A SOCIOMETRIC STUDY OF UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON STUDENTS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY, SPRING QUARTER, 1948

by

GORDON KIYOSHI HIRABAYASHI

A thesis submitted for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

1949

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER OUR SUPERVISION

BY GORDON KIYOSHI HIRABAYASHI

ENTITLED A SOCIOMETRIC STUDY OF UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON STUDENTS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY, SPRING QUARTER, 1948

COMPLIES WITH UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS AND IS APPROVED BY US AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

SIGNATURE	OFFICIAL TITLE
Calvin F. Schmid	Professor of Sociology

DATE Nov. 25, 1949

THIS THESIS COMPLIES WITH LIBRARY REQUIREMENTS.

J. Ronald Todd THESIS LIBRARIAN

S. F. No. 3150—1935. 200 3-35 844-X.

PREFACE

During spring quarter of 1948 a sociometric study of the Japanese students registered at the University of Washington was conducted under the sponsorship of the Department of Sociology. Accordingly, under the supervision of Doctor George A. Lundberg, the writer undertook the direction of the study which is described in this thesis.

The study was primarily formulated as an attempt to answer a query--is it by chance that people choose other people as friends and as leaders? Or are there factors present indicating the operation of something more than pure chance? A sociometric type of study is peculiarly suitable for this kind of research in that it calls for each individual to choose or reject his associates upon the basis of a specific criterion. These choices (for each specific criterion) are then compared with hypothetical choices which could be the result from chance alone. The frequency above chance with which individuals are chosen or isolated shows the presence and operation of factors other than chance alone in the situation. (See pages 6 and 7.)

A paper, "'Consciousness of Kind' in a College Population" [a]

---

a. George A. Lundberg and Virginia Beazley, "'Consciousness of Kind' in a College Population", Sociometry, 11:59-74, February-May, 1948. The results of the study indicated a definite and sometimes a very strong tendency to name people belonging to one's own in-group as regards (a) common domicile, (b) college class, (c) major scholastic interest, and (d), socio-economic status. "Frequency of association is perhaps also the most important factor in the choices

describes and analyzes the choice patterns of a college population to determine what factors, if any, are associated to a greater degree than pure chance with friendship choices. To a large extent, this thesis attempts to verify or reject certain findings of the above study. Another paper, "Attraction Patterns in a University"[b] sociometrically analyzes students in the four women's residence halls at the University of Washington, offers further areas of comparison. The latter study included a rejection question, which presents very interesting material for analysis. To some extent, this thesis presents comparable data on the rejection question.

From a slightly different angle, there is another series of studies sompleted on the choice patterns of Garfield High School, a polyethnic secondary school in Seattle. Four similar studies made from the above data are on file in the University of Washington Library. Lenore

---

among the various years and majors. In the discussion of the major indices we noted that those divisions with the largest degree of necessary contact, i.e., Drama-Dance, Science, and Music, in which most of the work is done in close association with the other members of the division, had the largest degrees of in-group preference."

b. George A. Lundberg, Virginia B. Hertzler, and Lenore Dickson, "Attraction Patterns in a University", (to be published in the forthcoming issue of Sociometry).
This study on the whole, confirmed the findings of the Bennington study, but the results were less conclusive. In addition, this study attempted to secure direct data on the inverse question, namely, the relation of intergroup dislike to the in-group categories used. The results suggest that propinquity (nearness of relationship; association) is the overall influential factor in accounting for both positive and negative choices.

Dickson studied the population as a whole,[c] Marilyn Graalfs studied the Chinese population,[d] and Jessie Reichel studied the Jewish students.[e] Perhaps offering the most interesting data for comparison is the study on the Japanese students by Virginia Hertzler.[f] The data of Mrs. Hertzler's study are Japanese students of high school age and the data of this study are Japanese students of college age.

The writer is deeply indebted to the Department of Sociology for sponsoring this study. Special thanks are due Doctor George A. Lundberg, who offered many suggestions and valuable criticisms. The writer wishes to make special mention of his inspirational assistance, without which many aspects of research could resemble drudgery.

The writer is also deeply indebted to Professors Calvin F. Schmid, Robert W. O'Brien, S. Frank Miyamoto, and Delbert C. Miller who offered many valuable criticisms; to Anne Daty and Edwin Horiuchi who gave assistance in the interviewing supervision; to Esther Schmoe Hirabayashi who proof-read and typed the final copy of this thesis; and last, but not least, to the 131 Nisei students who participated in this study.

---

c. Lenore Dickson, "Social Distance in a Polyethnic High School" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Washington, 1949).

d. Marilyn Graalfs, "A Sociometric Study of Chinese Students in a Polyethnic High School" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Washington, 1949).

e. Jessie Reichel, "A Sociometric Study of Jewish Students in a Polyethnic High School" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Washington, 1949).

f. Virginia Hertzler, "A Sociometric Study of Japanese Students in a Polyethnic High School" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Washington, 1949).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

A SOCIOMETRIC STUDY OF UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON STUDENTS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY, SPRING QUARTER, 1948

CHAPTER I

DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

A. The Questions for Study.

Among the Nisei students at Washington what factors are associated to a greater degree than pure chance with the five different choice situations? Is the criterion of the question associated with the verbal choice behavior? What relationship, if any, is there between the friendship and the rejection choice patterns? What factors indicate the strongest in-group cohesion?[1] On ethnic considerations, do the Nisei students choose other Nisei in the five choice situations?

---

1 In-group as used in this study refers to the individual's own category when he is classified by any given criterion. For example, in age, his age category is the in-group; in sex, his sex category is the in-group. On ethnic grounds, however, the term, in-group, is used to refer to students of Japanese ancestry, and out-group is used to refer to students of non-Japanese ancestry.

B. Hypotheses.

Students of Japanese ancestry prefer themselves over all other students, as determined by the Criswell technique.

There are factors (class, sex, age, religion, veteran status) operating more than pure chance in the friendship and rejection choice behavior patterns of the universe here studied, as determined by the Criswell technique.

None of the five factors: class, sex, age, major, and religion are significantly associated with organizational leadership choices, as tested by the Chi-square technique.

None of the five factors: class, sex, age, major, and religion are significantly associated with social leadership choices, as tested by the Chi-square technique.

None of the four factors: class, age, major, and religion are significantly associated with dating choices, as tested by the Chi-square technique.

None of the five factors: class, sex, age, major, and religion are significantly associated with friendship choices, as tested by the Chi-square technique.

None of the five factors: class, sex, age, major, and religion are significantly associated with rejection choices, as tested by the Chi-square technique.

C. The Given Conditions.

1. The universe of study included the University of Washington students of Japanese ancestry[2] registered for spring quarter, 1948. There were 191 of such students registered of which 126 were males and 65 were females. This population compares with the total student body of the University of Washington for the same period as follows: total enrollment, 14,737;

---

2 The term "Nisei" will be found frequently in this thesis as a synonym for "Japanese". Technically, the term, Nisei, means second generation, those born in this country of immigrant parents. However, popular usage has limited the term to refer to American-born and American-reared persons of Japanese ancestry. Those who are born in America but reared in Japan are called "Kibei".

males, 10,946; females, 3,791.[3]

2. The variables selected for testing as to whether they were associated with the five questions of attraction and rejection were:

a. Year in college. Instead of classifying students according to the conventional categories of freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior, the categories of upper class (juniors and seniors) and lower class (freshmen and sophomores) were selected. This was done for two purposes--to insure a sufficient number of cases in all questions, and to minimize some of the deviations caused by the war.[4]

b. Major scholastic interest. Preliminary tabulations showed that the great majority (71.2%) of the Nisei students were either social science or science majors. For this reason the scholastic interests were classified and tabulated as social science, science, and other.

---

3 The data for the total University enrollment were secured from the registrar's office. The data for the Nisei students were secured by going through 14,737 cards in the file at the Office of Student Affairs. Criterion for the latter data constituted recognition of the Japanese names since no information is available on ethnic stock. Professor Henry S. Tatsumi of the Far Eastern Department at the University of Washington, told the writer that this method is practically 100% reliable and valid. Actually, the writer experienced one mistake, and that was an error of inclusion. A William Maki turned out to be a student of Finnish ancestry; Maki is a Japanese name, also.

4 Because of the interruption caused by time spent out of college during the war, many older students were a year or two (and in some cases more) behind their original classes. By classifying students as lower or upper class, these deviations were somewhat minimized. However, the chief reason was to insure that a sufficient number of cases would appear in each category.

c. Religious preference. Because of the small number of non-Protestants, and the reticence of many students to indicate preference of any kind, religious preference was classified and tabulated as Protestant, other, and no answer. For the Criswell test in Chapter II, the other and no answer categories were combined.

d. Age. Arbitrarily, the writer classified the students into three categories: under 20, 20 to 24, and 25 and over.

e. Sex. The generally accepted, non-technical dichotomy of male and female was used.

f. Students of Japanese ancestry. Ancestry was dichotomized as Japanese ancestry or non-Japanese ancestry. Part-Japanese ancestry was classified and tabulated as Japanese ancestry.[5]

3. The data for the study were secured from responses to a questionnaire designed for this survey and which will be described later.[6] In addition, the registration records of the University were utilized through the Office of Student Affairs. Information regarding the total campus population of registered students was secured through the cooperation of the Office of the Registrar.

D. The Method.

1. The Questionnaire. During the spring quarter of 1948, a

---

5 As far as the writer knew, there was only one case of a part-Japanese student enrolled at the University of Washington during the spring quarter of 1948.

