel.

The available data indicate that the stereotype is accurate.

### Conclusion

This chapter, which considered the validity of the stereotype traits ascribed to the North American Indians, constitutes a test of null hypothesis #1:

For each trait in the stereotype of the stimulus group, there is no difference between the incidence of that behavior in the stimulus group and in the general population.

Although the adequacy of the available data varies

and difficulty was encountered in statistically establishing the differential incidence of the attitudinal traits, the weight of the evidence supports rejection of the hypothesis. Only one trait, "nonmaterialistic" is demonstrably inaccurate. In short, the data presented in this chapter indicate that the stereotype characteristics are essentially valid, shorthand descriptions of the native ancestry people. Stereotype traits correctly label significant Indian, non-Indian differences.

## CHAPTER 8

### VALIDATION OF THE UKRAINIAN STEREOTYPE

#### Introduction

Chapter 8 is concerned with establishing the degree to which the Ukrainian stereotype is accurate. As expected, existing public records and sociological studies relevant to the stereotype characteristics were less plentiful for the Ukrainians<sup>1</sup> than for the Indians and Hutterites. The primary source of validation data was a survey investigation of Alberta Ukrainians carried out by Hobart, et al. (1967) in three rural communities (Willingdon, Thorhild, and Lamont) and in Edmonton, the same city in which the Ukrainian stereotype was subsequently measured. Hobart and his colleagues attempted 100% sampling in the rural areas. They chose from voters lists urban polling districts with heavy Ukrainian concentration. Although first and second generation Ukrainians in both working-class and middle-class areas were interviewed, the authors believe that the most successful Ukrainians may be underrepresented in their sample. The Alberta Ukrainian study was particularly useful for the purposes of this investigation because it had at its disposal

---

<sup>1</sup>In 1961, there were 105,923 people of Ukrainian ethnic origin in Alberta (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961:Catalogue 99-516). Ukrainians comprised 2.6% of the Canadian population, 8.0% of the Alberta population, and 11.3% of the Edmonton population. Seventy-seven percent of the Ukrainians were born in Canada.

special tabulations of 1961 census data. Various reports of the Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism provided a second important source of validation information.

Seven traits were ascribed to the Ukrainians by the semantic differential and open-ended questionnaire samples. Lack of information made it impossible to assess the accuracy of three of these traits. Three of the remaining four traits proved to be inaccurately assigned.

### Ukrainian Stereotype Traits

#### Live According to a Different Culture

Twenty-nine percent of the open-ended questionnaire sample made reference to the persistent influence of an East European-derived culture upon the life-style of Alberta Ukrainians. Were it not for the respondents' emphasis on the Ukrainians' tenacious insistence on clinging to the ways of the old country, this stereotype would be merely a predictable reaction to the task of differentiating Albertans of Ukrainian descent from Albertans generally. However, a significant proportion of the study sample did not simply state that this ethnic group spoke another language or practiced quaint customs. Rather, sample members wrote (many with some annoyance) that the Ukrainians refused to speak English and were determined to retain their cultural autonomy. The accuracy of this folk perception is readily documented. For example, the Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1969b:85) made the following comment:

Spokesmen for this cultural group press various governments for recognition as a group and for assistance in the maintenance of their culture and language more than the members of any other sizable cultural group. . . . They take a lead in efforts to organize a 'third force' [non-English, non-French recognition].

A variety of indices including within-group friendship choices, language retention, number of ethnic associations and publications, show that the Ukrainians maintain a remarkably strong allegiance to their European cultural heritage.

The Alberta Ukrainian study sample (Hobart, 1967a: 223) was asked the following question: "Think of your three closest friends. How many of them are Ukrainian?" All of the closest friends of 71% of the sample were Ukrainians. Sixteen percent had one non-Ukrainian friend, 7% had two non-Ukrainian friends, and 4% reported that all three of their three closest friends were non-Ukrainians. The proportion of within-group friendship choices was greater among rural than urban respondents (Hobart, 1967a:225).

The cohesiveness of the Ukrainians is also shown by their high rates of endogamy. In 1961, 66.5% of Alberta Ukrainian males were married to Ukrainian females and 63.2% of Alberta Ukrainian females had husbands from the same ethnic origin group (Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969b:296, table A-71). The Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961:Catalogue 99-516) reported that the Ukrainian endogamy rate was exceeded by those of native peoples, Jews, French, British, Asiatics, and Italians. However, the Ukrainian rate was higher than those of the

following groups: Dutch, German, Polish, Russian, Scandinavian, and other European. Seventy percent of the Alberta Ukrainian study sample (Hobart, 1967a:277) felt that intermarriage between Ukrainians and non-Ukrainians should not be discouraged.

The Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1969b:129) described the prairie Ukrainians' retention of their mother tongue as "remarkable" because maintenance of their language has been achieved without much support from immigration. Table 8.1 shows the percentage of Canadian Ukrainians and comparative ethnic groups whose mother tongue corresponds to their ethnicity and the proportion of immigrants in each group. These data were prepared by the Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1969b) from the 1961 census. While 64% of the Canadian Ukrainians gave Ukrainian as their mother tongue, only 23% of the group were foreign-born. The Alberta situation is similar. Although only 18.3% of Alberta Ukrainians were not born in Canada, 67.8% of the total ethnic group gave Ukrainian as their mother tongue in 1961 (Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969b:336, table A-142). The proportions varied with place of residence. Eighty-two percent of Alberta rural farm, 70% of the rural nonfarm, and 59% of the urban Ukrainians reported Ukrainian as their mother tongue (Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969b:337, table A-143). The maintenance of ancestral language is partially the result of the efforts of the Ukrainian

TABLE 8.1. RETENTION OF ANCESTRAL LANGUAGE FOR UKRAINIANS  
AND SELECTED ETHNIC GROUPS. PERCENTAGE OF IMMIGRANTS  
AND OF THOSE WHOSE MOTHER TONGUE CORRESPONDS  
TO ETHNIC ORIGIN, CANADA, 1961

Ethnic Origin	Number	% of Immigrants	% of Those Whose Mother Tongue Corresponds to Their Ethnic Origin
Non-British & Non-French	4,701,232	34.2	41.9
Ukrainian	474,377	23.3	64.4
German	1,049,599	27.4	39.4
Italian	450,351	58.9	73.6
Dutch	429,679	36.2	37.6

Source: Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism  
(1969b:121, table 10).

Canadian Committee, the coordinating body for most Ukrainian organizations:

It was paramountly the efforts of the Committee and its branches in the particular centres that Ukrainian language, literature, and history courses were established first at the University of Saskatchewan in 1945 and subsequently at the Universities of Manitoba, Alberta, Montreal, Toronto, McMaster, Ottawa and British Columbia. The introduction of Ukrainian in the secondary (high) schools of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta was the work of the Committee . . . (Yuzyk, 1967:51).

Wangenheim (1966:52) states that the Ukrainians have more ethnic associations than any other Canadian minority group. This finding was confirmed by a Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission (1969b:110) survey which identified 225 Ukrainian, 204 Italian, 106 Dutch, and 105 German voluntary associations. Further, Ukrainian associations have the largest proportion of native-born members (Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969b:110).

People who join ethnic associations indicate a sense of ethnic identity, and membership in such associations probably reinforces this sense of identity because participation in the association increases contact with other members of the same cultural group at the expense of contact with others (Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969b:110).

Two related points are worth noting. Sixty-one percent of the Canadian Ukrainian population profess membership in their traditional churches, Ukrainian Greek Orthodox and Ukrainian Catholic (Yuzyk, 1967:36-37). Seventy percent of the Alberta Ukrainian study sample reported such membership (Borhek and Jacoby, 1967:373). Finally, the Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1969b:150, table 15) reported that in 1965, there were 35 Ukrainian part-time schools in Alberta. During the same period, the Commission located 32 German, 3 Hungarian, 2 Polish, 1 Italian and 1 Lithuanian schools in Alberta.

Ukrainian Canadians are well served by mass media in their native tongue. The Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1969b:345, table A-150) recorded the radio hours broadcast in languages other than French or English for the week of February 7th to 13th, 1966. In Alberta, there were 8 hours, 40 minutes of program hours in Ukrainian. The second highest number of such broadcast hours was in German (3 hours, 45 minutes).

Wangenheim (1966:49) says that the ". . . Ukrainians are certainly better provided with periodical reading matter in their own language than any other minority group in Canada." She further notes that the 11 weekly Ukrainian



newspapers have a circulation of approximately 100,000, while all the other non-French, non-English periodicals together send out about 32,000 copies a week (Wangenheim, 1966:49). The Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission (1969b:176) also reports that Ukrainian publications constituted the most numerous category of Canada's ethnic press.

The Ukrainian and Polish cultural groups seem to have the most politically vocal presses. They have many publications, representing different factions or approaches to politics in Canada and in the homeland. They all articulate the demands of nationally self-conscious and politically assertive ethnic communities (Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969b: 73).

Kellner (1966:152) describes the Ukrainian press as "emigré" or "exile" rather than "immigrant" newspapers. However, it cannot, of course, be assumed that every Ukrainian-Canadian is exposed to these publications. Hobart (1967a:249, table 5.32) found that 25% and 4% respectively of the Alberta Ukrainian sample subscribed to Ukrainian newspapers and magazines.

The Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1969b:207) states that the Ukrainians have ". . . supported more extensive literature in a language other than English or French than any other cultural group in Canada." Slavutych (1966:109) estimates that the number of Ukrainian books published in Canada exceeds a thousand titles. Klymasz (1966:110) cites a report on a National Museum of Canada survey into Western Canadian folk culture:

The survey confirmed what was suspected beforehand-- that Ukrainian-Canadians have the most widespread and

flourishing folkmusic and folklore in Western Canada. After French, English, and Indian, theirs is potentially the largest body of folklore in Canada.

In order to measure the persistence of Ukrainian culture, the Alberta Ukrainian study asked the subjects a series of questions. Although the more educated proved to be more assimilationist in attitude (Borhek, 1967b:539-40), the investigators found that in general, a fairly strong loyalty exists to the symbolic aspects of Ukrainian culture (Borhek, 1967b:516). Eighty-three percent of the sample disagreed with the proposition that "some of our customs should no longer be practiced because they delay the acceptance of Ukrainians into Canadian society" (Borhek, 1967b:515). Sixty-five percent felt that Ukrainian-speaking separate schools ought to be established and 67% disagreed with the idea that Ukrainian churches might have their hymns sung and sermons preached in English. Ninety-two percent felt that Ukrainian choral singing, folk dancing, and Christmas ceremonies should be retained. Sixty-five percent of the sample believed that a change from a Ukrainian to an English name is never justified (Borhek, 1967b:516). Yuzyk (1967:53) observes that while certain customs, such as wailing at funerals, have disappeared,

Many family and church customs, such as the Holy Christmas Eve supper with twelve dishes, Easter egg exchanges, ceremonies connected with birth, marriage, and death, as well as the language and certain national celebrations are still vigorously retained.

All the foregoing indices corroborate the accuracy of the stereotypical perception of the Ukrainians as a minority

group which maintains unusually strong allegiance to many aspects of its European derived culture. Sociologists offer several explanations for this phenomenon. Kalbach and McVey (1967:147) suggest that the rural bloc settlement of Alberta Ukrainians facilitated the retention of their distinctive ethnic culture and identity. Wangenheim (1968:185) attributes Ukrainian nationalism to the influx of political exiles who entered Canada after the second World War and eventually acquired control of the Ukrainian press:

By constantly claiming that the U.S.S.R.'s Russification tactics pose a threat to the continued existence of a Ukrainian language and culture, they have created within many of the younger generation, born or educated here, a sense of commitment--an obligation to fight for the perpetuation of the Ukrainian language, the glorification of Ukrainian history and culture, its myths and symbols (Wangenheim, 1968:185).

### Large Families

Fifty-five percent of the semantic differential sample believed that the Ukrainians were extremely or quite likely to have larger families than the Alberta population generally. The mean and average deviation were 5.5 and 1.1, respectively. Demographic analysis of census data indicates that although the Ukrainians were previously more prolific than the other ethnic origin groups combined, their average family size in 1961 was slightly lower than that of the total population. The stereotype trait is therefore inaccurate.

Table 8.2 presents the age-specific fertility rates for Ukrainian and total Canadian populations between 1931

TABLE 8.2. AGE SPECIFIC FERTILITY RATES, UKRAINIANS  
AND TOTAL POPULATION, CANADA, 1931-1961

Decade	Age Categories	Ukrainian Births Per 1000 Females	Canadian Births Per 1000 Females
1931	15-19	50	30
	20-24	228	135
	25-29	255	172
	30-34	165	145
	35-39	132	102
	40-44	60	50
1941	15-19	35	30
	20-24	155	135
	25-29	150	160
	30-34	110	118
	35-39	68	75
	40-44	40	35
1951	15-19	48	48
	20-24	172	182
	25-29	160	185
	30-34	105	130
	35-39	55	80
	40-44	20	30
1961	15-19	82	58
	20-24	252	230
	25-29	212	218
	30-34	138	142
	35-39	60	78
	40-44	22	30

Source: Kalbach and McVey (1967:105, figure 3.3).

and 1961. These data were obtained from the work of Kalbach and McVey (1967:105). The age-specific rates show that the Ukrainian fertility rate which was considerably higher than that of all Canadian women in 1931, dropped below the general rate during the depression decade and remained lower during the succeeding two decades (Kalbach and McVey, 1967: 104).

Not until the 1951-1961 decade did the total fertility rate for all Ukrainian women recover to the level for all Canadian women (125 versus 127). This recovery was due almost entirely to the upsurge in rates for women in the two youngest age groups (Kalbach and McVey, 1967: 104).

Special tabulations of 1961 census data revealed that both family size and number of children under 25 years of age living at home were lower for families with Ukrainian heads than for all Alberta families. Family size and total number of children at home were 3.73 and 1.73, respectively for Ukrainians, and 3.84 and 1.85, respectively for Albertans generally (Kalbach and McVey, 1967:147-48). According to Kalbach and McVey (1967:147-48), the general Alberta rates exceeded those for Ukrainians, regardless of whether the latter were native-born or foreign-born, or lived in rural or metropolitan areas.

Table 8.3 gives the comparative distribution of Ukrainian and Alberta populations in the younger age categories. This table shows that 35.3% of the total Alberta population were under 15 years of age.

All the foregoing data indicate that in 1961 Ukrainian families were not larger than those of the containing

TABLE 8.3. POPULATION DISTRIBUTIONS FOR SELECTED AGE CATEGORIES, UKRAINIANS AND TOTAL POPULATION, ALBERTA, 1961

Age Categories	Total Alberta		Ukrainians	
	#	%	#	%
Total Populations	1,331,944	100.0	105,923	100.0
0-4	179,888	13.6	13,290	12.5
5-9	159,053	11.9	11,867	11.2
10-14	130,383	9.8	9,617	9.1

Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961, Bulletin 1.3, table 82).

society.

The historical variation of Ukrainian age-specific fertility rates (Table 8.2) suggests that a time lag may have occurred between the stereotype and the actual condition of the ethnic group. This possibility receives further support from information concerning the members of the Alberta Ukrainian study sample. Most of the respondents had large families of origin, 43% having come from a home which had seven or more children and another 30% from homes with five or six children (Hobart, 1967a:199). Family of origin size varied with both the age and generation of respondents. Thirty-seven percent of the sample members under 35 years came from families with seven or more children. Forty-five percent of those between 35 and 49 years, and 49% of those 50 years and over originated in such families (Hobart, 1967c: 269). Thirty-six percent of the respondents born in the Ukraine originated in families with six or more children.

Fifty-two percent of those born in Canada of Ukrainian-born parents came from families with six or more children. Only 12% of the respondents born in Canada of Canadian-born parents came from families with six or more children. Hobart (1967c:269-70) explains these generational differences as follows:

In comparison with the Ukrainian areas from which the settlers came, the manpower needs of the new settlement areas were large and the conditions for raising large families were favorable since plenty of good land was rather easy to obtain. The result was that the first generation of settlers had very many children, significantly more than those families which had lived most of their lives in the old country. The third generation, of course, came from families in which Canadian influences have been prominent.

The respondents themselves tended to have small families. Fifty-five percent of the urban sample and 34% of the rural sample had two or fewer children (Hobart, 1967a:215).

In summary, the above data indicate that although the description of the Ukrainians as a prolific people was accurate a generation ago, today the stereotype is invalid.

### Religious

Sixty-nine percent of the semantic differential sample felt the Ukrainians to be extremely or quite religious in comparison with Albertans generally. The mean and average deviation were 2.3 and 1.1, respectively. According to the available evidence, the Ukrainians are not particularly religious and the stereotype is inaccurate.

The Alberta Ukrainian study (Hobart, et al., 1967) proved to be the only source of information regarding

Ukrainian religiosity. Although comparative data on non-Ukrainian Edmonton respondents are drawn from the present investigation, the unrepresentative nature of both urban samples limits the significance of the findings that Ukrainian subjects attended church more often and that a higher proportion claimed affiliation with churches than did the members of the present study sample. Both samples were asked, "About how often do you attend church?" The results are shown in Table 8.4.

TABLE 8.4. CHURCH ATTENDANCE, UKRAINIAN AND STUDY SAMPLES, BY PERCENT

Frequency of Church Attendance	Ukrainian Sample*	Study Sample
Twice a month or more often	30	43
Once a month	40	14
Three times a year or less	30	43
	100	100

\*Source: Hobart (1967a:229).

Since priests are available to many of the rural churches only once or twice a month (Hobart, 1967a:229), Table 8.4 understates the religiosity of the Ukrainians. Hobart (1967a:229) reports that 6% of the Edmonton sample and 2% of the rural samples never attend church. The comparative figure for the combined semantic differential and open-ended sample was 12.5%. Thirty percent of the urban Ukrainian sample and 24% of the rural Ukrainian sample



reported attending church no more than three times a year (Hobart, 1967a:229). As Table 8.4 shows, 43% of the present study sample attended church no more than three times a year. Finally, only 2% of the total Ukrainian sample did not claim affiliation with an established church (Borhek and Jacoby, 1967:373, table 8.15). Nine percent of the present study sample did not belong to any church. (Unfortunately, the 1961 census did not publish a category of nonmembership.) Although the above data suggest that Ukrainians are more religious than the present study sample, the differences could very well be the result of sample inadequacies. The Edmonton Ukrainian sample underrepresents the more "successful" Ukrainians (Hobart, et al., 1967:13) and the present study overrepresented people in the higher socioeconomic classes. Further, information provided by Borhek and Hobart (1967) shows that second- and third-generation Ukrainians are not unusually pious.

The Ukrainian subjects were asked the following question: "If you had to decide which one of the following was most important to you, in the long run, which would it be?" --Getting along in the world (making money); politics or community affairs; religious beliefs or activities; the respect of others; being well-liked; being highly-skilled in what I do; being a just and honest person; leisure time activities such as hunting, fishing, reading, or relaxing; maintaining Ukrainian traditions; family relationships (Borhek and Hobart, 1967:382). Fifteen percent of the

first-generation respondents designated religion as the most important of the ten values. Only 6% of both second- and third-generation Ukrainians gave religion first priority (Borhek and Hobart, 1967:384, table 9.1). Religion was the third most frequently chosen value for the first generation, "being just and honest" and "being well-liked" having been first and second, respectively. In the case of second-generation Ukrainians, religion tied for sixth place with "being skilled." Only maintaining Ukrainian traditions and "leisure time activities" were less important. Religion was placed seventh in priority by third-generation respondents, once again placing ahead of leisure pursuits and Ukrainian traditions (Borhek and Hobart, 1967:384, table 9.1). Altogether, only 61 out of 719 respondents (8%) said that religion was most important to them.

The Ukrainian sample members were directly asked how religious they were (Hobart, 1967a:230). Seven percent of the Edmonton sample and from 11% to 22% of the rural samples considered themselves "very religious." Thirty-two percent of the urban sample answered that they were "not very or not at all" religious. The comparable replies from the three rural samples were 17%, 12%, and 8% (Hobart, 1967a:230).

Although comparative data are not available, it would appear from the above material that rural, first-generation Ukrainians are more concerned with religion than Canadian-born, urban Ukrainians, and that the latter group quite probably differs little from Albertans generally in this

regard. Since 77% of the Ukrainian origin group were born in Canada, one must conclude that religion does not have high priority among the group as a whole. There are at least two possible explanations for the presence of this characteristic in the Ukrainian stereotype. The Byzantine architecture of their churches and the strange garb of their priests make Ukrainian religious activity in the Edmonton area more visible than that of most other minority groups. Or, the trait may reflect a lag between the behavior of the first-generation peasant homesteaders and the contemporary perception of the entire Ukrainian group. However this may be, the existing validation evidence suggests that the stereotype is false.

#### Hardworking

Both instrument samples perceived the Ukrainians as more industrious than Albertans generally. Sixty-six percent of the semantic differential respondents described them as extremely or quite hardworking, resulting in a mean of 2.4 and an average deviation of 1.3. Twenty-nine percent of the open-ended questionnaire sample ascribed to the Ukrainians the adjective "hardworking" and its synonyms. Unfortunately, behavioral data concerning Ukrainian work habits are unavailable. Attitudinal responses collected by Borhek and Hobart (1967) indicate that the Ukrainians find less intrinsic value in work than do several comparative Alberta samples. However, the existing evidence fails to provide a test of whether or not Ukrainians actually work harder than Albertans

generally.

Borhek and Hobart (1967:388-95) attempted to measure Ukrainian acceptance of the Protestant Ethic, conceptualized by the authors as follows:

It is an orientation toward life in which work is regarded as the most important area of human endeavor . . . 'Idleness,' 'waste' and dilettantism are the mortal sins of the Protestant Ethic (Borhek and Hobart, 1967:388).

The following questions served to operationalize the Weberian concept (Borhek and Hobart, 1967:390):

1. If you had a great deal of money, would you work as much as you do now?
2. Would you say that the worst thing about being sick is that your work does not get done?
3. Would you say you work like a slave at everything you do until you are satisfied with the results?
4. Would you say that it is all right for a man to take off from work now and then if there is something else he would rather do?
5. Would you say that most people spend too much time working and not enough time enjoying life?
6. If you had the choice of taking a paid vacation or working during that time and getting paid extra, would you take the vacation?

The respondents were asked, first, whether they agreed or disagreed with each item, and second, how sure they were of their answer--very sure, fairly sure, or not too sure.

Answers were distributed along a six-point scale, with the "work emphasizing" response always being the highest score. Borhek and Hobart's (1967:392) comparative results are shown in Table 8.5 which presents mean Protestant Ethic scores for Alberta Ukrainian, Italian urban, and English urban and rural

TABLE 8.5. PROTESTANT ETHIC SCORES FOR ALBERTA  
UKRAINIAN, ITALIAN, AND ENGLISH SAMPLES

Group	Males		Females		TOTAL	
	#	Mean Score	#	Mean Score	#	Mean Score
Ukrainian Sample						
Younger	224	17.7	256	18.1	480	17.9
Older	159	18.4	139	18.9	298	18.7
Total	383	18.0	395	18.3	778	18.2
Urban (Edmonton) Italian Immigrant Sample						
Younger	100	21.2	103	18.8	203	20.0
Older	112	21.2	103	18.8	215	20.6
Total	212	21.2	206	18.8	418	20.3
English Sample						
Urban (Drumheller)					208	20.6
Rural (Four Alberta Farming Areas)					442	18.4
Total					650	19.1

Source: Borhek and Hobart (1967:392, table 9.2).

samples.

The authors believe that the English data probably understate the Protestant Ethic value of "old stock" Anglo-Saxon Albertans since most of the "English" samples were from poorer areas and a previous study found that the more prosperous had higher Protestant Ethic scores (Borhek and Hobart, 1967:392-93). However, the more successful members of the Ukrainian group may be underrepresented so that the Ukrainian index may also underestimate that minority group's attitudes toward work. Borhek and Hobart (1967:393) conclude that

The present data suggest that hard work values, particularly the value of hard work as an end in itself, are less important to Ukrainians than they are to 'old stock' Albertans and to Italian urban migrants.

Further, the evidence failed to confirm their expectation that each succeeding generation of Ukrainians would show greater acceptance of Protestant Ethic values:

It would seem that these scores actually show that the major tenets of this set of values have not really penetrated the Ukrainian-Canadian community (Borhek and Hobart, 1967:395).

The foregoing attitudinal data suggest that Ukrainians are less impressed than other Alberta groups with the merits of work for work's sake. However, these data may not provide a good test of the attribution, "hardworking." A group which has a relatively low opinion of work may nevertheless work assiduously.

### Ambitious

Sixty-five percent of the semantic differential sample described the Ukrainians as extremely or quite ambitious in comparison with the Alberta population generally. The mean was 2.4 and the average deviation, 1.3. Since information regarding the aspirations of comparable Canadian minority groups is unavailable, judgment on the accuracy of this stereotype trait is not easily rendered.

Most early Ukrainian immigrants to Western Canada were semiliterate peasants, who either settled on the land or took unskilled jobs in mines, or railway construction and maintenance (Porter, 1965:68). (The towns and cities of Eastern Canada attracted much of the influx of middle-class

Ukrainian political refugees which came after World War II (Wangenheim, 1968:182).) Despite the fact that each succeeding generation of Alberta Ukrainians shows an improvement in educational attainment and the proportion of urban versus rural residents has steadily increased, they have not demonstrated exceptional socioeconomic advancement in the 70 years since their arrival in this province. Census data indicate that the Ukrainians still lag behind Albertans generally in income and education levels and proportions in high status, skilled employment categories. Ukrainians are overrepresented in agriculture; movement from the farms to the urban centres has meant downward or lateral, rather than upward mobility. Further, the Alberta Ukrainian study (Hobart, et al., 1967) reports that Ukrainians do not place a high value on success and getting ahead in the world, nor have they been particularly mobile. However, these findings are difficult to interpret because the authors note that their urban sample may underrepresent the "most successful" members of the Ukrainian community. In general, then, the evidence shows that although Alberta Ukrainians have through time improved their socioeconomic position, their rate of progress does not warrant a reputation for exceptional ambition.

The 1951 census showed that the Ukrainians were underrepresented in the highest occupational levels and overrepresented in the low-ranking occupations. Blishen (1958), who devised a Canadian socioeconomic scale based on average

years of schooling and average income for selected occupations, ranked 343 occupations into seven classes. The top two occupational classes constituted 11.6% of the Canadian labor force. Six percent of the Ukrainian labor force was located in classes I and II. His bottom two classes made up 40.9% of the Canadian labor force. Ukrainians were over-represented in classes VI and VII (46.4%) (Porter, 1965:85).

Table 8.6 gives the 1961 percentage distributions of foreign-born and native-born total Alberta and Ukrainian populations into the census occupational categories. The relative position of the Ukrainians has not dramatically altered since the 1951 census. This table is based upon special tabulations of census data made available to the Hobart, et al. (1967) study. Table 8.6 shows the Ukrainians to be underrepresented in the professional and managerial classes and overrepresented in agricultural occupations. Fifty-three percent of the Ukrainians who immigrated to Alberta prior to 1946 took up farming (Kalbach and McVey, 1967:136). Thirty-two percent of the Alberta Ukrainians are still located in agricultural occupations.

According to the Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1969b:56),

. . . the Ukrainians who came to Canada before World War I had little education themselves and belonged to faiths which had not demonstrated much interest in education, particularly scientific education.

Table 8.7 shows that the Ukrainian educational level is still comparatively low. Only the Italian and native groups had



TABLE 8.6. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPATIONS  
FOR NATIVE- AND FOREIGN-BORN UKRAINIAN  
AND TOTAL ALBERTA POPULATIONS,  
CURRENT EXPERIENCED  
LABOR FORCE, 1961

Occupation	Total Alberta	Native-Born		Foreign-Born	
		Alberta	Ukrainians	Alberta	Ukrainians
Managerial	8.6	8.7	6.2	8.6	5.0
Professional	9.6	10.4	8.2	7.7	3.9
Clerical	11.3	12.9	13.3	7.2	2.4
Sales	6.5	7.3	5.6	4.6	1.5
Service & Recreation	12.1	11.1	9.5	14.7	11.9
Transport. & Communic.	5.7	6.6	6.1	3.6	2.5
Farmers	13.4	11.9	16.3	17.1	32.6
Farm Workers	7.9	8.5	12.8	6.5	10.8
Loggers	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.1
Fishermen, Trappers	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1
Miners, Quarrymen	1.1	1.1	0.9	0.8	1.0
Craftsmen	17.0	15.1	15.6	21.9	19.5
Laborers	3.8	3.2	3.3	5.5	6.4
Not Stated	2.3	2.6	2.0	1.5	2.4
Totals	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1

Source: Kalbach and McVey (1967:135, table 3.9).

TABLE 8.7. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF CANADIAN POPULATION  
25 YEARS AND OVER, BY ETHNIC GROUPS, 1961 (PERCENT)

Ethnic Group	Highest Level of Schooling				
	No Schooling	Some Elem.	Some Second.	Some Univ.	Univ. Degree
All Groups	1.7	47.1	44.5	3.3	3.4
Jewish	4.0	32.3	48.3	6.4	8.9
Asiatic	10.8	44.0	35.9	3.6	5.6
Russian	8.8	47.7	35.1	3.9	4.5
British	0.7	36.5	54.5	4.1	4.3
Polish	4.8	55.1	34.1	2.9	3.1
Scandinavian	0.5	43.0	50.0	3.7	2.8
Netherlands	0.7	49.1	44.0	3.4	2.8
German	1.3	49.8	43.4	3.0	2.6
French	1.3	60.5	33.7	2.1	2.4
Ukrainian	6.5	55.3	33.7	2.5	2.0
Italian	4.0	72.6	21.2	1.1	1.1
Indian and Eskimo	31.5	59.9	8.2	0.3	0.1
Other European	0.7	54.7	36.8	4.0	3.8

Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961:Catalogue 99-516).

lower percentages with a university degree. Table 8.8 gives the educational attainment for native- and foreign-born Alberta Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian populations. Although native-born Ukrainians are more highly educated than foreign-born Ukrainians, the former still lag behind the general education level. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961: Catalogue 99-516, table xix) reported that the Ukrainian group had a slightly higher rate of school attendance of their population aged 5 to 19 years than did the Canadian population as a whole--84.4% versus 81.3%. However, Kalbach and McVey (1967:131) conclude their examination of comparative census data by stating that "it is significant to note that for the youngest native-born Ukrainians there is still

TABLE 8.8. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF UKRAINIANS AND TOTAL POPULATION, 25 YEARS AND OVER, ALBERTA, 1961

Schooling	Ukrainians			Total Population		
	Total	Native-Born	Foreign-Born	Total	Native-Born	Foreign-Born
Elementary School or Less	60.1	47.4	85.9	41.9	34.2	55.5
High School, One Year or More	35.1	46.9	11.6	50.4	57.3	38.4
University, One Year or More	2.7	3.3	1.3	4.1	4.5	3.5
University Degree	2.0	2.4	1.3	3.5	4.0	2.6
Totals	99.9	100.0	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0

Source: Kalbach and McVey (1967:131, table 3.7). From Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Special Tabulations 1961 Census.

a considerable differential in educational attainment."

Relative income level represents yet another measure of the success of the Ukrainian group in Canada. When the 1961 average total income of the Alberta male nonagricultural labor force (\$4,595) is employed as an index of 100, the Ukrainian income was 94.3 (Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969a:18). Kalbach and McVey (1967:138-39) summarize the special census tabulations of Alberta income distribution as follows:

With the predominantly rural background and deficiencies in formal education which have characterized the Ukrainian population, it is not surprising to find that they have had larger proportions with total earnings under \$3,000, as well as under \$6,000, than have the

total urban population in Alberta. The differences hold for native-born as well as foreign-born in both metropolitan urban areas. . . . Only in the rural non-metropolitan areas do the Ukrainians in non-farm households exceed the total population's proportion of those reporting total earnings of \$6,000 or over, and this is true only for the native-born.

It should be noted that a higher percentage of Ukrainians than non-Ukrainians in rural nonmetropolitan areas earned less than \$3,000, 56.5% versus 52.9% (Kalbach and McVey, 1967:138, table 3.10).

Respondents to the Alberta Ukrainian study were asked several attitudinal questions which directly relate to the stereotype characteristic under purview. Their answers do not support the contention that the Ukrainians are an especially ambitious group.