6 See Appendix A.

questionnaire was circulated to all students of Japanese ancestry currently registered at the University of Washington. The schedules were administered in three stages. The first stage included personal contact of Nisei respondents by Nisei assistants secured by the writer to work with him. The second stage included mail contact with all those who could not be contacted in person. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was included to facilitate response. The third stage constituted an overall follow-up by mail to all those who had failed to return questionnaires. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was again included in the packet mailed out.[7]

In order to secure the interest and cooperation of campus Nisei the writer interviewed those who were active in one or more organizations. Some questions included in the questionnaire were the results of these interviews--questions desired by certain groups, but which were not analyzed in this study.

Also kept in mind was the sociometric study conducted at a polyethnic high school.[8] Effort was made to make the questionnaire as similar as possible so that comparisons of the findings might be made.

---

7 Mail, even with self-addressed, stamped envelopes included, is a poor substitute for personal contact in terms of responses secured. The second stage brought 30% returns, and the third stage brought only 21%. Mail technique was used because students left the campus during the summer. A desirable alternative would have been to administer the schedules during the fall or winter quarter, leaving at least one school quarter for follow-up on a personal basis.

8 Virginia Beazley Hertzler, op. cit. Also, see Appendix C.

The basic data of this thesis were secured from answers to five questions.

a. Who among the students seems to you to have the best organizational ability in group and club affairs?

b. Who among the students seems to you to have the best ideas about social matters? (dates, arranging socials and parties, etc.)

c. Of the students now attending the University of Washington, who would you choose to date?

d. Who among the students are your best friends? (boys and girls)

e. It is an obvious fact that we do not like everyone equally well. List here the names of students whom you don't like so well, wouldn't care to run around with, or feel that your personalities clash.

The questions roughly represent an increasing order of intimacy as follows: organizational leadership, social leadership, dating, and friendship.[9]

The fifth question on rejection choices, was designed to bring out the characteristics of the dislike choice pattern. Respondents

---

9 Dating and friendship are closely related behavior phenomena. Which is the more intimate may be open to question. Usually, dates are secured from among friends, however, it has been argued that dates can be more casual as it may be just for one occasion in our culture, whereas friendship is the more enduring and, therefore, the more intimate of the two. At least, that is the assumption here taken, and the tabulations give it some support, albeit not a statistically significant difference.

are reluctant to answer this question for a number of reasons; therefore, the percentage of participation on this question was low.[10] Previous studies have indicated that persons disliked tend to be chosen more frequently than by chance from the same in-group as the persons liked. Is it possible that one's own friends and one's greatest dislikes come from the same in-groups? In the analysis of the rejection question these problems will be discussed at greater length.

It was anticipated that the inclusion of the rejection question would lower the proportion of returns. However, as a result of a sample pretest among twelve randomly selected Nisei students, there was 83% cooperation, which was encouraging enough to attempt inclusion of the question. As it turned out, the pretest was too optimistic, particularly among the male students.

2. Statistical Analysis. In analyzing the data two statistical techniques were utilized: (a) the Criswell technique,[11] and (b) the Chi-square technique.

The Criswell technique was employed to compute an index indicating the strength of the tendency toward in-group or out-group

---

10 George A. Lundberg in his study of women's residence halls found that girls objected to the rejection question with such reasons as "contrary to what I have learned at home and in church"; "I think it very unfair to deliberately dig out of my mind three people that I don't like especially"; "I think questions like this encourage intolerance". There seems to be a strong moral objection in our culture to admitting or vocalizing our personal dislikes. Elsewhere in this thesis, similar reactions by Nisei students will be noted.

11 Joan H. Criswell, "Sociometric Methods of Measuring Group Preferences", Sociometry, 6:398-408, November, 1943.

choices in relation to the selections that could be expected from chance alone. The Chi-square technique was applied to each of the tables, to test the null hypothesis that none of the factors mentioned earlier were significantly associated with the choice of friends.

The Criswell index consists of securing for each sub-group (a) the actual ratio by the expected (chance) ratio. The basic formula for the expected ratios involves the following terms:

Let a = the number of individuals in any sub-group.
t = total number of choices by any sub-group.
n = total number of individuals in whole population tested.
E = expected ratio between in-group and out-group choices.

If it is assumed that a population consists of two sub-groups 1 and 2 making t_1 and t_2 choices respectively. Then:

(1) $\frac{t_1(a_1-1)}{n-1}$ = Number of expected in-group choices by sub-group 1, and

(2) $\frac{t_1(n-a_1)}{n-1}$ = Number of expected out-group choices by sub-group 1, dividing the first expression by the second, the expected ratio between in-group and out-group choices for sub-group 1 is:

(3) $\frac{a_1-1}{n-a_1} = E$ The index for self-preference (for their own group as against the total population minus their own group) then becomes:

(4) $$\frac{\text{Observed No. of in-group choices} \,/\, \text{Observed No. of out-group choices}}{E} = I_g.$$ (General Index)

An index greater than 1.00 indicates a preference for their own group; and index of 1.00 indicates complete indifference as between their own group and the rest of the population; and an index below 1.00 indicates a preference for the out-group rather than their own group. This index, I_g, is known as the General Index.

If it is desired to secure an index of in-group preference as against any particular out-group (rather than as against the total population minus their own group), the following is used:

(5) $$\frac{\text{Observed No. of in-group choices} \,/\, \text{Observed No. of choices given to particular out-group}}{\text{Population of in-group} \,/\, \text{Population of out-group}} = I_s.$$

I_s is termed the specific index. The interpretation of the numerical value of the index is the same as for the above case.

3. Sampling design. Since the universe of study involved a student population of only 191, the writer attempted to cover the entire universe. Consequently, no sampling design was involved. The number of students who participated in the study was 131, or 68.6%. This included 86 males (68.3% of the males) and 45 females (69.2% of the females).

The question is raised in regards to studies with only partial returns from a questionnaire: In what way would the conclusions have differed if the entire universe had responded? George A. Lundberg points out that two sharply opposing hypotheses may be formulated regarding such an inquiry.[12]

> a. On the one hand, it may be hypothesized that people who refuse to answer an inquiry of this kind (those who resent it, are indifferent, etc.) are likely to be more independent also in their choices of friends, with the result that their answers would probably show less in-group tendencies than the answers of the group here reported upon. If so, the inclusion of those who failed to reply would, of course, reduce the size of the indices reported for the sample obtained and here reported upon.
>
> b. On the other hand, it may be hypothesized that the group which did not answer the questionnaire are the less inhibited on questions of the kind used in this study ('I-choose-whom-I-like-and-don't-care-who-knows-it.') and therefore were less likely to make in-group choices than the group which failed to reply. If so, the indices here reported would be higher if the answers of the non-answering group had been included. The higher indices secured in the college study, which included the

---

12 Lundberg, George A., Hertzler, Virginia B., Lenore Dickson, "Attraction Patterns In a University"; op. cit.

whole student body, might suggest the validity of the latter hypothesis, although only a direct check on the University population could conclusively answer the question.

It is possible, of course, that neither of these differences between the two groups exist, and that no significant difference exists. This remains a question for further study.

It must be assumed that the conclusions from this study apply only to the universe which responded. Any further claims would be scientifically unwarranted.

E. The Description of the Data.

In this section characteristics of the sample are described. Since the universe of study (Nisei students registered at the University of Washington, Spring, 1948) is not totally represented, the description will be concerned with the 86 males and 45 females, or 131 students who participated in this study.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF JAPANESE STUDENTS BY SEX

Sex	Number in Universe	Number in Sample	Percent in Sample
Male	126	86	68.3
Female	65	45	69.2
Total	191	131	68.6

Table 1 shows that approximately the same percentage responded to the questionnaire in terms of the two sexes: male, 68.3% and female, 69.2%.[13]

---

13 If the survey was initiated during the winter quarter instead of spring quarter, the percentage of returns would have undoubtedly been increased. As it was, students scattered for the summer and call-backs were extremely difficult to make.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF JAPANESE STUDENTS BY CLASSES

Class	Number in Universe	Number in Sample	Percent in Sample
Lower	104	72	69.2
Upper	87	59	67.8
Total	191	131	68.6

Distribution of the Japanese students by class and age categories are shown in Tables 2 and 3. 72 students, or 69.2%, of the lower division students participated in the study. The upper class had a slightly lower participation percentage in proportion to their total number, 67.8%.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF JAPANESE STUDENTS BY AGE

Age	Number in Universe	Number in Sample	Percent in Sample
Under 20	49	36	73.4
20 to 24	100	62	62.0
25 and over	42	33	78.5
Total	191	131	68.6

Over 50% of the Nisei students fall in the 20 to 24 age group, but this group's participation in the study was the poorest, 62%, as compared to 73.4% for the under 20, and 78.5% for the 25 and over group.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF JAPANESE STUDENTS BY MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY

Major	Number in Universe	Number in Sample	Percent in Sample
Social Science	65	43	66.1
Science	71	55	77.4
Other	55	33	60.0
Total	191	131	68.6

Table 4 indicates that approximately 75% of the Japanese students are either social science or science majors (98 out of 131). The science group had the highest percentage of returns, as well as being the largest group. The leading fields included within the other category were art, architecture, pre-majors, and general studies.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF JAPANESE STUDENTS BY RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE

Religion	Number in Universe	Number in Sample	Percent in Sample
Protestant	101	68	67.3
Non-Protestant	28	20	71.4
No Answers	62	43	69.3
Total	191	131	68.6

Table 5 shows that the Protestants are the largest group in the religious category. The other religious groups were represented in such small numbers that they were combined as Non-Protestants. A large group failed to indicate religious preference.

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF JAPANESE STUDENTS BY VETERAN STATUS

Veteran Status	Number in Universe	Number in Sample	Percent in Sample
Veteran	86	52	60.4
Non-veteran	105	79	75.2
Total	191	131	68.6

There were 86 veterans of Japanese ancestry and Table 6 indicates that 52, or 60.4%, participated in the study. The non-veterans are proportionately numerous because all but one of the girls are non-veterans. The response by non-veterans was much better, 75.2% participating in this study.

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON STUDENT BODY BY SEXES

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	10,946	74.3
Female	3,791	25.7
Total	14,737	100.0

Table 7 shows the total student population according to sex. An overwhelming male proportion is indicated.[14]

---

14 The figures for the University of Washington student body for spring quarter, 1948, (Tables 7 through 11) were secured from the Office of the Registrar, University of Washington.

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON STUDENT BODY BY AGE

Age	Number	Percent
Under 20	1,606	10.9
20 to 24	7,511	51.0
25 and over	5,620	38.1
Total	14,737	100.0

89.1% of the students are 20 or over in age, according to Table 8. The postponement of school life for a great many during the war probably explains the predominance of students over 20.

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON STUDENT BODY BY CLASS

Class	Number	Percent
Lower	7,899	53.6
Upper	6,838	46.4
Total	14,737	100.0

While Table 9 indicates a fairly even distribution of students according to upper and lower class students, the preceding table would suggest a greater proportion of upper class students. This further strengthens the hypothesis that war postponement explains the older age distribution of the University of Washington students in 1948.

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON STUDENT BODY BY RELIGION

Religion	Number	Percent
Protestant	9,437	64.0
Non-Protestant	5,300	36.0
Total	14,737	100.0

Table 10 clearly shows that the majority of students are affiliated or indicate preference for the Protestant group. 64% indicated Protestant preference.

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON STUDENT BODY BY VETERAN STATUS

Veteran Status	Number	Percent
Veteran	8,893	60.3
Non-veteran	5,844	39.7
Total	14,737	100.0

60.3% are veterans, according to Table 11, which helps to explain the predominance of students over 20 (Table 9).

In summary, 131 of the 191 Japanese students (68.6%) at the University of Washington responded to this study. Tables 1 through 6 show the breakdown by the number of Japanese students registered at the University and the number who responded according to the categories of sex,

class, age, major, religion, and veteran status, respectively.

Table 7 through 11 show the total student population and the proportion as they are categorized. The data on the total student body is included in order to utilize the Criswell technique. The University population is preponderantly male, veteran, and protestant. The age and class categories are more equally divided.

Utilizing the population data here described, the following two chapters will analyze the in- and out-group choices on the five questions, and the null-hypotheses of no association between their choices and the background factors.

CHAPTER II

IN-GROUP PREFERENCE AND REJECTION PATTERNS

A. In-group Preference on Ethnic Factor.

Hypothesis: Students of Japanese ancestry prefer themselves over all other students, as determined by the Criswell technique.

Do the students of Japanese ancestry prefer members of their own group over other students? The answer is clearly indicated, according to the Criswell technique, in Table 12.

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES AND INDICES OF IN-GROUP PREFERENCE FOR JAPANESE STUDENTS IN RELATION TO NON-JAPANESE STUDENTS ON THE FIVE QUESTIONS

Questions	Number	Choices Given to: Japanese No.	Japanese Pct.	Non-Japanese No.	Non-Japanese Pct.	Total	General Indices
A. Organizational Leader	191	117	66.9	58	33.1	175	153.97
B. Social Leader	191	109	81.3	25	18.7	134	332.82
C. Dating	191	86	77.5	25	22.5	111	262.60
D. Friendship	191	254	79.9	64	20.1	318	303.05
E. Rejection	191	76	81.7	17	18.3	93	341.22

It is found that in each of the five situations, Nisei students prefer Japanese over non-Japanese without an exception. The organizational leadership situation seemed to have the least cohesiveness, with the three other attraction patterns and the one rejection pattern indicating much more cohesiveness. This seems logical inasmuch as organizational leadership involves activities such as Associated Women Students, A. S. U. W., Associated Men's Students, and other large organizations of the campus open to all students. Nisei have much more access to these leaders, who happen to be almost entirely non-Japanese.

In the social leadership situation there is less access for members of the out-groups to know intimately the doings of the in-group social clubs, and such things as who are the most capable and best organizers. By the limitation of access and proximity, Nisei seem to choose those they know to have produced the best results in social activities, and these happened to be fellow Nisei in the clubs and activities in which they had participated. The General Index of 332.82 indicates more cohesiveness in the social leadership situation than in either the dating or the friendship situations.

However, dating and friendship are both strong in-group situations. Dating produced a General Index of 262.60 and friendship had a General Index of 303.05. By percentage, dating had 22.5% of their choices for the out-group, and friendship had 20.1% for the out-group. For the Nisei who participated in this study, friendship seems to be a more intimate situation than dating, if we are to judge by the strength of in-group cohesiveness.

On the rejection question, there is an amazing parallel in the choice

patterns with the three more intimate attraction choices. Nisei rejected 81.7% of their own group, and rejected only 18.3% of the outgroup, possessing a General Index of 341.22. However, it is interesting to note that only 93 choices were cast in the rejection question, and 318, or over three times as many choices were cast in the friendship question.

These findings strongly suggest that there are factors operating other than pure chance in the choice behavior of the Nisei students in the universe of study. What are some of these factors? Already, we have found marked cohesiveness around the ethnic factor, according to the Criswell technique. Are there further factors?

The subsequent tables in this chapter, analyzing the friendship and the rejection questions, attempt to throw light on the above question.

B. In-Group Preference on Other Background Factors.

Hypothesis: There are factors (class, sex, age, religion, veteran status) operating more than pure chance in the friendship and rejection choice behavior patterns of the universe here studied, as determined by the Criswell technique.

Tables 13 and 14 show the choice patterns of the friendship and rejection questions by classes. These were responses to the following two questions respectively:

Who among the students are your best friends? (boys and girls)

It is an abvious fact that we do not like everyone equally well. List here the names of students whom you don't like so well, wouldn't care to run around with, or feel that your personalities clash.

Persons disliked tend to be chosen more frequently than by chance from the same in-group as the persons liked. In both instances, the upper class shows greater in-group tendencies. This may be expected, as

upper class students have presumably known each other longer, have had opportunities to experience more things together, including the attendance of many classes as well as extra-curricular activities.

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES AND INDICES OF IN-GROUP PREFERENCE AMONG CLASSES

Class	Number	Choices Given to: Lower	Upper	Total	General Indices
Lower	7,899	140	45	185	2.57
Upper	6,838	26	99	125	4.627
Total	14,737	166	144	310	

Having more frequent contacts may be the source of greater rejection choices also, as indicated by the indices. The conditions which favor friendship seem also to favor rejection choices.

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES AND INDICES OF IN-GROUP REJECTION AMONG CLASSES

Class	Number	Choices Given to: Lower	Upper	Total	General Indices
Lower	7,899	30	20	50	1.24
Upper	6,838	11	35	46	3.86
Total	14,737	41	55	96	

Probing in the rejection area poses a difficult problem.[15] Students are not accustomed to making known to others whom they dislike, or to even admit it to themselves. In regards to the rejection question, remarks such as, "None-what-so-ever"; "Never gave it a thought"; "I do not dislike anybody"; "It is against my principles to dislike"; indicate either considerable reticence in responding or actually didn't know who to name. In a follow-up letter the following comments were made to encourage the naturalness of the question:

> In asking for persons with whom you would least like to associate I am cognizant of the fact that most of us do not usually think in such terms and that such thinking is quite disturbing. At the same time, we know we do not like all people to the same degree--we like some people more than others. That is not the same as saying we hate some people. Some people have special food allergies even though they don't necessarily dislike the food. We react similarly with people quite often.

Indices of Table 15 and 16 again indicate the in-group choice pattern of the friendship and rejection situations.

---

15 In an attempt to secure greater response in the area of rejection, the following remarks were inserted in the questionnaire: "In previous studies a few students have shown reluctance to name people here because they feel it is contrary to certain religious and ethical ideals. This is a misunderstanding both of the nature of our inquiry and of ethics. We are not asking you to judge these people or to be uncharitable toward them. We all know very well that in our daily lives we avoid people we do not like and that others avoid us for the same reason. We may regret the fact, but only by facing it, rather than hypocritically denying it to ourselves, can we hope to find out why we dislike some people, and thus be able to do something to overcome our dislike. Our dislikes may reflect our own shortcomings."

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES AND INDICES OF IN-GROUP PREFERENCE AMONG THE SEXES

Sex	Number	Choices Given to: Male	Female	Total	General Indices
Male	10,946	166	32	198	1.79
Female	3,791	19	101	120	15.38
Total	14,737	185	133	318	

These tables show the choices according to sex. Females seem to have the higher General Indices in both the friendship and rejection situations, but more so in the friendship situation.

TABLE 16

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES AND INDICES OF IN-GROUP REJECTION AMONG THE SEXES

Sex	Number	Choices Given to: Male	Female	Total	General Indices
Male	10,946	23	7	30	1.137
Female	3,791	17	49	66	8.324
Total	14,737	40	56	96	

Males seem to be less in-group (practically approaching the indifferent score of 1.00), and more independent in their rejections choices, while the females, not yet experienced as equals, perhaps feel a greater need to stick together. In this respect, females are not dissimilar to a minority racial or religious group.