The Ukrainian sample was asked, "If you had your choice, would you most like to be successful, independent, or well-liked?" (Hobart, 1967d:504). Fifty-eight percent preferred to be well-liked. (The author (Hobart, 1967d:504) describes this as "the more distinctively Ukrainian peasant response.") Nineteen percent answered "independent" and 23% answered "successful." The sample was requested to specify which one of the following values was the most important: getting along in the world (making money); politics or community affairs; religious beliefs or activities; the respect of others; being well-liked; being highly-skilled in what I do; being a just and honest person; leisure time activities such as hunting, fishing, reading, or relaxing; maintaining Ukrainian traditions; family relationships (Borhek and

Hobart, 1967:382). Since only 90 out of 719 respondents gave success highest priority, "getting ahead in the world" was ranked fourth. (The item chosen most frequently was "being just and honest.") Twenty-two percent of the third-generation respondents, and 11% of both first- and second-generation respondents designated success as most important to them (Borhek and Hobart, 1967:384). Comparative data would make the above results more meaningful. Fortunately, the authors have provided information for non-Ukrainian Alberta samples on a related series of questions. In answer to the query, "Would you say that most people spend too much time working and not enough time enjoying life?" 63% of the Ukrainians and 46% of the non-Ukrainian sample replied "yes." Sixty-five percent of the first-generation Ukrainians and 56% of the third-generation Ukrainians agreed with the proposition (Borhek and Hobart, 1967:399, table 9.5). A second item asked "Would you say that it is all right for a man to take off from work now and then if there is something else he would rather do?" Forty-seven percent of the Ukrainians and 65% of the non-Ukrainians disagreed (Borhek and Hobart, 1967:399, table 9.5). Once again, more third-generation than first-generation Ukrainians viewed work as important. Because the non-Ukrainian sample was generally less prosperous than Albertans generally and a direct relationship was found between high economic position and high preference for work activities, the authors believe that the non-Ukrainian scores understate general Anglo-Saxon Alberta

values. However, again it must be pointed out that the Ukrainian sample probably underrepresents the most successful members of that community. In general, it appears that the Ukrainians are not unusually ambitious. This conclusion based on attitudinal data is reinforced by Hobart, et al.'s (1967) inquiry into the social mobility of the Ukrainian study sample.

The extent of upward mobility was examined in terms of the first and current occupations of the male Ukrainian respondents (Hobart, 1967a:205). Although lack of information regarding other Alberta populations makes interpretation difficult, the results do not show the Ukrainians to be an especially mobile group. Forty-four percent of the total sample began as farmers and 43% of these men are currently farmers (Hobart, 1967a:207). Eighty-three percent of the 276 Edmonton urban respondents started out in manual labor positions of which 8% were skilled and 75% were semiskilled or unskilled. (Throughout, farming was classified as semi-skilled work.) Seventy-eight percent were currently employed in manual labor occupations of which 22% were skilled and 56% semiskilled or unskilled. Seventeen percent of the Edmonton sample began in white-collar occupations of which 6% were skilled and 11% clerical. At the time of the study, 22% were employed in white-collar occupations of which 12% were skilled and 10% clerical (Hobart, 1967a:209).

Borhek (1967a:335, emphasis in original) states that the ". . . chief occupational mobility of these respondents

has been away from the farm." Elkin (1964:53) uses the adjective "remarkable" to describe the extent of the Ukrainian rural-urban migration. In 1941, the Alberta Ukrainian population was 82% rural (Kaye, 1966:42). By 1951, that population was 50% urban (Elkin, 1964:53). The 1961 census showed that while 63% of the Alberta population was urban, 54% of the Ukrainian population lived in urban areas (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961:Catalogue 92-561). Porter (1965:75) points out that by 1961 all ethnic groups except indigenous Indians and Eskimos were more than 50% urban. Borhek (1967a:335) says that, ". . . it is difficult to tell whether movement from farming to other kinds of employment constitutes mobility 'up' or 'down' or 'sideways' . . ." Elsewhere, the Alberta Ukrainian study (Kalbach and McVey, 1967:139) observes that for both native- and foreign-born Ukrainians, the proportion making \$6,000 or more a year is higher in rural than urban metropolitan Alberta areas. Non-Ukrainians show the opposite pattern. In terms of income at least, migration to the city may perhaps represent temporary downward mobility. Essentially, it is movement of unskilled labor. Further, census data showed the proportion of both native-born and foreign-born Ukrainians who changed their place of residence during the five-year period prior to the census to be lower than that for the total Alberta population. Fifty-four percent of the Ukrainian population and 46% of the total Alberta population were nonmovers (Kalbach and McVey, 1967:140-41). For the

above reasons, it is difficult to regard Ukrainian geographic mobility as indicative of extraordinary social mobility.

TABLE 8.9. INTERGENERATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY OF ALBERTA UKRAINIAN STUDY RESPONDENTS, BY PERCENT

Generation	Upward Mobile	Non-mobile	Downward Mobile	Total	Number
First	7	89	4	100	236
Second	25	74	1	100	403
Third	31	58	11	100	72

Source: Borhek (1967a:337, table 7.10).

Borhek (1967a:335) measured the intergenerational occupational mobility of the Ukrainian sample. Mobility was classified according to differentials between father and son in terms of both white-collar and blue-collar work and level of skill involved in each category of work. These results are reproduced in Table 8.9. Borhek (1967a:338-39) gives the following interpretation of the data shown in this table:

Although no comparative data on other immigrant groups is available, it appears that this population is not a very mobile population in terms of status. It appears, from other studies of general populations, that the kind of upward and downward mobility which these data show is no greater than that of the general population in any industrialized country. (Emphases in original.)

Although individuals do not appear to hold unusually high aspirations to succeed, a case can be made for collective Ukrainian ambition expressed by their political chauvinism. The Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1969b:84) reports that soon after their arrival in Canada,



Ukrainians voted in blocks for English-speaking candidates. As early as 1910 they began to nominate Ukrainian candidates. Their endeavor has been relatively successful. Between 1867 and 1964 Alberta had eight non-English, non-French origin members in the House of Commons. Of these, six were Ukrainian, one was German and one Scandinavian (Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969b:272, table A-28).

They boast of the number of Canadians of Ukrainian origin who have held political office at the federal, provincial, and municipal levels, counting each to be a representative of their group and expecting each to work for policies favourable to the group's interest (Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1969b:85).

The efforts of Ukrainian spokesmen to organize a "third force" in Canada has already been discussed. Nevertheless, it is improbable that the sample members intended such a group connotation in their ascription of the trait "ambitious" to the Ukrainians. Since the available evidence does not justify its application to individual Ukrainians, the stereotype is judged to be inaccurate.

### Conclusion

Seven stereotypic characteristics were ascribed to the Ukrainians. The absence of relevant information makes it impossible to assess the validity of two of these traits, "not neglectful of the needs of their children" and "self-sufficient."<sup>2</sup> A further trait, "hardworking," could not be

---

<sup>2</sup>A research project with greater financial resources at its disposal than the present study might conceivably investigate the accuracy of these two traits by gaining access to welfare, family court, etc. records and attempting to

satisfactorily verified. Although attitudinal evidence suggests that Ukrainians place less intrinsic value upon work than other Alberta groups, such evidence is not a test of their actual work behavior. The available data indicate that little difference exists between Ukrainians and the general Alberta population on the following three characteristics: "religious," "ambitious," and "prolificacy." Among the traits which could be verified, only one, the Ukrainians' insistent maintenance of various aspects of their European culture, was accurately perceived by the study sample. The inconclusive results reported in this chapter emphasize the need for sociological inquiry into the correlates of stereotype accuracy.

---

isolate Ukrainian names. However, Wangenheim (1966:46) reports that she abandoned her plan to sample Ukrainian high school students from a list of names. Although she learned all the Cyrillic rules, she still could not distinguish Ukrainian names from those of other Slavic groups. The exogamy of Ukrainian women further complicates the problem.

## CHAPTER 9

### VALIDATION OF THE HUTTERITE STEREOTYPE

#### Introduction

Chapter 9 examines the accuracy of the 18 stereotype traits which were ascribed to the Hutterites. Field studies constitute the primary source of validation data. Few government documents relevant to the Hutterite stereotype could be located. Since the Dominion Bureau of Statistics combined the Hutterite and Mennonite populations, even census data had limited value.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, reliance has been placed upon the judgment of sociologists and other professional observers to establish the extent to which the folk knowledge of the Hutterites is accurate. In general, the evidence disconfirms the assumption that stereotypes are false.

#### Hutterite Stereotype Traits

##### Religious

Both the semantic differential and the open-ended questionnaire samples described the Hutterites as religious.

---

<sup>1</sup>The size of the Hutterite population in 1970 is not precisely known. In 1965, there were approximately 17,800 Hutterites in North America, 12,500 in Canada and 5,300 in the United States (Bennett, 1967:33). In that year, the Canadian Hutterites were established on 120 colonies, 63 in Alberta, 42 in Manitoba and 15 in Saskatchewan (Hostetler, 1965:9). On November 27, 1970, there were 78 colonies in Alberta (Department of Municipal Affairs, 1970). The 6,029 Hutterites in Alberta in 1966 made up about 0.4% of the population (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1970).

Twenty-four percent of the respondents to the latter instrument spontaneously referred to Hutterite religiosity. The semantic differential mean and average deviation were 1.3 and 0.5 respectively, 94% of the sample members having placed their responses in the two extreme scale positions adjacent to the mean. According to ethnographic reports, this stereotype trait is unquestionably accurate.

A brief description of the Hutterian cultural "character" (Malinowski, 1944:52-53) will provide a frame of reference for this section and the chapter as a whole. The Hutterian Brethren are a fundamentalist Christian sect, a wing of the Anabaptist movement which originated during the early 16th century in the aftermath of the Peasants' Revolt. They believe in God and Jesus Christ and a literal interpretation of the Bible. According to the Hutterites, salvation can be attained only by turning away from the sinful world and practicing communal living, the one valid form of Christianity. Biblical justification for economic communism is found in the book of Acts:

And all that believed were together, and had all things common;

And sold their possessions and goods and parted them to all men, as every man had need. (Chapter 2, verses 44 and 45.)

Other important Hutterite beliefs include adult baptism, pacifism, austerity in consumption, and a rigid moral code.

Since most of the present chapter involves an analysis of the correspondence between Hutterian religious ideals and behavior, conclusive judgment on the validity of this

pivotal trait must await the presentation of all the data. However, it is possible to arrive at an interim decision by applying the customary indices of religiosity, such as those employed by Lenski (1963:56). These indices include adherence to the following beliefs: the existence of God and the divinity of Christ; life after death; attendance at weekly worship; daily prayer. According to the ethnographic evidence to be presented below, the Hutterites are characterized by unusual doctrinal orthodoxy and participation in religious rituals. Conkin (1964:3), for example, states that "in few cases in human history have ideas and beliefs been so enduringly significant, or even determinant, in the lives of a people." The Hutterite system is literally a sacred society, a *Gemeinschaft* grounded upon religious beliefs. No disjunction exists between sacred and secular pursuits. All the available data suggest that religion is a more pervasive influence among the Hutterites than among Albertans generally.

The evidence indicates that the Hutterites are firmly committed to a fundamentalistic Christian ideology. Eaton and Weil (1955:175) wrote that "the entire Hutterite way of life is infused with religious significance," and further,

The culture is orthodox, integrated around an absolute value system. No major deviation from central beliefs and socially approved practices is tolerated. Each generation is indoctrinated systematically to grow up to believe and live as close to tradition as possible (Eaton and Weil, 1955:31).

Similarly, Bennett (1967:108) described religion as "all-important" to the Brethren, ". . . for on it is established

the basic frame of their existence." Kaplan and Plaut (1956:12) found these people to be "religious to an unusual degree" and state that ". . . there is hardly a doubter among all the Hutterites." Mange (1964:104) speaks of them as "firm believers in God and Jesus Christ." According to Peters (1965:185), the Hutterites subscribe without reservation to both the doctrine shared with non-Hutterite fundamentalist sects and their own sacred teachings:

Its articles of faith have been rigidly maintained, and young Hutterians are dedicated and loyal to the beliefs enunciated by their ancestors four hundred years ago.

Several ethnographers (Bennett, 1967:24; Peters, 1965:120) comment upon the Hutterites' constant reference to the Bible as a source of guidance in everyday colony affairs. The colony vernacular is permeated with Biblical language. Perhaps the most dramatic impression recorded of Hutterite religiosity is the form which mental illness takes among these people. Nearly three-quarters of the cases discovered were manic-depressives (Kaplan and Plaut, 1956:65). The Hutterites, who refer to the depression as *Anfechtung*, or temptation by the devil, believe the disorder to be God's test of their religious sincerity (Eaton and Weil, 1955: 101-02). Delusions centre around past sins and obsessive concern with the devil (Kaplan and Plaut, 1956:67).

Comparative data concerning degree of doctrinal orthodoxy show that Hutterites are more religious than various non-Hutterite samples. For example, Stark and Glock (1968:7) conclude that American religion is rapidly becoming

demythologized. While only a minority so far doubt the existence of a personal God or the divinity of Christ,

. . . a near majority reject such traditional articles of faith as Christ's miracles, life after death, the promise of the second coming, and the virgin birth. An overwhelming majority reject the existence of the Devil (Stark and Glock, 1968:8).

Somewhat earlier, Lenski (1963:56) reported that only 32% of his white Protestant Detroit sample were committed to all of the following beliefs: existence of a God who answered prayers; divinity of Jesus Christ; life after death; and the need for weekly worship. Finally, 9% of the sample employed in the present study declared themselves to be atheists or agnostics. However, the study sample was not a representative sample.

The Hutterites also demonstrate regular and frequent participation in their religious rituals. Church services are held daily and attended by almost every older child and adult. Lengthy prayers are offered before and after meals (Eaton and Weil, 1955:31). The religious indoctrination begun in infancy is continued by daily instruction in kindergarten and German school (Eaton and Weil, 1953:9). Children attend German school before and after public school until they are 15 years old (Peters, 1965:133). Hutterite youngsters are required to attend Sunday school (as well as church) from the time they are ten years old until they are baptized. Baptism normally occurs between the ages of 20 and 26 years (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:81). The children are subjected to continuous, rote religious

indoctrination. As a result, their faith ". . . is often more a consequence of institutionalized habit than of dynamic conviction" (Eaton and Weil, 1955:31); they simply remain unaware of alternative thought-ways.

The Hutterites appear to devote considerably more time and energy to religious ritual than do non-Hutterites. Lenski (1963:56) reports that 29% of the white Protestant sample and 47% of the white Catholic sample prayed daily. The present investigation questioned subjects on the frequency of their church attendance. Table 9.1 presents these results.

TABLE 9.1. FREQUENCY OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE. COMBINED SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AND OPEN-ENDED SAMPLES

Frequency	Number	Percent
More than once a week	33	5.6
Once a week	125	21.4
Two or three times a month	91	15.6
Once a month	82	14.0
Two or three times a year	181	30.9
Never	73	12.5
TOTALS	585	100.0

The frequencies shown in the above table probably understate Alberta church attendance. Nevertheless, these data do suggest that a much smaller percentage of Albertans than Hutterites attend religious services daily. Although the amount of time devoted to the religious education of the average Alberta child is unknown, one can safely assume it



to be considerably less than the time spent indoctrinating the average Hutterite child. Moreover, the Hutterites do not compartmentalize sacred and secular concerns. For them, religion is not a matter to be considered on the sabbath and forgotten during the work week. On the contrary,

The entire Hutterite way of life is infused with religious significance. There is no clear line separating religious from secular elements. . . . One need not go to church or pray to achieve spiritual grace. 'Good works' for the community, whether milking cows or looking after children, can pave one's road to eternal salvation (Eaton and Weil, 1955:175).

No church organization exists apart from the colony organization (Peters, 1965:78).

Professional opinion corroborates the folk impression of Hutterite religiosity. Subsequent sections of this chapter which examine the correspondence between specific Hutterian beliefs and behavior further document the accuracy of this stereotype trait.

### Rural

The semantic differential sample considered the Hutterites to be more rural than the Alberta population generally. Ninety-two percent of the responses were placed in the two adjacent extreme scale positions resulting in a mean and average deviation of 6.6 and 0.7, respectively. The evidence shows the stereotype to be accurate.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>In 1961 the Dominion Bureau of Statistics reported that the combined Mennonite and Hutterite populations were 78% rural (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961:Bulletin 1.3-3, table 86).

In 1959, the Alberta government formed a committee to inquiry into the acquisition of land by the Hutterian Brethren. The *Report of the Hutterite Investigation Committee* (Department of Municipal Affairs, 1959:13) stated that the Hutterites who owned 0.86% of the 46 million acres of occupied agricultural land in Alberta, constituted 1.37% of the total Alberta farm population. The Alberta Department of Municipal Affairs was unable to supply either a map showing the location of Hutterite colonies or a listing of their geographical locations from which such a map could be prepared. However, a list of postal addresses which was provided shows all 78 colonies to be located in rural counties or municipal districts (Department of Municipal Affairs, 1970). The Dominion Bureau of Statistics gives colony locations according to township and range (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1970).

Sociological field studies invariably describe the Hutterites as agriculturalists. Hostetler and Huntington (1967:37) state that "all Hutterite colonies are dependent upon agricultural lands for their basic resources." Bennett (1969:247) offers the following observation:

The economy is that of a large, diversified agricultural enterprise, and all Hutterites are farmers since no satisfactory way has been found to exist communally in an urban-industrial setting.

Peters (1965:107) gives a less utilitarian interpretation:

The Hutterian dedication to farm work is motivated by a conviction that for them this way of life is most pleasing in the eyes of God. As a result they have no alternative.

*Bruderhofs* or colonies are communal farms and less than 0.5% of the Hutterite population have permanently defected from their colonies (Mackie, 1965). (The majority of these defectors continue to live on farms.) In comparison, the Alberta population was 63% urban in 1961 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961:Catalogue 1.3-2, table 82) and 69% urban in 1966 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1968a:194). Therefore, the stereotypic description of the Hutterites as rural is accurate.

#### Likely to Have Large Families

Eighty-three percent of the semantic differential respondents described the Hutterites as quite or extremely likely to have large families. The mean was 6.3 and the average deviation, 0.9. Both demographic and ethnographic studies affirm the validity of this stereotype trait.

Eaton and Mayer (1954) carried out an intensive investigation of the sect's population growth between 1874 and 1950. The relevant findings are summarized as follows:

Hutterites showed the highest sustained net reproduction rate (366.44) of any modern population which, to the best of our knowledge, has ever been studied. Their fertility ratio in 1950 was 96.3. At present rates, the sect will double its membership every sixteen years. Most Hutterites get married, but not particularly early in life. . . . There are almost no social factors which interfere with procreation after marriage. Having children is strongly supported by all cultural institutions. . . . The average completed family has over ten children (Eaton and Weil, 1955:42).

In his commentary on the above report, Cook (1954:97) noted that the Hutterites whose birth rate was 45.9, are ". . . definitely out-multiplying such rapidly growing peoples as

the Brazilians and Mexicans of Latin America and the Ceylonese and Malayans of Southeast Asia." (The Canadian birth rate in 1951 was 27.4.)

A more recent genetic study of American and Canadian *Schmiedenleut*<sup>3</sup> colonies reached similar conclusions. Mange (1964:106) states that the age-specific birth rates for all categories except the 15 to 19 age group were the highest observed in any population. Further,

The nuptial fertility of 498 births per 1000 married women per year in the 25-29 age group indicated that for these women there was a birth almost every two years (Mange, 1964:106).

The fertility rate for all Alberta women between 25 and 29 years is 163.6 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1967c:75). Once again, the average Hutterite family is reported to include more than ten children (Sheps, 1965:65). In 1961, the average number of children in Alberta rural families was 2.1 and in urban families, 1.7 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961:Catalogue 93-514, table 49). Less than 2% of the Alberta women ever married, 15 years and older, had borne ten or more children (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961: Catalogue 98-507, table G-1). According to Peter (1966:35), the Hutterite net reproduction rate is 4.12 per year. The general Canadian population is increasing at about 3% per

---

<sup>3</sup>The Hutterites are divided into three kinship clans called the *Schmiedenleut*, *Lehrerleut*, and *Dariusleut* after the name or occupation of their first leaders in North America. Although they share a common history, doctrine, social organization and culture, intermarriage is rare.

year (Hawthorn, 1967:88). Finally, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1970) reports that according to the U.S. Population Reference Bureau, the 1968 North American Hutterite birth rate was 46. In comparison, the 1967 Alberta birth rate was 20.6 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1967c:14).

Sociologists describing Western Canadian Hutterite colonies generally remark upon the unusually large size of Hutterian families (Peters, 1965:152; Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:57; Bennett, 1967:164). Usually, their observation is supported with citations from the Eaton and Mayer (1954) study. Apparently, nothing has occurred since 1954 to alter the Hutterites' attitudes toward large families or the practice of birth control. (Goldscheider and Uhlenberg (1969:371) hypothesize that the Hutterites' high fertility results in part from their desire to resist assimilation.) Peter (1966:30) notes that within 40 years, the number of Alberta colonies increased from 16 to 65. The continuing need for colony fission results from the pressure of natural increase.

The foregoing data show that the Hutterites are more prolific than Albertans generally. The stereotype trait is accurate.

### Cliquish

Both instrument samples characterized the Hutterites as cliquish. Eighty-two percent of the semantic differential respondents checked the two adjacent extreme categories, producing a mean of 6.3 and an average deviation of 1.1.

Forty-two percent of the open-ended questionnaire sample made reference to Hutterite avoidance of personal relationships with outsiders. The relevant ethnographic evidence shows that although the Brethren do not lead a cloistered existence, they are a self-consciously exclusive group.

Hutterites regard themselves as the Chosen People, the only Christians surrounded by a sinful world under the domination of the devil (Friedmann, 1961:92). Salvation is guaranteed to the Brethren alone. The colony and its people must be protected from the corrupting temptations of the containing society. Their doctrine demands withdrawal from the world. Nevertheless, contemporary Hutterites find themselves in a paradoxical situation. In order to finance their separatism they must take an active role in the North American agricultural economy (Bennett, 1969:247). However, the material to be presented shows that most Hutterite relationships with outsiders are instrumental in nature.

Amount of exogamy provides an index of the extent of a minority group's intimacy with the out-group. According to this index, the Hutterites are indeed cliquish. Biologists have referred to the Hutterites as a "human isolate" (Mange, 1964). Marriage outside the sect is forbidden and ". . . nearly all of the present members (over 14,000) stem from the original 101 couples" who migrated to the United States in the 1870s (Eaton, 1964:66). Between 1930 and 1950, 30 individuals joined the group and intermarriage produced 34 children (Eaton and Weil, 1955:33). Mange (1964:111)

reports that in 1960, the *Schmiedenleut* clan population of 5,450 included 15 persons of non-Hutterite descent. In 1950, there were only 15 patronyms among the Hutterites, and three surnames accounted for nearly half the families (Eaton and Weil, 1953:7). The biological separatism of the Hutterites has been so complete that their inbreeding levels have attracted the interest of a team of biologists (Mange, 1964).

Professional observers invariably comment upon the refusal of the Hutterites to participate in rural community affairs. Conkin (1964:68) remarks that they were ". . . correctly accused of being aloof nonparticipants, with their parochial-type schools and their total lack of interest in civic affairs and local politics." Sanders (1964:227) offers the following description of Hutterite relations with outsiders:

[Colonies are] . . . a social island in the community. Unless the farmer takes the initiative to establish friendly relations none will be established. He will never meet his neighbors at church or any other community organization. They speak a different language and live a different life.

Peters (1965:181) notes that although the Hutterites graciously receive the businessmen and farmers who come to the colonies, they do not often visit neighboring farms. If an emergency or accident occurs, they will offer assistance.

Beyond that they generally remain on the *Bruderhof*. Their faith and attitude, language, garb, and appearance isolate them as effectively as if walls surrounded their communities. The Hutterians remain aloof from most neighborhood undertakings. They are rarely seen at political meetings, fairs, field and sports days, dances and weddings, and similar occasions (Peters, 1965:181).

The above comments are supported by Hostetler (1965: 216) who recorded the number and purposes of trips made from one Alberta colony during a two-week summer period. Thirty-five of 42 trips were made for economic reasons, i.e., buying machinery parts, taking care of mail at the post office. Five social trips were made to a neighboring colony. A relative in a hospital was visited twice. The colony received 30 visits from outsiders during the same period (Hostetler, 1965:231). Eight were tourists. Most involved buying or selling agricultural commodities. Nobody came to pay a social call.

Hostetler and Huntington (1967:95-96) believe that Hutterian neighboring practices vary with the size and economic security of the colony. A small, newly-established colony was making deliberate attempts to be neighborly. However, the spokesman of a large, economically self-sufficient colony is quoted as follows: "A good neighbor is one we never see, talk with, or help back and forth, or that never comes on the place" (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967: 95). Serl (1964:113) also found that ". . . contacts tend to diminish rather than increase with the length of time a colony has been in a particular area." This phenomenon is apparent in the behavior of the first contingent of Hutterite settlers in Saskatchewan. Non-Hutterites in the region were critical of the Brethren's refusal to participate in the social life of the communities. Accordingly, the Hutterites began to make a special effort to take a small



part in civic affairs (Bennett, 1969:268). The Saskatchewan Hutterites acknowledged that their social participation was considerably greater than it had been previously on their Alberta parent colony location (Bennett, 1967:77).

The ethnographic evidence shows that the Hutterites are more cliquish than Albertans generally. Peters (1965:4) says that they ". . . have resisted integration and assimilation to a greater degree than any other ethnic group of European origin." The stereotype trait is accurate.

#### Believe University Education Unimportant

Seventy-four percent of the semantic differential sample described the Hutterites as extremely or quite negative toward university education. The mean was 6.0 and the average deviation 1.2. Data from both ethnographic reports and government commissions demonstrate that the sect's disapproval of formal education beyond the elementary level has resulted in few Hutterites proceeding beyond the eighth or ninth grade.

Since the 16th century, the Hutterites have maintained their own primarily religious system of education. Indeed, Bennett (1967:276) says that they showed more respect for learning than their rural Saskatchewan neighbors. However, the Hutterites are reluctant to expose their youth to the alien values of the outside world. The Hutterite Investigation Committee (Department of Municipal Affairs, 1959: 25-26) found the Brethren's attitude toward education to be

as follows:

The problem as it appears to them is that if their children are compelled to attend public schools they will be subject to indoctrination of values of the world outside the colony, which they regard as sinful. They fear they will be exposed to the doctrine of private ownership of goods which leads to greed and materialistic values. They fear also that they will be inculcated with the patriotic attitudes of the country leading to war; and that they will acquire the habits and tastes of the outside community, leading to a gradual submission of the Hutterite way of life in the culture of the larger society.

Hutterite children are sent to the one-room, public schools situated on the colonies only because their attendance is compulsory under the law (Kaplan and Plaut, 1956:18).

Hostetler and Redekop (1962) report that by bringing the public school within their communities the Hutterites have successfully neutralized its impact upon their children.

The members of the Alberta Royal Commission on Education (1959:396) agree:

Colony influences are such that school facilities are poor, the program is inadequate, and the objectives that warrant public support are nullified by internally planned counteraction.

With few exceptions, Hutterite children are removed from school on their 15th birthday (Peters, 1965:149; Eaton and Weil, 1955:29; Davies, 1960:19). The Hutterite Investigation Committee (Department of Municipal Affairs, 1959:30-32) examined the enrolment records of 24 randomly selected Alberta colony schools and found that no pupil went beyond the ninth grade.

The Hutterites strongly oppose post-secondary education.

Hutterites are insistent that education should not go beyond the eighth grade or include much more than reading, writing, and arithmetic. 'Too much learning gives people funny ideas about themselves' is the common view of Hutterite elders. They consciously raise their children to be colony people. No alternative careers are held out (Eaton, 1964:68, emphasis in original).

Further, Peters (1965:130) says that a ". . . distrustful attitude toward higher education has remained a salient characteristic of Hutterian education to this day."

Enrolment in post-secondary institutions may be regarded as a conservative index of attitude toward education. At the present time in North America, there are three college-educated Hutterite school teachers and a few young people taking correspondence courses from American state colleges (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:100). In 1961, 65.8% of the Alberta population between 15 and 19 years was in school (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961:Bulletin 1.3-6, table 99). In 1967-1968, 16% of the age group 18 to 24 years was enrolled full-time in post-secondary institutions (Economic Council of Canada, 1969:128). The foregoing data show that the Hutterites are less interested in the acquisition of formal education than Albertans generally. Therefore, one may conclude that the stereotype is accurate.

### Self-Sufficient

The semantic differential scale "self-sufficient" was differentially applied to the Hutterites, 89% of the respondents having checked the two adjacent extreme scale positions. The mean and average deviation were 1.5 and 0.7, respectively. Self-sufficiency is defined by Webster's

*Dictionary* as independence or the ability to get along without help. Whether the stereotype trait is conceptualized as economic self-reliance or broadened to include detachment from various additional institutional areas of Canadian society, the available data indicate that the Hutterites are in fact more self-sufficient than the containing population. Their relative autonomy is motivated by religious and economic considerations.

Originally, the Brethren envisaged themselves as an independent "island" in the midst of the various countries they inhabited (Bennett, 1967:161). Their doctrine of the two worlds--the Hutterites as Chosen People surrounded by the wicked--led them to deliberately minimize the number and kinds of contacts with outsiders; their advocacy of austerity in consumption reduced their needs. In an attempt to achieve their ideal of self-sufficiency, communal economic activities were widely diversified:

When the Hutterites reached their first peak of prosperity and numbers during the Moravian period, they practiced nearly every important sixteenth-century craft, plus the arts of estate-management, bookkeeping, letter-writing, medicine, and other professional services (Bennett, 1967:161).

Their goal of total independence which was never completely realized in the past has become ever more elusive during the years spent in North America. Total economic independence has had to be sacrificed to ensure continuance of their system. Nevertheless, despite their compromises, contemporary Hutterites still manage considerably greater self-reliance than do non-Hutterites.

In Bennett's (1967:164) opinion, the Brethren might have sustained the economic diversity required to maintain a totally separate subsociety had they not had a high rate of population growth. Large amounts of cash were needed to buy from outsiders the land required to domicile their increasing numbers. (Hutterite social organization begins to break down when the colony population exceeds 130 to 150 persons (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:44).) The funds necessary for colony fission could be accumulated only by entrance into the agricultural market. To compete successfully, Hutterite farm practices had to become specialized and mechanized. Total self-sufficiency depends upon broad diversification of activity and many traditional home crafts were abandoned when the Hutterites discovered that the human labor deflected from farming became more costly than manufactured articles (Bennett, 1967:165). However, colonies still remain more diversified than most farms. Peters (1965:108) notes that

One consequence of their farm diversification is that the Hutterians rarely have marketing problems with surplus grains. Government quotas on grain shipment hardly affect them.

The ability of the Brethren to get along without financial help from non-Hutterites is the result of the prosperity made possible by relatively great diversification as well as the large scale of their enterprises (Bennett, 1967:19). During the depression Alberta municipalities attempted to attract new colonies since the Hutterites remained sufficiently solvent to pay taxes and patronize local business

(Peters, 1965:52-53).

According to Peters (1965:118-19), the Hutterites ". . . practice a self-sufficient economy to a much greater degree than their neighbors . . . ." Home production of food other than staples continues to be financially worthwhile. Bennett (1967:165) estimated that in a year one Saskatchewan colony saved almost \$10,000 (exactly the cash savings per year needed to finance eventual fission) by producing rather than buying food. The financial records of another colony showed yearly expenditures of \$43 per member for groceries and \$18 for clothing (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:47-48). Hutterites still make by hand most of their clothing, shoes, and furniture and construct their own houses and farm buildings (Bennett, 1967:162-63). They repair their own machinery and manufacture some farm implements and kitchen gadgets (Bennett, 1967:5, 163). The Hutterites' relatively greater economic self-sufficiency is shown by the fact that although the Saskatchewan Brethren were found to spend considerably more money than the handful of farmers they displaced, their purchasing power was ". . . concentrated in a few important commodities instead of being spread evenly across the retail market" (Bennett, 1967:79).

Because of their wealth and their principle of "self-help," the Hutterites make few demands upon the larger society's welfare institutions. Peters (1965:118) concluded that ". . . the community economy of all colonies appears to be sufficiently healthy to provide complete economic security

for all its members . . . ." Should a colony encounter a major problem such as crop failure, flood or fire damage, other colonies will provide assistance in the form of cash, produce or labor (Peters, 1965:166; Bennett, 1967:165). Hutterites do not become public charges (Hostetler, 1961:127). Few take advantage of the various forms of social assistance which are available. The illness or death of a Hutterite father does not threaten his family's economic security (Peters, 1965:153). The Hutterites completely finance the retirement of their aged (Bennett, 1967:129). In short, "the sick, the aged, the widows and orphans are well taken care of" (Eaton and Weil, 1953:9). Davies (1960:6-7) who examined the records of eight Alberta colonies states that none of them had benefited from old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, public assistance based on indigency, Provincial Supplementary Allowances, or pensions for widows, the blind, or the disabled. No Hutterite was in a home for the aged. Similarly, Hostetler and Huntington (1967:48) found that no old age pensions or social security benefits had been accepted. Although the Canadian Hutterite elders have outlawed the family allowance (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:103), a small number of Alberta colonies do get this government grant (Davies, 1960:6; Sanders, 1964:237). The Hutterites do not institutionalize their mentally ill or their mental defectives (Eaton and Weil, 1955:168, 175). A subsequent section of this chapter will show that few Hutterites have been incarcerated in penal institutions.

Despite the compromises to the ideal of self-sufficiency necessitated by their need for cash, the Brethren remain aloof from most other facets of Canadian society. To farm competitively they must rely upon the larger society's production and distribution network and technical expertise (Serl, 1964:170). Moreover, the Hutterites do use (and pay for) the medical and legal services of non-Hutterites (Sanders, 1964:227). However, they do not use our high schools or post-secondary educational institutions; their children attend separate primary schools only because the law so demands. The Brethren continue to operate their own parallel education system which extends from kindergarten through adult apprenticeship. Little use is made of outside recreational facilities. "Film stars, comic strip heroes, and sports celebrities are unknown to most Hutterites . . ." (Eaton and Weil, 1955:157). Although the Hutterites are indirectly dependent upon government protection, they refuse to participate in the political process. Voting or holding public office is forbidden (Eaton and Weil, 1955:157). They are completely detached from the larger society's religious institutions and a high birth rate obviates the necessity to proselytize outsiders. The above argument is encapsulated by the following quotation:

The colony incorporates everything that is necessary for the life of the individual. Whether the colony is located in Slovakia, Russia, or Saskatchewan is of secondary importance. Indeed the ability of the colony to thrive in Moravia, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, the Ukraine . . . , and now in the United States and Canada . . . , under a variety of unfriendly governments, differing languages, and economic resources is a remarkable



record of overcoming geographic limitations (Hostetler, 1965:32).

The Hutterites are much more self-reliant than Albertans generally. Hence, the stereotype is correct.

### Hardworking

Both instrument samples described the Hutterites as hardworking. Twenty-one percent of the open-ended questionnaire respondents made reference to the industriousness of the Hutterite Brethren. Eighty-eight percent of the semantic differential sample regarded them as extremely or quite hardworking. The mean was 1.7 and the average deviation, 0.8. Hutterite work behavior and attitudes have received considerable attention from sociologists who also consensually describe the sectarians as an energetic people. An early scholar (Clark, 1924:364) wrote

Love for work and pride in the kind of work they do are two of their outstanding traits; and so contagious are they both that it would seem the problem of idleness is one that has needed very little attention.

Professional opinion has not changed. For the Hutterites, work is almost a sacrament; laziness is not tolerated. Although it is unlikely that the individual adult Hutterite works longer hours or at a brisker pace than his non-Hutterite rural counterpart, these people collectively merit their reputation for industriousness compared with the general population. There is full employment of young and old. As the previous section showed, no Hutterite is known to have received social assistance or unemployment

benefits.<sup>4</sup> The continuance of this communitarian system is contingent upon the energetic activity of its members.

For the Hutterites, work is an economic necessity and indirectly, a religious rite. Agriculture is the only occupation which meets God's approval:

This way of life has little in common with commercial farming, in which work is regarded as a means to the end or profit. To the Hutterians work itself is a purposeful ingredient of life, and idleness is almost sinful . . . . The whole Hutterian philosophy of work is rooted in this medieval school of thought. 'Dig and sow that you may have wherewith to eat and drink and be clothed, for where sufficiency is, there is stability, and where stability is there is religion' (Peters, 1965:106-07).

Karl Peter (1966:33) agrees with the above interpretation:

Energetic participation in the mode of production then is seen as a demonstration of the workings of the Holy Spirit in the individual. Work produces for him the highest goal--that of salvation.

Each member's labor contributes to the well-being of the colony, the one corridor to heaven for himself and his fellows.

Work is the physical manifestation of the individual's assent to the group purpose. While working, the Hutterite is expected to be conscious that he is making his contribution, and to take 'joy' in it; therefore he is expected to work steadily and regularly (Bennett, 1967:201).

The attainment of both a place in heaven and status and respect within the community are dependent upon satisfactory work performance: "An individual Hutterite gains the respect

---

<sup>4</sup>In 1965-66, the Alberta expenditure for all provincial welfare was \$24 per capita (Alberta Department of Agriculture, 1968:245). The unemployment rate for the prairie province region fluctuated between 2% and 3% during the years 1964 to 1968 (Economic Council of Canada, 1969:143).

of his brothers if he works well and hard" (Bennett, 1969: 264). Laziness is subjected to ridicule and shame (Peter, 1963:58), and shirking work rarely occurs (Kaplan and Plaut, 1956:17).

As Bennett (1967:165) points out, Hutterite activity is a survival necessity rather than simply a manifestation of strong character. A colony farm must support a large population, a majority of which are children and older people. Moreover, cash savings of at least \$10,000 a year must be accumulated towards eventual fission. The labor of all members, including children, is a significant factor in their economy. The Brethren construct all their own farm buildings and living quarters, produce most of their food and clothing, and perform the repairs on their equipment (Bennett, 1967:162). A widely diversified agricultural economy contributes to financial stability. However, it also enables the Hutterites to make use of the labor of even children and old people. Although Hutterites may retire in their 40s, Peters (1965:103) reports that the elderly earn their keep. The work of boys between the ages of 10 and 15 years is important to the colony operation (Bennett, 1967: 202). In one colony that was studied, the school playground equipment provided by the government was used only during the school year and during school hours. The preacher was overheard to say to the children, "If you have enough energy to run around after the ball, it would be better for you to be working" (Hostetler, 1965:41). Hostetler (1965:81-82)

studied the self-concept of Hutterite and non-Hutterite children by asking them to reply to the question, "Who are you?" Hutterite children defined themselves more frequently than control subjects in terms of their work responsibilities on the colony. These children had not yet reached the age of 15 when adult work roles are assigned. Through experience, Hutterite leaders have learned that too much leisure disrupts communal life (Peter, 1963:56; Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:41). Therefore, they take pains to continually employ all available manpower. Many of the traditional crafts such as broommaking and bookbinding are retained mainly to keep people occupied during slack seasons. Industry, then, has pragmatic as well as religious value.

The work tempo depends upon the colony's stage of growth. A newly-established colony lacks both manpower and machinery. The first stage is characterized by "austerity and hard work" (Hostetler, 1965:52). As labor-saving devices are acquired and the population increases, "the furious activity is replaced by a more measured tempo" (Bennett, 1967:190). During its mature stage, colony members express their increased income by relaxation of work schedules rather than increasing consumption benefits (Bennett, 1967:238). Prosperity presents difficulties for the elders:

A well-to-do colony has the additional problem of guarding against individual pleasures, such as disappointed forms of moonlighting for the neighbors, and of keeping everyone occupied at meaningful productive jobs . . . (Hostetler, 1965:52).

The field reports referred to above suggest that the Hutterites are correctly viewed as an industrious people.

### Thrifty with Money

The semantic differential scale "thrifty with money" was differentially attributed to the Hutterites. Eighty-five percent of the sample described them as quite or extremely thrifty, the mean and average deviation being 1.8 and 1.1 respectively. *Webster's Dictionary* defines the term as follows: "frugality; industry and clever management of one's money or resources, usually so as to result in some savings." All of the pertinent ethnographic evidence supports the conclusion that the Hutterites do exercise more stringent control of their finances than do their neighbors.

The Hutterites believe that wealth and luxury lead to ungodliness and therefore enforce both personal and collective austerity.

They reject the 'consumer culture' around them and they especially resist spending money on luxuries, for they consider this 'idolatry.' . . . They lack any concept of an expanding standard of living . . . (Bennett, 1967:45-46).

. . . . .  
The austerity of Hutterian life shows up in the uniformity and sparsity of possessions and furnishings in the various households . . . (Bennett, 1967:168).

. . . . .  
Personal adornment or purely functionless possessions are still officially taboo, and commercial amusements are forbidden (Bennett, 1967:169).

Bennett (1967:172) compared the personal possessions of a Hutterite man with those of a neighboring non-Hutterite rancher of similar age and responsibility. A low estimate of the value of the latter was \$2,500. The Hutterite "owned"

approximately \$225 worth of goods, including his homemade clothes. According to Bennett (1969:266), a typical farm family in this Saskatchewan area spent \$2,500 in a year on recreation and entertainment, while a colony of 74 persons spent \$1,500. Adult Hutterites receive a personal allowance of about \$1 a month (Eaton, 1964:67). A 1960 report on the spending habits of a typical Hutterite colony prepared for the City of Drumheller, Alberta, reinforces the same point (Sanders, 1964:227). The total expenditures for Hutterites and non-Hutterites were nearly the same when compared on an acreage basis. However, the concentration of Hutterite population is twice as high (Davies, 1960:216).

The Hutterian style of life represents a classic example of Weber's Protestant Ethic:

We have here a situation where the modes of production and consumption stand in a relationship, which is opposite to that of the surrounding society. Basically a number of people band together, work hard to produce a surplus and then refuse to consume the surplus. . . . The concentration of this capital for only one purpose, namely the expansion of the group, results in the acquisition of new resources and a broadening of the resource base (Peter, 1966:34).

Generally, the disposal of excess wealth does not become a problem. Rather, the Brethren must reduce their expenditures in order to save sufficient funds to finance their land expansion. Their reproductive rate is such that the colony population becomes unwieldy within 15 to 20 years after establishment. Within this period, a new colony must establish itself economically and accumulate at least \$200,000 to pay for a daughter colony (Peter, 1966:35;

Bennett, 1967:165). Both religious belief and economic necessity demand thrift. The Hutterite ". . . attitude toward money reflects a tendency toward saving rather than spending, accumulating it where possible . . ." (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:49). Nearly all colony purchases are for cash (Bennett, 1967:71) and the average profit is \$20,000 per year (Peters, 1966:35).

Savings are made possible by the diversification of Hutterite agriculture, the reduction of personal and collective consumption, and their self-sufficiency. Moreover, the Brethren's frugality has resulted in several practices which have attracted the attention of outsiders. They ". . . have been resented by shopkeepers and merchants for their sharp bargaining and parsimonious attitude . . ." (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:54), and criticized by local townsmen for buying in bulk from city wholesalers (Davies, 1960:4). Bennett (1967:175) reports that farmers are "amazed" at the Brethren's ". . . seeming ability to take advantage of every economic opportunity, their shrewdness at bargaining, and their ability to stretch a dollar by repairs and clever innovations." Hostetler and Huntington (1967:49) provide examples of Hutterite ingenuity in saving money:

Baby foxes were captured and reared until they were old enough to collect bounty. Large petroleum tanks discarded by the oil company were converted into grain storage bins. Damaged canned goods were bought at reduced prices from chain stores. Grain that had been damaged by fire was purchased from elevators for half price and fed to the livestock.

The Hutterites accumulate money to guarantee the

continuation of the group and they are not niggardly about spending money for its collective welfare. They are willing to pay more than the going price to acquire the land they want (Bennett, 1969:256). Their people receive the best medical care and funds are not begrudged for long trips to hospitals or to other colonies to visit seriously ill relatives (Bennett, 1967:209). The separate education of their children costs them money. Schools and teacherages are built and maintained at their expense. Rural Alberta school divisions require the Hutterites to pay a special tax of between \$500 and \$1,500 in addition to the mill rate (Sanders, 1964:239). Sanders (1964:226) points out that the Hutterites could avoid paying federal taxes if they were willing to show payment of wages to their members on their tax returns. However, their leaders refuse to do so on the ground that their religious principles would be compromised. Finally, a colony that has accumulated savings beyond its needs must lend money to less fortunate colonies (Bennett, 1967:193).

One may conclude that the Hutterites were accurately stereotyped as thrifty in their handling of money.

#### Seldom Involved in Physical Fights

The adjectival scale "seldom involved in physical fights," was differentially assigned to the Hutterites.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Frequent reference in newspaper reports and letters to the editor to native people engaging in fighting originally motivated the inclusion of this particular scale in the semantic differential instrument. Only respondents with some university education described the Hutterites as



Seventy-seven percent of the sample members placed their responses in the two extreme scale positions adjacent to the mean. The mean was 2.0 and the average deviation 1.1. Throughout their history, the Hutterian Brethren have obeyed the injunction against physical violence which is contained in their cultural charter. Pacifism is one of the most important Hutterite religious beliefs.

A Hutterite who serves in an army is violating Jesus' admonition against violence. To some Hutterites, a soldier is almost a murderer. He invites on himself eternal damnation (Eaton and Weil, 1955:144).

Their mass migration from Russia to the United States in the 1870s, and from the United States to Canada in 1918 resulted from the threat of conscription and the unpleasant consequences brought upon the Hutterites by their refusal to go to war (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:91-94). In World War I, every Hutterite was a conscientious objector (Peters, 1965:77). During World War II, approximately 6 Canadian (Peters, 1965:77) and 20 American (Eaton and Weil, 1955:146) Hutterites volunteered for service in the armed forces. Some 276 Hutterites in both countries served in alternate service work camps (Conkin, 1964:66). Because of a strict interpretation of the principle of pacifism, Hutterites are not supposed to initiate litigation (Bennett, 1967:33).

Field investigators have observed that the Hutterites

---

pacifistic. During the testing, many subjects requested an explanation of the term. The word "pacifism" does not appear to comprise part of the vocabulary of the less well-educated.

also refrain from expressing aggression in their interpersonal relationships. Children are taught that fighting will not be tolerated. Hostetler and Huntington (1967:66) describe the kindergarten as follows:

Asocial behavior is quickly punished; the children are not allowed to fight, quarrel, or hit; they are not to call one another names, or to use 'bad words.'

According to Eaton and Weil (1955:141),

Children were taught early not to fight with each other. Teachers reported that before their youngsters left school at the age of 15, they had learned this cultural doctrine well. They might get angry, but words were their only weapon. Fighting among adults was severely frowned upon. Physical aggression was approved of only against children for disciplinary purposes.

Most adults manage to live up to the ideal cultural prescription. Eaton and Weil (1955:141) note that "physical aggressiveness of any sort was quite rare" and that even most psychotics refrained from displaying overt aggression (Eaton and Weil, 1955:211). Hutterite history showed no case of murder or severe physical assault (Eaton and Weil, 1953:6). Kaplan and Plaut (1956:90) describe the Hutterite success in repressing hostility as "remarkable."

No fighting or verbal abuse is permitted. A spirit of compromise, of giving in to one's opponent, is the accepted guide for interpersonal disagreements and frictions. It is expected that a Hutterite man will not get angry, swear or lose his temper (Kaplan and Plaut, 1956:19-20).

Kaplan and Plaut (1956:66) were unable to discover any actual instances of violence. Hostetler and Huntington (1967:87) concur with the above conclusions. Finally, Bennett (1967:208) observed that the Hutterites frown upon

the display of conflicting opinion regarding such matters as the advisability of major purchases. Whenever possible, contentious issues are quietly resolved before a meeting of the voting membership is called.

The foregoing ethnographic data suggest that the Hutterites do engage in physical aggression less often than non-Hutterites.

#### Seldom in Trouble with the Law

The semantic differential sample described the Hutterites as less likely than the general population to be involved in difficulties with the law. Eighty-three percent of the responses were placed in the two extreme adjacent scale positions, the mean and average deviation being 1.8 and 0.9 respectively. The available data corroborate the validity of this stereotype trait. No Hutterite has ever been charged with a major criminal offence. Very few minor offences have come to the attention of either Canadian or American law enforcement agencies.

The field staff associated with the mental health study (Eaton and Weil, 1955) made a concerted effort to document every instance of deviant behavior which had occurred since the Hutterites settled in North America. Only a few petty violations were discovered. Not a single case of murder, sex crime, or assault was found (Eaton and Weil, 1955:141, 143). During an 80-year period, 17 Hutterite offences were known to have occurred. Twelve people, generally one-time offenders, served jail sentences

for theft. Four Hutterites were caught selling homemade wine, and one young man spent a short time in jail for trapping without a license (Eaton and Weil, 1955:141). Several additional cases of petty theft by Hutterians, particularly from their own colony, were not reported to the police (Eaton and Weil, 1955:142). Inquiries regarding officially recorded Hutterite crime made to the police in both countries confirmed the accuracy of the above findings. Eaton and Weil (1955:142-43) quote the remarks of a Canadian provincial law enforcement officer: "I can say from my personal experience that while these people live in colonies, they are free from crime and juvenile delinquency."

A decade later Eaton (1964:71) again tallied the incidence of Hutterite conflict with the law and concluded that "they have little trouble with secular criminal laws." No cases were found of murder, embezzlement, assault or other felonies. "Rare" occurrences of stealing colony property and five cases of petty theft from non-Hutterites were recorded (Eaton, 1964:69, 70). Davies' submission to the Alberta government (1960:7) notes that the records of eight colonies showed no people detained in provincial or federal jails.

Victor Peters (1965:70) who studied the Manitoba colonies comments upon the Hutterites' "freedom from crime." According to the gentleman who has acted as solicitor for the Manitoba Hutterite communities since 1918, no Hutterite has ever been charged with a major offence (Peters, 1965:

156). This statement was corroborated by interviews held with representatives of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Winnipeg City Police. One or two adolescent Hutterites caught for misdemeanors were turned over to the colony elders for punishment (Peters, 1965:156). Peters (1965:157) states that the most serious offence ever brought against Hutterites involved smuggling commodities received from intercolony barter across the American border. In 1957, fines were imposed against two colonies for breach of the Customs Act.

Both Eaton and Weil (1955:142) and Peters (1965:161) comment upon the falsity of prevalent local opinion that Hutterites "will steal anything they can get their hands on." However, Bennett (1969:269) reports that all the Saskatchewan colonies do have problems in teaching their children to respect the property of outsiders. Occasionally, they are unable to resist the temptation to appropriate small items from stores or local farms. Bennett (1967:93) suggests that petty theft may be a function of Hutterian exclusiveness. Colony children raised in this atmosphere initially look upon the possessions of outsiders as fair game. Restitution is usually made by colony elders and most of these incidents never come to the attention of legal authorities.

Hostetler (1961:127) has described the Alberta Hutterites as follows:

They obey all laws except those that conflict with their faith. They pay all taxes levied . . . . They are quiet and orderly. (Emphasis in original.)

Two examples were found of Hutterite refusal to obey laws perceived as contrary to their beliefs. The Hutterite Investigation Committee (Department of Municipal Affairs, 1959:16) stated that it had proof of the "circumvention of the intent and meaning" of the Communal Property Act. In 1965 charges were brought against the Rock Lake colony near Lethbridge, Alberta for purchasing land without the government's permission. The Hutterites set aside their distaste for litigation and took the case to the Supreme Court of Canada in order to test the constitutionality of the Communal Property Act. In its March 26, 1969 edition, the *Edmonton Journal* reported that the minister of Spring Point colony was convicted for refusing to send his son to school.

In general, the available evidence indicates that the Hutterites do merit their reputation for encountering less trouble with the law than the environing population.

### Sober

When the respondents considered the applicability to the Hutterites of the semantic differential scale "sober-drunken," 81% described the Brethren as extremely or quite sober in comparison with the general population. The mean and average deviation were 1.7 and 0.9, respectively. The available data indicate that although the Hutterites are not teetotalers, their unobtrusive and moderate use of alcohol rarely results in problems for themselves or the surrounding communities. Rates of alcoholism and conviction for alcohol related offences appear to be infinitesimal compared with

those of the environing population. Once again, one must conclude that the stereotype trait is accurate.

The Hutterites approve the use of alcohol in moderation. Eaton and Weil (1955:195) quote a *Schmiedenleut* ruling on drinking at weddings which nicely illustrates the balance struck by the elders between the principle of austerity and recognition of human appetite:

When there is a wedding, nobody shall take the liberty of carrying home drinks or taking away from the wedding that which he could not drink. . . . And everyone shall drink only so much that his conscience remains clear, because all excess and misuse are sinful.

Each family receives a monthly beer and wine allotment. In one colony, each adult is given 12 bottles of beer four times a year and a quart of homemade wine every month (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:51). Since the manager controls all colony funds (aside from a personal allowance of a dollar or so a month), alcohol in large amounts could only be obtained through disapproved practices such as stealing colony property.

Field workers report that drinking seldom becomes a problem on the colony. Peters (1965:161) says that at the time of writing, there were no alcoholics in the Manitoba colonies. A school teacher who spent many years on these colonies maintained that drunkenness was "very rare indeed" (Peters, 1965:161). In answer to Peters' inquiries, the hotel personnel of a town close to one-third of the Manitoba colonies replied that none of the Hutterite men who drop in for a glass of beer had ever "taken too much" (Peters, 1965:

161). Eaton and Weil (1955:140) who attempted to document all past and present cases of deviance, located two instances of alcohol-related problems. (Both involved appropriation of colony funds to buy liquor.) Canadian and American physicians stated that fewer Hutterite than non-Hutterite patients were extreme alcoholics (Eaton and Weil, 1955:235). In a later paper, Eaton (1964:70) reported that heavy drinking among males "occasionally" occurred. However, cases of heavy drinking among females were not discovered. Using the Jellinek formula, the Alcoholism Research Foundation estimated that the Alberta alcoholism rate per 100,000 population, 20 years and older in 1956 was 8,960 (Popham and Schmidt, 1958:118). To match this rate, there would have to be approximately 750 Hutterite alcoholics. Given the Hutterite proclivity for gossip, it is unlikely that field workers could overlook that number of secret deviants.

Such comparative evidence as is available indicates that the Hutterite population is underrepresented in convictions for liquor offences and alcoholic admissions to mental institutions. Although the figures are not necessarily complete, sociologists have mentioned only two incidents where Hutterites came to the attention of the police concerning alcohol. As noted in the previous section, both involved the illegal sale of homemade wine. In 1961 alone, the Canadian rate of conviction for alcohol offences was 662 per 100,000. In the same year, 139 per 100,000 Canadians were convicted for driving offences related to



alcohol (Kohn, 1965:63). The Hutterite mental health study found no psychoses stemming from alcoholism (Eaton and Weil, 1953:7). In 1962, alcoholic admissions accounted for approximately one-tenth of all admissions to Canadian mental institutions (Kohn, 1965:63).

The evidence shows a correspondence between the stereotype trait "sober" and Hutterite behavior.

### Stable Marriages

The semantic differential sample described Hutterite marriages as more stable than those of the environing population. Eighty-two percent of the sample members characterized Hutterite marriages as "extremely" or "quite" stable. The mean was 1.8 and the average deviation, 0.9. Both ethnographic data and an investigation of census and Hutterite records between the years 1875 and 1950 (Eaton and Mayer, 1954) confirm the accuracy of this stereotype trait.

An examination of the records of Hutterite marriages between the time of emigration to this continent and 1950 produced the following finding: "Marriages are remarkably stable. Only one divorce and four separations are known to have occurred in the history of the group in America" (Eaton and Weil, 1955:143).<sup>6</sup> The team composed of two clinical psychologists, a sociologist, and a psychiatrist which studied Hutterite mental health also commented upon the

---

<sup>6</sup>In 1954, the Alberta divorce rate was 57.7 per 100,000 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1967c:table M-9).

stability of Hutterite marriages. Kaplan and Plaut (1956: 84), the psychologists, noted that

These findings [from projective tests] confirm a strong personal impression of all of the investigators that heterosexual relationships are particularly sound among the Hutterites. There is a remarkable stability of Hutterite marriage . . . , a great interest of adult Hutterites in frequent and regular sexual relations, and finally, considerable interest of young people in finding marriage partners.

Eaton and Weil (1953:6) state that "divorce, desertion, separation or chronic marital discord were rare."

Recent sociological field studies continue to remark upon the permanence of Hutterite marriage. Peters (1965: 101) states that "as one of the main pillars of the *Gemeinschaft* the Hutterian family appears unusually stable and functional." Finally, Hostetler (1965:69), who is well-acquainted with Alberta and American colonies, asserts that

Marriage is a permanent relationship. Children grow up, marry and may be separated when the colony branches, but only death or a major religious transgression can separate man and wife. There is no divorce.

Social scientists have been able to document only one divorce since 1875 among the Hutterites in Canada and the United States. Obviously, the stereotype is accurate.

### Sexually Moral

The stereotype trait "sexually moral" was attributed to the Hutterites by the semantic differential sample. Seventy-five percent of the responses were placed in the two extreme adjacent categories, the mean and average deviation being 2.1 and 1.1, respectively. Field investigators have been able to discover very few transgressions against the

Hutterian moral code which forbids any sexual activity outside the marital relationship. Adherence to the religious taboo is reinforced by several factors. Colony members are discouraged from developing personal relations with outsiders. Most work and leisure activities within the colony are carried out in groups. The Hutterites lack any notion of privacy, and both children and adults are free to enter colony homes without knocking (Peters, 1965:156). Adolescent couples in particular are carefully watched by their elders (Bennett, 1967:127).

In connection with their study of Hutterite mental health, Eaton and Weil (1955:143-44) attempted to locate all cases of deviation from Hutterite sex mores. (The related demographic study (Eaton and Mayer, 1954) had been especially interested in the impact which sexual relations with outsiders had had upon the genetic composition of the sect.) Four Hutterites were known to have had sexual relations with non-Hutterites. One Hutterite woman who was impregnated by an outsider subsequently defected and married the man involved. Approximately ten illegitimate babies were believed to have been born to Hutterite couples since the 1920s. No act of homosexuality was discovered. No sex crime involving a Hutterite had come to the attention of the authorities. No syphilis was found (Eaton and Weil, 1955:113). Eaton and Weil (1955:143) concluded that the frequency of violation of the rather strict Hutterite sex code was ". . . negligible if the Kinsey reports on human sex behavior are accepted as

a point of reference." Kaplan and Plaut (1956:86), the psychologists associated with the above project, found little psychopathology centred around sexual problems. As far as they knew, ". . . actual adultery, promiscuity, or homosexuality was unknown . . ." (Kaplan and Plaut, 1956:66).

In a more recent paper, Eaton (1964:70) recorded his knowledge of the extent of forbidden sex practices among the Hutterites. His conclusions, based on 25 years of experience with these people, were as follows:

	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Homosexuality	None	None
Sodomy	None	None
Premarital sex relations	Rare	Rare
Prostitution	Very rare	?
Necking	Common	Common
Petting	?	?
Rape	One	None
Telling dirty stories	Common	Occasional

Hostetler and Huntington (1967:57) and Cook (1954:100) agree that premarital sex relations rarely occur. In 1967, illegitimate births accounted for 11.4% of the total live births recorded in Alberta (Department of Health, 1967:7).

According to the evidence available, premarital and extramarital relations, illegitimacy, and promiscuity are very uncommon among the Hutterites. Therefore, the stereotype trait "sexually moral" represents an accurate description of the Hutterites.

#### Not Neglectful of Their Children's Needs

The semantic differential scale "not neglectful of the needs of their children" was differentially applied to

the Hutterites, the mean and average deviation being 2.4 and 1.5. Sixty-nine percent of the sample members placed their responses in the two extreme scale positions adjacent to the mean.

The validation problem is somewhat complicated because the term "needs" may be variously interpreted. If needs are defined as the basic necessities of life, the stereotype is unquestionably accurate. As Eaton and Weil (1955:133) note, "gross neglect of the kind that would bring an urban child to the attention of school or police authorities, is virtually impossible in this group." Hutterite children receive adequate food, clothing, shelter, physical protection, and medical care (Kaplan and Plaut, 1956:17). If, however, responsibilities of Canadian parents toward their children involve inculcating the ideal values and aspirations of an open society, the Hutterite situation becomes less straightforward. As a dissenting subsociety, the Hutterites have had to consider carefully the problem of socializing their children to conform to their goals and values rather than those of the outside world. Communitarians cannot afford to neglect their children's needs, as they perceive them, the foremost being to equip their youngsters to live in contentment within their system so that the group may survive. For 4½ centuries, the younger generation has been subjected to a consciously designed regimen. The fact that the Hutterites have out-lived all other experiments in communalism attests to their success in socializing their

children. According to professional observers, the children's physical and psychological needs are adequately met. However, Hutterite children are denied opportunities to acquire education, to freely choose their life's work, to enjoy the material bounty of a technological economy. Their individualism is systematically repressed. They have been well-prepared to live in their world, but not in ours. In effect, decision on the validity of the stereotype depends on whether their children's needs are evaluated from the Hutterite perspective or from that of the containing society.

Child-rearing is a colony rather than a family activity and the communal nature of their settlements cushions Hutterite families against the financial and emotional burdens which would face non-Hutterites raising ten or more children (Cook, 1954:98). Since their system is modelled after the extended family, the illness or death of a parent does not threaten the stability of the Hutterite family. As mentioned previously, most colonies are relatively prosperous. Consequently, they have no difficulty in fulfilling the type of parental obligations which child-care workers consider essential (provision of food, clothing, shelter, and physical safety). Eaton and Weil (1955:143) remark that ". . . no Hutterite child has ever been known to suffer neglect requiring the intervention of either Hutterite or government officials."

Hutterites value their children highly; they are the

only "possession" which they may have in unlimited quantity (Eaton and Weil, 1955:133). However,

The Hutterites consider the child a sinful being, but unlike the Puritans, they do not hold him responsible for his state. Rather, responsibility rests with the adults, who must teach the child the Christian way, not censure him and burden him with guilt feelings (Bennett, 1967:247).

Therefore, it is the duty of the colony to break the child's will so that he may fit into communal life and thereby attain salvation. Individualism and spontaneity are inhibited as the child learns that he has little importance compared with the group. For example, when the colony bell rings for work duty, the Hutterite mother immediately interrupts her activity with her young child, places him in his crib, and walks out (Hostetler, 1965:56). The activities of Hutterite youngsters through adolescence are under almost constant scrutiny (Peters, 1965:102). Any adult may correct the behavior of any child (Peter, 1963:58). As a result of the attention given to the behavior and development of the children, few get into serious difficulties with the law. Illegitimacy among teenagers is almost nonexistent (Cook, 1954:100). Moreover, psychological maladjustment is rare. Psychiatrists found no severe habit disturbances or anti-social behavior among some 330 Hutterite children. Not a single child was considered to be a severe psychiatric problem (Eaton and Weil, 1955:128). Unlike many outsiders, the majority of Hutterites are well-satisfied with their limited educational achievements and their occupational choices (Eaton, 1964:68).

The Hutterites may not be well-prepared for life and participation in the big world. But there is no question about their effective socialization process. Religion, tradition and the active manipulation of parents and leaders work hand-in-glove to bring up the Hutterite young people to want what their way of life can give them (Eaton, 1964:73).

In summary, the physical neglect of children is certainly less prevalent among Hutterites than in the Alberta population generally. From a legal vantage point, negligence toward children is unheard of. The Brethren succeed in molding their youngsters into the sort of adults who can fit into colony life. In these important respects, the stereotype is accurate. However, Hutterite socialization deliberately falls short of several middle-class ideals. For the Hutterites at least, the cost of eliminating materialism, status striving and competition includes denial of individualism and restricted cognitive horizons. If self-determination and untrammelled intellectual development are regarded as basic rights, then the Hutterites do fail to satisfy their children's needs.

### Healthy

The semantic differential sample described the Hutterites as healthier than the general Alberta population. Seventy-four percent of the sample placed their responses in scale positions "1" and "2" and the mean and average deviation were 2.0 and 0.9 respectively. Quite possibly, this stereotype trait resulted from an image of the Hutterites as a robust rural people, who enjoy wholesome food, fresh air, and exercise, and no vices. Unfortunately, the only



comparative assessment of physical health is now 15 years old. It proved impossible to obtain the results of a recent study which was purportedly carried out by a Western Reserve University medical team. Therefore, the validity of this trait remains inconclusive.

Eaton and Weil (1955:234-37) mailed a check-list concerning Hutterite health conditions to all doctors whose names were provided by leaders of the sect. Fifty-five Canadian and American doctors (69% of the sample) cooperated. Twenty-two doctors estimated that they had examined over 100 Hutterites during the previous year. Eleven had seen 50 to 99 Hutterites. In the opinion of these physicians, there were differences in the physical health of their Hutterite and non-Hutterite patients. The following list includes those symptoms which fewer Hutterites than non-Hutterites had at less than the 0.05 confidence level:

Chronic insomnia	Hay fever
Drug addiction	Complaints of poor appetite
Extreme alcoholism	Urinary tract infections
Asthma	Syphilis
Food allergies	Coronary heart disease

Although the following complaints were not significant at the .05 level, the doctors believed that Hutterites showed less:

Chronic headaches	Chronic constipation
Cancer	Spastic colitis
Kidney malfunctions	Chronic digestive disturbances

Little or no difference between Hutterites and the general population was thought to exist in arteriosclerosis, arterial hypertension under the age of 40, or eczema. The

Hutterites had more obesity and arterial hypertension over the age of 40. In general, the doctors believed that the Hutterites enjoyed "more general good physical health."

More recently, Peters (1965:155) and Huntington and Hostetler (1966:321) have remarked upon the high level of health among the Hutterites. The fact that the Brethren are extremely health-conscious and willing to seek medical advice has frequently been noted (Peters, 1965:153; Bennett, 1967:100). Nevertheless, the ability of sociologists to make this sort of comparative judgment would appear to be limited.