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES AND INDICES OF IN-GROUP PREFERENCE AMONG AGE GROUPS

Age	Number	Choices Given to: Under 20	20-24	25 and over	Total	General Indices
Under 20	1,606	65	26	4	95	17.76
20 to 24	7,511	19	108	24	161	2.42
25 and over	5,620	2	31	26	59	1.28
Total	14,737	86	165	54	305	

Age appears to be a factor in the choice behavior among those who are under twenty in age. The young students, by their indices, show the strongest cohesiveness in both the friendship and rejection situations. (Tables 17 and 18)

TABLE 18

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES AND INDICES OF IN-GROUP REJECTION AMONG AGE GROUPS

Age	Number	Choices Given to: Under 20	20-24	25 and over	Total	General Indices
Under 20	1,606	21	17	3	41	8.61
20 to 24	7,511	7	21	14	42	.96
25 and over	5,620	2	4	7	13	1.60
Total	14,737	30	42	24	96	

Again, there is a marked similarity in the pattern of verbal behavior, although the 20 to 24 age group deviates slightly in the rejection situation and shows an indifferent tendency, even slightly out-

group, according to the Criswell technique.

There appears to be a contradiction between the indices according to classes and the indices according to age groups. In the class categories, the upper class showed more cohesiveness. In the age group, the youngest group showed the strongest in-group. A partial explanation may be that age, at the time of the survey, did not necessarily correlate with the class hierarchy. In fact, the number of returning G.I. students temporarily threw the age category askew. Also, this may be an indication that class is the more likely factor for influencing choices--it being the more likely factor for greater association in school situations.

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES AND INDICES OF IN-GROUP PREFERENCE AMONG RELIGIONS

Religion	Number	Choices Given to: Protestants	Non-Protestants	Total	General Indices
Protestants	9,437	96	63	159	.85
Non-Prot.	5,300	85	75	160	2.01
Total	14,737	181	138	319	

Unlike the other factors, religion, when categorized as Protestants and Non-Protestants (including "No answers"), shows an index of out-group preference in so far as Protestant friendship choices are concerned. This is probably due to the fact that religious classifications are not

important and that students are not regular church attenders (as indicated by the great number of "No answers"; see Table 41). Also, the great number of Protestants at the University of Washington creates a high expectancy value for the Protestants. The indices for Non-Protestants are very similar for both the friendship and rejection situations. The Protestant rejection index is practically one of indifference.

TABLE 20

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES AND INDICES OF IN-GROUP REJECTION AMONG RELIGIONS

Religion	Number	Choices Given to: Protestants	Non-Protestants	Total	General Indices
Protestants	9,437	39	21	60	1.04
Non-Prot.	5,300	18	14	32	2.28
Total	14,737	57	35	92	

Data were secured for analysis according to the veteran status. Again, there is noted a remarkable similarity in the choice patterns of the friendship and rejection questions. Both veterans and non-veterans show in-group preferances, with non-veterans exhibiting strong self preference.

TABLE 21

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES AND INDICES OF IN-GROUP PREFERENCE AMONG VETERANS

Veteran Status	Number	Choices Given to: Veteran	Non-veteran	Total	General Indices
Veteran	8,893	85	29	114	1.93
Non-vet.	5,844	41	158	199	5.86
Total	14,737	126	187	313	

John Griswold, in 1947, found that there were no significant attitudinal differences between veterans and non-veterans.[16] The pre-

TABLE 22

DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES AND INDICES OF IN-GROUP REJECTION AMONG VETERANS

Veteran Status	Number	Choices Given to: Veteran	Non-veteran	Total	General Indices
Veteran	8,893	12	5	17	1.58
Non-vet.	5,844	23	55	78	3.64
Total	14,737	35	60	95	

16 Manzer J. Griswold, "Comparison of Certain Attitudes Held by Male World War II Veteran and Non-Veteran Students at the University of Washington, 1945-1946" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Washington, 1947).

sent study, for the universe as stated earlier, indicates that both friendship and rejection choices show in-group cohesiveness according to veteran status. This suggests two possible hypotheses:

> Veterans share many experiences of the past and find themselves in similar campus plights of being above-age, lower class, male sex.
>
> Most of the non-veterans are females, and it is found in Tables 15 and 16 that females exhibit strong self-preference.

C. Summary.

Are there factors operating more than pure chance would indicate in the choice behavior patterns of the universe here studied? In order to secure an answer to the above question, the Criswell technique was applied to the responses of the Japanese students in the five choice situations.

The indices when determined with the ethnic affiliation as the background factor indicated that Nisei students strongly prefer themselves to non-Nisei students in every choice situation. Their least cohesive choice situation proved to be the choice of organizational leaders. The three other attraction choices, social leaders, dating, and friendship, showed much more self-preference. Of the latter three, dating indicated the least in-group tendency.

The fifth choice situation, that of rejection, indicated in-group relations just as the friendship situation. From the ethnic standpoint, the rejection index indicated an even greater General Index than friendship. Because of the amazing similarity between the friendship and the rejection choice patterns, further analyses were made on them using class, sex, age, religion, and veteran status

as background factors.

With the exception of the 20 to 24 category in the rejection question and the Protestant category in the friendship question, all other factors indicated self-preference more than chance would indicate. Protestants had an index of .854, which indicates out-group preference. Non-Protestants showed an index of in-group preference for both questions. The 20 to 24 age group indicated indifference to slight out-group tendency in their rejection choice pattern. Otherwise, age appeared to be a factor in the choice situations.

The consistency with which the background factors showed indices of in-group preference indicates that there definitely are factors operating more than mere chance in the covert behavior of students. These factors could very well be summarized as factors of association, or propinquity, as each of the factors facilitate easy access through greater probability of association. For example, class in-group means probability of frequent associations and long-term associations; age in-group also indicates, for students, with some deviations due to G. I. students, probabilities of frequent associations because of the likelihood of being in the same class in-group. Students of Japanese ancestry seem to be very strongly in-group; most of their functions appear to be primarily based on the fact that they are of Japanese ancestry, then secondarily, that they have similar interests, etc.

The rejection in-group indices suggest that non-contact is not the chief factor for rejection. In fact, students apparently reject those

with whom it is difficult to get along, and students are most aware of such situations within the confines of their own group where frequency of contact forces attention upon the unpleasant aspects of daily activities.

CHAPTER III

BACKGROUND FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH IN-GROUP AND OUT-GROUP CHOICES

Whether or not the criterion of the question is significantly associated with the choice of organizational leaders, social leaders, dates, friends, and also with the rejection choice shall be examined in this chapter by the use of the Chi-square technique. In the null hypothesis it shall be assumed that none of the factors (class, age, sex, religion, major scholastic interest) are associated with the various choices. If the Chi-square is not significant at the .05 level, the null hypothesis shall be accepted. If, on the other hand, the Chi-square is significant at the .05 level, the null hypothesis shall be rejected and it shall be assumed that the pertinent factor is significantly associated with the choice situation.

A. The first question to be analyzed will be, "Who among the students seems to you to have the best organizational ability in group and club affairs?", otherwise known as the organizational leadership question.

Hypothesis: None of the five factors: class, sex, age, major, and religion are significantly associated with organizational leadership choices, as tested by the Chi-square technique.

Table 23 shows the distribution and percentages of choices among college classes. We notice here that class status is not significantly associated with the choices for organizational leaders. The lower class

TABLE 23

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP CHOICES AMONG COLLEGE CLASSES

Class	Choices Given to: Lower		Upper		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Lower	23	25.6	67	74.4	90	100
Upper	9	12.3	64	87.7	73	100
Total	32	19.6	131	80.4	163	100

Chi-square = 4.46 Critical value at .05 level = 3.84

gave to its out-group, the upper class, 67 out of 90 choices, or 74.4%. The upper class gave to its own group 64 out of 73 choices, or 87.7%. For this criterion, upper class membership seems to be an important factor, and the Chi-square of 4.46 is significant at the .05 level. Therefore, we shall reject the hypothesis that class status is not significantly associated with the organizational leadership choices.

TABLE 24

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP CHOICES AMONG THE SEXES

Sex	Choices Given to: Male		Female		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Male	86	90.5	9	9.5	95	100
Female	17	23.3	56	76.7	73	100
Total	103	61.3	65	38.7	168	100

Chi-square = 78.6 Critical value at .05 level = 3.84

Table 24 shows that for organizational leaders male Nisei students gave 86 out of 95 choices to themselves, or 90.5%. The female Nisei students gave only 56 out of 73 choices to themselves as organizational leaders, or 76.7%. There is an indication that sex is significantly associated with the organizational leadership choices. The Chi-square of 78.6 is significant at the .05 level, and the null hypothesis that sex is not associated with the choices for organizational leaders is therefore rejected.

TABLE 25

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP CHOICES AMONG GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY AGES

Age Groups	Choices Given to: Under 20		20 to 24		25 and over		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Under 20	2	4.3	41	89.1	3	6.5	46	100
20 to 24	7	8.4	55	66.2	21	25.3	83	100
25 and over	1	3.0	22	66.7	10	30.3	33	100
Total	10	6.1	118	72.8	35	21.6	162	100

Chi-square = 10.04 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

Table 25 indicates that the age group 20 to 24 is the most popular group for organizational leaders. 118 out of 162 choices were given to this group, or 72.8%. The under 20 group gave 41 out of 46, or 89.1%, the 20 to 24 group gave 55 out of 83 choices, or 66.2%, and even the 25 and over group gave 22 out of 33 choices to the 20 to 24 age group. Apparently, the older group spends more time with serious study leaving the activities to the 20 to 24 age group, and the under 20 group gave even a greater proportion to the 20 to 24 group.

The Chi-square of 10.04, critical value at the .05 level being 9.49, indicates that age, as classified above, is significantly associated with the choices of organizational leaders, and therefore the null hypothesis must be rejected.