The Royal Commission on Health Services (Kohn, 1965: 110) has stated that the measurement of mortality is the most reliable single indicator of health conditions. The Hutterites do have a lower crude death rate than the Canadian population generally, 4.4 versus 9.3 (Peters, 1965:152). However, when adjustments are made which take into consideration the greater concentration of the Hutterite population in the younger age categories, with one exception, the Hutterite mortality rates are the same as that of the Canadian population (Peters, 1965:152). The study of the *Schmiedenleut* colonies revealed that contrary to the usual pattern, the death rate for females between the ages of 15 and 59 years was higher than for males in that age range (Mange, 1964:106). It was hypothesized that repeated pregnancies lowered the resistance of Hutterite women during and after the child-bearing years.

Although the available data suggest that the stereotype has some foundation in fact, the nature of the evidence does not warrant a firm conclusion.

### Mentally Healthy

The semantic differential sample members consensually held the impression that the Hutterites are mentally healthy compared with the Alberta population generally. Sixty-six percent of the respondents described them as extremely or quite mentally healthy. The mean scale position was 2.3, the average deviation, 1.1.

There are several reasons why any statement concerning the accuracy of this stereotype trait must remain highly probabilistic. The only information which exists on the prevalence of mental disorders in Alberta consists of the rates of hospitalized patients (Blair, 1969:21). While these official statistics of patients in mental hospitals may be useful in generating estimates of the occurrence of mental disorders in a population, they are "almost worthless" for comparative purposes (Eaton and Weil, 1955:214). Further, Hutterite patients are cared for on the colony and therefore do not become part of these statistics. No Hutterite is known to have been admitted to a mental hospital (Kaplan and Plaut, 1956:2; Davies, 1960:6). The incidence of mental illness among these people can be determined only by a psychiatric enumeration of the entire population. Although such a study (which was the first evaluation of the mental health of an entire cultural group) (Kaplan and

Plaut, 1956:1) was carried out by Eaton and Weil (1955), no one since has attempted to replicate this remarkably ambitious task. Eaton and Weil (1955:189) concluded that while the Hutterite way of life provided no immunity from mental disorders, their work did ". . . not invalidate the clinical impression of 'good mental health' which Hutterites make on those who visit their colonies." Similarly, the psychologists (Kaplan and Plaut, 1956:102) involved in an affiliated investigation of a sample of "normal" Hutterites stated that "our opinion is that the Hutterites come off rather well in comparison with other peoples we have known." In the 1950s, the Hutterite reputation for good mental health was upheld. (Apparently, the belief that the Brethren enjoy unusual "peace of mind" dates back to at least 1669 (Eaton and Weil, 1955:45).) Lack of more recent data rules out a definitive statement regarding the present situation.

Eaton and Weil (1955) attempted to locate every case of mental disorder, past or present, within the Hutterite population. Twenty active cases of psychosis were found in a total population of 8,542 (Eaton and Weil, 1955:47). These authors estimated that the rate of hospitalizable cases was 1.3 per 1,000 (Eaton and Weil, 1955:99). In 1956, the rate of hospitalized cases in Alberta was 3.4 per 1,000 (Blair, 1969:174). Between 1958 and 1964, the Alberta rate per 1,000 was between 3.5 and 3.9 (Blair, 1969:22). (These comparative figures should be interpreted with caution.) Kaplan

and Plaut (1956:7) believe, for the following reasons, that the psychotics were in fact overenumerated. Seventy percent of the psychotics were depressives and Eaton and Weil stated that all doubtful cases were classified as psychotic rather than neurotic. (Only nine Hutterites had ever exhibited symptoms of schizophrenia (Eaton and Weil, 1953:6).) Moreover, Hutterite patients showed a particularly high recovery rate. Few were ever so ill that they required constant watching or were unable to look after their children or do some of their regular work.

Eaton and Weil (1955) estimated that the Hutterites suffered less than other North Americans from other types of mental disorder:

The Hutterite sect probably has significantly fewer psychoneurotic members than groups who live under unusually stressful social conditions, such as . . . inhabitants of American urban areas (Eaton and Weil, 1955:124).

In the judgment of the 55 doctors consulted by the Hutterites, the Brethren manifested fewer psychosomatic symptoms than their non-Hutterite patients (Eaton and Weil, 1955:44). The Hutterite reputation for mental health was clearly confirmed in the areas of childhood psychiatric difficulties (Eaton and Weil, 1955:128) and personality disorders such as psychopathy (Eaton and Weil, 1955:137). The final conclusion of this investigation was as follows:

We judge that the Hutterite lifetime risk of all types of mental disorders is as low as or lower than that of any contemporary Euro-American group within the Judaeo-Christian complex of cultures for which comparable data are available . . . (Eaton and Weil, 1955:210).

Kaplan and Plaut (1956) undertook to analyze the personalities of a large sample of "normal" Hutterites. Their conclusion is also worth quoting.

Unanimously, if not independently, the investigators were impressed with the apparent emotional stability of the people, their simplicity, poise and balance. Despite the fact that the field workers kept an exceedingly sharp eye out for any signs of psychopathology, they could not help being impressed with the good mental health of most individuals. . . . The overwhelming impression was of good adjustment to their cultural pattern (Kaplan and Plaut, 1956:7-8).

At that time, the stereotype trait was accurate.

What can be said about the present state of Hutterite mental health? Since recent ethnographers continue to incorporate in their reports citations from Eaton and Weil (1955), they apparently have not observed a significant number of mental patients on the colonies. According to these field reports (Hostetler, 1965; Peters, 1965; Bennett, 1967), Hutterite heredity and sociocultural environment show little change in the intervening years. More particularly, the sectarians have not tempered those lofty religious expectations which Kaplan and Plaut (1956) believed responsible for the *Anfectung* depression, the most characteristic Hutterite mental disorder. Although the above considerations suggest that contemporary Hutterites also enjoy good mental health, no definitive statement is possible regarding the stereotype's accuracy at this point in time.

#### Disliked by Other Groups

The semantic differential scale "disliked by other groups" was applied to the Hutterites, 58% of the responses

having been placed in the two extreme categories. The mean was 5.6 and the average deviation, 1.1. According to the evidence available (ethnographic and government reports, legal opinion on the reason for the enactment and retention of restrictive land legislation, and social distance scale data), the Hutterites as a group are indeed the objects of considerably more enmity than Alberta citizens generally.

In 1918, the Hutterites abandoned their settlements in the United States. The ill-feelings against them produced by their pacifism and mistaken resemblance to the enemy during the first world war and the threat of conscription with the outbreak of the Spanish American war combined to make their situation intolerable (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:92). The Canadian prairies needed settlers and the Hutterites were welcomed. Since the Brethren were able to pay taxes and spend money in the local towns, they were considered especially valuable assets to Alberta municipalities during the depression years (Peters, 1965:53). A search of the Calgary Glenbow Museum archives carried out by the author showed that between 1918 and 1938 the major Alberta newspapers mentioned the sectarians only in an occasional admiring descriptive report of their strange ways. When Canada again went to war, the situation abruptly changed:

With the outbreak of World War II and in the following years the friendly attitudes toward the Hutterians changed into open hostility. The ill-feeling was more marked in Alberta . . . (Peters, 1965:54).

According to Conkin (1964:67), this hostility was the result

of economic rather than political considerations, although resentment fed upon the Brethren's refusal to take an active role in Canada's defense. During the war, farming once more became profitable and Hutterite land purchases were viewed as unfair competition and wartime profiteering.

The open opposition of farm groups, the vehement criticism of most local newspapers, and, in some areas, the anger of urban businessmen, was abetted by the vehement hostility of the Canadian Legion, which was mainly concerned with the pacifism and communism of the 'un-Canadian' Hutterites (Conkin, 1964:68).

In 1942 the Alberta legislature reacted to community sentiment by passing the Land Sales Prohibition Act which forbade the sale of land to Hutterites and enemy aliens. Solon Low introduced the bill by stating that the Act was designed to ". . . allay public feeling which has been aroused to the point of threatened violence" (Peters, 1965:54). In 1947, the above legislation was replaced by the Communal Property Act which stipulated that a new colony must be at least 40 miles away from existing colonies. In 1959, the Alberta government appointed a committee to consider the Hutterite question. (Its terms of reference state that the ultimate goal was assimilation (Department of Municipal Affairs, 1959:18, 20).) The committee report documents the opposition of Alberta farmers and townsmen toward the Hutterites. As a result of this report, the Communal Property Act was amended. The new provisions stated that a colony could be formed only on cabinet authorization after a public hearing of the land sale application had been held (Sanders, 1964:230). Some authorities seriously question the constitutionality of the



Act. Hostetler (1961:126), for instance, raises the following points:

In the guise of legislation relating to property and civil rights, does it not in substance constitute a colourable attempt to regulate aliens, or to abridge religious freedom or, by rendering their continued residence within the province untenable, to drive the Hutterites out?

More pertinent to the present discussion is the fact that this legislation was enacted as a response to public antipathy towards the Hutterites. In Sanders' (1964:234) opinion,

The government, in passing the legislation, was not concerned with the Hutterites *per se*, but with the friction that exists between the colonies and the communities in which they are located.

Further, the Communal Property Act ". . . will not be repealed for obvious political reasons . . ." (Sanders, 1964:241). The public hearings required by the Act certainly have had the effect of intensifying the negative public opinion (Hostetler, 1961:127). Although it cannot of course be assumed that Alberta's rural population is solidly anti-Hutterite, the Communal Property Control Board has encountered hostility toward the Hutterites wherever hearings have been held (Sanders, 1964:225).

Evidence from field reports further substantiates the fact that the Brethren are disliked more than the environing population. Anant (1969:14) observes that while community attitudes toward the Hutterites vary in Alberta,

There are, however, a number of individuals who are violently anti-Hutterite. Some local businessmen are uniformly hostile to the settlement because they are convinced that the Hutterites would not purchase

locally. Some of these community attitudes were responsible for the passage of the legislation in Alberta restricting the purchase of land for colonies by the Hutterites.

According to Peters (1965:189), the Hutterites' self-imposed cultural isolation has brought upon them the disapproval of the larger society. Bennett (1967) explores at some length the attitudes of both Saskatchewan and Alberta non-Hutterites. A preliminary study (Lobb and Agnew, 1953) of the acceptance of the first two colonies established in Saskatchewan had concluded that few intergroup difficulties existed which could not be resolved by community planning plus circulation of factual information concerning the newcomers. However, Bennett (1967:90) reports that with the entrance of the fifth colony in 1953 resentment broke out into the open. Protest meetings were held and delegations sent to the provincial capital. By the 1960s local hostility had become less obvious; the net direction of sentiments was acceptance of the fact that the Hutterite colonies were there to stay (Bennett, 1967:91). Nonetheless, many small farmers and businessmen remained opposed to the Hutterites (Bennett, 1967:91). Bennett (1967:91) found the Alberta farmers to be considerably more unfriendly toward the Hutterites than were their Saskatchewan counterparts:

This must be set against the fact that strong resentment of the Hutterites has continued to grow in southern Alberta, even though the Gentile farmers there are prosperous. However, in the case of the Alberta districts, the colonies are numerous enough to constitute a serious competitive threat.

Hostetler and Huntington (1967:94) consider the 20th

century treatment of the Hutterites to be a more subtle continuation of the persecution they faced in the 16th century. Various examples are given of community intolerance (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:95). Colony windows have been broken and tools and supplies pilfered. Livestock has been stolen. Foreign substances have been put in gasoline tanks. Some colonies have been summoned in the middle of the night to assist nearby towns to put out nonexistent fires. One of these authors (Hostetler, 1961:127) attributes the hatred experienced by Alberta Hutterites to scapegoating: the rural populace unjustly blames the Brethren for the agricultural cost-price squeeze and the disappearance of small villages. However, the above ethnographers generally believe that the Hutterites are disliked because of their economic competition and voracious need for land, their pacifism, and their refusal to assimilate.

Social distance scale data reported by Hirabayashi (1963a) and the present investigator also support the proposition that the Hutterites are not accepted by Albertans. The mean social distance shown the Hutterites by an Edmonton sample of young people was 3.48. The Hutterites were ranked at the bottom of 24 ethnic groups (Hirabayashi, 1963a:361). These results are supported by the data discussed in Chapter 6 of the present study. As Table 6.1 shows, both semantic differential and open-ended questionnaire samples displayed more social distance toward the Brethren than any other ethnic group. However, it is highly probable that these

numerical scores incorporate both distaste for the Hutterites and respect for the sect's wish to remain aloof. In other words, each group knows that it is rejected by the other and these reciprocal sentiments are reflected in the stereotype traits. Sample members perceived the Hutterites as "disliked" and as "cliquish" and "self-sufficient." Indeed, Peter (1964:8) argues that the Hutterites actually welcome demonstrations of aversion from outsiders. Such disapproval fosters their distinctive identity and reinforces their conviction that they are the only true Christians in a spiritually contaminated world: "The world didn't like Christ, if the same world doesn't like us, we are in the same boat with Christ" (Peter, 1964:8).

Although it has not been possible to statistically establish the distribution of negative attitudes toward the Hutterites, the foregoing material does indicate that urban samples place social distance between themselves and the Hutterites. Considerable hostility has been reported in certain segments of the population, particularly among southern Alberta farmers and Canadian Legionnaires (Sanders, 1964:227). The evidence shows that Hutterites are disliked more than Albertans generally. Therefore, the stereotype is accurate.

#### Old-Fashioned

Both instrument samples differentially attributed the stereotype trait "old-fashioned" to the Hutterites. Spontaneous reference to this trait was made by 27% of the

open-ended questionnaire respondents. Ninety percent of the semantic differential sample described the Brethren as extremely or quite old-fashioned, resulting in a mean of 6.5 and an average deviation of 0.8. The following discussion will show that social scientists concur with the laymen's consensual application of this characteristic to the Hutterites.

Validation of the proposition that the Hutterites (like the Indians) are more old-fashioned than Albertans generally will once again involve answers to the following question: "Are the Hutterites divorced from the life-patterns and values of the modern urban-industrial world?" An answer to this question will be determined by applying to the Hutterites the various canons of traditionalism versus modernism which were outlined in Chapter 7.

According to Etzioni and Etzioni (1964:181), the following structural changes are involved in the transition from traditional to modern society: (1) decline in birth and death rates; (2) movement from rural to urban settlement patterns; (3) reduction in the size, authority and functions of the family; (4) intensive development of a mass education system which equips people with the skills demanded by a technological economy; (5) decline in the influence of religion; (6) the emergence of industrialization and with it, a skilled/professional labor force occupied with secondary and tertiary rather than primary level tasks. The "logic of industrialism" requires commitment to certain values (Kerr,

et al., 1964:25-29). Traditional conservatism is replaced by positive evaluation of progress and change. The relatively open stratification system based on achieved rather than ascribed status reduces traditional loyalties to family. Industrialism demands geographic as well as social mobility, which further weakens the extended kinship groups. Life becomes secularized. Scientific and technical knowledge are esteemed, and education valued as the instrumentality for job preparation and vertical mobility. Finally, industrialism requires a disciplined, responsible work force. Hutterite values and social structure will now be examined in the light of the above criteria of modernism.

The Hutterites have not completed the demographic transition from traditionalism to modernism. Although their mortality rate is very similar to that of the containing society, their birth rate remains one of the highest in the world. Their beliefs encourage high fertility and forbid the practice of birth control. The Hutterites, like many underdeveloped nations, owe their low death rate to outside medical knowledge and facilities.

With the exception of a score of defectors (Mackie, 1965), all Hutterites are rural. The labor force engages exclusively in primary agricultural occupations and related crafts. However, the Brethren are dedicated to the disciplined work performance required by an industrial economy. Despite their religiosity, the Brethren are not mystics; they share modern notions of efficiency and practicality and

active mastery of their environment. They have also adopted those benefits of technology which improve their ability to compete in the agricultural market. Colony farms are highly mechanized (Bennett, 1967:269).

Since the Hutterites modified the traditional family functions to serve communitarian ends in the 16th century, the analysis of their family in terms of the criteria of modernism presents some difficulty. Both Hutterite and urban-industrial families perform fewer functions than the ideal-typical folk society family. Similarly, both exercise reduced authority. However, the Brethren have delegated traditional familial prerogatives to a primary group composed of a set of families (the male heads of which are often brothers), rather than to secondary institutions. Hutterite society is not segmented into separate institutional spheres. Religious, economic, political and educational activities all involve the same people. All rest upon informal, primary group consensus (Hostetler and Huntington, 1967:114). In fact, personal ties are maintained throughout the entire clan (*leut*):

Today it is still possible for the chief elder, Peter Hofer, to send mimeographed letters to the congregations in Manitoba and refer to *Samuelvetter* of Elmspring colony, *Johanvetter* of Spink colony, or *Jakobvetter* of Bon Homme colony, all in South Dakota, and know that all his readers will know exactly whom he means, without using their surnames (Peters, 1965:188).

Most sociologists (e.g., Eaton and Weil, 1955) assert that the Hutterite society is differentiated but unstratified. Despite some tendency to differentially evaluate colony work

roles, relative importance still depends upon age, sex, marital and baptismal statuses.

The Brethren often say that when two equally good candidates are competing for a managerial or executive position, the older will get the vote. A check on candidates in two colonies over a five-year period bore this out. . . . It should be remembered that since the Hutterian Brethren's basic values and social structure change little or not at all, age does bring wisdom . . . (Bennett, 1967:149, emphasis in original).

Of course the Hutterites have no interest in individual vertical mobility within the class system of the containing society.

The Hutterites' views on education have already been discussed. In short, they believe that too much knowledge will make their young people dissatisfied and eventually destroy their communal system. Intellectual curiosity and skeptical analysis of existing "truths" remain foreign to them (Peters, 1965:138). They continue to maintain their own religiously-oriented educational program which was developed in the 16th century. Adolescents are prepared for their adult work roles through apprenticeship on the colony premises (Bennett, 1967:163). Nevertheless, the Brethren are quite willing to take advantage of the outside world's agricultural and medical technology. Indeed, Bennett (1967: 222) found that the Hutterites possessed a larger store of technical knowledge than did their neighbors.

Religion continues to be the focal point of Hutterite existence:



In doctrine and in organization the Hutterian Church has not changed. Its articles of faith have been rigidly maintained, and young Hutterians are dedicated and loyal to the beliefs enunciated by their ancestors four hundred years ago (Peters, 1965:185).

Religious innovation ceased around the middle of the 17th century. Any attempt to develop novel interpretations of the sacred scripture would be considered most improper (Peter, 1964:7). All of the sermons and hymns used today date back to the early days of the brotherhood (Peters, 1965:124, 125).

Perhaps the firmest justification for the label "old-fashioned" rests upon the Hutterites' orientation towards the past rather than the present and the status quo rather than change.

Ideas and prescriptions of the Bible, and their written and oral interpretations by men long dead, are regarded as being better, wiser, and morally worthier than anything the present generation might think of (Eaton and Weil, 1955:180).

This social equilibrium is facilitated by the Hutterite emphasis on tradition rather than on change. Life is basically oriented on the status quo (Eaton and Weil, 1955:206).

Hutterite adolescents and control subjects were asked the following question: "If you could be changed and be different from what you are, how would you want to be changed? What would you want to be like?" (Hostetler, 1965:77). Twenty-seven percent of the Hutterites and 15% of the controls expressed the desire not to be changed in any way. (The difference was statistically significant at the .01 level.) Hostetler believes that these data provide a basis for the assumption that resistance to change is instilled

early in the socialization of Hutterian children. Hostetler and Huntington (1967:114) state that although the Hutterites are willing to adopt those technological innovations which are functional for the colony economy, ". . . they would rather die than change their basic social patterns, which they believe to be ordered by supernatural authority." Bennett (1967:175) says that the "miracle" of Hutterite society lies in the fact that little revision has been necessary in their basic societal structure or objectives since the 16th century. Peters (1965:76) describes the Brethren's unchanged social organization as a "case of arrested development." Karl Peters (1964:7) views active resistance to change as the only action open to Hutterite elders. Such conservatism places the Hutterites closer to traditional than modern society.

The above discussion may now be summarized. The Hutterites are not ethnographically primitive. Rather, they are a literate people engaged in large-scale competitive agricultural enterprises which utilize modern technology. Nevertheless, the trait "old-fashioned" accurately delineates actual differences between the Brethren and the general Alberta population. Their demographic and settlement patterns, their *Gemeinschaft* social organization, their preoccupation with the sacred and distaste for formal secular education all depart from the sociological canons of modernity. Progress remains an alien notion. Instead, "the events of the early sixteenth century are a living

presence in Hutterian consciousness . . ." (Peters, 1965:4).  
The ethnographic data substantiate the stereotype.

### Conclusion

The evidence presented in this chapter shows no major inconsistency between folk and expert knowledge of the Hutterites. Although insufficient data precluded judgment of the present validity of two characteristics ("mentally health," "healthy"), not one stereotype trait proved to be demonstrably false. This finding of accuracy is particularly interesting in view of the following assertion:

It is perhaps a sociological truism that wherever we discover a minority that lives in extreme isolation, we find more than the usual misconceptions (Hostetler, 1961:127).

A critical examination of this "truism" has disclosed that outsiders have a generally valid impression of how the Hutterites are. The foregoing analysis supports the basic thesis that sociologists cannot consider stereotypes inaccurate by definition.

## CHAPTER 10

### SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

#### Introduction

This study is a test of the accuracy of ethnic stereotypy. Stereotypes of the North American Indians, Hutterites, and Ukrainians (as well as seven other categories) have been measured by two instruments, a modified semantic differential and an open-ended questionnaire. A judgmental sample of 590 subjects was drawn from 25 organizations which were chosen to obtain coverage of selected demographic characteristics. The accuracy of the stereotypes was subsequently assessed against data provided by available public records and existing studies of the referent groups.

Several secondary objectives were incorporated. The study was also concerned with investigating the alleged equivalence between stereotypy and prejudice; Bogardus social distance scales were employed to measure the latter variable. An exploratory analysis was conducted of the demographic correlates of the stereotypy of both ethnic and nonethnic categories. The relationship between education and stereotypy was also examined in some detail. Finally, consideration is given to the metasociological implications of the substantive results.

## Results

### Accuracy of Stereotypy

Research hypothesis 1 was stated as follows:

For each trait in the stereotype of the stimulus group, the incidence of that behavior will be greater in the stimulus group than in the general population.

The initial prediction that folk perception of ethnic categories would be correct rested upon the postulate that people are motivated to "know" accurately their social environment (Boulding, 1967; Asch, 1952; Campbell, 1967). Although the adequacy of the available data varied and difficulty was encountered in statistically establishing differential incidence of traits, the weight of the evidence supports hypothesis 1. Table 10.1, which summarizes the validation results for the Indians, Ukrainians, and Hutterites, shows that of the 40 traits examined, 31 traits proved to be accurate, 4 inaccurate, and 5 remain unverified. Although insufficient data precluded judgment of the present validity of 5 characteristics, the evidence showed that 2 of these traits which referred to the Hutterites were accurate 15 years ago. Since relevant Hutterite conditions have changed very little, it is likely that they still hold true for contemporary Hutterites. As Table 10.1 shows, a close correspondence exists between folk impressions of the Indians and Hutterites and the actual condition of these groups. The high proportion of unassessed traits makes it somewhat more difficult to render a clear-cut verdict on the accuracy of the Ukrainian stereotype.

TABLE 10.1. THE ACCURACY OF THE INDIAN, UKRAINIAN,  
AND HUTTERITE STEREOTYPES

Group	Stereotype Trait	Accurate	Inac- curate	Unveri- fied
INDIANS	Believe univ. unimport.	X		
	Dirty	X		
	Disliked by other groups	X		
	Drunken	X		
	Frivolous with money	X		
	Large families	X		
	Lazy	X		
	Not materialistic		X	
	Often in trouble w/law	X		
	Old-fashioned	X		
	Oppressed by others	X		
	Poor	X		
	Rural	X		
	Unambitious	X		
	Uneducated	X		
UKRAINIANS	Ambitious		X	
	Different culture	X		
	Hardworking			X
	Large families		X	
	Not neglectful of child.			X
	Religious		X	
Self-sufficient			X	
HUTTERITES	Believe univ. unimport.	X		
	Cliquish	X		
	Disliked by other groups	X		
	Hardworking	X		
	Healthy			X
	Large families	X		
	Mentally healthy			X
	Not neglectful of child.	X		
	Old-fashioned	X		
	Religious	X		
	Rural	X		
	Seldom fight	X		
	Seldom in trouble w/law	X		
	Self-sufficient	X		
	Sexually moral	X		
	Sober	X		
	Stable marriages	X		
	Thrifty with money	X		

However, the Ukrainian image is clearly the least valid of the three stereotypes.

Because most sociologists have not regarded stereotype accuracy as a variable, the literature contains few hypotheses concerning the conditions under which stereotypes are valid or invalid. Four proposed correlates of accuracy are relevant to the present findings. Three of these hypotheses receive support from this study.

The following hypothesis emerged from Campbell's (1967:821) integration of learning theory with phenomenological social psychology:

The greater the real differences between groups on any particular custom, detail of physical appearance, or item of material culture, the more likely it is that that feature will appear in the stereotyped imagery each group has of the other. (Emphasis in original deleted.)

The fact that the Hutterite and Indian stereotypes are more accurate than the Ukrainian stereotype appears to substantiate Campbell's prediction. Both the Indians and the Hutterites are quite different from the general population. Their distinctive characteristics seem to have attracted the attention of outsiders, who incorporated these differentiae into their folk imagery of those groups. The Ukrainians were initially selected precisely because they are a relatively assimilated group. Several factors suggest that the sample members had difficulty in distinguishing this group from the general population. The Ukrainian stereotype contains only seven traits, whereas the Indian and Hutterite stereotypes contain 15 and 18 characteristics, respectively.

Moreover, the Ukrainian image is rather indefinite; those traits which are included just exceed the criterion levels. And most important, only one of the verified traits was demonstrably accurate. Therefore, the present results affirm Campbell's hypothesis.

Schuman's (1966) study of the validity of East Pakistani stereotypes resulted in several propositions. The first hypothesis concerns the length of time exposure to a stable stimulus:

[Stereotypes] . . . are most likely to be accurate when they concern a group that has changed relatively little over a long period of time. However haphazard the observations that contribute to a stereotype, the latter should become more accurate as these observations accumulate on the basis of consistent experience (Schuman, 1966:440).

The Hutterites have presented an essentially unchanging stimulus for more than 450 years. The Indians have been caught between their indigenous culture and that of white society for the duration of the adult life of most sample members. The Ukrainians, on the other hand, have changed from generation to generation. They therefore represent a much less consistent stimulus. The results of this study, particularly the Hutterite data, suggest a positive relationship between stereotype accuracy and stability over time of referent group characteristics.

A second and related hypothesis proposed by Schuman (1966:440) has some applicability to these results:



. . . since the part of a stereotype that is accurate can come only after the objective fact, stereotypes should tend to be more descriptive of prior than of current phases of ethnic history. . . . But other things being equal, stereotypes may serve most accurately as a collective memory of the stable past rather than as an image of the changing present. (Emphasis in original deleted.)

Campbell (1967:822) too speaks of stereotype "inertia."

The validation evidence showed that three of the four incorrect stereotype traits (the Indian trait, "nonmaterialistic," and the Ukrainian traits, "large families" and "religious") had *in the past* represented accurate descriptions of the groups. These results do suggest that under certain as yet unknown conditions, a time-lag may persist between image and condition of an object group.

Finally, the literature contains conflicting predictions concerning the relationship between stereotype accuracy and favorability of traits. Schuman (1966:440) has hypothesized for the following reason that positive characterizations are more accurate than negative ones:

. . . there is a general tendency to describe other ethnic groups in negative terms, at least relative to one's own group, a finding consistent with the mutual suspicion often found between ethnic groups. With this initial negative bias operating, a favorable stereotype probably requires stronger evidence than an unfavorable one before winning wide acceptance.

Conflict theorists, on the other hand, view the "true" behavior of the out-group as the cause of ethnocentrism (in the sense that groups have incompatible goals and compete for scarce resources) and negative traits as relatively accurate evaluations of out-group behavior (Campbell and Levine, 1965:31). Extrapolating from this position, one

might expect that positive out-group traits would receive more casual appraisal from the stereotyping group.

How do the present findings bear upon this controversy? The level of the data is such that it is possible to speak of trait accuracy or inaccuracy but not of degrees of accuracy. Nonetheless, the results indicate that regardless of directionality, this hypothesis inadequately conceptualizes both stereotypy and the general conditions of stereotype validity. Although Table 10.1 shows that the inaccurate traits tend to be favorable attributions, this offers little support for Schuman's hypothesis. The Indian stereotype contains mostly unfavorable traits and the Hutterite stereotype mostly favorable traits. Yet both groups are "underdog" groups and both sets of characteristics are accurate. The initial position is faulty because it assumes an equivalency between prejudice and stereotypy. People who subscribe to stereotypes range from friendly, to indifferent, to hostile towards the object groups. Their imagery contains favorable, neutral, and unfavorable characteristics. This study, which used demographic groups as the units of analysis, failed to establish a relationship between extreme social distance toward stimulus groups and the ascription of unflattering traits. Clearly, stereotypy represents more than the cognitive dimension of prejudice. The following section will discuss the relationship between stereotypy and prejudice in greater detail.

*The most significant finding is that folk cognition*

*of ethnic groups is not uninformed by the facts.* Therefore, it is most inappropriate to regard stereotypes as false by definition.

### Stereotypy and Prejudice

Research hypothesis 6 read as follows:

As the social distance position of a stimulus group increases, the amount of stereotypy of that group will increase.

Bogardus social distance scales were used to operationalize prejudice. Amount of stereotypy refers to quantity of traits ascribed to a given category. The directionality of this hypothesis follows from the assumption of covariance between stereotypy and prejudice prevalent in both theoretical discussions and measurement of these variables. Allport (1954: 187), for example, holds that:

Whether favorable or unfavorable, a stereotype is an exaggerated belief associated with a category. Its function is to justify (rationalize) our conduct in relation to that category.

Further, it is often assumed that prejudice has been demonstrated when subjects subscribe to stereotypical items on attitude scales.

The results show that the relationship between prejudice and stereotypy is neither independent as stated by the null hypothesis, nor direct as predicted by the research hypothesis. Rather, the disposition to admit an ethnic group to close association was found to be related to richer cognitive imagery concerning that group. The erroneous equation of prejudice and stereotypy derives in part from

the failure to appreciate the fact that categorical percepts also encompass favorable and neutral traits. If sociologists agreed to restrict the term "stereotype" to unfavorable traits, neologisms would be required to describe neutral and favorable imagery. An exploratory analysis of the relationship between social distance and unflattering trait assignment showed that greater social distance from an ethnic group was *not* consistently associated with either more frequent or more extreme assignment of negative traits.

The data support the conclusion that other factors besides affection or antipathy for a group influence impressions of that group. In view of the results presented in the previous section, the proposition that hatred for a group is only built out of false impressions becomes highly questionable. Stereotypes are also the product of the cognitive need to structure the group environment.

#### Amount and Degree of Stereotypy

Hypotheses 2 through 5 tested the relationship between stereotypy and formal education. Their directionality rested upon the assumption that more schooling results in increased exposure to the value position that ethnic stereotypy is inappropriate.

Research hypothesis 2 was stated as follows:

As amount of education increases, the amount of stereotypy of stimulus groups will decrease.

Amount of stereotypy is a standardized measure of the number of traits consensually assigned to a stimulus group or

groups. This hypothesis was not supported by the findings. Indeed, just the opposite relationship emerged: as the amount of education increased, the amount of stereotypy increased.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that, within the general pattern of low education-high stereotypy (since disconfirmed), those with more formal education would exhibit a greater amount of nonethnic stereotypy and a lesser amount of ethnic stereotypy than would their less well-educated counterparts. Since people do think categorically, it was felt that the better-educated respondents would be more willing to reveal their images of nonethnic groups.

The results disconfirmed hypothesis 4. Instead, amount of ethnic stereotypy increased with education on both semantic differential and open-ended questionnaire instruments. A positive relationship between education and amount of nonethnic stereotypy was found with the open-ended data. The semantic differential results showed no significant difference between education subsamples in amount of nonethnic stereotypy.

Two parallel hypotheses concerning education and degree of stereotypy were initially postulated. Degree of stereotypy is a measure of the extremity or polarity with which semantic differential traits were assigned to stimulus groups.

Research hypothesis 3 predicted that as amount of education increased, the degree of stereotypy of stimulus

groups would decrease. Once again, just the opposite effect occurred. As amount of education increased, degree of stereotypy of stimulus groups increased.

Research hypothesis 5 read as follows:

As amount of education increases, the within-category difference between degree of stereotypy of ethnic and nonethnic stimulus groups will increase, with stereotypy of ethnic groups decreasing and stereotypy of nonethnic groups increasing.

The amount of within-category difference between degree of stereotypy of ethnic and nonethnic groups increased as predicted as one moves from the lowest to highest education levels. However, the degree of stereotypy components did not function as predicted. Degree of ethnic stereotypy increased rather than decreased with education. Further, although the lowest education subsample exhibited the highest degree of nonethnic stereotypy, the rate remained rather stable across education categories.

In short, the well educated in our sample were more willing than the less well educated to describe ethnic groups as being quite different from the containing population on more dimensions. Several possibilities exist which may explain the observed proclivity of the better educated to stereotype ethnic groups. Perhaps, categorical descriptions are gaining acceptability in a social environment of groups striving to preserve their cultural autonomy. Alternatively, an answer may be found in the proposition that well-educated people are simply more accustomed to thinking in terms of abstract generalizations. (The term

"stereotype" was never mentioned to the respondents.) The most interesting implication of this finding is its bearing upon the definitional specification of stereotypy and prejudice. A strong relationship between high education and low prejudice has been repeatedly observed (Harding, et al. 1969:28-29). The present study found that the social distance expressed toward ethnic groups decreased with education. Obviously, stereotypy and prejudice are not identical phenomena.

#### Substantive Conclusions

This investigation has established that the critical aspect of stereotypy is not error. Newcomb (1950:214) is incorrect when he states that categorical percepts ". . . have the virtues of efficiency but not of accuracy." On the contrary, these findings provide support for Fishman's (1956:32) hypothesis that the substitution of sociocultural experience for individual analysis of the other augments perceptual acuity. No empirical substantiation has been found for the incorporation of inaccuracy into the definition of stereotypes or for the equation of stereotypy and prejudice. Accuracy is a variable and further inquiry is required into the conditions under which categorical percepts are correct or incorrect. This study suggests that folk beliefs do provide a fairly accurate cognitive map of the social environment.

### Metasociological Implications

The substantive findings of this study raise a series of metasociological issues. Some explanation is called for to account for the fact that many sociologists have been reluctant to entertain the possibility that folk concepts of ethnic categories might be grounded in reality. When the evidence in support of the stereotypy-as-error allegation is examined (Chapter 2), it becomes clear that the proposition's appeal is not empirical. Indeed, research has established that various ethnic and nonethnic categories possess characteristics which are not at variance with folk impressions of these groups. Why, then, has sociology preserved a rigid distinction between its own "national character" and socioeconomic studies and popular notions of what ethnic groups are like, maintaining that the first are worthwhile and valid, the latter immoral and erroneous by definition? It appears that sociologists uncritically adopted a layman's (Lippmann, 1922) pejorative conceptualization of stereotypy and elevated to a classic La Piere's (1936) defective test of stereotype accuracy because they liked the answer. The results of this study cast doubt upon the assumption of certain students (Becker, 1967; Gouldner, 1963) that sociology can take a moral-political stance and yet remain correct. Partisanship can vitiate objectivity (Gouldner, 1968).

Sociology's safeguard against the retention of faulty generalizations lies in the self-corrective mechanisms of the science as a social enterprise. If an answer is



suspect, the study is replicated and the error exposed. However, this investigation shows that when the majority of the professional audience finds a report such as La Piere's (1936) congruent with its values, erroneous findings may stand unchallenged. In short, the fact that so many practitioners share the same sympathies and, consequently, the same blinders, threatens the integrity of some social scientific "truths." Even Becker (1967:244), one of the most vocal advocates of partisanship, acknowledges the problem:

. . . it is no secret that most sociologists are politically liberal to one degree or another. Our political preferences dictate the side we will be on and, since those preferences are shared by most of our colleagues, few are ready to throw the first stone or are even aware that stone-throwing is a possibility.  
(Emphasis added.)

Becker (1967:246) believes that if sociologists can be persuaded to avoid "sentimentality," their inevitable sympathies will not render their scientific results invalid. In view of the sociology of knowledge dilemma, one might well ask how sociologists are to know when sentimentality is a possibility. Nettler (1970:90) notes that ". . . the intrusion of preference upon observation makes social facts and sociological propositions, of a scientific character, a tough ore to mine." Facile solutions simply do not exist.

The present investigation of stereotypy also illustrates the folly which can ensue when sociologists confuse their verbal constructs with how the social world is. Real definitions embody built-in hypotheses about empirical relationships. Such truth-asserting hypotheses cannot be

consensually adopted as conventional usage (Zetterberg, 1965:37). Instead, propositions such as "Folk impressions of ethnic categories are false" must be tested before they can be accepted. Sometimes, sociologists become so accustomed to their definitions that they mistake verbal equivalencies with empirical results. Although this pitfall is not, of course, confined to "sensitive" areas such as ethnic relations, the probability of arriving at "truth-by-definition" is enhanced when the hypothesized relations accord with our ethical preferences.

Further, these findings caution against a tendency on the part of some sociologists to dichotomize folk and scientific knowledge. Since their thoughtways are untutored, the people are assumed to be incorrect in their evaluation of others. It seems that folk beliefs which social scientists find unpleasant are particularly likely to be denigrated because they are not based on scientific canons of evidence. In the substantive area under purview, this double standard is revealed in scientists' distaste for categorization in folk taxonomy. As Nettler (1970:11-12) remarks, "If we are sociologists, we call offensive categories 'stereotypes' in contrast to our organizing constructs that are 'ideal' or 'constructed' types." For example, Singer (1967:28) writes that

Stereotypes and prejudices are generally assumed to be related. That is, an inability or unwillingness to see members of a group as separate and unique individuals--a tendency, in fact, to see them as being essentially alike in some basic or derogatory way--can be regarded and tested as a basic characteristic of

prejudice. . . . (Technically, this is called lack of 'cognitive differentiation.")

What success would the social sciences enjoy if they considered improper all generalizing statements concerning these "separate and unique individuals"?

Given the present stage of development of their science, sociologists are advised to avoid magnifying the difference between folk and scientific methods of seeking the "truth." Boulding (1967:881) states that,

. . . the method by which the scientific subculture discovers error is not different in essence from the method by which error is detected in the folk culture, that is, in the ordinary business of life.

Shibutani (1966:154)<sup>1</sup> takes the same position:

As Malinowski (1925) points out, . . . no organized form of hunting, tilling, or search for food could be carried out without the careful observation of natural processes and a firm belief in their regularity. . . . The more accurate a symbolic representation of the environment, the greater its efficacy in facilitating adjustment; for this reason there tends to be a progressive approximation of reality through a continual modification of perspectives. (Emphasis in original deleted.)

On the other hand, scientific knowledge is not free from some of the defects we deplore in common-sense thought:

. . . even in a realm in which ideas are presumably accepted or rejected solely on the basis of evidence, well-established perspectives tend to resist revision (Shibutani, 1966:155).

This study has shown that contemporary social science is, in some phases, ideological and hence unscientific, and that

---

<sup>1</sup>Shibutani (1966) tested and found inadequate the traditional sociological assumption that rumor (folk communication in ambiguous situations) is a pathological phenomenon, whose central attribute is error.

laymen are, under some circumstances, motivated to perceive their social environment accurately. Furthermore, the research reviewed in Chapter 1 revealed that social scientists have not established an impressive record as superior judges of the other. It is unwise for sociologists either to assume implicitly that, since nonscientists do not have sophisticated cognitive techniques at their disposal, they are invariably incorrect, or to profess a blind faith in the wisdom of the people when they agree with social scientists' value positions (Key, 1966). If they are to function as scientists, sociologists must seek independent criteria of accuracy without preconception as to the improvement that social science may make over public perception.

Scientific inquiry cannot always produce pleasant truths. As increasing numbers of sociologists dedicate their expertise to the amelioration of "social problems," many are confronted with a choice between their ethical responsibilities to their discipline and possible disservice to their cherished values. In the present instance, one could refrain from tampering with the happy myth of stereotype inaccuracy lest information bearing the scientific cachet be misused against minority groups.<sup>2</sup> Although Boulding

---

<sup>2</sup>The devaluation of minority group differences by certain publics has in the past had deleterious consequences for minority groups. However, many contemporary North American minorities are now demanding recognition of their distinctive characteristics. Previous discussion showed that both the Hutterites and the Ukrainians are concerned with preserving their unique identities. Native spokesmen such as Cardinal (1969), who also find the prospect of

(1967:880) asserts that "the only really unforgivable sin of the scientist is deliberate deception and the publication of false results," Becker (1967:239-40) implies that under some circumstances, deceit is understandable, if not forgivable:

One can imagine a liberal sociologist who set out to disprove some of the common stereotypes held about a minority group. To his dismay, his investigation reveals that some of the stereotypes are unfortunately true. In the interests of justice and liberalism, he might well be tempted, and might even succumb to the temptation, to suppress those findings, publishing with scientific candor the other results which confirmed his beliefs.

Gouldner (1968:112) suggests that such issues may no longer be matters for the individual conscience to resolve:

As the ideology of an establishment, such official liberalism has things to protect. It has reasons to lie. It has all the social mechanisms available to any establishment by which it can reward those who tell the right lies, and punish and suppress those who tell the wrong truths.

A sociology which permits only palatable stories to be published could eventually discover that its credibility has been lost and its generalizations have little predictive power. However, the opposite extreme, the prospect of inflicting damage upon human beings in the interests of scientific progress, is even more disturbing. Perhaps, it is best to admit that sometimes there are limits to our intellectual curiosity. Sociologists who adopt this course of action better serve their discipline than do those who demand that their science substantiate their values.

---

assimilation distasteful, are emphasizing Indian differentiae. Even unflattering traits (perceived by these spokesmen as the product of white maltreatment) are being publicized by the Indians themselves.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abate, Mario and F. K. Berrien  
1967 "Validation of stereotypes: Japanese versus American students." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 7:435-38.
- Adorno, T. W., E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford  
1950 *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper.
- Akers, F. C.  
1968 "Negro and white automobile-buying behavior: New evidence." *Journal of Marketing Research* (August):283-89.
- Akers, Ronald L.  
1968 "Problems in the sociology of deviance: Social definitions and behavior." *Social Forces* 46:455-65.
- Alberta Human Rights Association  
1969 A study into the attitudes of Edmonton landlords toward native tenants. Mimeographed paper, Edmonton.
- Alberta Medical and Pharmaceutical Associations  
1969 "Inequalities of opportunity in health services in Alberta." Paper presented to the Symposium on Social Opportunity in Alberta, Alberta Human Resources Research Council, Edmonton.
- Alberta Royal Commission on Juvenile Delinquency  
1967a Report on the Alberta Royal Commission on Juvenile Delinquency. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.  
1967b Supplementary Report on Juvenile Delinquency in Alberta. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Allport, Gordon W.  
1954 *The Nature of Prejudice*. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor.
- Allport, Gordon W. and B. M. Kramer  
1946 "Some roots of prejudice." *Journal of Psychology* 22:9-39.
- Anant, Santokh S.  
1969 "A study of mutual perception of Hutterites and non-Hutterites." Paper presented to the Symposium on Social Opportunity in Alberta, Alberta Human Resources Research Council, Edmonton.

- Asch, Solomon E.  
 1952 Social Psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- 1959 "A perspective on social psychology." In S. E. Koch (ed.), Psychology: A Study of a Science, Volume 3. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ball, Donald W.  
 1969 "The definition of the situation: Some theoretical and methodological consequences of taking W. I. Thomas seriously." Paper presented to the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, Toronto.
- Bay, Christian  
 1967 "Political and apolitical students: Facts in search of theory." Journal of Social Issues 23:76-91.
- Beach, Leroy and Michael Wertheimer  
 1961 "A free response approach to the study of person cognition." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 62:367-74.
- Becker, Howard S.  
 1963 Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. Glencoe: Free Press.
- 1967 "Whose side are we on?" Social Problems 14:239-47.
- Bennett, John W.  
 1967 Hutterian Brethren: The Agricultural Economy and Social Organization of a Communal People. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- 1969 Northern Plainsmen. Chicago: Aldine.
- Berelson, B. and P. J. Salter  
 1946 "Majority and minority Americans: An analysis of magazine fiction." Public Opinion Quarterly 10:168-90.
- Berger, Peter L.  
 1963 Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor.
- Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann  
 1966 The Social Construction of Reality. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor.

- Berkowitz, L. and R. E. Goranson  
1964 "Motivation and judgmental determinants of social perception." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 69:296-302.
- Berrien, F. Kenneth  
1969 "Stereotype similarities and contrasts." *Journal of Social Psychology* 78:173-83.
- Bettelheim, B. and M. Janowitz  
1964 *Social Change and Prejudice*. New York: Free Press.
- Bieri, J.  
1955 "Cognitive complexity-simplicity and predictive behavior." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 51:263-68.
- Bieri, J., A. L. Atkins, S. Briar, R. L. Leaman, H. Miller, and T. Tripodi  
1966 *Clinical and Social Judgment: The Discrimination of Behavioral Information*. New York: Wiley.
- Bierstedt, Robert  
1948 "The limitations of anthropological methods in sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 54:22-30.
- 1959 "Nominal and real definitions in sociological theory." Pp. 121-44 in Llewellyn Gross (ed.), *Symposium on Sociological Theory*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Blair, W. R. N.  
1969 *Mental Health in Alberta: A Report on the Alberta Mental Health Study*. Edmonton: Human Resources Research and Development.
- Blake, R. and W. Dennis  
1943 "The development of stereotypes concerning the Negro." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 38:525-31.
- Blishen, B. R.  
1958 "The construction and use of an occupational class scale." *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 24 (November):519-31.
- 1967 "A socio-economic index for occupations in Canada." *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 4 (February):41-53.



- Bogardus, Emory S.  
 1925 "Measuring social distances." *Journal of Applied Sociology* 9:299-308.
- 1950 "Stereotypes versus sociotypes." *Sociology and Social Research* 34:286-91.
- Borhek, J. T.  
 1967a "The position of the respondents in the economic system." Pp. 319-40 in C. W. Hobart, W. E. Kalbach, J. T. Borhek, and A. P. Jacoby, *Persistence and Change: A Study of Ukrainians in Alberta*. Edmonton: Ukrainian Canadian Research Foundation, Inc.
- 1967b "The persistence of the Ukrainian community." Pp. 512-53 in C. W. Hobart, et al., *ibid.*
- Borhek, J. T. and C. W. Hobart  
 1967 "Orientations and avocations." Pp. 379-432 in C. W. Hobart, et al., *ibid.*
- Borhek, J. T. and A. P. Jacoby  
 1967 "Participation of the respondents in voluntary associations, politics, and religion." Pp. 341-78 in C. W. Hobart, et al., *ibid.*
- Boulding, Kenneth E.  
 1967 "Dare we take the social sciences seriously?" *American Psychologist* 22:879-87.
- Braroe, Niels Winther  
 1965 "Reciprocal exploitation in an Indian-white community." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 21:166-78.
- Bronfenbrenner, U.  
 1961 "The mirror image in Soviet-American relations." *Journal of Social Issues* 17:45-56.
- Bronowski, Jacob  
 1968 *Science and Conscience*. Toronto: CBC Publications.
- Brown, Roger W.  
 1965 *Social Psychology*. New York: Free Press.
- Bruner, Jerome S.  
 1958 "Social psychology and perception." Pp. 85-94 in E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology*, 3rd edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Buchanan, W. and H. Cantril  
1953 How Nations See Each Other. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Buck, Roger C.  
1968 "Reflexive predictions." Pp. 436-47 in May Brodbeck (ed.), Readings in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences. New York: Macmillan.
- Buckley, Helen, J. E. M. Kew, and John B. Hawley  
1963 The Indians and Metis of Northern Saskatchewan. Saskatoon: Centre for Community Studies.
- Burgers, J. M.  
1968 "Letter to the editor." Science 161 (August 2): 420.
- Cahalan, Don and Frank N. Trager  
1949 "Free answer stereotypes and anti-Semitism." Public Opinion Quarterly 13:93-104.
- Cameron, Ann and Thomas Storm  
1965 "Achievement motivation in Canadian Indian, middle- and working-class children." Psychological Reports 16:459-63.
- Campbell, Donald T.  
1947 "The generality of a social attitude." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California.  
  
1950 "The indirect assessment of social attitudes." Psychological Bulletin 47:15-38.  
  
1957 "Factors relevant to the validity of experiments in social settings." Psychological Bulletin 54:297-312.  
  
1967 "Stereotypes and the perception of group differences." American Psychologist 22 (October):817-29.
- Campbell, Donald T. and R. A. LeVine  
1965 Propositions about ethnocentrism from social science theories. Mimeographed paper, Northwestern University.
- Canadian Corrections Association  
1967 Indians and the Law. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Card, B. Y.  
1963a "Economic aspects of I.D. 124." Pp. 79-184 in B. Y. Card, G. K. Hirabayashi, and C. L. French, The Metis in Alberta Society. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

- Card, B. Y.  
 1963b "Organizational and recreational aspects of community life in I.D. 124." Pp. 240-72 in B. Y. Card, et al., *ibid.*
- 1963c "Ethnic relations and social class in I.D. 124." Pp. 185-215 in B. Y. Card, et al., *ibid.*
- Cardinal, Harold  
 1969 The Unjust Society. Edmonton: M. G. Hurtig Ltd.
- Carter, L. F.  
 1948 "The identification of 'racial' membership." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 43:279-86.
- Christie, R. and Marie Jahoda (eds.)  
 1954 Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality." Glencoe: Free Press.
- Clark, Bertha W.  
 1924 "The Hutterian communities." Journal of Political Economy 32:357-74.
- Clark, E. L.  
 1949 "Motivation of Jewish students." Journal of Social Psychology 29:113-17.
- Clark, John D.  
 1969 "Letter to the editor." Science 161 (July 5):5.
- Clarke, R. B. and Donald T. Campbell  
 1955 "A demonstration of bias in estimates of Negro ability." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 51:585-88.
- Cohn, W.  
 1958 "The politics of American Jews." Pp. 614-26 in M. Sklare (ed.), The Jews. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Coleman, James S., Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol F. Hobson, James McPartland, and Alexander M. Mood.  
 1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington: U.S. Office of Education.
- Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism  
 1965 Preliminary Report. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- 1969a The Work World. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- 1969b The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

- Conkin, Paul K.  
1964 Two Paths to Utopia. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Cook, Robert C.  
1954 "The North American Hutterites: A study in human multiplication." Population Bulletin 10 (December):97-107.
- Cook, S. W. and C. Selltiz  
1966 "A multiple indicator approach to attitude measurement." Pp. 325-52 in Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (eds.), Attitudes. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- Cooper, Eunice and Marie Jahoda  
1947 "The evasion of propaganda: How prejudiced people respond to anti-prejudice propaganda." Journal of Psychology 23:15-25.
- Cooper, Joseph B. and Lawrence Michiels  
1952 "The study of attitudes as functions of objective knowledge." Journal of Social Psychology 36:59-71.
- Costner, Herbert L.  
1965 "Criteria for measures of association." American Sociological Review 30:341-53.
- Cronbach, L. J.  
1955 "Processes affecting scores on 'understanding of others' and 'assumed similarity.'" Psychological Bulletin 52:177-93.
- Crow, W. J.  
1957 "The effect of training upon accuracy and variability in interpersonal perception." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 55:355-59.
- Davies, P. G.  
1960 Submission to the Agricultural Committee of the Legislature of the Province of Alberta on Behalf of Alberta's 51 Hutterite Colonies of the Darius-Leut and Lehrer-Leut Groups. Edmonton: Department of Municipal Affairs.
- De Cocq, Gustave  
1962 Northeast Edmonton Youth Survey. Edmonton: Council of Community Services, mimeographed.
- De Fleur, Melvin  
1964 "Occupational role as portrayed on television." Public Opinion Quarterly 28 (Spring):57-74.

De Fleur, Melvin and Lois B. De Fleur  
 1967 "The relative contribution of television as a learning source for children's occupational knowledge." American Sociological Review 32 (October): 777-89.

Department of Agriculture

1968 The B-12 Plan: An Outline for Rural Development in Alberta's Census Division 12. Edmonton.

Department of the Attorney General

1969 General Report. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.

Department of Citizenship and Immigration

1964 The Indian in Transition: The Indian Today. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch.

1965 Statement for the Federal-Provincial Conference on Poverty. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch.

1967 Indian Affairs: Facts and Figures. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch.

Department of Health

1967 Division of Vital Statistics, Annual Report. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.

1970 Personal Communication. Edmonton: Division of Vital Statistics.

Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development

1968 Report of the Indian Act Consultation Meeting, Edmonton Alberta. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch.

1969 Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch.

1970 Alberta Region Statistical Report, 1969-1970. Edmonton: Indian Affairs Branch.

Department of Labour

1970 Personal Communication. Edmonton: Human Affairs Branch.

Department of Municipal Affairs

1959 Report of the Hutterite Investigation Committee. Edmonton.

1970 Personal Communication. Edmonton: Communal Property Control Board.

Department of National Revenue

1968 Taxation Statistics. Ottawa.

- Deutsch, M. and Mary E. Collins  
 1951 Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deutsch, Martin and Harold Proshansky  
 1961 "Information and opinion during an international crisis." Journal of Social Psychology 54:169-75.
- Deutscher, Irwin  
 1966 "Words and deeds: Social science and social policy." Social Problems 13:235-54.
- 1969 "Looking backward: Case studies on the progress of methodology in sociological research." The American Sociologist 4 (February):35-40.
- Dexter, Lewis Anthony  
 1964 "On the politics and sociology of stupidity in our society." Pp. 37-50 in Howard S. Becker (ed.), The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Diab, Lutfy N.  
 1962 "National stereotypes and the 'reference group' concept." Journal of Social Psychology 57:339-51.
- 1963 "Factors affecting studies of national stereotypes." Journal of Social Psychology 59:29-40.
- Dominion Bureau of Statistics  
 1961 Census of Canada. Ottawa.
- 1966 Census of Canada. Ottawa.
- 1967a Canada Year Book. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- 1967b Statistics of Criminal and Other Offences, Catalogue 85-201. Ottawa.
- 1967c Vital Statistics, Catalogue 84-202. Ottawa.
- 1968a Canada Year Book. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- 1968b Household Facilities and Equipment. Ottawa.
- 1970 Personal Communication. Ottawa: Information Division.
- Douglas, J. W. B., J. M. Ross, and H. R. Simpson  
 1968 "The myopic elite." New Society 12 (October 3): 483-84.

- Drake, Joseph T.  
1957 "Some factors influencing students' attitudes toward older people." *Social Forces* 35:266-71.
- Dudycha, G. J.  
1942 "The attitudes of college students toward war and the Germans before and during the second world war." *Journal of Social Psychology* 15:317-24.
- Duijker, H. C. J. and N. H. Frijda  
1960 *National Character and National Stereotypes*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Dunning, R. W.  
1962 "Some aspects of governmental Indian policy and administration." *Anthropologica* 4:209-31.
- Dworkin, Anthony G.  
1965 "Stereotypes and self-images held by native-born and foreign-born Mexican Americans." *Sociology and Social Research* 46:214-24.
- Eaton, Joseph W.  
1964 "Adolescence in a communal society." *Mental Hygiene* 48 (January):66-73.
- Eaton, Joseph W. and Albert J. Mayer  
1954 *Man's Capacity to Reproduce: The Demography of a Unique Population*. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Eaton, Joseph W. and Robert J. Weil  
1953 "The mental health of the Hutterites." *Scientific American* 189 (December):3-9.  
  
1955 *Culture and Mental Disorders: A Comparative Study of the Hutterites and Other Populations*. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Ebel, Robert L.  
1961 "Must all tests be valid?" *American Psychologist* 16:640-47.
- Economic Council of Canada  
1968 *Fifth Annual Review: The Challenge of Growth and Change*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.  
  
1969 *Sixth Annual Review: Perspective 1975*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Ehrlich, Howard J. and James W. Rinehart  
1965 "A brief report on the methodology of stereotype research." *Social Forces* 43:564-75.

- Ehrlich, Howard J. and Norman Van Tubergen  
 1967 "Exploring the components of ethnic stereotyping."  
 Revised version of a paper presented to the Mid-  
 west Sociological Society, April.
- Elkin, Frederick  
 1964 The Family in Canada. Ottawa: The Vanier Insti-  
 tute of the Family.
- Elliot, D. N. and B. H. Wittenberg  
 1955 "Accuracy of identification of Jewish and non-  
 Jewish photographs." Journal of Abnormal and  
 Social Psychology 51:339-41.
- Erskine, Hazel  
 1968 "The polls: Demonstrations and race riots."  
 Public Opinion Quarterly (Winter):655-77.
- Etzioni, Amitai and Eva Etzioni  
 1964 Social Change. New York: Basic Books.
- Eysenck, H. J. and S. Crown  
 1948 "National stereotypes: An experimental and method-  
 ological study." International Journal of Opinion  
 and Attitude Research 2:26-39.
- Family Service Association of Edmonton  
 n.d. Adjustment Factors in the Indian Moving to the  
 Urban Community. Mimeographed paper, Edmonton.
- Farber, W. O., Philip A. Odeen, and Robert A. Tschetter  
 1957 Indians, Law Enforcement, and Local Government.  
 Report 379 of the Government Research Bureau of  
 the State University of South Dakota. Brookings:  
 University of South Dakota.
- Fishbein, M.  
 1963 "An investigation of the relationships between  
 beliefs about an object and the attitude toward  
 that object." Human Relations 16:233-39.
- Fisher, A. D.  
 1966 "Education and social progress." Alberta Journal  
 of Educational Research 12 (December):257-68.
- 1969 "White rites versus Indian rights." Trans-action  
 7 (November):29-33.
- Fishman, Joshua A.  
 1956 "An examination of the process and function of  
 social stereotyping." Journal of Social Psycholo-  
 gy 43:27-64.



- Foff, Arthur  
1958 "Scholars and scapegoats." The English Journal 47:118-26.
- Frazier, E. Franklin  
1964 "Black bourgeoisie: Public and academic relations." Pp. 305-11 in Arthur J. Vidich, Joseph Bensman, and Maurice R. Stein (eds.), Reflections on Community Studies. New York: Wiley.
- Freestone, A.  
1968 "Environmental sanitation on Indian reserves." Canadian Journal of Public Health 59 (January): 25-27.
- French, Cecil L.  
1967 "Social class and motivation among Metis, Indians, and Whites in Alberta." Pp. 124-69 in Arthur K. Davis (ed.), A Northern Dilemma: Reference Papers. Bellingham: Western Washington State College.
- Friedmann, Robert  
1961 Hutterite Studies. Goshen, Indiana: Mennonite Historical Society.
- Fuchs, L. H.  
1956 The Political Behavior of American Jews. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Gardner, Robert C. and Donald M. Taylor  
1968 "Ethnic stereotypes: Their effects on person perception." Canadian Journal of Psychology 22:267-76.
- Gardner, R. C., E. Joy Wonnacott, and D. M. Taylor  
1968 "Ethnic stereotypes: A factor analytic investigation." Canadian Journal of Psychology 22:35-44.
- Gibbs, Jack P.  
1966 "Conceptions of deviant behavior: The old and the new." Pacific Sociological Review 9:9-14.
- Gibson, Quentin  
1960 The Logic of Social Enquiry. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Gilbert, G. M.  
1951 "Stereotype persistence and change among college students." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 46:245-54.
- Glazer, N.  
1950 "What sociology knows about American Jews." Commentary 9:275-84.

- Goffman, Erving  
1959     The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor.
- 1961     Asylums. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor.
- Goldberg, Philip  
1968     "Are women prejudiced against women?" Transaction 5:28-30.
- Goldscheider, Calvin and Peter R. Uhlenberg  
1969     "Minority group status and fertility." The American Journal of Sociology 74 (January):361-72.
- Gould, Julius and William L. Kolb  
1964     A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. New York: Free Press.
- Gouldner, Alvin W.  
1963     "Anti-minotaur: The myth of a value-free sociology." Pp. 35-52 in Maurice Stein and Arthur Vidich (eds.), Sociology on Trial. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- 1968     "The sociologist as partisan: Sociology and the welfare state." The American Sociologist 3 (May):103-16.
- Greenhill, Stanley and B. A. Ruether  
1963     "Health and employability." Pp. 197-304 in B. Y. Card, et al., op. cit.
- Gross, Paul S.  
1965     The Hutterite Way. Saskatoon: Freeman.
- Hammond, K. R.  
1948     "Measuring attitudes by error-choice: An indirect method." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 43:38-48.
- Harding, John  
1968     "Stereotypes." Pp. 259-62 in David L. Sills (ed.), International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Volume 15. New York: Macmillan.
- Harding, John, Bernard Kutner, Harold Proshansky, and Isidor Chein  
1954     "Prejudice and ethnic relations." Pp. 1021-61 in Gardner Lindzey (ed.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume 2. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

- Harding, John, Harold Proshansky, Bernard Kutner, and Isidor Chein  
1969 "Prejudice and ethnic relations." Pp. 1-76 in Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson (eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume 5. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Harris, Adeline and Goodwin Watson  
1946 "Are Jewish or Gentile children more clannish?" Journal of Social Psychology 24:71-76.
- Hartley, Eugene L. and Ruth E. Hartley  
1952 Fundamentals of Social Psychology. New York: Knopf.
- Hastings, Philip K.  
1954 "Level of information and opinion content." Political Science Quarterly 69:234-40.
- Hastorf, Albert H., Stephen A. Richardson, and Sanford M. Dornbusch  
1958 "The problem of relevance in the study of person perception." Pp. 54-62 in Renato Tagiuri and Luigi Petrullo (eds.), Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hatt, Fred K.  
1967 Community Opportunity Assessment, Appendix A. Metis of the Lac La Biche Area. Edmonton: Human Resources Research and Development, Executive Council.
- Hausknecht, Murray  
1962 The Joiner: A Sociological Description of Voluntary Association Memberships in the United States. New York: Bedminster.
- Hawthorn, Harry B.  
1966 A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada, Volume I. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch.  
1967 A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada, Volume II. Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch.
- Hawthorn, H. B., C. S. Belshaw, and S. M. Jamieson  
1958 The Indians of British Columbia. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hayakawa, S. I.  
1950 "Recognizing stereotypes as substitutes for thought." Etc.: A Review of General Semantics 7:208-10.

- Heise, David R.  
 1969 "Some methodological issues in semantic differential research." *Psychological Bulletin* 72:406-22.
- Himmelfarb, Milton  
 1966 "How we are." Pp. 399-410 in Norman Podhoretz (ed.), *The Commentary Reader*. New York: Atheneum.
- Himmelfarb, S.  
 1966 "Studies in the perception of ethnic group members: I. accuracy, response bias, and anti-Semitism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 4:347-55.
- Hirabayashi, G. K.  
 1963a "Social distance and the modernizing Metis." Pp. 355-74 in B. Y. Card, G. K. Hirabayashi, and C. L. French, *op. cit.*
- 1963b "Apathy as a mode of adjustment: A hypothesis." Pp. 375-84 in B. Y. Card, G. K. Hirabayashi, and C. L. French, *op. cit.*
- Hobart, Charles W.  
 1967a "Characteristics of the total sample and of the four community sub-samples." Pp. 189-267 in C. W. Hobart, W. E. Kalbach, J. T. Borhek, and A. P. Jacoby, *Persistence and Change: A Study of Ukrainians in Alberta*. Edmonton: Ukrainian Canadian Research Foundation, Inc.
- 1967b *Community Opportunity Assessment, General Report*. Edmonton: Human Resources Research and Development, Executive Council.
- 1967c "Family size, structure and attitudes." Pp. 268-318 in C. W. Hobart, *et al.*, *op. cit.*
- 1967d "Integration into Canadian society." Pp. 476-511 in C. W. Hobart, *et al.*, *ibid.*
- 1970 "Eskimo education in the Canadian Arctic." *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 7 (February):49-69.
- Hobart, C. W., W. E. Kalbach, J. T. Borhek, and A. P. Jacoby  
 1967 *Persistence and Change: A Study of Ukrainians in Alberta*. Edmonton: Ukrainian Canadian Research Foundation, Inc.
- Honnigman, John J.  
 1965 "Social disintegration in five northern Canadian communities." *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 2 (November):199-214.

- Honnigman, John J.  
1969 "Deculturation and proletarianization of Canada's far northern native people." Paper presented to the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, Toronto, June.
- Hopkins, McMillan  
1967 "Letter to the editor." *Social Forces* 46:108-09.
- Horner, Matina S.  
1969 "Fail: Bright women." *Psychology Today* 3 (November):36-38.
- Hostetler, John A.  
1961 "The communal property act of Alberta." *The University of Toronto Law Journal* 14:125-28.  
  