Table 26 shows that the social science majors are the most frequently selected choices for organizational leadership, receiving 90 out of 160 choices, or 56.2%. All groups gave over 50% to the social

TABLE 26

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP CHOICES AMONG COLLEGE MAJORS

College Majors	Choices Given to: Social Science		Science		Other		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Social Science	35	56.4	5	8.0	22	35.4	62	100
Science	29	52.7	17	30.9	9	16.3	55	100
Other	26	60.4	7	16.2	10	23.2	43	100
Total	90	56.2	29	18.1	41	25.6	160	100

Chi-square = 13.04 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

science group, but the choices to the science group deviated significantly. The Chi-square of 13.04, critical value at the .05 level being 9.49, indicates that college major, as classified above, is significantly associated with choices of organizational leaders, and therefore, the null hypothesis must be rejected.

The distribution of choices as classified in Table 27 fall in the expected manner with deviations which are not significant statistically at the .05 level. The Chi-square of 5.084, with the critical value at the .05 level being 9.49, indicates that religion, as classified above, is not significantly associated with the choices of organizational leaders,

TABLE 27

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP CHOICES AMONG RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Religious Groups	Choices Given to: Protestant		Other		No Answer		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Protestant	61	71.7	10	11.8	14	16.4	85	100
Other	27	67.5	5	12.5	8	20.0	40	100
No Answer	25	65.8	2	5.3	11	28.9	38	100
Total	113	69.3	17	10.4	33	20.2	163	100

Chi-square = 5.084 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

and therefore, the null hypothesis must be accepted.

In summary, it is found by the use of the Chi-square technique that the following factors, class status, sex, age and college majors are significantly associated with the choices for organizational leaders, while religious preference was not significantly associated with the choices for organizational leaders.

B. The second question to be analyzed will be, "Who among the students seems to you to have the best ideas about social matters? (dates, arranging socials and parties, etc.)," otherwise known as the social leadership question.

Hypothesis: None of the five factors: class, sex, age major, and religion are significantly associated with social leadership choices, as tested by the Chi-square technique.

TABLE 28

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF SOCIAL LEADERSHIP CHOICES AMONG COLLEGE CLASSES

Class	Choices Given to: Lower		Upper		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Lower	43	47.8	47	52.2	90	100
Upper	15	27.3	40	72.7	55	100
Total	58	39.3	87	60.7	145	100

Chi-square = 6.00 Critical value at .05 level = 3.84

Table 28 shows the predominance of choices for social leadership given to the upper class members; however, the significantly greater preference for their own group by the upper class is noted. The Chi-square of 6.00 is significant at the .05 level, so the null hypothesis must be rejected. Class membership is found to be significantly associated with the choices for social leadership.

Table 29 shows both sexes preferring themselves as social leaders, but with a stronger preference on the part of the females, 85.2% as

TABLE 29

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF SOCIAL LEADERSHIP CHOICES AMONG THE SEXES

Sex	Choices Given to: Male		Female		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Male	53	68.8	24	31.2	77	100
Female	10	14.8	58	85.2	68	100
Total	63	43.4	82	56.6	145	100

Chi-square = 43.0 Critical value at .05 level = 3.84

compared with the males in-group preference of 68.8%. The Chi-square of 43.0 is significant at the .05 level; therefore, sex must be accepted as being significantly associated with the choices of social leadership.

TABLE 30

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF SOCIAL LEADERSHIP CHOICES AMONG GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY AGE

Age Groups	Choices Given to: Under 20		20 to 24		25 and over		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Under 20	19	40.4	22	46.8	6	12.7	47	100
20 to 24	15	19.7	55	72.3	6	7.8	76	100
25 and over	4	15.3	11	42.3	11	42.3	26	100
Total	38	25.5	88	59.0	23	15.4	149	100

Chi-square = 26.03 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

Table 30 shows that the age group 20 to 24 is the most popular choice for social leadership. However, the equal preference of the 25 and over group toward themselves as toward the 20 to 24 group, as well as the extraordinary in-group preference of the 20 to 24 group indicate deviations from the expected pattern according to the null hypothesis. The Chi-square of 26.03 is significant at the .05 level, and the age groupings, as classified above, is found to be significantly associated with the choices for social leadership.

TABLE 31

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF SOCIAL LEADERSHIP CHOICES AMONG COLLEGE MAJORS

College Majors	Choices Given to: Social Science		Science		Other		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Social Science	30	61.2	6	12.2	13	26.5	49	100
Science	25	41.6	16	26.6	19	31.6	60	100
Other	22	59.4	9	24.3	6	16.2	37	100
Total	77	52.7	31	21.2	38	26.0	146	100

Chi-square = 7.39 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

Table 31 shows the social science majors receiving 77 out of 146, or 52.7% of all choices as the social leader. Each group preferred themselves as social leaders, except the lump group known as "Other", who preferred the science group. The Chi-square of 7.39 is not significant at the .05 level, and so the null hypothesis that college

majors are not significantly associated with the choices of social leadership is accepted.

TABLE 32

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF SOCIAL LEADERSHIP CHOICES AMONG RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Religious Groups	Choices Given to: Protestant		Other		No Answer		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Protestant	51	67.1	13	17.1	12	15.8	76	100
Other	10	40.0	6	24.0	9	36.0	25	100
No Answer	23	53.5	12	27.9	8	18.6	43	100
Total	84	58.3	31	21.5	29	20.1	144	100

Chi-square = 8.34 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

Table 32 shows that the religious groups, as classified above, prefer Protestants as social leaders, giving 84 of the 144 choices, or 58.3%. The Chi-square of 8.34 is not significant at the .05 level, and therefore, the null hypothesis that religious groups are not significantly associated with the choices for social leadership is accepted.

In summary, it is found by the use of the Chi-square technique that the following factors, class status, sex, and age were significantly associated with the choices for social leadership, while col-

lege major and religious groups were not found to be significantly associated with the choices for social leadership.

C. The third question to be analyzed will be, "Of the students now attending the University of Washington, who would you choose to date?", otherwise known as the dating question.

Hypothesis: None of the four factors: class, age, major, and religion are significantly associated with dating choices, as tested by the Chi-square technique.

TABLE 33

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF DATING CHOICES AMONG COLLEGE CLASSES

Class	Choices Given to: Lower		Upper		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Lower	40	62.5	24	37.5	64	100
Upper	9	19.1	38	80.9	47	100
Total	49	44.1	62	55.9	111	100

Chi-square = 20.65 Critical value at .05 level=3.84

Table 33 shows that the upper class prefer to date themselves more strongly than the lower class prefer themselves, 80.9% to 62.5%. The Chi-square of 20.65 is significant at the .05 level; therefore, class status must be accespted as being significantly associated with

the choices of social leadership.

Because in our culture dating is considered almost exclusively with the opposite sex, there was no purpose in tabulating and analyzing choice distribution on the ground of sex. Only one girl deviated by naming another girl as her choice of date. Undoubtedly, she misunderstood the intent of the question and considered dating as equivalent to a partner for a social evening which need not be of the opposite sex.

TABLE 34

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF DATING CHOICES AMONG GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY AGE

Age Groups	Choices Given to: Under 20		20 to 24		25 and over		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Under 20	12	34.3	14	40.0	9	25.7	35	100
20 to 24	19	29.6	36	56.3	9	14.1	64	100
25 and over	3	15.0	15	75.0	2	10.0	20	100
Total	34	28.6	65	54.6	20	16.8	119	100

Chi-square = 7.14 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

The pattern of distribution of date choices as indicated in Table 34 shows the 20 to 24 group as the most desirable by all groups, especially by the 25 and over group. Altogether, the 20 to 24 group received 65 of the 119 choices, or 54.6%. The Chi-square conclusion on this table could be questioned in view of the fact that one cell, the 25 and over choosing 25 and over, had an expected value of only 3.36.

Ordinarily, statisticians are warned against using the Chi-square technique on tables where less than an expected value of 5 obtains.[17]

With the above precautions, the following conclusion is presented. The Chi-square of 7.14 is not significant at the .05 level, so the null hypothesis that age is not significantly associated with the choices of dating partners is accepted.

TABLE 35

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF DATING CHOICES AMONG COLLEGE MAJORS

College Majors	Choices Given to: Social Science No.	Pct.	Science No.	Pct.	Other No.	Pct.	Total No.	Pct.
Social Science	27	61.3	8	18.1	9	20.4	44	100
Science	8	25.1	10	31.2	14	43.7	32	100
Other	10	31.0	8	25.0	14	43.7	32	100
Total	45	41.6	26	24.0	37	34.2	108	100

Chi-square = 12.52 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

Social science majors, according to Table 35 appear to be the most popular, receiving 45 of the 108 choices or 41.6%. However, the major reason for this popularity seems to be the strong in-group preference of the Social science group, who gave 27 of the 44 choices or 27% to their own group. The Science and Other groups both seem to

---

17 Allen Edwards, Statistical Analysis, Rinehart and Co., Inc., New York, 1946, p.253.

prefer as their choice of dates, others.

The Chi-square of 12.52 is significant at the .05 level, indicating that college majors are significantly associated with the choices for dates. Accordingly, the null hypothesis is rejected.