1965 *Education and Marginality in the Communal Society of the Hutterites*. Washington: Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Hostetler, John A. and Gertrude Enders Huntington  
1967 *The Hutterites in North America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hostetler, John A. and Calvin Redekop  
1962 "Education and assimilation in three ethnic groups." *Alberta Journal of Education Research* 8:unpaginated.
- Hoult, Thomas Ford  
1968 ". . . Who shall prepare himself to the battle?" *The American Sociologist* 3:3-7.
- Hovland, C. I., O. J. Harvey, and M. Sherif  
1957 "Assimilation and contrast effects in reactions to communication and attitude change." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 55:244-52.
- Hughes, Robert H.  
1968 *A Study of High School Dropouts in Alberta*. Edmonton: Department of Youth, Research Division.
- Humphrey, Norman Daymond  
1945 "The stereotype and the social types of Mexican-American youths." *Journal of Social Psychology* 22:69-78.
- Huntington, Gertrude E. and John A. Hostetler  
1966 "A note on nursing practices in an American isolate with a high birth rate." *Population Studies* 19 (March):321-24.

- Hyman, Herbert H. and Paul B. Sheatsley  
 1954 "The current status of American public opinion." Pp. 33-48 in Daniel Katz, Dorwin Cartwright, Samuel Eldersveldt, and Alfred McClung Lee (eds.), *Public Opinion and Propaganda*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Ichheiser, G.  
 1947 "Projection and the mote-beam mechanism." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 42:131-33.
- Janowitz, Morris  
 1968 *Social Control of Escalated Riots*. Chicago: University of Chicago Center for Policy Study.
- Jensen, Arthur R.  
 1969 "How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement?" *Harvard Educational Review* 39 (Winter):1-123.
- Jones, Edward E. and John W. Thibault  
 1958 "Interaction goals as bases of inference in interpersonal perception." Pp. 151-78 in Renato Taguiri and Luigi Petrullo (eds.), *Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kalbach, W. E. and W. W. McVey, Jr.  
 1967 "The Ukrainian population in Canada and Alberta since World War I." Pp. 98-155 in C. W. Hobart, *et al., op. cit.*
- Kaplan, Bert and Thomas F. A. Plaut  
 1956 *Personality in a Communal Society*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Publication.
- Karlins, Marvin, Thomas L. Coffmann, and Gary Walters  
 1969 "On the fading of social stereotypes: Studies in three generations of college students." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 13:1-16.
- Katz, Daniel  
 1960 "The functional approach to the study of attitudes." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 24:163-204.
- Katz, Daniel and Kenneth W. Braly  
 1933 "Racial stereotypes of 100 college students." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 28:280-90.
- 1935 "Racial prejudice and racial stereotypes." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 30:175-93.

- Katz, Daniel and Kenneth W. Braly  
 1958 "Racial stereotypes and racial prejudice." Pp. 40-46 in E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology*, 3rd edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kaye, V. J.  
 1966 "Three phases of Ukrainian immigration." Pp. 36-43 in *Proceedings of the First National Conference on Canadian Slavs, Slavs in Canada*. Edmonton: The Inter-University Committee on Canadian Slavs.
- Kellner, P. J.  
 1966 "Canadian Slavs through the mirror of their press." Pp. 148-53 in *Proceedings . . . Canada, ibid.*
- Kephart, W. M.  
 1954 "Negro visibility." *American Sociological Review* 19:462-67.
- Kerr, Madeline  
 1943 "An experimental investigation of national stereotypes." *Sociological Review* 35:37-43.
- Kerr, Clark, John T. Dunlop, Frederick Harbison, and Charles A. Myers  
 1964 *Industrialism and Industrial Man*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Key, V. O. with assistance of Milton C. Cummings, Jr.  
 1966 *The Responsible Electorate: Rationality in Presidential Voting, 1936-1960*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Klein, Viola  
 1950 "The stereotype of femininity." *Journal of Social Issues* 6:3-12.
- Klineberg, Otto  
 1944 *Characteristics of the American Negro*. New York: Harper.  
 1950 *Tensions Affecting International Understanding*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Klymasz, Robert B.  
 1966 "The case for Slavic folklore in Canada." Pp. 110-20 in *Proceedings . . . Canada, op. cit.*
- Koenig, Frederick W. and Morton B. King  
 1964 "Cognitive simplicity and out-group stereotyping." *Social Forces* 42:324-27.

- Kohn, Robert  
1965 The Health of the Canadian People. Royal Commission on Health Services. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Kuhn, Manford H. and Thomas S. McPartland  
1954 "An empirical investigation of self-attitudes." American Sociological Review 19:68-76.
- Kusonoki, K.  
1936 "Mental characteristics of the Japanese race as seen by Japanese and American students." Japanese Journal of Applied Psychology 4:232-37.
- Lambert, Wallace E. and Otto Klineberg  
1967 Children's Views of Foreign Peoples. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- La Piere, Richard T.  
1930 "The Armenian colony in Fresno County, California: A study in social psychology." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.  
1936 "Type-rationalizations of group antipathy." Social Forces 15:232-37.
- Lashuk, Maureen G. L.  
1970 "Effects of role conflict on employed mothers: An empirical investigation and a sociology of knowledge interpretation of its study." Unpublished master's thesis, The University of Calgary.
- La Violette, Forrest and K. H. Silvert  
1951 "A theory of stereotypes." Social Forces 29:257-62.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F.  
1959 "Latent structure analysis." In S. Koch (ed.), Psychology: A Study of a Science, Volume 3. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lefford, A.  
1946 "The influence of emotional subject matter on logical reasoning." Journal of General Psychology 34:127-51.
- Lenski, G.  
1961 The Religious Factor: A Sociological Study of Religion's Impact on Politics, Economics and Family Life. New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Liebow, Elliot  
1967 Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.



- Lindzey, G. and S. Rogolsky  
 1950 "Prejudice and identification of minority group membership." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 45:37-53.
- Lippmann, Walter  
 1922 *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.  
 1953 "Stereotypes." Pp. 61-69 in Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz (eds.), *Reader in Public Opinion and Communication*. New York: Free Press.
- Lobb, Harold O. and Neil McK. Agnew  
 1953 *The Hutterites and Saskatchewan: A Study of Inter-Group Relations*. Regina: Canadian Mental Health Association.
- Lorenz, Konrad  
 1966 *On Aggression*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Mackie, Marlene  
 1965 "The defector from the Hutterite colony." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta at Calgary.
- Malinowski, B.  
 1944 *A Scientific Theory of Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Mange, Arthur P.  
 1964 "Growth and Inbreeding of a human isolate." *Human Biology* 36 (May):104-33.
- Mayer, A. J. and H. Sharp  
 1962 "Religious preference and worldly success." *American Sociological Review* 27:218-27.
- McDavid, John W. and Herbert Harari  
 1968 *Social Psychology*. New York: Harper and Row.
- McDonald, Lynn  
 1969 "Crime and punishment in Canada: A statistical test of the 'conventional wisdom.'" *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 6 (November): 212-36.
- McGrath, W. T.  
 1968 *Report of the Alberta Penology Study*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Meehl, P. E.  
 1965 "Seer over sign: The first good example." *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality* 1:27-32.

- Meenes, M.  
1943 "A comparison of racial stereotypes of 1935 and 1942." *Journal of Social Psychology* 17:327-336.
- Meier, Frank A.  
1968 "Letter to the editor." *Science* 161 (September 27):1298.
- Merton, Robert  
1957 *Social Theory and Social Structure*, revised edition. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Metis Association of Alberta  
1969 *Metis Study Tour*. Mimeographed paper, Edmonton: Department of Youth.
- Miller, Delbert C.  
1964 *Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement*. New York: David McKay.
- Moore, Wilbert E. and Melvin M. Tumin  
1949 "Some social functions of ignorance." *American Sociological Review* 14:787-95.
- Morgan, J. B. and J. T. Morton  
1944 "The distortion of syllogistic reasoning produced by personal conviction." *Journal of Social Psychology* 20:39-59.
- Morlan, G. K.  
1950 "An experiment in the identification of body odor." *Journal of Genetic Psychology* 77:257-65.
- Moynihan, Daniel P.  
1968 "Sources of resistance to the Coleman Report." *Harvard Educational Review* 38:23-36.
- Murphy, Gardner and Rensis Likert  
1938 *Public Opinion and the Individual*. New York: Harper.
- Myrdal, G.  
1944 *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York: Harper.
- Native Alliance for Red Power  
1970 "NARP newsletter." Pp. 64-65 in Norman Sheffe (ed.), *Issues for the Seventies: Canada's Indians*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.
- Nettler, Gwynn  
1945 "A test for the sociology of knowledge." *American Sociological Review* 10:393-99.

- Nettler, Gwynn  
 1946 "The relationship between attitude and information concerning the Japanese in America." *American Sociological Review* 11:177-91.
- 1961 "Good men, bad men, and the perception of reality." *Sociometry* 24 (September):279-94.
- 1968 "Using our heads." *The American Sociologist* 3 (August):200-07.
- 1970 *Explanations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Newcomb, Theodore M.  
 1950 *Social Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Newman, Morton  
 1967 *Community Opportunity Assessment, Appendix F. Indians of the Saddle Lake Reserve*. Edmonton: Human Resources Research and Development, Executive Council.
- Oakes, R. H. and R. J. Corsini  
 1961 "Social perceptions of one other self." *Journal of Social Psychology* 53:235-42.
- Olmsted, D. W.  
 1962 "The accuracy of the impressions of survey interviewers." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 25:635-47.
- Oppenheim, A. N.  
 1966 *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement*. New York: Basic Books.
- Osgood, C. E., G. J. Suci, and P. H. Tannenbaum  
 1958 *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Peabody, Dean  
 1968 "Group judgments in the Philippines: Evaluative and descriptive aspects." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 10:290-300.
- Peter, Karl  
 1963 "The Hutterites: Values, status, and organizational systems." *Variables* 2 (February):55-59.
- 1964 "The Hutterites: Values, status, and organizational systems." *Variables* 3 (February):7-8.
- 1966 "Toward a demographic theory of Hutterite population growth." *Variables* 5 (Spring):28-37.

- Peters, Victor  
 1965 All Things Common: The Hutterian Way of Life. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F.  
 1958 "Personality and sociocultural factors in inter-group attitudes: A cross-national comparison." Journal of Conflict Resolution 11:29-42.  
 1964 A Profile of the Negro American. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- Popham, Robert E. and Wolfgang Schmidt  
 1958 Statistics of Alcohol Use and Alcoholism in Canada 1871-1956. Alcoholism Research Foundation. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Porter, John  
 1965 The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Prentice, Norman M.  
 1957 "The influence of ethnic attitudes on reasoning about ethnic groups." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 55:270-72.
- Prothro, E. T.  
 1954a "Cross-cultural patterns of national stereotypes." Journal of Social Psychology 40:53-59.  
 1954b "Lebanese stereotypes of America as revealed by the sentence completion technique." Journal of Social Psychology 40:39-42.
- Prothro, E. T. and J. D. Keehn  
 1957 "Stereotypes and semantic space." Journal of Social Psychology 45:197-209.
- Prothro, E. T. and L. Melikian  
 1955 "Studies of stereotypes: V. familiarity and the kernel of truth hypothesis." Journal of Social Psychology 41:3-10.
- Prothro, E. T. and Otha King Miles  
 1952 "A comparison of ethnic attitudes of college students and middle class adults from the same state." Journal of Social Psychology 36:53-58.
- Province of Alberta  
 1959 Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.

- Rasky, Frank  
1970 "You're a good man, Charlie Squash." Canadian Magazine (April 18):26-29.
- Reigrotski, Erich and Nels Anderson  
1959 "National stereotypes and foreign contacts." Public Opinion Quarterly 23:515-28.
- Rice, S. A.  
1928 Quantitative Methods in Politics. New York: Knopf.
- Richey, M. H., L. McClelland, and A. M. Shimkunas  
1967 "Relative influence of positive and negative information in impression formation and persistence." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 6:322-27.
- Richter, Maurice  
1956 "The conceptual mechanism of stereotyping." American Sociological Review 21:568-71.
- Rose, Edward  
1960 "The English record of a natural sociology." American Sociological Review 25:193-208.
- Rosen, Bernard C.  
1956 "The achievement syndrome: A psychocultural dimension of social stratification." American Sociological Review 21 (April):203-11.  
1959 "Race, ethnicity and the achievement syndrome." American Sociological Review 24:47-60.
- Rosenthal, R.  
1966 Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Rosenthal, Robert and Lenore Jacobson  
1968 Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Rossi, Alice S.  
1970 "Status of women in graduate departments of sociology, 1968-1969." The American Sociologist 5:1-12.
- Sanders, Douglas E.  
1964 "The Hutterites: A case study in minority rights." The Canadian Bar Review 42 (May):225-42.
- Sauve, Clayton  
1969 Theoretical Considerations for Socio-Economic Development Among Native Peoples. Edmonton: Human Resources Development Authority.

- Schafer, Walter E. and J. Michael Armer  
1968 "Athletes are not inferior students." *Transaction* 6:21-26.
- Schneider, Louis  
1962 "The role of the category of ignorance in sociological theory: An exploratory statement." *American Sociological Review* 27:492-508.
- Schoenfeld, N.  
1942 "An experimental study of some problems relating to stereotypes." *Archives of Psychology* 270.
- Schonbar, Rosalea Ann  
1949 "Students' attitudes toward communists: I. the relation between intensity of attitude and amount of information." *Journal of Psychology* 27:55-71.
- Schuman, Howard  
1966 "Social change and the validity of regional stereotypes in East Pakistan." *Sociometry* 29:428-40.
- Schutz, Alfred  
1963 "Concept and theory formation in the social sciences." Pp. 231-49 in Maurice Natanson (ed.), *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*. New York: Random House.
- Science  
1968 Volume 162 (October 11):243.
- Scodel, A. and H. Austrin  
1957 "The perception of Jewish photography by non-Jews and Jews." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 54:278-80.
- Seago, Dorothy W.  
1947 "Stereotypes: Before Pearl Harbor and after." *Journal of Psychology* 23:55-63.
- Secord, P. F.  
1959 "Stereotyping and favorableness in the perception of Negro faces." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 59:309-15.
- Secord, P. F. and C. W. Backman  
1964 *Social Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Seeley, John R.  
1964 "Crestwood Heights: Intellectual and libidinal dimensions of research." Pp. 157-206 in Arthur J. Vidich, Joseph Bensman, and Maurice R. Stein (eds.), *Reflections on Community Studies*. New York: Wiley.

- Serl, Vernon C.  
1964 "Stability and change in Hutterite society." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Sharplin, C. D.  
1964 The Indian Alcoholic: His Social Characteristics. Mimeographed paper, Edmonton: Alcoholism Foundation of Alberta.
- Sheps, Mindel C.  
1965 "An analysis of reproductive patterns in an American isolate." Population Studies 19 (July):65-80.
- Sherif, M. S. and H. C. Cantril  
1947 The Psychology of Ego-Involvement. New York: Wiley.
- Sherif, M. S. and Carl I. Hovland  
1961 Social Judgment. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sherif, M. S. and Carolyn W. Sherif  
1953 Groups in Harmony and Tension: An Integration of Studies in Intergroup Relations. New York: Harper.
- Shibutani, Tamotsu  
1966 Improvised News: A Sociological Study of Rumor. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Shor, J.  
1946 "Report on a verbal projective technique." Journal of Clinical Psychology 2:279-82.
- Shosteck, R.  
1957 The Jewish College Student: Report of the Third Decennial Census of Jewish College Students in the United States and Canada with Comparative Data from Earlier Censuses. Washington: B'nai B'rith Vocational Service.
- Shuey, A. M.  
1958 The Testing of Negro Intelligence. Lynchburg, Virginia: J. P. Bell.
- Shuey, A. M., N. King, and B. Griffith  
1953 "Stereotyping of Negroes and whites: An analysis of magazine pictures." Public Opinion Quarterly 17:281-87.

- Silkiner, D. S.  
1962 "A cross-cultural study of the measurement, determinants, and effects of stereotype accuracy." Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University.
- Simmons, J. L.  
1965 "Public stereotypes of deviants." *Social Problems* 13 (Fall):223-32.
- Simpson, George Eaton and J. Milton Yinger  
1958 *Racial and Cultural Minorities*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Singer, Dorothy G.  
1967 "Reading, writing, and race relations." *Transaction* 4 (June):27-31.
- Sinha, A. K. P. and O. P. Upadhyaya  
1960 "Change and persistence in the stereotypes of university students towards different ethnic groups during the Sino-Indian border dispute." *Journal of Social Psychology* 52:31-39.
- Sklare, Marshall (ed.)  
1958 *The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group*. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Slavutych, Yar  
1966 "Slavic literature in Canada." Pp. 92-109 in *Proceedings . . . Canada, op. cit.*
- Smith, M. Brewster, Jerome S. Bruner, and Robert W. White  
1956 *Opinions and Personality*. New York: Wiley.
- Snider, James G.  
1962 "Profiles of some stereotypes held by ninth-grade pupils." *Alberta Journal of Education Research* 8:147-56.
- Solotaroff, Theodore and Marshall Sklare  
1966 "Introduction." In C. H. Stember, George Saloman, and Marshall Sklare, *Jews in the Mind of America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Spaulding, Philip  
1967 "The social integration of a northern community: White mythology and Metis reality." Pp. 90-111 in Arthur K. Davis (ed.), *A Northern Dilemma*. Bellingham: Western Washington State College.
- Special Planning Secretariat  
1965 *Profile of Poverty in Canada*. Mimeographed paper, Ottawa.



- Stagner, R. and C. E. Osgood  
1946 "Impact of war on nationalistic frames of reference: I. changes in general approval and qualitative patterning of certain stereotypes." *Journal of Social Psychology* 24:187-215.
- Star, Shirley A., R. M. Williams, Jr., and S. A. Stouffer  
1965 "Negro infantry platoons in white companies." Pp. 680-85 in H. Proshansky and B. Seidenberg (eds.), *Basic Studies in Social Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Stark, Rodney and Charles Y. Glock  
1968 "Will ethics be the death of Christianity?" *Transaction* 5 (June):7-14.
- Stautland, S.  
1959 "Some correlates and determinants of national stereotypy." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Stelmachers, Z. T. and R. B. McHugh  
1964 "Contribution of stereotyped and individualized information to predictive accuracy." *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 28:234-42.
- Stember, C. H.  
1961 *Education and Attitude Change: The Effects of Schooling on Prejudice Against Minority Groups*. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press.
- Stember, C. H., George Saloman, and Marshall Sklare  
1966 *Jews in the Mind of America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stewart, Omer  
1964 "Questions regarding American Indian criminality." *Human Organization* 23 (Spring):61-66.
- Stone, G. C., G. S. Leavitt, and N. L. Gage  
1957 "Two kinds of accuracy in predicting another's response." *Journal of Social Psychology* 45:245-54.
- Sullivan, Patrick L. and Joseph Adelson  
1954 "Ethnocentrism and misanthropy." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 49:246-50.
- Sydiaha, D. and J. Rempel  
1964 "Motivational and attitudinal characteristics of Indian school children as measured by the thematic apperception test." *The Canadian Psychologist* 5 (July):139-48.

- Taft, Ronald  
1955 "The ability to judge people." Psychological Bulletin 52:1-23.
- Taguiri, Renato  
1958 "Introduction." Pp. ix-xvii in Renato Taguiri and Luigi Petrullo (eds.), Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Tajfel, H., A. A. Sheikh, and R. C. Gardner  
1964 "Content of stereotypes and the influence of similarity between members of stereotyped groups." Acta Psychologica 22:191-201.
- Thielbar, Gerald and Saul D. Feldman  
1969 "Occupational stereotypes and prestige." Social Forces 48 (September):64-72.
- Thistlethwaite, D. L.  
1950 "Attitude and structure as factors in the distortion of reasoning." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 45:442-58.
- Thomas, W. I.  
1928 The Child in America. New York: Knopf.
- Thorndike, Robert L.  
1968 Book Review of Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson, Pygmalion in the Classroom. American Educational Research Journal 5:708-11.
- Thornton, G. R.  
1944 "The effect of wearing glasses upon judgments of personality traits of persons seen briefly." Journal of Applied Psychology 28:203-07.
- Triandis, Harry C. and Vasso Vassiliou  
1967 "Frequency of contact and stereotyping." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 7:316-28.
- Van Baal, J.  
1960 "Erring acculturation." American Anthropologist 62 (February):108-21.
- Van den Berghe, Pierre L.  
1966 "Checklists versus open ended questions: A comment on 'a brief report on the methodology of stereotype research.'" Social Forces 44:418-19.
- Veroff, J., Sheila Feld, and G. Gurin  
1962 "Achievement motivation and religious background." American Sociological Review 27:205-17.

- Vinacke, W. Edgar  
 1949 "Stereotyping among national-racial groups in Hawaii: A study in ethnocentrism." *Journal of Social Psychology* 30:265-91.
- 1956 "Explorations in the dynamic processes of stereotyping." *Journal of Social Psychology* 43:105-32.
- 1957 "Stereotypes as social concepts." *Journal of Social Psychology* 46:229-43.
- Wangenheim, E. D.  
 1966 "Problems of research on Ukrainians in Eastern Canada." Pp. 44-53 in *Proceedings . . . Canada, op. cit.*
- 1968 "The Ukrainians: A case study of the 'third force.'" Pp. 178-90 in W. E. Mann, *Canada: A Sociological Profile*. Toronto: Copp Clark.
- Wax, Rosalie and Murray Wax  
 1968 "Indian education for what?" Pp. 163-69 in Stuart Levine and Nancy O. Lurie (eds.), *The American Indian Today*. De Land, Florida: Everett Edwards.
- Webb, E. J., D. T. Campbell, D. Schwartz, and L. Sechrest  
 1966 *Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Weller, Leonard  
 1964 "The relationship of personality and nonpersonality factors to prejudice." *Journal of Social Psychology* 63:129-37.
- Yoshino, Roger  
 1959 "The stereotype of the Negro and his high-priced car." *Sociology and Social Research* 44:112-18.
- Yuzyk, Paul  
 1967 *Ukrainian Canadians: Their Place and Role in Canadian Life*. Toronto: Ukrainian Canadian Business and Professional Federation.
- Zawadzki, Bohdan  
 1948 "Limitations of the scapegoat theory of prejudice." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 43:127-41.
- Zentner, Henry  
 1967 "The pre-machine ethic of the Athabaskan-speaking Indians: Avenue or barrier to assimilation?" Pp. 69-89 in Arthur K. Davis (ed.), *A Northern Dilemma*. Bellingham: Western Washington State College.

Zetterberg, Hans L.  
1965 On Theory and Verification in Sociology. Totowa,  
New Jersey: Bedminster Press.

**APPENDIX A**

**DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE**

### Discussion of Sample Characteristics

The primary purpose for measuring the stereotypes of people located in existing groups was to expand the scope of the sample beyond the usual university student samples. Although the aim was not representativeness, the comparison of sample characteristics with Edmonton census distributions makes explicit possible limitations to the generalizability of the results of this research. To facilitate such comparison, the questionnaire adopted the same question phraseology and category boundaries as that employed by the census. Unfortunately, the 1961 census is somewhat out-dated.

As compared with the census distribution, the study sample overrepresents the younger age categories, particularly those 15 to 19 years old (Table A.1). (It should be noted that most people in this category are 18 or 19 years of age.) The sample underrepresents those in the older age groups, and the older people tested are from the higher education and socioeconomic status levels (Tables A.14 and A.17). The sex ratios for the 25 to 49 and 50 to 69 age categories are reasonably congruent with those for the Edmonton area. However, the 15 to 24 age category overrepresents females by a factor of four to one (Table A.2). The young females are primarily nursing and nursing-aide students. A protracted attempt to rectify this imbalance by locating young males, particularly from the lower socioeconomic levels, proved unsuccessful. Apparently, these

people do not affiliate with noneducational organizations in large numbers.

As Table A.3 demonstrates, the study sample contains more than twice the proportion of people with some university education than was the case in the 1961 Alberta population. Nevertheless, 78% of the study sample is composed of people who would not be caught up in the usual university student testing pool. The occupational distribution reflects the educational level of the sample. It contains 38% in the two highest census occupational classifications, managerial, and professional and technical, as compared to 22% in the 1961 city population (Table A.4). The two lowest categories (craftsmen, production process workers and laborers) include 26% of the city population but only 19% of the study sample (Table A.4). This imbalance becomes even more obvious when one compares the sample distribution of occupations classified by the Blishen (1967) socioeconomic scale with Blishen's (1967:52) estimation of the 1961 provincial distribution (Table A.5). Such occupational comparisons are complicated by the fact that 77 people were dependents of farmers (Tables A.15, A.16, A.17). Since the pretest sample did not contain people of rural background and the study was carried out in the city, this result was unanticipated. Therefore, the questionnaire did not include those questions necessary to reliably classify farmers according to socioeconomic status. The farmers are dealt with as a separate subsample throughout the analysis.

The sample distributions of ethnicity (Table A.6) and religious denomination (Table A.7) are reasonably close to census distributions. The slight overrepresentation of people from the British Isles and of both Protestants and agnostics probably reflects the larger numbers of people from higher socioeconomic levels.

The questions on place of nativity (Table A.9), length of Alberta residence (Table A.10) and length of Edmonton residence (Table A.11) were included to assess whether the people describing Alberta ethnic groups against a comparative base of the province as a whole had had the experience to do so. Since 81% of the sample had lived in Alberta 11 years or longer, they have presumably had sufficient opportunity for exposure to the prevalent views about the province's ethnic groups.

Finally, respondents were asked to list those voluntary associations in which they hold membership. As Table A.8 shows, membership in the various types of organizations involves 20% or less of the sample. The largest number hold membership in "School Groups," which includes the community league playschool mothers associations discussed in Chapter 3.

One may conclude that the attempt to locate people not ordinarily found in university student samples or voluntary associations was successful.



TABLE A.1. AGE DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE,  
COMPARED WITH 1966 CENSUS  
FOR EDMONTON AREA

Age Category	Total Edmonton Metro*	Percent Total Edmonton Pop. 15-69	Total Sample	Percent Total Sample 15-69
15-19	34,254	13.8	153	26.2
20-24	32,845	13.3	116	19.9
25-29	29,058	11.7	74	12.7
30-34	28,564	11.5	73	12.5
35-39	28,025	11.3	45	7.7
40-44	25,451	10.3	37	6.3
45-49	20,482	8.3	25	4.3
50-54	17,087	6.9	19	3.3
55-59	13,439	5.4	19	3.3
60-64	10,542	4.3	8	1.4
65-69	7,924	3.2	14	2.4
	247,671	100.0	583	100.0

  

Age Category	Open-Ended Sample	Percent Open-Ended	Semantic Differential Sample	Percent Semantic Differential
15-19	78	26.5	75	26.0
20-24	53	18.0	63	21.8
25-29	41	13.9	33	11.4
30-34	35	11.9	38	13.1
35-39	24	8.2	21	7.3
40-44	22	7.5	15	5.2
45-49	13	4.4	12	4.1
50-54	7	2.4	12	4.1
55-59	9	3.1	10	3.5
60-64	4	1.4	4	1.4
65-69	8	2.7	6	2.1
	294	100.0	289	100.0

  

Age Category	Percent Total Edmonton Population	Percent Total Sample	Percent Open-Ended	Percent Semantic Differential
15-24	27.1	46.1	44.5	47.8
25-49	53.1	43.5	45.9	41.1
50-69	19.8	10.4	9.6	11.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

\*Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1966:Catalogue 92-610, table 23).

TABLE A.2. AGE DISTRIBUTION BY SEX CATEGORIES,  
COMPARED WITH 1966 CENSUS FOR  
EDMONTON METROPOLITAN AREA

Age Category	Edmonton Metro*		Edmonton Metro*	
	#	%	#	%
15-19	16,429	48.0	17,825	52.0
20-24	15,136	46.1	17,709	53.9
25-29	14,264	49.1	14,794	50.9
30-34	14,497	50.8	14,067	49.2
35-39	14,428	51.5	13,597	48.5
40-44	12,726	50.0	12,725	50.0
45-49	10,176	49.7	10,306	50.3
50-54	8,520	49.9	8,567	50.1
55-59	6,753	50.3	6,686	49.7
60-64	5,252	49.8	5,290	50.2
65-69	3,825	48.3	4,099	51.7

  

Age Category	Total Sample Males		Total Sample Females	
	#	%	#	%
15-19	14	9.2	139	90.8
20-24	37	31.9	79	68.1
25-29	29	39.2	45	60.8
30-34	38	52.1	35	47.9
35-39	31	68.9	14	31.1
40-44	17	45.9	20	54.1
45-49	18	72.0	7	28.0
50-54	13	68.4	6	31.6
55-59	13	68.4	6	31.6
60-64	4	50.0	4	50.0
65-69	4	28.6	10	71.4
	218		365	

  

Age Category	Average Percent Males	Average Percent Females
15-24	20.5	79.5
25-49	55.6	44.4
50-69	53.8	46.2

\*Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1966:Catalogue 92-610,  
table 23).

TABLE A.3. EDUCATION LEVEL OF SAMPLE,  
 COMPARED WITH 1961 CENSUS  
 FOR EDMONTON AREA

	Total Edmonton Population 15 Years of Age and Older & Not Attending School*	2 Years High School or Less	3-5 Years High School	Some University	Univer- sity Degree
#	200,511	112,851	70,027	8,974	9,181
%	100.1	56.2	34.8	4.5	4.6
Total Sample 15 Years of Age and Older					
#	588	178	279	79	52
%	100.0	30.3	47.5	13.4	8.8
Semantic Differential Sample, 15 Years of Age and Older					
#	290	89	133	44	24
%	100.0	30.7	45.9	15.2	8.3
Open-Ended Questionnaire Sample 15 Years of Age and Older					
#	298	89	146	35	28
%	100.1	29.9	49.0	11.7	9.4

\*Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961:Catalogue 92-557,  
 table 105.

TABLE A.4. OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE,  
COMPARED WITH 1961 CENSUS FOR EDMONTON AREA

Census Occupational Classification	Percent Edmonton*	Total Sample**	
		#	%
Managerial	9.7	94	15.9
Professional & Technical	12.3	129	21.9
Clerical	17.3	31	5.3
Sales	8.5	55	9.3
Service, Recreation	14.6	45	7.6
Transport, Communication	7.1	22	3.7
Farming	1.3	77	13.1
Loggermen	0.05	0	0.0
Fishermen, Trappers	0.01	1	0.2
Miners	0.6	4	0.7
Craftsmen, Production Proc.	21.5	93	15.8
Laborers, n.e.s.	4.5	16	2.7
Not stated	2.5	8	1.4
Unclassifiable	-	15	2.5
	100.0	590	100.1

  

Census Occupational Classification	Semantic Differential**		Open-Ended Questionnaire**	
	#	%	#	%
Managerial	41	14.1	53	17.7
Professional & Technical	64	22.1	65	21.7
Clerical	15	5.2	16	5.3
Sales	29	10.0	26	8.7
Service, Recreation	24	8.3	21	7.0
Transport, Communication	13	4.5	9	3.0
Farming	41	14.1	36	12.0
Loggermen	0	0.0	0	0.0
Fishermen, Trappers	0	0.0	1	0.3
Miners	1	0.3	3	1.0
Craftsmen, Prod. Proc.	43	14.8	50	16.7
Laborers, n.e.s.	7	2.4	9	3.0
Not stated	4	1.4	4	1.3
Unclassifiable	8	2.8	7	2.3
	290	100.0	300	100.0

\*Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961:Bulletin 3.1.1,  
table 3.

\*\*Dependents classified by male breadwinner's occupation.

TABLE A.5. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF SAMPLE,  
CLASSIFIED BY BLISHEN INDEX

Blishen* S.E.S. Index	1961 Alberta** Distribution		Total Sample***		Semantic Differential		Open-Ended	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
70+	5	69	14.3	37	16.0	32	12.7	
60-69.99	4	49	10.2	25	10.8	24	9.6	
50-59.99	10	113	23.4	47	20.3	66	26.3	
40-49.99	20	99	20.5	57	24.7	42	16.7	
30-39.99	29	111	23.0	48	20.8	63	25.1	
0-29.99	33	41	8.5	17	7.4	24	9.6	
	101	482	99.9	231	100.0	251	100.0	

\*Source: Blishen (1967:41-53).

\*\*Source: Blishen (1967:52).

\*\*\*N excludes 8 people who did not state their occupation, 23 whose answer was unclassifiable, and 77 farmers.

TABLE A.6. ETHNIC ORIGIN OF SAMPLE, COMPARED WITH 1961  
ALBERTA CENSUS DISTRIBUTION

Ethnic Origin	1961 Alberta*		Total Sample		Semantic Differential		Open-Ended	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
British Isles	45.2	298	50.5	145	50.0	153	51.0	
French	6.3	18	3.1	7	2.4	11	3.7	
German	13.8	58	9.8	25	8.6	33	11.0	
Italian	1.1	1	0.2	1	0.3	0	0.0	
Jewish	0.3	2	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	
Netherlands	4.2	10	1.7	4	1.4	6	2.0	
Polish	3.0	11	1.9	8	2.8	3	1.0	
Russian	1.3	9	1.5	4	1.4	5	1.7	
Scandinavian	7.2	34	5.8	18	6.2	16	5.4	
Ukrainian	8.0	61	10.3	29	10.0	32	10.7	
Other Europ.	5.4	11	1.9	7	2.4	4	1.3	
Asiatic	0.9	2	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	
Other & Not Stated	3.3	75	12.7	40	13.8	35	11.7	
	100.0	590	100.0	290	99.9	300	100.1	

\*Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961:Catalogue 99-516,  
table 4).

TABLE A.7. DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY  
RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS, COMPARED  
WITH 1961 EDMONTON CENSUS

Denomination	% 1961		Total Sample		Semantic Differential		Open-Ended	
	Edmonton*	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Anglican	12.3	78	13.4	39	13.6	39	13.3	
Baptist	3.4	24	4.1	11	3.8	13	4.4	
Greek Orth.	5.1	15	2.6	7	2.4	8	2.7	
Jewish	0.7	2	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	
Lutheran	8.6	43	7.4	15	5.2	28	9.6	
Presbyterian	3.9	23	4.0	12	4.2	11	3.8	
Rom. Catholic	23.2	94	16.2	49	17.1	45	15.4	
Uk(Grk) Cath.	3.2	12	2.1	6	2.1	6	2.1	
United	31.2	191	32.9	103	35.9	88	30.0	
Others	8.3	45	7.8	22	7.7	23	7.8	
None	-	17	2.9	8	2.8	9	3.1	
Atheist, Agnostic	-	36	6.2	14	4.9	22	7.5	
	99.9	580	99.9	287	100.0	293	100.0	

\*Dominion Bureau of Statistics (1961:Bulletin 7.1-11, table 6).

TABLE A.8. VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP

Type of Organization	Semantic Differential N = 290		Open-Ended N = 300	
	#	%	#	%
Service Clubs	30	10.3	44	14.7
Professional Organs.	55	19.0	49	16.3
Labor Unions	10	3.4	12	4.0
Athletic Organizations	35	12.1	51	17.0
School Groups	59	20.3	61	20.3
Lodges, Fraternal Orgs.	23	7.9	23	7.7
Religious Organizations	34	11.7	37	12.3
Veterans' Organizations	20	6.9	26	8.7
Social Clubs	50	17.2	44	14.7
Miscellaneous Orgs.	27	9.3	26	8.7

TABLE A.9. PLACE OF NATIVITY

	Semantic Differential		Open-Ended	
	#	%	#	%
Canadian-born	253	87.5	248	82.9
Foreign-born, in Canada 11 years or longer	28	9.7	36	12.0
Foreign-born, in Canada 6-10 years	2	0.7	3	1.0
Foreign-born, in Canada 1-5 years	6	2.1	11	3.7
Foreign-born, in Canada less than 1 year	0	0.0	1	0.3
	289	100.0	299	99.9

TABLE A.10. LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

	Semantic Differential		Open-Ended	
	#	%	#	%
11 years or longer	236	81.9	242	81.2
6-10 years	17	5.9	13	4.4
1-5 years	25	8.7	29	9.7
Less than 1 year	10	3.5	14	4.7
	288	100.0	298	100.0

TABLE A.11. LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN THE CITY OF EDMONTON

	Semantic Differential		Open-Ended	
	#	%	#	%
11 years or longer	137	47.7	140	47.0
6-10 years	29	10.1	35	11.7
1-5 years	63	22.0	70	23.5
Less than 1 year	58	20.2	53	17.8
	287	100.0	298	100.0

TABLE A.12. AGE DISTRIBUTION BY SEX

Age	<u>Semantic Differential</u>				Total
	Males		Females		
15-24 years	25	18.1% 23.8%	113	81.9% 61.1%	138
25-49 years	60	50.4% 57.1%	59	49.6% 31.9%	119
50 years and over	20	60.6% 19.0%	13	39.4% 7.0%	33
	<hr/> 105		<hr/> 185		<hr/> 290
		<u>Open-Ended</u>			
15-24 years	26	19.8% 22.4%	105	80.2% 57.4%	131
25-49 years	73	54.1% 62.9%	62	45.9% 33.9%	135
50 years and over	17	51.5% 14.7%	16	48.5% 8.7%	33
	<hr/> 116		<hr/> 183		<hr/> 299



TABLE A.13. NUMERICAL DISTRIBUTION OF HIGHEST LEVEL  
OF EDUCATION COMPLETED, BY AGE AND SEX CATEGORIES

	<u>Semantic Differential</u>							
	15-24		25-49		50 & over		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	#	%
Grades 1-6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0.7
Grades 7-8	0	0	2	2	4	0	8	2.8
Grades 9-11	6	29	12	27	3	2	79	27.2
Comp. High School	12	80	17	19	2	3	133	45.9
Some University	7	4	19	5	5	4	44	15.2
University Graduates	0	0	9	5	6	4	24	8.3
N.I.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0
	25	113	60	59	20	13	290	100.1
	<u>Open-Ended</u>							
Grades 1-6	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.3
Grades 7-8	0	1	3	1	2	0	7	2.3
Grades 9-11	6	21	21	23	4	6	81	27.0
Comp. High School	18	80	20	22	5	2	147	49.0
Some University	3	3	16	6	3	4	35	11.7
University Graduates	0	0	13	9	3	3	28	9.3
N.I.	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.3
	27	105	73	61	17	16	300	99.9

TABLE A.14. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED,  
BY AGE AND SEX CATEGORIES

	<u>Semantic Differential</u>										Total #	%		
	15-24 Years		25-49 Years		50 Years & Over		Total		#	%				
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females						
2 Yrs. or less h.s.	6	21.4% 24.0%	29	47.5% 25.7%	15	53.6% 25.0%	30	49.2% 50.8%	7	25.0% 35.0%	2	3.3% 15.4%	89	30.7
3-5 Yrs. h.s.	12	38.7% 48.0%	80	78.4% 70.8%	17	54.8% 28.3%	19	18.6% 32.2%	2	6.5% 10.0%	3	2.9% 23.1%	133	45.9
1 or more yrs. univ.	7	15.2% 28.0%	4	18.2% 3.5%	28	60.9% 46.7%	10	45.5% 16.9%	11	23.9% 55.0%	8	36.4% 61.5%	68	23.4
	25	113	60	59	20	13	300	100.0						
	<u>Open-Ended</u>													
2 Yrs. or less h.s.	5	14.3% 19.2%	22	41.5% 21.0%	24	68.6% 32.9%	24	45.3% 39.3%	6	17.1% 35.3%	7	13.2% 43.8%	88	29.5
3-5 Yrs. h.s.	18	41.9% 69.2%	80	76.9% 76.2%	20	46.5% 27.4%	22	21.2% 36.1%	5	11.6% 29.4%	2	1.9% 12.5%	147	49.3
1 or more yrs. univ.	3	7.9% 11.5%	3	12.0% 2.9%	29	76.3% 39.7%	15	60.0% 24.6%	6	15.8% 35.3%	7	28.0% 43.8%	63	21.1
	26	105	73	61	17	16	298	99.9						

TABLE A.15. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS BY SEX CATEGORIES

Blishen S.E.S. Scale	<u>Semantic Differential</u>				Total
	Males		Females		
Unclassifiable	8	57.1% 7.8	6	42.9% 3.3	14
Farmers	1	2.4 1.0	40	97.6 21.9	41
70+	11	29.7 10.7	26	70.3 14.2	37
60-69.99	19	76.0 18.4	6	24.0 3.3	25
50-59.99	23	48.9 22.3	24	51.1 13.1	47
40-49.99	20	35.1 19.4	37	64.9 20.2	57
30-39.99	15	31.3 14.6	33	68.8 18.0	48
0-29.99	6	35.3 5.8	11	64.7 6.0	17
	<u>103</u>		<u>183</u>		<u>286</u>
		<u>Open-Ended</u>			
Unclassifiable	5	55.6% 4.3	4	44.4% 2.2	9
Farmers	6	16.7 5.2	30	83.3 16.6	36
70+	9	28.1 7.8	23	71.9 12.7	32
60-69.99	13	54.2 11.3	11	45.8 6.1	24
50-59.99	31	47.0 27.0	35	53.0 19.3	66
40-49.99	21	50.0 18.3	21	50.0 11.6	42
30-39.99	19	30.2 16.5	44	69.8 24.3	63
0-29.99	11	45.8 9.6	13	54.2 7.2	24
	<u>115</u>		<u>181</u>		<u>296</u>

TABLE A.16. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS BY SEX CATEGORIES

<u>Semantic Differential</u>					
Blishen S.E.S. Scale	Males		Females		Total
Unclassifiable	8	57.1% 7.8	6	42.9% 3.3	14
Farmers	1	2.4 1.0	40	97.6 21.9	41
60+	30	48.4 29.1	32	51.6 17.5	62
40-59.99	43	41.3 41.7	61	58.7 33.3	104
Below 39.99	<u>21</u>	32.3 20.4	<u>44</u>	67.7 24.0	<u>65</u>
	103		183		286
<u>Open-Ended</u>					
Unclassifiable	5	55.6% 4.3	4	44.4% 2.2	9
Farmers	6	16.7 5.2	30	83.3 16.6	36
60+	22	39.3 19.1	34	60.7 18.8	56
40-59.99	52	48.1 45.2	56	51.9 30.9	108
Below 39.99	<u>30</u>	34.5 26.1	<u>57</u>	65.5 31.5	<u>87</u>
	115		181		296

TABLE A.17. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS BY AGE CATEGORIES

Blishen SES Scale	<u>Semantic Differential</u>						
	15-24	25-49	50 & Over	Total			
Not Indicated	0	0.0 0.0	1	25.0% 0.8	3	75.0% 9.1	4
Unclassifiable	2	14.3 1.5	10	71.4 8.4	2	14.3 6.1	14
Farmers	40	97.6 29.0	1	2.4 0.8	0	0.0 0.0	41
60+	17	27.4 12.3	29	46.8 24.4	16	25.8 48.5	62
40-59.99	50	48.1 36.2	46	44.2 38.7	8	7.7 24.2	104
Below 39.99	29	44.6 21.0	32	49.2 26.9	4	6.2 12.1	65
	<u>138</u>		<u>119</u>		<u>33</u>		<u>290</u>
		<u>Open-Ended</u>					
Not Indicated	0	0.0 0.0	0	0.0 0.0	4	100.0 12.1	4
Unclassifiable	2	22.2 1.5	6	66.7 4.4	1	11.1 3.0	9
Farmers	33	91.7 25.2	1	2.8 0.7	2	5.5 6.1	36
60+	18	32.1 13.7	28	50.0 20.7	10	17.9 30.3	56
40-59.99	36	33.3 27.5	61	56.5 45.2	11	10.2 33.3	108
Below 39.99	42	48.8 32.1	39	45.4 28.9	5	5.8 15.2	86
	<u>131</u>		<u>135</u>		<u>33</u>		<u>299*</u>

\*One respondent, 14 years of age, has been excluded.

TABLE A.18. SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, BY AGE  
AND SEX CATEGORIES

Blishen SES Scale	<u>Semantic Differential</u>						Total
	<u>15-24</u>		<u>25-49</u>		<u>50 &amp; Over</u>		
	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Not Indicated	0	0	1	0	1	2	4
Unclassifiable	0	2	6	4	2	0	14
Farmers	1	39	0	1	0	0	41
60+	7	10	15	14	8	8	62
40-59.99	9	41	29	17	5	3	104
Below 39.99	8	21	9	23	4	0	65
	25	113	60	59	20	13	290
	<u>Open-Ended</u>						
Not Indicated	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Unclassifiable	1	1	3	3	1	0	9
Farmers	5	28	0	1	1	1	36
60+	2	16	15	13	5	5	56
40-59.99	7	29	38	23	7	4	108
Below 39.99	12	31	17	22	1	4	87
	27	105	73	62	17	16	300

**APPENDIX B**

**INSTRUMENTS**



OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

We are presently conducting a study of the impressions that people have of a number of Alberta groups. Your assistance in carefully filling out this booklet would be very much appreciated.

It is a frank description of your own ideas that is important, so please don't talk over your answers with others around you.

Please do each page in order and don't skip ahead. Please follow the directions as carefully as possible. Our work depends on your serious cooperation.

You will not be asked to give your name. There is no way your answers can later be identified.



## OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

## PART I

## I N S T R U C T I O N S

We are interested in your impressions of "kinds of people." The names of various groups of people appear at the top of each of the following pages. For each group, please write down as many things as you can think of to describe that group. Try to make ten statements about each group.

For example, if the heading were to say AMERICANS, you might describe them as "rich," "loud," "patriotic," or whatever other impressions come to mind.

You may, of course, have no impressions of certain types of persons, in which case you should indicate this. However, we are interested in your immediate and first impression and should appreciate your responding to each page with some comment as to how you ordinarily think of these groupings of persons.

Please work steadily forward, page by page, without looking back at your first impressions written down.

Do not put your name on this. You cannot be identified. Our interest is in your frank feeling about each group.

## OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

One of the following categories appeared at the top of the page, followed by space for its description. The order of presentation of the nine ethnic and nonethnic groups was randomized, with "People Like Me" always appearing on the last page.

In comparison with Albertans generally, most NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS tend to be:

In comparison with Albertans generally, most HUTTERITES tend to be:

In comparison with Albertans generally, most UKRAINIANS tend to be:

In comparison with Albertans generally, most JEWS tend to be:

SCHOOL TEACHERS in general tend to be:

LAWYERS in general tend to be:

WOMEN in general tend to be:

LOWER CLASS PEOPLE tend to be:

OLD PEOPLE in general tend to be:

PEOPLE LIKE ME tend to be:



SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

We are presently conducting a study of the impressions that people have of a number of Alberta groups. Your assistance in carefully filling out this booklet would be very much appreciated.

It is a frank description of your own ideas that is important, so please don't talk over your answers with others around you.

Please do each page in order and don't skip ahead. Please follow the directions as carefully as possible. Our work depends on your serious cooperation.

You will not be asked to give your name. There is no way your answers can later be identified.

## SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

## PART I

I N S T R U C T I O N S

The names of various groups of people appear at the top of each of the following pages of the booklet. We are interested in your impressions of what these groups are like.

Beneath each group-name is a list of characteristics for describing the group, for example, "strong-weak", "passive-active". Between each characteristic and its opposite is a row of boxes.

## HERE IS HOW TO DESCRIBE THE GROUPS:

Take each characteristic in order and consider the extent to which it describes the group. For example:

Let "X" stand for a characteristic and let "Y" stand for its opposite.

"X" 

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

 "Y"

If you feel that the group at the top of the page is extremely "X", place your check-mark in the extreme left-hand box.

"X" 

✓							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

 "Y"

If you feel that the group is extremely "Y", then place your check-mark in the extreme right-hand box:

"X" 

						✓	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

 "Y"

If the group seems to you to be quite "X", then place your check-mark as follows:

"X" 

	✓						
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

 "Y"

(continued over page)

If the group seems to be quite "Y", then place your check-mark here:

"X"						✓		"Y"
-----	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	-----

If you feel that the group is slightly "X", place your check-mark:

"X"			✓					"Y"
-----	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	-----

If it seems to be slightly "Y", then:

"X"					✓			"Y"
-----	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	-----

Finally, if you feel that the group is equally "X" and "Y" or that it is neither "X" nor "Y" (the characteristic doesn't apply to the group being described), then you should place your check-mark in the middle box:

"X"				✓				"Y"
-----	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	-----

A N E X A M P L E: Someone might describe "Americans" as follows:

AMERICANS

patriotic	✓							unpatriotic
poor						✓		rich
quiet					✓			loud
old				✓				young

(continued over page)

In this example, the rater feels that the Americans, as a group, are an extremely patriotic, quite rich people who are slightly loud. On the other hand, both "old" and "young" seem to this person to apply equally to the Americans.

IMPORTANT:

- (1) Be sure to check every characteristic for every group. DO NOT OMIT ANY.
- (2) Never put more than one check-mark in a row of boxes.
- (3) Sometimes you may feel that you are repeating a description you made earlier. This will not be the case, so please don't look back and forth. It is your first impressions, your immediate feelings that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless because we want your true impressions.
- (4) Do not put your name on this. You cannot be identified. Our interest is in your frank feelings about each group.

## SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

One of the following categories appeared at the top of the page, followed by 29 adjectival scales. The order of presentation of the nine ethnic and nonethnic groups was randomized, with "People Like Me" always appearing on the last page.

Categories:

In comparison with Albertans generally, most NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS tend to be:

In comparison with Albertans generally, most HUTTERITES tend to be:

In comparison with Albertans generally, most UKRAINIANS tend to be:

In comparison with Albertans generally, most JEWS tend to be:

SCHOOL TEACHERS in general tend to be:

LAWYERS in general tend to be:

WOMEN in general tend to be:

LOWER CLASS PEOPLE tend to be:

OLD PEOPLE in general tend to be:

PEOPLE LIKE ME tend to be:

Scales:

1. materialistic-not materialistic
2. irreligious-religious
3. old-fashioned-up-to-date
4. ambitious-unambitious
5. rural-urban
6. oppressed by others-not oppressed by others

7. naive in dealing with other groups--shrewd in dealing with other groups
8. contributing to our country's financial resources-a burden upon our country's financial resources
9. disliked by other groups-liked by other groups
10. neglectful of the needs of their children-not to be neglectful of the needs of their children
11. poor-rich
12. drunken-sober
13. not pacifistic-pacifistic
14. likely to have large families-likely to have small families
15. sexually moral-sexually immoral
16. mentally healthy-mentally ill
17. competitive-cooperative
18. lazy-hard working
19. healthy-sick
20. seldom in trouble with the law-often in trouble with the law
21. cliquish-not cliquish
22. not educated-educated
23. self-sufficient-not self-sufficient
24. greedy-generous
25. frivolous with money-thrifty with money
26. physically dirty-physically clean
27. seldom involved in physical fights-often involved in physical fights
28. characterized by unstable marriages-characterized by stable marriages
29. characterized by the belief that it is important to get a university education-characterized by the belief that it is not important to get a university education



PART II

I N S T R U C T I O N S

1. For each race or nationality listed below, put a check mark under each of the relationships in which you would be willing to accept the average member of that race or nationality.
2. Give your reactions to each race or nationality as a group. Do not give your reactions to the best or the worst members you have known but think of the chief picture that you have of the whole group.
3. Remember to give your first feeling reactions in every case.
4. Check as many of the seven columns in each case as your feelings dictate.
5. Please work as rapidly as possible.

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP

GROUPS	To close kinship by marriage	To my club as personal chums	To my street as neighbors	To employment in my occupation	To citizenship in my country	As visitors only to my country	Would exclude from my country
Americans (U.S. white)							
British (Irish, Scots)							
Canadians							
Chinese							
Dutch							
Eskimos							
French							
French-Canadians							
Germans							
Hungarians							

(continued over page)

## DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP

GROUPS	To close kinship by marriage	To my club as personal chums	To my street as neighbors	To employment in my occupation	To citizenship in my country	As visitors only to my country	Would exclude from my country
Hutterites							
Indians (India)							
Indians (N.American)							
Italians							
Japanese							
Jews							
Metis							
Negroes							
Norwegians							
Poles							
Russians							
Swedes							
Ukrainians							
West Indians							

PART III

F A C T U A L I N F O R M A T I O N

Information given will be used for statistical purposes only. It will not be disclosed in any form which would identify you.

Most of the questions are answered by placing a check mark in the appropriate space. Others need a brief answer written in. Please don't leave any question blank.

(1) SEX:

Male \_\_\_\_\_  
 Female \_\_\_\_\_

(2) AGE AT LAST BIRTHDAY:

14 and under	_____	45 - 49	_____
15 - 19	_____	50 - 54	_____
20 - 24	_____	55 - 59	_____
25 - 29	_____	60 - 64	_____
30 - 34	_____	65 - 69	_____
35 - 39	_____	70 - 74	_____
40 - 44	_____	75 and over	_____

(3) MARITAL STATUS:

Single \_\_\_\_\_  
 Married \_\_\_\_\_  
 Widowed \_\_\_\_\_  
 Separated \_\_\_\_\_  
 Divorced \_\_\_\_\_

(4) EDUCATION: Please place a check mark beside the HIGHEST LEVEL of education you have completed. If you are still attending school, indicate this by circling the category in which you are currently enrolled.

No formal schooling \_\_\_\_\_  
 Grades 1 - 6 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Grades 7 - 8 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Grades 9 - 11 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Completed high school \_\_\_\_\_  
 Had some university \_\_\_\_\_  
 University graduate \_\_\_\_\_

(continued over page)

OCCUPATION:

- (5) What is your main occupation? (PLEASE BE SPECIFIC) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- (6) If a married woman, what is your husband's main occupation?  
 (PLEASE BE SPECIFIC).  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- (7) What is (was) your father's main occupation? (PLEASE BE  
 SPECIFIC) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

NATIVITY:

- (8) In what province (or country) were you born? \_\_\_\_\_  
 (If outside Canada, please name the country according to its  
present boundaries)
- (9) If you were born in another country, how old were you when you  
 first came to Canada? \_\_\_\_\_
- (10) In what country was your father born? \_\_\_\_\_  
 (If outside Canada, please name the country according to its  
present boundaries)
- (11) What language did you or your ancestor (on the male side) speak  
 on coming to this continent? \_\_\_\_\_

RESIDENCE:

- (12) Approximately how long have you lived in Alberta?  
 less than a year \_\_\_\_\_  
 1 - 5 years \_\_\_\_\_  
 6 - 10 years \_\_\_\_\_  
 11 years or longer \_\_\_\_\_
- (13) Approximately how long have you lived in this city (town)?  
 less than a year \_\_\_\_\_  
 1 - 5 years \_\_\_\_\_  
 6 - 10 years \_\_\_\_\_  
 11 years or longer \_\_\_\_\_

(continued over page)

RELIGION:

(14) What is your religious preference, if any?

Atheist or Agnostic	_____
Anglican	_____
Baptist	_____
Greek Orthodox	_____
Jewish	_____
Lutheran	_____
Presbyterian	_____
Roman Catholic	_____
United Church	_____
Other (please specify)	_____

(15) About how often do you attend church?

more than once a week	_____
about once a week	_____
about 2 or 3 times a month	_____
about once a month	_____
2 or 3 times a year	_____
never	_____

(16) To what clubs, associations or organizations do you belong?

(Please circle the names of those organizations whose meetings you attend regularly. If you do not belong to any organizations, please indicate this by writing "NONE").

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

**APPENDIX C**

**DESCRIPTION OF THE CONTENT ANALYSIS**

## CODING INSTRUCTIONS OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

General Instructions

The study is concerned with subjects' perceptions or stereotypes of groups of people. Each questionnaire consists of the respondent's free description of ten categories of people (hereafter called "target groups"): North American Indians, Ukrainians, Hutterites, Jews, School Teachers, Lawyers, Lower Class People, Women, Old People, and People Like Me. Although the ordering of the target groups differs from questionnaire to questionnaire, it is necessary to always code them in the above sequence.

It will require two coding sheets to record the responses for each subject. First, number each sheet in the space provided at the top, beginning with "1." Carry this numbering through consecutively for all coding sheets used. Next, place the subject's identification number (the number in red writing in a square box on the first sheet of the questionnaire) just above the first large rectangle at the top of each of the two coding sheets needed to record that individual's answers. Then, write in the names of the target groups (Indians, etc.) just above each rectangle of 80 boxes, always in the order given above.

One rectangle of boxes is needed to code the description of each target group. Boxes 1 to 59 correspond to the numbers of the descriptive categories. For example, suppose you were coding a subject's description of the first group, North American Indians, and considering the first

descriptive category, "hardworking" versus "lazy." If the subject included a response which fit under "hardworking," you would put the number "1" in box 1. If, alternatively, he gives an answer which fits under "lazy," place the number "5" in box 1. If, finally, there is no indication of the "hardworking-lazy" dimension in his characterization of Indians, place a "0" in box 1. Box 2 always corresponds to "competent versus incompetent work habits," and so on to box 59. Each descriptive category must be considered in relation to each target group. In the majority of cases, either a "0," a "1" or a "5" must be put in each box. However, categories 4, 12, and 31 are three-dimensional and contain a "9" option, as well as a "0," "1," and "5." For one-dimensional categories 5, 8, 33, 42, 43, and 47, only a "0" or a "1" are appropriate alternatives. Category 46 has 5 possible coding responses, "0," "1," "5," "7," and "9."

Boxes 60 through 64 are used to code various instances of subject's refusal to provide a description of a target group. A "1" indicates that the subject made the relevant response, a "0" that he did not. For example, box 62 is used to code "No opinion since I don't know any (many) Indians, etc." If a subject made such a statement, the number "1" would be placed in box 62. If he did not, a "0" would be recorded.

Box 65 is used to record the number out of the possible total of 59 descriptive categories which a respondent used. If he gave 7 responses which corresponded to the



descriptive categories, "7" is written in box 65, and so forth. It doesn't matter how many additional characteristics, idiosyncratic to him, which he has provided. The figure in box 65 should be the total of "1s," "5s," "7s," and "9s" (nonzero responses) already placed in boxes 1 to 59 for a given target group.

Box 66 is used to refer to the total number of words used by a given subject to characterize a given target group. It is a record of his sheer verbiage, and consists of a count of the number of words written on the page.

Boxes 67 through 80 are always left blank.

## RULES

- (1) The recording unit of analysis is the theme. Coders are looking for indications of each of 59 traits in the subject's description of a target group. Anything from a single word up to the entire description of that target group may be used to indicate presence of one theme (one of the 59 descriptive categories).
- (2) The unit of enumeration is the respondent. Code a given category response only once for each respondent's description of a particular target group. For example, in describing Indians, a subject may give three different synonyms for "lazy," or may even fill the entire sheet with examples of "lazy" behavior. Regardless of the amount of verbiage involved, he has, for our purposes, offered only one trait.
- (3) Intermediate responses such as "middle income," "average intelligence," etc., are coded as "0" since such answers infer that the target group does not differ from the Alberta population generally.
- (4) Qualified responses require careful attention. Code the predominant tendency in each case. For example, "quite rich" = "rich"; "most are uneducated" = "uneducated"; "few are intelligent" = "stupid"; "while some are honest, most seem to be dishonest" = "dishonest"; "some are dishonest, some are honest" = "not indicated"--"0."
- (5) In some cases, the subject will make specific

distinctions within the target group. In other words, instead of saying "some" or "many," he identified subgroups as "old" or "young Ukrainians," "educated and uneducated Indians," etc. For example, "While the young Ukrainians are educated, the older Ukrainians are not educated." Or, "Older teachers are hardworking. The young ones aren't interested in helping students." If the two responses are contradictory aspects of the same descriptive category, e.g., "educated" and "not educated," code Not Indicated "0." If, however, the two responses belong to two different descriptive categories, e.g., "hardworking" and "not interested in helping students," code them both. In the cases of Indians, Hutterites and Ukrainians only, keep a separate record of cases falling under this rule. List the subject's identification number and the trait or traits involved, so that it may be quickly located for later scrutiny.

- (6) There are several instances where a general descriptive category is followed by one or more categories, which are more specific instances of the same sort of behavior. For example, category #25, "Moral-Immoral" includes conformity to general societal standards of goodness or rightness. Category #26, "Sexually Moral-Sexually Immoral" is one particular dimension of morality. In all such cases, when in doubt about whether to place respondents' statements in the

particular or general category, code it under the general category.

- (7) It is extremely important to be sure that all the meaning relevant to the descriptive categories is distilled from each phrase and sentence. In other words, one phrase or one sentence may contain references to two or more of the study categories. For example, "extremely competent farmers" = extremely competent (Code "1" under category #2); farmers (Code "5" under category #3). "They seem satisfied with their life on colonies" = satisfied with life (Code "1" under category #46), colonies (Code "1" under category #5).

## CODING CATEGORIES

(1) Hardworking versus Lazy

This category refers to the habitual characteristic of steady, zealous effort to accomplish something, versus habitual disinclination to exertion. It refers to the amount of effort put forth by a group towards central life goals, usually that of earning a living. In the case of WOMEN, it may refer to their work role within the home.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Hardworking, e.g., Hardworking. Industrious. Diligent. Certainly not lazy. Overworked. They earn their salary!

"5" = Lazy, e.g., Not fond of working. Indolent. Shiftless. Won't work. Idle. Too easygoing. Not anxious to work.

(2) Competent Work Habits versus Incompetent Work Habits

Refers to proficiency versus deficiency in aptitude or ability to satisfactorily perform work. Category #1 above refers to the sheer effort put forth, or overall attitude toward work. Category #2 refers to the capability or lack of capability shown in the manner in which the work is performed.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Competent Work Habits, e.g., Know more about farming than other nationalities. Dependable workers. Conscientious. Efficient. Reliable. Responsible. Able. Well-organized. Meticulous. Practical. Businesslike. Dedicated to their work. Careful.

"5" = Incompetent Work Habits, e.g., Poor workers. Unreliable. Irresponsible. Careless. Impractical. Undependable. Procrastinators (lawyers).

(3) Urban versus Rural

This category refers to the geographical locality of the group, whether it is predominantly a city people or a people living and working in the country (as distinguished from cities or towns).

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Urban, e.g., Urbanites. Tend to live in cities.

"5" = Rural, e.g., Farmers. Ranchers. Hunters (Indians). Fishermen (Indians). Loggersmen (Indians). Close to the soil. Agricultural.

(4) Particular Occupations Characteristic of Group

This category refers to selected classes of occupations thought to be characteristic of several target groups (excluding rural occupations under #3).

"0" = Not Indicated. "0" is the appropriate code for all groups except Hutterites, Jews, Ukrainians and Lower Class People.

"1" = (a) FOR JEWS ONLY, any reference to fact that they are characteristically engaged in retail or commercial occupations, e.g., Businessmen. Self-employed. Sales types. Clothiers for men and women. Smarter business heads.

(b) FOR LOWER CLASS PEOPLE AND UKRAINIANS ONLY, any reference that they are laborers, or unskilled workers.

"5" = (a) FOR JEWS ONLY, any reference to fact that they are typically found in professional occupations, e.g., doctors, lawyers, university professors, etc., or broad description, "professional people."

(b) FOR HUTTERITES ONLY, any reference to fact that they sell farm produce (vegetables, eggs) door-to-door, that they are peddlars.

"9" = FOR JEWS ONLY, a "9" is coded when the same respondent writes that Jews are found in both retail occupations and the professions.

(5) Communal Social Organization (HUTTERITES ONLY)

This category covers any statements of the Hutterites' communal or cooperative organizations, from broad references to the fact that they live in colonies, to more specific mentions of cooperative work behavior, child care, etc.

"0" = Not Indicated. Code "0" for all groups except Hutterites.

"1" = Communal Social Organization, e.g., Communal. Live in colonies. Colony is an economic unit. A group which shares everything. Their society is like one big family. Cooperative. Communistic.

"5" = Not Applicable.

(6) Ambitious versus Unambitious

This category indicates that a group is or is not characterized by the desire to rise above its present condition or position.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Ambitious, e.g., Aspiring. Eager. Go-getters. Considerable drive. Seeking to better themselves. Competitive.

"5" = Unambitious, e.g., Less ambition. Without drive. Lack initiative. Not interested in getting ahead. Apathetic. Satisfied with anything. Set no goals.

(7) Ambitious versus Unambitious for Enhanced Social Status

This category is a more specific dimension of category #6. It refers not to general ambition, but to the desire for improved "social" or class position.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Ambitious for Enhanced Social Status, e.g., Social climbers. Status conscious. Willing to sacrifice much for prestige. Social position means a lot. Women are anxious to have bigger cars, etc., than their neighbors.

"5" = Unambitious for Enhanced Social Status, e.g., Lacking in a desire to improve their status. Satisfied to be low class. Given up hope of rising to the top.

[NOTE: Categories (6) and (7) were subsequently collapsed.]

(8) Fatalistic "Present" Time Orientation

This category refers to a group's acceptance of all things and events as inevitable, its submission to fate, its exclusive concern with present as opposed to future time.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Fatalistic "Present" Time Orientation, e.g., Take life as it is. Living for today, tomorrow might never come. Don't care about the future. Less concerned about time.

"5" = Not Applicable.

(9) Materialistic versus Not Materialistic

This category indicates a devotion to material versus spiritual objects, needs and considerations. "Materialism" includes references to a group working or acting merely for gain. There is no implication of the nature of the methods by which this goal is pursued. "Not materialistic" also covers references to the Hutterites' austerity of life. N.B. Religiosity is not included here.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Materialistic, e.g., Money conscious. Mercenary. Openly after money. Gold diggers. In the business for money.

"5" = Not Materialistic, e.g., Not money or possession conscious. Interested in the basic things of life. Live a simple life. Don't believe in the many pleasures of life.

(10) Thrifty with Money versus Frivolous with Money

Refers to competent versus incompetent management of money. This category refers to how carefully money is handled, not to the fact that money is important (#9) or to generosity or lack of it (#11). However, there will be borderline cases where the same adjective, e.g., "cheap," may in common usage refer to either categories 10 and to 11. In such cases, code them under category 10.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Thrifty, e.g., Frugal. Penny-pinching. Try to live within their means. Money cautious. Miserly. Cheap.