TABLE 36

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF DATING CHOICES AMONG RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Religious Groups	Choices Given to: Protestant		Other		No Answer		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Protestant	40	59.7	10	14.9	17	25.4	67	100
Other	10	52.6	5	26.3	4	21.1	19	100
No Answer	11	40.7	12	44.4	4	14.8	27	100
Total	61	54.0	27	23.9	25	22.1	113	100

Chi-square = 9.562 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

The Protestant group are the most popular choices for dates, according to Table 36. Of the 113 choices cast, 61, or 54% were for Protestants. However, 40 of the 61 choices were from Protestants themselves. The distribution of choices to the group known as "Other" showed considerable deviation from the expected value. Perhaps, this is due to the fact that Catholics, Buddhists, Jews and "none" are all lumped together in the category. Persons who didn't indicate their religion seemed to show slightly more preference for non-Protestants as dates.

Accordingly, the null hypothesis is rejected.

In summary, it is found by the use of the Chi-square technique that the following factors are significantly associated with the choices for dates: class status, college major, and religious groups. Age, as here classified, was found not to be significantly associated with the choices for dates. The analysis by sex was not made for the obvious reason that dates (according to our mores) are with the opposite sex.

D. The fourth question to be analyzed will be, "Who among the students are your best friends? (boys and girls)", otherwise known as the friendship question.

Hypothesis: None of the five factors: class, sex, age, major, and religion are significantly associated with friendship choices, as tested by the Chi-square technique.

Friendship appears to be an accustomed and pleasant choice to make judging by Table 37. While the other tables range from 108 to 168 choices, the Friendship table has over 300 choices. Both classes, as

TABLE 37

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF FRIENDSHIP CHOICES AMONG COLLEGE CLASSES

Class	Choices Given to: Lower		Upper		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Lower	140	75.7	45	24.3	185	100
Upper	26	20.8	99	79.2	125	100
Total	166	54.5	144	46.5	310	100

Chi-square = 90.31 Critical value at the .05 level = 3.84

categorized above, prefer their own group to about the same degree. The Chi-square of 90.31 is significant at the .05 level; therefore, the null hypothesis that class status is not significantly associated with friendship choices will be rejected.

TABLE 38

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF FRIENDSHIP CHOICES AMONG THE SEXES

Sex	Choices Given to: Male		Female		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Male	166	83.8	32	16.2	198	100
Female	19	15.9	101	84.1	120	100
Total	185	57.9	133	42.1	318	100

Chi-square = 142.01 Critical value at .05 level = 3.84

In Table 38 the two sexes seem to prefer themselves as friends to about the same degree, both very strongly in-group, 83.8% for males and 84.1% for females. The Chi-square of 142.01 is significant at the .05 level, which forces the rejection of the null hypothesis that sex is not significantly associated with friendship choices.

Table 39 shows the 20 to 24 group as the most desired group for friendship, receiving 165 of the 305 choices, or 54.1%. The under 20 group prefer their own group giving 68.42% of their choices to themselves; the 20 to 24 group also prefer themselves, giving 81.7% of

TABLE 39

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF FRIENDSHIP CHOICES AMONG THE GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY AGE

Age Groups	Choices Given to: Under 20		20 to 24		25 and over		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Under 20	65	68.4	26	27.4	4	4.2	95	100
20 to 24	19	12.6	108	81.7	24	15.9	151	100
25 and over	2	3.4	31	52.5	26	44.1	59	100
Total	86	28.2	165	54.1	54	17.7	305	100

Chi-square = 130.33 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

their choices to themselves. The 25 and over group prefer the 20 to 24 group as friends in preference to themselves, 52.5% to 44.1%. The Chi-square of 130.33 is significant at the .05 level, calling for the rejection of the null hypothesis that age, as classified above, is not significantly associated with friendship choices.

Social science majors and science majors, according to Table 40 prefer themselves for friends, 54.3% and 60%, respectively. In total number of choices received, science majors received the most votes as

TABLE 40

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF FRIENDSHIP CHOICES AMONG COLLEGE MAJORS

College Major	Choices Given to: Social Science		Science		Other		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Social Science	56	54.3	27	26.2	20	19.4	103	100
Science	29	23.2	75	60.0	21	16.8	125	100
Other	33	37.0	35	39.3	21	23.5	19	100
Total	118	37.2	137	43.2	62	19.5	317	100

Chi-square = 31.31 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

friends, getting 137 or 43.2%, but this would be expected as they have the greatest number of students. The Chi-square of 31.31 is significant at the .05 level, and the null hypothesis that the college majors are not significantly associated with the friendship choices must be rejected.

Protestants are preferred as friends, according to Table 41, receiving 181 of the 319 choices, or 56.7%. The Chi-square of 24.95 is significant at the .05 level, indicating the rejection of the null hypothesis that religious groups, as here classified, are not significantly associated with the friendship choices.

TABLE 41

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF FRIENDSHIP CHOICES AMONG RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Religious Groups	Choices Given to: Protestant No.	Pct.	Other No.	Pct.	No Answer No.	Pct.	Total No.	Pct.
Protestant	96	60.4	19	11.9	44	27.7	159	100
Other	34	54.0	20	31.7	9	14.3	63	100
No Answer	51	52.6	8	8.2	38	39.2	97	100
Total	181	56.7	47	14.7	91	28.5	319	100

Chi-square = 24.95 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

In summary, it is found by the use of the Chi-square technique that the following factors are significantly associated at the .05 level with friendship choices: college class, sex, college majors, and religious groups.

E. The fifth question to be analyzed will be, "It is an obvious fact that we do not like everyone equally well. List here the names of students whom you don't like so well, wouldn't care to run around with, or feel your personalities clash", other wise known as the rejection question.

Hypothesis: None of the five factors: class, sex, age, major, and religion are significantly associated with rejection choices, as tested by the Chi-square technique.

Comparisons, wherever possible, will be made with the choice pattern of the friendship choices.

TABLE 42

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF REJECTION CHOICES AMONG COLLEGE CLASSES

Class	Choices Given to: Lower		Upper		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Lower	30	60.0	20	40.0	50	100
Upper	11	23.9	35	76.1	46	100
Total	41	42.7	55	57.3	96	100

Chi-square = 12.75 Critical value at .05 level = 3.84

Table 42 shows the lower classes giving 60% of its rejection choices to themselves, and the upper classes giving 76.1% rejection choices to themselves. In Table 37, lower classes gave 75.7% friendship choices to themselves, and the upper classes gave 79.2% friendship choices to themselves. The pattern of self-preference is strikingly similar. The Chi-square of 12.75 is significant at the .05 level, so the null hypothesis that classes are not significantly associated with rejection choices is rejected.

Rejection choices, according to Table 43, indicate a heavy in-group percentage by sexes, males rejecting themselves 76.7%, and the females 74.2%. Comparative figures for the friendship choices (Table

TABLE 43

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF REJECTION CHOICES AMONG THE SEXES

Sex	Choices Given to: Male		Female		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Male	23	76.6	7	23.4	30	100
Female	17	25.8	49	74.2	66	100
Total	40	41.7	56	58.3	96	100

Chi-square = 21.99 Critical value at .05 level = 3.84

38) show males choosing themselves 83.8% and the females, 84.1%. Again, a striking similarity of choice pattern between rejection and friendship. The Chi-square of 21.99 is significant at the .05 level, calling for rejection of the null hypothesis that sex is not significantly associated with rejection choices.

Table 44 shows 51% of the rejection choices of the youngest group from their own group; 50% of the rejection choices of the middle group from their own group; and 53% of the rejection choices of the oldest group from their own group. While there is some comparability, the similarity with the friendship choice pattern is not

TABLE 44

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF REJECTION CHOICES AMONG GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY AGE

Age Groups	Choices Given to: Under 20		20 to 24		25 and over		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Under 20	21	51.2	17	41.5	3	7.3	41	100
20 to 24	7	16.7	21	50.0	14	33.3	42	100
25 and over	2	15.4	4	30.8	7	53.9	13	100
Total	30	31.3	42	43.8	24	25.0	96	100

Chi-square = 20.69 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

striking. The under 20 group chose as friends 68% from their own group; the 20 to 24 group chose 81% from their own group; and the 25 and over group chose from their own group only 44%. The Chi-square of 20.69 is significant at the .05 level, and the null hypothesis that age, as classified above, is not significantly associated with the rejection choices must be rejected.

TABLE 45

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF REJECTION CHOICES AMONG COLLEGE MAJORS

College Majors	Choices Given to: Social Science		Science		Other		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Social Science	19	48.7	7	17.9	13	33.3	39	100
Science	10	34.4	14	48.2	5	17.2	29	100
Other	7	33.3	5	23.8	9	42.8	21	100
Total	36	40.4	26	29.2	27	30.3	89	100

Chi-square = 11.58 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

In Table 45, social science majors direct 48.7% of their rejection choices to their own group; science majors direct 48.2% to their own group; and other direct 42.8% to their own group. Except for the other group, there is a similar pattern for the distribution of friendship choices, although the in-group feeling is a little more pronounced among the friendship choices. (See Table 40). The Chi-square of 11.58 is significant at the .05 level, and the null hypothesis that college majors, as classified above, is not significantly associated with the rejection choices must be rejected.

In Table 46, three cells of expected values, namely, other choices to no answer, no answer choices to other, and no answer choices to no answer were lower than five. Therefore, the Chi-square is questionable, and must be viewed with the above-mentioned caution. The pattern shows the Protestant to be the most popular rejection choice by all groups, receiving 57 of the 92 choices, or 62%. In this respect there is a similarity with the pattern of friendship choices. (Table 41.) However,

TABLE 46

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF REJECTION CHOICES AMONG RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Religious Groups	Choices Given to: Protestant No.	Pct.	Other No.	Pct.	No Answer No.	Pct.	Total No.	Pct.
Protestant	39	65.0	12	20.0	9	15.0	60	100
Other	13	56.5	8	34.8	2	8.7	23	100
No Answer	5	55.5	3	33.3	1	11.1	9	100
Total	57	62.0	23	25.0	12	13.0	92	100

Chi-square = 2.522 Critical value at .05 level = 9.49

the pattern differs for the other two groups. If the Chi-square can be considered at all, it is not significant at the .05 level, and the null hypothesis that religious groups, as here classified, are significantly associated with the rejection choices must be accepted.

In summary, it is found by the Chi-square technique that the following factors are significantly associated at the .05 level with the rejection choices: college class, sex, age, and college major. With the previously explained cautions taken into consideration, the Chi-square for the religious group rejection choices were found to be not significant at the .05 level.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Summary.

During the spring quarter of 1948 a sociometric study was conducted among the 191 students of Japanese ancestry registered for full time study at the University of Washington. Of these students, 131, or 68.6%, responded to the questionnaire. The data of this paper is concerned with the responses of the 68.6% who participated.

This study was chiefly concerned with two problems: (1) Which, if any, of certain objectively determinable factors were associated to a greater degree than pure chance with the friendship and rejection choices? What was the strength of in-group cohesion from an ethnic point of view? And (2), is the criterion of the question associated with the choice behavior? That is, would age be associated with the choice behavior? What about sex, class, religion, major scholastic interest?

The basic data for this study were secured from answers to the following questions:

1. Who among the students seems to you to have the best organizational ability in group and club affairs?

2. Who among the students seems to you to have the best ideas about social matters? (dates, arranging socials and parties, etc.)

3. Of the students now attending the U. of W., who would you choose to date?

4. Who among the students are your best friends? (boys and girls)

5. It is an obvious fact that we do not like everyone equally well. List here the names of students whom you don't like so well, wouldn't care to run around with, or feel that your personalities clash.

With these data at hand the analysis required the classification of all participants according to sex, class, major, religion, and age; and the tabulations to show the number of choices each group made to (a) their own group and (b) to outside groups.

In an attempt to answer part (1) of the previously stated problems, the Criswell technique was applied. To part (2) of the problem, the Chi-square technique was applied to test the null hypothesis, that is, that none of the factors were significantly associated with the choice in the five situations.

Since a sampling design was not utilized, the findings of this study can be claimed only for the population studied. Whether or not generalizations are applicable to the Nisei group as a whole is open to question.

On an ethnic basis, it was found that Nisei prefer themselves to all other groups in each of the four attraction questions. In the rejection question Nisei students again selected heavily from their own group. While the organizational leadership question showed the least in-group preference, as was expected, the social leadership question unexpectedly showed the greatest attraction self-preference. This was followed by friendship, and then dating. The highest General Index score

occurred in the rejection question.

Next, using background factors as in-group categories on the friendship and rejection questions, it was found that virtually all factors indicated self preference more than chance would indicate. The exceptions were the Protestant category in the friendship question and the twenty to twenty-four age category in the rejection question.

By the Chi-square technique it was found that the following factors, age, sex, and major were significantly associated with the choices for organizational leaders, while class and religion were not. In the choices, for social leaders, class, sex, and age were significantly associated, while major and religion were not. Class, major, and religion were significantly associated with choices in dating. Class, age, major, and religion were significantly associated with the choices for friends. In the rejection choices, the following were significantly associated with the choices, class, age, sex, and major.

Table 47 summarizes the Chi-square values.

TABLE 47

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR TABLES 23 - 46

Factors	Organization Leader	Social Leader	Dating	Friend	Rejection
Class	4.46	6.00	20.65	90.31	12.75
Sex	78.60	43.00	-- --	142.01	21.99
Age	10.04	26.03	7.14*	130.33	20.69
Major	13.04	7.39*	12.52	31.31	11.58
Religion	5.08*	8.34*	9.52	24.95	2.52*

* Indicates a value not significant at the .05 level.

B. Conclusions.

Human society has been described by Professor Lundberg as a plurel bound together by the energy that flows between people in the form of various communicative prosesses.[18] The big problem is to uncover these patterns of energy which form the interconnective network of human society.

This sociometric study supports the view that frequency of association is perhaps the most important factor in the choices of the five situations tested. There are atrong presumptive grounds to believe that such categories as class, major, age, religion, and sex facilitate greater association within their own categories. While these categories do not exhaust the background factors involved, they strongly suggest that the accident of propinquity is the dominant factor which largely determines positive in-group indices. "That is, the accidents of propinquity determine, first of all, the universe from which choices are possible." [19] For example, class in-group means probability of frequent associations and long-term associations. Age in-group for students, with some deviations due to G.I. students, indicates probabilities of frequent associations because of likelihood of being in the same class in-group. In fact, Lundberg suggests that friendship may not be much more than another term for frequent associations.

> For example, can it be shown that the phenomenon called attraction is merely a special case of conditioning and learn-

---

18 George A. Lundberg, Foundations of Sociology, MacMillan and Co., New York, 1939, pp. 203-7.

19 George A. Lundberg and Virginia Beazley, "'Consciousness of Kind' in a College Population", Op. Cit., p. 71.

> ing in approximately the following sequence: we learn to react to the people with whom we have contact; it therefore becomes easier to interact with them than with people with whom we have fewer or less intense contact; the easier interactions are the more pleasant; we call people with whom it is easy and pleasant to interact our "friends", "in-group", etc.[21]

Of particular interest were the findings on the rejection situation. This study suggests that persons disliked tend to be chosen more frequently than by chance from the same in-groups as the persons liked.[22] From the above, can it be concluded that the interaction known as rejection results not merely from lack of exposure and contact but from greater difficulty of learning to interact with facility between some people due to intrinsic differences in their personality make-up? If such conclusions can be asserted, certain social implications are suggested. Getting people together in itself may not necessarily be the solution to differences between people. Merely throwing groups together and forcing them to interact may only aggravate the difficulty.

An interpersonal study of this nature facilitates the understanding of the factors upon which preference and rejection are based. The factors selected here are arbitrary and are the conventional classifications used in academic studies. The determination of other factors which produce strong in-group feelings or strong rejection feelings remain as

---

21 ibid., page 73.

22 Clarification of the term "dislike" may here be pertinent. "Dislike" may refer to a stereotyped response pattern toward some group. In this case personal contact is not necessary; in fact, stereotypes are more secure without personal contacts. There is another reference to "dislike", namely, the kind that results from personal contact, and is not of the stereotype kind. The latter is the kind of "dislike" that is referred to in sociometry.

problems for further study.

This thesis corroborates the findings of two studies mentioned previously. One of the studies was conducted on the Bennington campus and the other at the University of Washington. Both studies used female population only. Both studies indicated a definite tendency to name people belonging to one's own in-group as regards common domicile, class, and major. This thesis extends the applicability of the above findings to the Nisei population, and also to the male population. The Nisei students tend to behave very much like the students at Bennington and the students living at the women's residence halls of the University of Washington.

The research methods used in this thesis are applicable to identifying in- and out-group relationships of any kind--friendship,[23] racial,[24] occupational, political,[25] religious and ethnic,[26] status,[27] rejection,[28] and other criteria.

---

23 Raymond E. Bassett, "Cliques in a Student Body of Stable Membership", Sociometry, 7: August, 1944.

24 Virginia B. Hertzler, "A Sociometric Study of Japanese Students in a Polyethnic High School", op. cit.

25 Charles P. Loomis, "Political and Occupational Cleavages in a Hanoverian Village, Germany", Sociometry, 9: 3160333, November, 1946.

26 Jessie Reichel, "A Sociometric Study of Jewish Students in a Polyethnic High School", op. cit.

27 Paul Deutschberger, "Interaction Patterns in Changing Neighborhoods: New York and Pittsburgh", Sociometry, 9: 303-312, November, 1946.

28 George A. Lundberg, Virginia Hertzler, Lenore Dickson, "Attraction Patterns in a University", op. cit.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Department of Sociology
Seattle, Washington

May 25, 1948

Dear Student:

The Department of Sociology is currently engaged in a series of study on groups of all kinds. We have studies under way at two Seattle high schools, one out-of-town high school, University of Washington student-body, an entire community in Snohomish County, to mention some. Out of these studies we hope to derive principles underlying social behavior which may facilitate the process of adjustment between peoples and groups.

The enclosed questionnaire has been constructed to ascertain the presence or absence of certain phenomena in the composition of groups, particularly the attraction and rejection patterns. Therefore, it is highly desirable that you answer all items that are possible to answer.

You will note that this is not an anonymous study; however, it is completely confidential. No other person except the undersigned will see this questionnaire. We need your name on the questionnaire you fill out, and further, we have requested the names of persons whom you have chosen for certain situations. Also, we would like for you to complete the questionnaire without discussing it with others, since we are primarily interested in the spontaneous personal reaction of each individual. Your participation in this research is of crucial importance. We are anticipating your cooperation.

Thank you,

George A. Lundberg
Department Head

Gordon K. Hirabayashi
(In charge of this study)

GAL:mh

1. Name _____ 2. Age _____

3. Status as student: a. Major _____ b. Class _____

4. a. Local Address _____
   b. Home Address _____

5. Your 1941 Address _____

6. Father's Occupation: Firm _____ Industry _____
   (e.g., grocery, railroad, law, fishing, foundry, furniture factory, farms, etc.)

   Position _____
   (e.g., owner, salesman, clerk, longshoreman, railroad switchman, gardner, foreman, etc.)

7. Mother's Occupation: Firm _____ Industry _____
   (e.g., grocery, restaurant, canneries, domestic service, etc.)

   Position _____
   (e.g., housewife, if not working outside home; housework if working in homes other than own; secretary, clerk, etc.)