"5" = Frivolous with Money, e.g., Spendthrift. Reckless with their money. Free spenders. Spend money on foolish things.

(11) Generous versus Greedy

Indicates concern for relieving the needs of others versus exclusive devotion to one's own or one's group's interest. This category connotes the giving or refusal to give of money, time, etc., to others.

"0" = Not Indicated.



"1" = Generous, e.g., Charitable. Unselfish. Women are willing to give more than men.

"5" = Greedy, e.g., Selfish. Self-centred. Act on own behalf before anyone else. Only think of themselves.

(12) Rich versus Poor

This category refers to the fact that a group is well off or not well off financially, compared with the general population.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Rich, e.g., Wealthy. Prosperous. Well-paid. Successful. Big cars. Rich as a group (Hutterites).

"5" = Poor, e.g., Lack of money. Needy. Lower income. Little to show for their life's work. Poor individually (Hutterites).

"9" = HUTTERITES ONLY. If a respondent writes that Hutterites are rich as a group and poor individually, code a "9."

(13) Contributing to Community (Country) versus Not Contributing to Community (Country)

"Contributing to community" covers responses varying from contributing time, leadership, and loyalty to the community, to replies indicating that a group is an asset to the community, financially or through its performance of a needed occupation. "Not Contributing to Community" spans lack of activity in local affairs to failure to provide its share of financial support; to unpatriotic feelings; to a group's existence being detrimental to the community (in the eyes of the respondent). Note that community is broadly defined to include groups of whatever size from agricultural hamlets to all of Canada.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Contributing, e.g., Strong community members. Patriotic. Asset to a city. Community leaders. Responsible for shaping young lives (teachers). Have a social conscience.

"5" = Not Contributing, e.g., Unpatriotic. Not active in the community. Don't pay taxes. Contribute nothing to society. Lack social responsibility.

(14) Economic Self-Sufficiency versus Economic Dependency

Refers to the ability or inability of a group to supply its own material, as opposed to emotional, needs; to make enough money to live on by its own efforts. "Economic Self-Sufficiency" should apply particularly to the Hutterites, and their relatively self-contained economy.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Economic Self-Sufficiency, e.g., Strictly to themselves economically. Produce all their own products and buy little from our stores. Reluctant to live on welfare.

"5" = Economic Dependency, e.g., Depending too much for help from the white. Content with welfare. Looking for a living to be supplied.

(15) Interested (Active) in Politics versus Not Interested (Active) in Politics

"Interested in Politics" refers to a group's either being more interested or more actively engaged, than Albertans generally, in governmental affairs, whether at municipal, provincial or federal levels. "Not Interested in Politics" means a group is less interested or actively involved than Albertans generally.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Interested in Politics, e.g., Politicians. Politically prone. Overrepresented in parliament.

"5" = Not Interested in Politics, e.g., Less interested in politics.

(16) Intelligent versus Stupid

This category includes references to a group's greater or lesser mental (intellectual) capacities or capabilities compared with the population generally.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Intelligent, e.g., Clever. Smart. Brilliant. Quick thinkers.

"5" = Stupid, e.g., Of low IQ. Low mentality. Mentally not too sharp. Slow to comprehend.

(17) Wise versus Impaired Mental Functioning (OLD PEOPLE ONLY)

"Wise" refers to the accumulation of knowledge, sound judgment, etc., which old people have by virtue of their many years of experience with living. "Impaired mental functioning" includes any reference to deficiencies or deterioration in intellectual processes brought about by aging.

"0" = Not Indicated. (All groups except OLD PEOPLE).

"1" = Wise, e.g., Wise from experience. Source of sound advice.

"5" = Impaired Mental Functioning, e.g., Slow thinking. Bewildered. Forgetful. Unable to concentrate. Senile. Vague. Confused. Childish.

(18) Educated versus Not Educated

Category connotes a group's completion of more or fewer years of formal schooling, compared with the population generally.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Educated, e.g., Better education. Very learned. Educated professionally.

"5" = Not Educated, e.g., Low education. Illiterate. Ignorant. Untrained.

(19) Believe it is Important versus Unimportant to Acquire Higher Education

As opposed to category #18, this category refers to a group's belief that more education is valued or not valued, whether or not education is actually possessed by the group.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Believe Education is Important, e.g., Higher education is a goal. Ambitious for education. Willing to sacrifice much for education.

"5" = Believe Education is Not Important, e.g., Unconcerned with children's education. Show no interest in education beyond the legal limit.

(20) Interested in Intellectual Pursuits/Knowledgeable versus Exclusive Concern with Basic, Personal, "Bread and Butter" Problems/Ignorant About World (External) Affairs

Involved here are references that a group is inclined toward pursuits that engage the intellect (reading, music, art, etc.) or is generally knowledgeable about the world around them, versus indications that a group's primary concerns are narrow and personalized or that it is unaware generally of the world beyond its sphere of life.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Interested in Intellectual Pursuits, etc., e.g., Intellectuals. Always reading. Studious. Well-informed. Well-versed. Interested in the arts, i.e., music, drama, etc. Well-informed about world affairs.

"5" = Exclusive Concern with Personal Problems, etc., e.g., Lose interest in broader aspects of life. Mentally indolent. Unaware generally. Care nothing for music, art, etc. Uninterested in anything happening outside the colony. Unaware of life outside the colony. Have too narrow a view of life in general.

(21) Strong Family Ties versus Weak Family Ties

This category includes all general references to the importance/unimportance to a group of family ties and home-life, to solicitous behavior shown to family members. However, this category excludes specific references to the strength of the marital bond (#22) and of fulfilling/not fulfilling parental obligations to offspring (#23).

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Strong Family Ties, e.g., Strong family members. Fond of family connections. Home-loving. Good homemakers. Loving to family.

"5" = Weak Family Ties, e.g., Not interested in family life. Families scatter to the winds.

(22) Characterized by Stable versus Unstable Marriages

This category refers specifically to the strength of the marital bond, whether a group is able or unable to forge relationships between man and wife which endure through time, whether or not it typically fulfills the recognized obligations to marital partners. Note: Any specific references to sexual conduct is coded under #26.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Stable Marriages, e.g., Good wives (husbands).  
Few divorces, desertions.

"5" = Unstable Marriages, e.g., Inadequate husbands.  
Divorce/desertion frequent.

(23) Not Neglectful versus Neglectful of the Needs of their Children

This category refers to the group's performance of its parental duties to its minor dependent children. It covers provision or lack of provision of food, shelter, etc., protection of physical safety, and adequate emotional support. General expressions of solicitous attention, or love for children (or lack of same) fall within this category.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Not Neglectful, e.g., Loving of their children.  
Good mothers. Children protected.

"5" = Neglectful, e.g., They have television and liquor before kids are fed. Careless of their young children. Mistreat their children.

(24) Likely to have Small Families versus Likely to have Large Families

This category refers to the number of offspring a group produces, compared with the population generally.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Small Families, e.g., Few children in family.

"5" = Large Families, e.g., Prolific. Have more children. Big families.

(25) Moral versus Immoral

Conformity versus deviation from the generally accepted, traditional standards of goodness or rightness in conduct or character. This category is the most general of the related categories, #25 to #29. Any general references to morality not specified by the following categories belong in this one.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Moral, e.g., Very well-behaved. Good-living.  
Morally clean. Trying to do what is right.  
Strait-laced. Conventional.

"5" = Immoral, e.g., Morally unrestrained. Lacking  
in moral values. Loose.

(26) Sexually Moral versus Sexually Immoral

This category refers to conformity versus deviation from generally accepted, traditional (middle class?) standards of goodness in sexual conduct.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Sexually Moral, e.g., Adultery is rare. The girls are virgins at marriage. Circumspect in sexual behavior.

"5" = Sexually Immoral, e.g., Girls sleep around. Prostitutes. Sexual deviants.

[NOTE: Categories (25) and (26) were subsequently collapsed.]

(27) Honest versus Dishonest

"Honesty" refers to a group's tendency to be truthful, frank. "Dishonesty" refers to a group's tendency to lie or be deceitful, cheat, or steal. This category excludes both questionable aspects of opportunism in dealing with other groups (#28) and specific references to trouble with legal authorities (#29).

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Honest, e.g., Truthful. Sincere. Trustworthy. Candid. Ethical. Fair to clients.

"5" = Dishonest, e.g., Liars. Hypocritical. Deceitful. Evasive. Crooked. Cheats. Sneaky. Crafty. Shifty. Sly. Light-fingered.

(28) Shrewd in Dealing with Others versus Naive in Dealing with Others

This category refers to a group's astuteness in handling or manipulating others for its own benefit versus its ineptness in dealing with others. "Shrewdness in dealing with others" includes getting what one wants from others by questionable, tricky but not blatantly dishonest (or illegal) means. It refers to a group's superior ability to realize its own ends, to the detriment of the other party in the relationship. This must be distinguished from #43, Domination

of Others (the desire to impose opinions on others and lead them, with no connotation of doing so for extrinsic gain). "Naive in Dealing with Others" means a group is on the losing end in such deals because it lacks sophistication in handling others. Distinguish carefully between this category and #45 (Submission to Others). The latter infers a passivity or willing submission to other people's wishes, rather than ineptness. "Naiveness in dealing with others" must also be distinguished from #44 (Oppressed by Others). This latter category refers to active discrimination suffered by a group because of its ethnic identity (or other categorical identity).

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Shrewdness in Dealing with Others, e.g., Have to be watched in a deal. Sly business dealers. Sharp traders. Expert in dealing with people. Out to skin the public. Leeches on mistakes of others of lower education. Shrewd.

"5" = Naive in Dealing with Others, e.g., Easily fooled. Taken advantage of. Taken for a sucker. Cheated. Exploited.

(29) Seldom versus Often in Trouble with the Law

This category encompasses specific statements that a group's activities do or do not lead them into direct contact with the community's authorized social control authorities (police, jail, courts, etc.).

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Seldom in Trouble with the Law, e.g., Law-abiding. Few are ever sentenced to jail.

"5" = Often in Trouble with the Law, e.g., Always being picked up by the police. They fill up our penitentiaries.

(30) Sober versus Drunken

The range of this category is from greater or lesser addiction to alcohol to greater or lesser indulgence in drinking, compared with the population generally.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Sober, e.g., Less addicted to alcohol. Less likely to become inebriated.

"5" = Drunken, e.g., Drink too much. Very heavy

drinkers. Alcoholics. Love their booze.

(31) Up-to-Date (Progressive) versus Old-Fashioned (Conservative)

"Up-to-date" encompasses references to a group's high evaluation of progress, reform, modern ideas or its repudiation of old ways. "Old-fashioned" means a group is living according to, or favoring the methods, manners or ideas of past times, that it resists or opposes any changes in established traditions or institutions. This category excludes all specific references to the old-fashioned or modern nature of a group's clothes or appearance. (See category #32.)

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Up-to-date, e.g., Up-to-date teaching methods. Willing to change. Progressive. Hutterites do accept modern farming equipment.

"5" = Old-fashioned, e.g., Stubbornly hold on to the past. Cling to tradition. Not willing to change with the times. Irritated by today's way of life. Stuffy.

"9" = HUTTERITES ONLY. If the same respondent writes that Hutterites are old-fashioned in ideas, etc., but they accept modern farming technology and equipment, code "9."

(32) Fashion-Conscious versus Not Fashion-Conscious (Dress)

This category refers to a group wearing stylish clothing and being concerned about their appearance (excluding cleanliness, as opposed to it being unaware of fashion, dowdily dressed, etc.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Fashion Conscious, e.g., Very smartly dressed. Well-dressed. Concerned about their appearance. Clothes conscious.

"5" = Not Fashion Conscious, e.g., Behind the times in fashion. Loudly dressed. Drab dressers. Hutterites only--wear black clothes, etc. Unconcerned about their appearance.

(33) Fact of Living According to a Different Culture

This covers statements that a group's style of life, or particular aspect thereof, differs from that of



the majority of Albertans. If a respondent remarks that a group is concerned with a different mode of living and different values, regardless of whether he also infers this is old-fashioned, undesirable or whatever, code it here. (In this example, the "old-fashioned" connotation would also be coded under #31.)

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Live According to Different Culture, e.g., From a different culture. Anxious to keep their old culture and customs. Speak English incorrectly. Mention of unique foods, ethnic skills, etc.

"5" = Not Applicable.

(34) Reminiscent "Past" Time Orientation (OLD PEOPLE ONLY)

Covers references to old people's predominant interest in bygone experiences, relationships, events, etc., as opposed to those in the present or in the future.

"0" = Not Indicated. Code for all groups, except old people.

"1" = Past Time Orientation, e.g., Live on memories of youth. Reminiscent. Story tellers.

"5" = Not Applicable.

(35) Not Critical versus Critical of Young People (OLD PEOPLE ONLY)

This category refers to the tendency of old people to be intolerant of and unsympathetic toward younger people, or alternatively, to be understanding toward them. Although such intolerance is a more specific segment of the dimension of "old-fashioned," this category refers to the elderly's relationships with younger people who carry new ideas rather than to the abstract values generally.

"0" = Not Indicated. Code for all groups, except old people.

"1" = Not Critical, e.g., More understanding of young people than people in their middle years are. Very seldom criticize youth.

"5" = Critical, e.g., Horrified by younger people. Intolerant of youth. Believe young people are someone to fight with.

(36) Religious versus Irreligious

"Religious" means that the group, compared to Albertans generally, is more devoted to sacred beliefs (or supernatural beings), more scrupulous in its "church" attendance or observance of church rituals. "Irreligious" means that the group is less concerned with sacred beliefs, or church affairs, or prescribed ritual practices.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Religious, e.g., Deeply religious. Practice their religion faithfully. Very pious.

"5" = Irreligious, e.g., Against religion. Completely nonreligious. Not interested in church affairs.

(37) Not Cliquish versus Cliquish

"Cliquish" infers that a group tends to form small, exclusive circles of people of its own kind. "Not cliquish" infers that its personal relationships do not exclude nonmembers of that group. For the Hutterites, it is important to distinguish between their tendency to remain together and resist relationships with or integration with outsiders, from their ignorance of the outside world (#20). Note: a simple statement that a group is friendly or hospitable falls into category #38.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Not Cliquish, e.g., Good mixers. Assimilated well with other groups. Tending to become less visible as an identifiable group.

"5" = Cliquish, e.g., Stick together. Clannish. Snobbish. Against intermarriage. Separatists. Segregated--self-induced. Unwilling to assimilate. Helpful to one another.

(38) Warmth of Feeling/Supportive Behavior towards Others versus Coldness/Unsympathetic Behavior towards Others

"Warmth of feeling" includes all types of benevolent feelings or acts shown towards others, which are not specifically included under other categories. "Coldness/unsympathetic behavior" includes all types of indifferent or malevolent sentiments or acts, not specifically included in other categories.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Warmth of Feeling, e.g., Helpful. Friendly. Considerate. Sympathetic. Understanding. Affectionate. Interested in people, etc., etc. Easy to get along with. Patient.

"5" = Coldness of Feeling, e.g., Spiteful. Inconsiderate. Crochety. Antagonistic. Malicious. Aloof. Sarcastic.

(39) Tolerance versus Intolerance of Other Ethnic Groups

This category encompasses specific statements of a group's acceptance or prejudice towards other ethnic groups, as distinguished from its attitudes towards people generally (#38) and towards shunning all out-groups in its personal relationships (#37).

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Tolerance, e.g., Unprejudiced towards other groups. Tolerant of other people.

"5" = Intolerance, e.g., Prejudiced against many ethnic and racial groups. Less willing to accept people of other races.

(40) Not Pacifistic versus Pacifistic

This category refers to a group favoring warlike behavior or interpersonal physical fighting versus its opposing war or the use of physical force.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Not Pacifistic, e.g., Become involved in fights. Belligerent.

"5" = Pacifistic, e.g., Believe war/fighting is wrong/immoral.

(41) Liked (Respected) versus Disliked (Not Respected) by Others

This category refers to the regard in which the group is held (feelings) rather than active discriminatory behavior toward them (#44). In borderline cases, where in doubt as to whether prejudice (#41) or discrimination (#44) is involved, code under category #41.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Liked, e.g., Respected. Well thought of.  
Looked up to. Socially accepted.

"5" = Disliked, e.g., Not totally accepted by society.  
Looked down upon. Butt of many jokes. Outsiders (not voluntarily as in #37). Widespread prejudice against them. Outcasts. Looked upon as a burden (old people). Resented (old people).

(42) Ignored by Others (OLD PEOPLE ONLY)

This category refers to attitudes and examples of behavior toward old people which indicate that the elderly are forgotten about, put aside.

"0" = Not Indicated. Code for all groups except Old People.

"1" = Ignored, e.g., Forgotten about. Overlooked by others. Neglected.

"5" = Not Applicable.

(43) Domination of Others versus Do Not Dominate Others

This category refers to members of a group imposing its opinions and wishes on others, controlling and directing the behavior of others. There is no implication under this category to motivation for gain, extrinsic to directing other's behavior.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Domination of Others, e.g., Bossy. Influential. Overbearing. Aggressive. Interested in wielding power. The decision-makers. Want their own way. Leaders rather than followers.

"5" = Do Not Dominate Others, e.g., Statements that a group does not impose its wishes or opinions on others. Is lenient where it could be strict. Unaggressive.

(44) Not Oppressed by Others versus Oppressed by Others

Refers to a group suffering active discrimination, unequal treatment rather than negative feelings, because if its membership in that group, rather than the implication of individual ineptness (category #28). Note: for WOMEN only, this category includes references to equal or unequal status with men.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Not Oppressed by Others, e.g., Women are equal to men. There is no discrimination against Jews in Canada.

"5" = Oppressed by Others, e.g., Discriminated against. Kicked around and treated like animals. Not given same opportunities as white men. Persecuted. Unequal to men (women). Deprived.

(45) Preservation of Autonomy versus Submission to Others

This category refers to a group's self-assertive maintenance of autonomy versus its voluntary (at least on the surface) tendency to yield to the influence, control, direction, etc., of others. It includes emotional independence-dependency, rather than financial independence-dependency (category #14).

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Preservation of Autonomy, e.g., Resent authority. Uninhibited. Don't care what others think of them. Self-reliant. Defiant. Dislike being told what to do. Individualistic. Won't follow crowd because it's the "in" thing. Fighting for its rights. Independent.

"5" Submission to Others, e.g., Deferent. Passive. Unable to think for themselves. Docile. Dependent on others for emotional security. Weak-willed, sheep-like followers. Easily led.

(46) Happy versus (a) Passive, "Self-Contained" Negative Emotional State; (b) Active, "Other-Directed" Negative Emotional State

This category refers to whether a group feels happy and content with its life or whether it (1) is miserable in an "inner-directed" passive fashion, or (b) whether its discontent with its lot is focused outward (whether the group sees conditions/people beyond itself as the cause for discontent and projects its dissatisfaction outward in some fashion).

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Happy, e.g., Happy. Content. Satisfied. Carefree. Optimistic. Well-adjusted to old age. Fun-loving. Happy-go-lucky. Jovial.

"5" = Passive, "Self-Contained" Negative Emotional State, e.g., Sad. Despondent. Miserable. Self-pitying. Worried. Discouraged. Defeated in attitude. Depressed. Frightened. Mixed-up. Restless.

"7" = Active, Other-Directed Negative Emotional State, e.g., Angry. Envious of those better-off. Jealous of white people. Complainers. Rebellious regarding status (Women). Getting more and more dissatisfied with the treatment they are getting.

"9" = Enter a "9" when the same respondent makes "5" and "7" responses.

(47) Lonely

Code statements that the members of the group are unhappy because they are alone, without the company of others.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Lonely.

"5" = Not Applicable.

(48) Ability versus Inability to Adjust to Dominant Culture

Pertains specifically to statements regarding the ability or inability to adapt to dominant ways of life, as opposed to happiness-sadness without reference to this particular cause (#46), acceptance-rejection of a different culture (#33), or valuation or repudiation of modern values and ideas (#31). This category implies that a group is able or unable to cope with 1969 Alberta style of living, values, etc., regardless of what the underlying reasons for this, or of what its feelings about these values might be.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Ability to Adjust, e.g., Well-adjusted to white man's ways.

"5" = Inability to Adjust, e.g., Backward in learning white man's ways. Not able to cope with white society. Lost in today's highly geared society. Don't understand or fit into our way of life.

(49) Mentally Healthy versus Mentally Ill

Refers to a group suffering or being free from mental illness. Note that "senility" is coded under #17.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Mentally Healthy, e.g., Stable in mind and action. Hutterites have less mental illness than Albertans.

"5" = Mentally Ill, e.g., Emotionally unstable. Unstable.

(50) Low Emotionality versus High Emotionality

Suggests that the temperament is one of equanimity versus emotional agitation. Refers to a group either having a low degree of emotional turbulence (or at least controlling their feelings) as opposed to its succumbing to and freely expressing extreme emotional states.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Low Emotionality, e.g., Very easygoing. Calm. Serene. Not upset easily. Controlled. Mild-natured.

"5" = High Emotionality, e.g., Temperamental. Moody. Quick-tempered. Nervous. Stormy. Sensitive (easily hurt). Giddy. Unstable. Anxious. Sentimental.

(51) Proud, Superiority Feelings versus Humble, Inferiority Feelings

This category refers to a member of a group showing either a proper or an overweening pride in self or group, versus demonstrating an absence of pride, ranging from unassuming humility to an abject lack of self-respect.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Proud, e.g., A proud race. Conceited. Boasting type. Smug. Egomaniacs. Self-confident. Pompous. Cocksure. Know-it-alls. Strong national pride.

"5" = Humble, e.g., No self-respect. Feel inferior. Lack confidence. Ashamed. Inferiority complex. Feel useless with jobs gone (old people). Insecure.

(52) Extroverted, Talkative versus Shy, Quiet

This category covers descriptions of a group as talkative, outgoing extroverts versus timid, withdrawn, quiet introverts. It refers to a group's reticence or lack of it in approaching others, drawing attention to themselves, and in particular, the verbal aspects of this behavioral dimension.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Extroverted, Talkative, e.g., Talkative. Outgoing. Sociable. Love the limelight. Outspoken. Gossipers.

"5" = Shy, Quiet, e.g., Bashful. Introverted. Reserved. Introspective. Uncommunicative. Afraid to speak out.

(53) Well-Spoken versus Not Well-Spoken (TEACHERS, LAWYERS ONLY)

Both teachers and lawyers are engaged in verbal sorts of occupations. This category refers to their ability or lack of ability to speak well, fittingly or pleasingly.

"0" = Not Indicated. Code for all groups except lawyers and teachers.

"1" = Well-Spoken, e.g., Orators. Eloquent speakers. Articulate. Witty. Interesting instructors.

"5" = Not Well-Spoken, e.g., Bores. Dry. Uninteresting. Not too effective in their classroom presentation of material.

(54) Mannerly, "Refined" versus Unmannerly, "Uncouth"

Encompasses references to the polished manners and *savoir faire* of a group, versus its proclivity to behave in a crude, boorish manner. Any reference which insinuates possession or lack of refinement or good taste belongs here.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Mannerly, Refined, e.g., Polite. Courteous. Dignified. Tactful. Sophisticated.

"5" = Uncouth, e.g., Crude. Talk filthy. Rude. Coarse. Loud. Naive. Boisterous. Like phony things like artificial flowers. Vulgar. Brassy. Very nosy.



(55) Physically Active versus Physically Inactive

Includes descriptions of people as physically energetic and engaged in numerous activities, or alternatively, as sedentary and dropping out of such activities (old people, especially).

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Physically Active, e.g., Active. Energetic. Involved in bridge clubs, etc.

"5" = Physically Inactive, e.g., Slow-moving. More conservative of their energies. Tire easily. Left with too much idle time on their hands.

(56) Physically Healthy versus Physically Ill (Impaired)

Refers to a group's physical fitness.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Healthy, e.g., Robust. Stronger physically.

"5" = Physically Ill, e.g., Sick. Prone to disease. Feeble. Weak. Handicapped with loss of eyesight. Poorly-nourished. Suffer from malnutrition.

(57) Open-Minded, Flexible versus Opinionated, Stubborn

This category refers to a group either being tolerant of other people's opinions, and to lack of fixedness of purpose, or being characterized by a fixedness of outlook or purpose. "Open-mindedness," however, holds no connotation of being duped as in category #28.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Open-Minded, e.g., Reasonable. Curious. Open to new ideas. Able to see all sides of a question. Willing to learn. Quite broad-minded. Tolerant.

"5" = Opinionated, e.g., Strong beliefs. Narrow-minded. Dogmatic in views. Set minds. Ornery. Inflexible. Not easily discouraged. Thing their ideas are the only ideas.

(58) Physically Clean versus Physically Dirty

This category covers statements that group members are or are not clean with their persons or their immediate surroundings.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = Clean, e.g., Well-groomed. Spotless house-keepers. Keep surroundings extra neat and tidy. Neat.

"5" = Dirty, e.g., Slovenly. Smelly. Sloppy. Unsanitary. Hate to smell fresh.

(59) Description of Physical Appearance

This category refers to descriptions of how a group's physical appearance differs from that of Albertans generally. Descriptions of dress (category #32) are excluded.

"0" = Not Indicated.

"1" = (a) INDIANS--Code references to differences in skin color, facial features.

(b) UKRAINIANS--Code references to big-boned, heaviness of figure.

(c) JEWS--Code references to large noses.

(d) HUTTERITES--Code references to beards.

(e) TEACHERS--Code references to predominance of women in occupation.

(f) LAWYERS--Code references to predominance of males in occupation.

(g) WOMEN--Code references to their attractive, or sexy appearance.

(h) OLD PEOPLE--Code references to wrinkles, grey hair, etc.

LOWER CLASS AND PEOPLE LIKE ME--NOT APPLICABLE.

(5) = (a) JEWS--Code references to their being overweight.

(b) TEACHERS--Code references to their being physically unattractive, sexless. N.B. Copy down I.D. number of any respondent who refers to male teachers as effeminate or homosexual.

(c) WOMEN--Code references to their being overweight.

(d) LAWYERS--Code references to their being attractive.

(60) Blank (Unexplained)

Respondent wrote nothing on page.

"0" = Not Applicable, i.e., respondent did write something.

"1" = A blank page for a particular target group.

IN THE FOLLOWING FOUR CASES, THE RESPONDENT EXPLAINS HIS REFUSAL TO DESCRIBE A GROUP WITH THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

(61) "No opinion"; "No comment"; "No impression"; "No feelings," etc.

"0" = Not Applicable, i.e., respondent didn't make such a statement.

"1" = One of above statements made.

(62) "No opinion since I don't know any (many) (have had no contact)"

"0" = Not Applicable, i.e., respondent didn't make such a statement.

"1" = One of the above statements was made.

(63) "No different from Albertans generally"; "Just people"; "Good and bad"; "Very nice people"; "Average types"; "Same as everyone else"; "Human," etc.

"0" = Not Applicable, i.e., respondent didn't make such a statement.

"1" = One of the above statements was made.

(64) "Individuals and they vary greatly"; "All different." Denies existence of group as a meaningful category for description, e.g., "What are lower-class people?"; "I don't believe in classes"; Re People Like Me: "IN comparison to whom?"

"0" = Not Applicable, i.e., respondent didn't make such a statement.

"1" = One of the above statements was made.

(65) Number of Traits Cited

Write in box 65 the number (ranging from 0 to 59) of traits cited by the respondent to describe each target group. This will be equal to the number of nonzero answers in boxes 0 to 59.

(66) Number of Words Used in Description of Group

Write in box 66 the total number of words used to describe a given target group.

TABLE C.1. INTERRATER AGREEMENT BY  
CONTENT ANALYSIS CATEGORIES

Coding Categories	Time of Sampling			Total	% Agree- ment
	End of Training Stage	Midpoint of Analysis	Completion of Analysis		
1 Agreement	21	18	17	56	96.6
Error	0	0	2	2	
2 Agreement	11	9	9	29	87.9
Error	0	0	4	4	
3 Agreement	0	2	3	5	83.3
Error	0	0	1	1	
4 Agreement	1	1	3	5	100.0
Error	0	0	0	0	
5 Agreement	1	4	2	7	77.8
Error	0	0	2	2	
6 Agreement	15	11	9	35	89.7
Error	2	0	2	4	
7 Agreement	1	5	3	9	75.0
Error	3	0	0	3	
8 Agreement	0	2	0	2	66.6
Error	0	0	1	1	
9 Agreement	4	0	4	8	80.0
Error	0	1	1	2	
10 Agreement	7	7	11	25	92.6
Error	0	0	2	2	
11 Agreement	3	8	7	18	78.3
Error	1	1	3	5	
12 Agreement	22	27	19	68	90.7
Error	3	1	3	7	
13 Agreement	5	7	10	22	88.0
Error	1	0	2	3	
14 Agreement	1	1	4	6	75.0
Error	0	1	1	2	
15 Agreement	1	0	3	4	80.0
Error	1	0	0	1	
16 Agreement	12	16	6	34	97.1
Error	0	0	1	1	
17 Agreement	2	7	3	12	100.0
Error	0	0	0	0	
18 Agreement	14	14	14	42	95.5
Error	1	0	1	2	

TABLE C.1 (continued)

Coding Categories	Time of Sampling			Total	% Agree- ment
	End of Training Stage	Midpoint of Analysis	Completion of Analysis		
19 Agreement	2	1	4	7	70.0
Error	1	0	2	3	
20 Agreement	4	2	4	10	66.6
Error	2	1	2	5	
21 Agreement	1	13	9	23	85.2
Error	1	1	2	4	
22 Agreement	0	1	1	2	100.0
Error	0	0	0	0	
23 Agreement	2	4	3	9	75.0
Error	1	0	2	3	
24 Agreement	1	6	3	10	100.0
Error	0	0	0	0	
25 Agreement	6	1	4	11	78.6
Error	1	0	2	3	
26 Agreement	1	0	0	1	100.0
Error	0	0	0	0	
27 Agreement	2	9	8	19	79.2
Error	2	2	1	5	
28 Agreement	0	6	3	9	69.2
Error	2	1	1	4	
29 Agreement	0	1	0	1	100.0
Error	0	0	0	0	
30 Agreement	2	4	6	12	100.0
Error	0	0	0	0	
31 Agreement	10	9	6	25	89.3
Error	0	2	1	3	
32 Agreement	11	15	8	34	94.5
Error	0	0	2	2	
33 Agreement	6	6	3	15	71.4
Error	2	3	1	6	
34 Agreement	0	3	1	4	100.0
Error	0	0	0	0	
35 Agreement	2	1	1	4	100.0
Error	0	0	0	0	
36 Agreement	6	6	3	15	88.3
Error	1	0	1	2	

TABLE C.1 (continued)

Coding Categories	Time of Sampling			Total	% Agree- ment
	End of Training Stage	Midpoint of Analysis	Completion of Analysis		
37 Agreement	7	11	12	30	90.9
Error	1	2	0	3	
38 Agreement	13	39	20	72	80.0
Error	6	3	9	18	
39 Agreement	0	1	3	4	44.4
Error	1	3	1	5	
40 Agreement	0	0	0	0	00.0
Error	1	1	0	2	
41 Agreement	1	7	2	10	62.5
Error	3	2	1	6	
42 Agreement	0	1	0	1	100.0
Error	0	0	0	0	
43 Agreement	15	13	3	31	81.6
Error	3	2	2	7	
44 Agreement	3	1	3	7	63.6
Error	1	1	2	4	
45 Agreement	12	12	12	36	78.3
Error	3	3	4	10	
46 Agreement	26	15	14	55	83.3
Error	5	1	5	11	
47 Agreement	1	3	2	6	85.7
Error	0	0	1	1	
48 Agreement	0	2	0	2	50.0
Error	1	0	1	2	
49 Agreement	0	0	0	0	-
Error	0	0	0	0	
50 Agreement	8	9	3	20	90.9
Error	0	1	1	2	
51 Agreement	13	9	8	30	85.7
Error	1	3	1	5	
52 Agreement	11	18	7	36	81.8
Error	4	2	2	8	
53 Agreement	2	2	3	7	87.5
Error	1	0	0	1	
54 Agreement	5	8	7	20	83.3
Error	0	1	3	4	

TABLE C.1 (continued)

Coding Categories	Time of Sampling			Total	% Agree- ment
	End of Training Stage	Midpoint of Analysis	Completion of Analysis		
55 Agreement	3	6	3	12	63.2
55 Error	2	2	3	7	
56 Agreement	4	9	2	15	78.9
56 Error	0	3	1	4	
57 Agreement	6	8	3	17	68.0
57 Error	5	2	1	8	
58 Agreement	5	21	6	32	96.9
58 Error	0	1	0	1	
59 Agreement	6	6	3	15	78.9
59 Error	1	1	2	4	

Average percent agreement end of training stage = 83.0

Average percent agreement midpoint of analysis = 89.9

Average percent agreement at end of analysis = 78.9