8. Of which "Assembly" and "Relocation" centers (if any) were you a resident, and for what length of time: _____

9. a. Did you relocate directly from camp to Seattle? _____ (yes, no)

   b. If no, what places preceded Seattle? (Mention only those places in which you lived for at least one month.) _____

10. a. Did you serve in the armed forces? _____ (yes, no)

    b. If yes, check the following and state the length of time served in each:
    100th Bn. _____ 442nd Inf. _____
    552nd Art. _____ M.I.S.L.S. _____
    Others _____

11. Marital status: single ___, married ___, divorced ___, separated ___, widowed ___.

12. a. If you go to church, which church? _____ location? _____
    b. How many times did you attend during the last 2 months? _____

13. Do you work after school? Yes ___ No ___ | Doing what? _____ For whom? _____ Do you receive pay? _____ (yes, no)

    What days? _____
    What hours? _____

14. Of what campus organizations are you a member? (Phrateres, J.S.C., honoraries) _____

15. List any office you hold (or held) in campus organizations _____

16. Of what off-campus organizations are you a member? (vet. org., athletic clubs) _____

17. List any office you hold (or held) in off-campus organizations_____

18. a. Do you feel that the Nisei are as active in campus activities as the general average of the University of Washington students?
1. more active_____ 2. about the same_____ 3. less active_____
b. If your answer is either "more active" or "less active", how would you account for it?_____

The following questions apply not only to Nisei, but to all students now attending the University of Washington. Please give full names.

19. Who among the students seems to you to have the best organizational ability in group and club affairs?

20. Who among the students seems to you to have the best ideas about social matters? (dates, arranging socials and parties, etc.)

21. Of the students now attending U. of W., who would you choose to date?

22. Who among the students are your best friends? (boys and girls)

23. It is an obvious fact that we do not like everyone equally well. List here the names of students whom you don't like so well, wouldn't care to run around with, or feel that your personalities clash.**

**In previous studies a few students have shown reluctance to name people here because they feel it is contrary to certain religious and ethical ideals. This is a misunderstanding both of the nature of our inquiry and of ethics. We are not asking you to judge these people or to be uncharitable toward them. We all know very well that in our daily lives we avoid people we do not like and that others avoid us for the same reason. We may regret that fact, but only by facing it, rather than hypocritically denying it to ourselves, can we hope to find out why we dislike some people, and thus be able to do something to overcome our dislike. Our dislikes may reflect our own shortcomings.

APPENDIX B

University of Washington
Department of Sociology
Seattle, Washington
August 12, 1948

Dear Student:

Toward the tag end of Spring Quarter, 1948, there was circulated among many of the Nisei students a questionnaire by me. The returns on the questionnaire were very gratifying and it is hoped the findings of this study will justify the fine spirit of cooperation demonstrated by the students.

There were a few questions and some misunderstandings among some of the students in the early returns which I would like to clarify:

1. This is not a popularity contest, e.g., I am not interested in who you think most people will choose as the best organizers. I am only interested in who appears to you as the best, even if nobody else thinks so.
2. I am not going to disclose any names to anyone because, in the first place, this is a confidential study; in the second place, this study is not interested in names as such. We asked for names only because we are interested in factors associated with choices, and names will facilitate our study.
3. In asking for persons with whom you would least like to associate I am cognizant of the fact that most of us do not usually think in such terms and that such thinking is quite disturbing. At the same time, we know we do not like all people to the same degree--we like some people more than others. That is not the same as saying we hate some people. Some people have special food allergies even though they don't necessarily dislike the food. We react similarly with people quite often.

Due to the heavy schedule at the end of last quarter, I was unable to reach all of the students, and it is highly important, as well as desirable, that I get as near a 100% return as possible. Therefore, you will find enclosed a questionnaire which will call for about 15 or 20 minutes of your time to fill out. Will you please fill in the blanks as fully as possible and return to me at the earliest possible date this month? You will also find a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Anticipating your immediate cooperation, I am thanking you most sincerely in advance.

Sincerely yours,

Gordon K. Hirabayashi

Gordon K. Hirabayashi
(In charge of this study.)

GKH:np
Enclosure

APPENDIX C

1. Sex Male ___ Female ___ Age ___ Date of Birth _____ (Day, Month, Year) Grade in School _____

2. Home Address _____

3. Father's Occupation: Firm _____ Industry _____ (e.g. grocery, railroad law, fishing, foundry, furniture factory, etc.,)

Position _____ (e.g. owner, salesman, clerk, longshoreman, gardner, foreman, railroad switchman, etc., etc.,)

4. Mother's Occupation: Firm _____ Industry _____ (e.g. grocery, restaurant canneries, domestic service, etc,etc.)

Position _____ (e.g. housewife, if not working outside home; housework if working in homes other than own; secretary, clerk, etc., etc.,)

5. Ethnic Background of Parents (please check)

	Mother	Father		Mother	Father
Canadian	___	___	Japanese	___	___
Chinese	___	___	Jewish,	___	___
Danish	___	___	Negro,	___	___
Dutch	___	___	Norwegian	___	___
English	___	___	Polish	___	___
Filipino	___	___	Rumanian	___	___
French	___	___	Swedish	___	___
German	___	___	Scotch	___	___
Greek	___	___	Welsh	___	___
Irish	___	___	Other (specify)	___	___
Italian	___	___			
Russian	___	___			

6. If you go to church, which church? _____ Loca tion _____

How often? once a week or more ___ 2 to 4 times a month ___

once a month ___ less than once a month ___

7. List any youth activities sponsored by the church in which you participate.

_____

8. Do you work after school? Yes ___ Doing what? _____

No ___ For whom? _____

Do you receive pay? _____ (yes, no)

What days? _____

What hours? _____

9. List any offices you hold in this school (examples--president of freshman class chairman of glee club, captain of football team, secretary, treasurer, etc.,)

_____, _____, _____

_____, _____, _____

10. Of what school organizations are you a member? (examples--J.O.G., drama club, gle cclub, rally team, Torch, Quill and Scroll, Hi-Y etc., etc.,)

_____, _____, _____, _____

_____, _____, _____, _____

11. In what organizations outside school do you participate? (examples--Scouts, Rainbow Girls, DeMolay, sororities, fraternities, etc.,) _____,

_____, _____, _____, _____

12. What do you want to do after graduation? go to college ___ work ___

get married, ___ other _____ dont' know _____

Give full name in answer to the following questions:

1. Name three students whom you would like to have represent your high school next week at a big national meeting of high school students.

_____

_____

_____

2. If all the students were asked to help on a school picnic, which three students would you like to work with?

_____

_____

_____

3. If you could have a date with anyone in this school which three people would you choose?

_____

_____

_____

4. Who are your three best friends in this high school? (boys or girls)

_____

_____

_____

5. If you think any of the students you listed in question 4 will choose you as one of their best friends, place an X in front of their names.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Jennings, Helen H. Leadership and Isolation, Longmans, Green and Co., 1943.

Krech, David and Crutchfield, Richard. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948.

Lundberg, George A. Foundations of Sociology, MacMillan and Company, New York, 1939.

Methods of Social Research, Longmans, Green and Company, New York, 1942.

Moreno, J. L. Who Shall Survive? A New Approach to the Problem of Human Interrelations, Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Company, Washington, D. C., 1934.

Young, Pauline. Scientific Social Surveys and Research, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1939.

Journals

Bassett, Raymond E. "Cliques in a Student Body of Stable Membership," Sociometry, 7:1944.

Criswell, Joan H. "Racial Cleavage in Negro-White Groups," Sociometry, 1:1937.

"Sociometric Measurement and Chance," Sociometry, 6:1944.

"Sociometric Methods of Measuring Group Preferences," Sociometry, 9:1946.

Deutschberger, Paul. "Interaction Patterns in Changing Neighborhoods," Progressive Education, 18:1941.

Elliott, Merle H. Patterns of Friendship in the Classroom," Sociometry, 9:1946.

Franz, J. D. "Survey of Sociometric Technique," Sociometry, 2:1939.

Jennings, Helen H. "Structure of Leadership-Development and Sphere of Influence," Sociometry, 1:1937.

Loomis, Charles P. "Political and Occupational Cleavages in a Hanoverian Village, Germany," Sociometry, 9:1946.

Lundberg, George A. and Beazley, Virginia. "'Consciousness of Kind' in a College Population," Sociometry, 11:1948

Lundberg, George A. and Steele, Mary. Social Attraction in a Village," Sociometry, 1:1938.

Moreno, J. L. "Sociometry in Action," Sociometry, 5:1942.

Sewell, William H. "Development of a Sociometric Scale," Sociometry, 5:1942.

Stewart, Frank A. "A Sociometric Study of Influence in Southtown," Sociometry, 10:1947.

Unpublished Manuscripts

Dickson, Lenore. "Social Distance in a Polyethnic High School." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Washington, 1949.

Graalfs, Marilyn. "A Sociometric Study of Chinese Students in a Polyethnic High School." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Washington, 1949.

Griswold, Manzer J. "Comparison of Certain Attitudes Held by Male World War II Veterans and Non-Veteran Students at the University of Washington, 1945-1946." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Washington, 1947.

Hertzler, Virginia. "A Sociometric Study of Japanese Students in a Polyethnic High School." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Washington, 1949.

Lundberg, George A., Hertzler, Virginia B., and Dickson, Lenore, "Attraction Patterns in a University," to be published in the forthcoming issue of Sociometry.

Reichel, Jessie. "A Sociometric Study of Jewish Students in a Polyethnic High School." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Washington, 1949.

Smucker, Orden C. "A Sociographic Study of Friendship Patterns on a College Campus." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Ohio State University, 1946.