

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**"NUTS, SLUTS AND PERVERTS": AN INVESTIGATION OF THE
MASTER STATUS THEORY IN RELATION TO SOCIAL DEVIANCE**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Psychology
at Massey University

Michel Roguski
1992

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my close friend and mentor

Una May Macartney

1909 - 1988

and secondly, to Amohia Te Raumahora o te Atakura Love

1991 -

ABSTRACT

The primary aim of this study was an investigation of the master status theory in relation to social deviance. Master status theory is a component of the labelling perspective. The perspective posits that the dominant social group socially constructs what is viewed as deviant and non-deviant in society. Master status theory states that if an individual is seen deviant on one trait he/she will be seen deviant on a host of auxiliary traits. Jenks' (1986) investigated the master status theory in relation to "non-deviant" individuals' perceptions of two "deviant" and two "non-deviant" social groups. The present study extended upon Jenks' in two major ways. "Non-deviant" individuals' perceptions of three "deviant" social groups were investigated. Also, a second component of labelling theory, social distance as a consequence of stigma was incorporated into the methodology. The two theories are believed to exist interdependently. Social distance was incorporated in an attempt to establish construct validity - to ensure that deviance was the construct under investigation. A questionnaire was administered to ninety-two tertiary level students. It was hypothesized that the master status theory would prove a robust phenomenon and that the social distance scale incorporated would support the deviant attributions. Both hypotheses were supported. Weaknesses of the study are outlined, as are implications of the study and recommendations for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank my supervisors, Dr. Keith Tuffin and Dr. Ross Flett, for their unending support, guidance and encouragement in this research. My thanks also to the many people who have helped me during the year, especially Dr. John Spicer, Kerry Chamberlain, Dr. John Podd, Shannon Roache, and Diana Bloor. Thank you to the students who responded to my questionnaire. Finally, I am grateful for the aroha and awahi of my friends throughout this thesis - you gave much and put up with a lot! Cheers.

PREFACE

In light of recent discussions regarding experimental bias (e.g. Parker, 1992), I believe that it is valuable to inform the reader of my perspective concerning social stigmatisation and being labelled as deviant.

The theories outlined in this thesis are personally validating. They reflect my encounters with discrimination, and have been encouraging in that they frame something that was for years simply experiential.

Since "coming out" as a gay male at 15, I have experienced discrimination in a variety of forms - having been assaulted, slandered, and "removed" from my church. None of the initiators of the discrimination knew me, and I doubt they understood what they were "fighting" against - albeit the "moral right" of the Church, or the gay bashers who gain conviction and courage as a collective.

My experiences have continually demonstrated to me, that many people (ill informed as they are) are all too ready to judge someone by their societal label. They seem to assume that I (and others who carry a "deviant" label) are so easily "boxed."

I found this research exciting. The further I studied labelling the stronger my conviction grew that people are so much more than the sum of their parts. That none of us can be boxed - people remain an exciting enigma.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
PREFACE	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION	1
Over of the Introduction	1
Background: Conceptualising Deviance	4
Labelling Theory	7
 CHAPTER TWO	
Master and the Present Study	13
Master Status Theory	13
Applications of the Master Status Theory	15
Critique	17
Jenks (1986)	20
The Present Study	24
Deviance and its Validation as a Construct - the use of Social Distance as an Independent Measure of Deviance	26
Justification of Deviant and Non-Deviant Groups	27
 CHAPTER THREE	
SUMMARY AND HYPOTHESES	43
 CHAPTER FOUR	
METHOD	
Subjects	45

Procedures	47
Materials	48
Questionnaire Content	48
Ethics	54
Pilot	54
 CHAPTER FIVE	
RESULTS	
Section One: Master Status Measure	55
Section Two: Social Distance Scale	62
 CHAPTER SIX	
DISCUSSION	
Hypothesis One: Master Status Attributions	68
Hypothesis Two: Social Distance	70
Research Question	71
Weaknesses of the Study	72
Implications	75
Future Recommendations	77
 REFERENCES	78
 APPENDIX ONE	
Jenks' (1986) Scale	90
APPENDIX TWO	
Questionnaire Used in This Study	94

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
CHAPTER TWO	
Table 2.1. Perception of Five Issues for Deviant and Non-deviant Groups	21
Table 2.2. Perception on Satisfaction Measures for Deviant and Non-deviant Groups	21
CHAPTER FIVE	
Table 5.1. Means and Standard Deviations for Perceived Highest Educational Qualification	58
Table 5.2. Mean and Standard Deviations for Perception on Four Issues For Deviant and Non-deviant Groups	59
Table 5.3. Means and Standard Deviations on Five Issues for Deviant and Non-deviant Groups	60
Table 5.4. Means and Standard Deviations for Perception on Satisfaction Measures for Deviant and Non-deviant Groups	61
Table 5.5. Proportion Matrix for 12 Social Groups Judged in Terms of Preference as Close Friends by the Massey and Teacher College Samples	65

INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW OF THE INTRODUCTION

This presentation adopts a labelling perspective of deviance, whereby deviance is viewed as a social construction. The perspective asserts that social groups create deviance by making rules, whose infraction results in the labelling of the rule breaker as deviant (Becker, 1963).

Two components of the labelling perspective are utilised in this investigation, "master status theory" and "social distance."

Master status theory posits that if an individual is perceived to possess a deviant status (for example, a homosexual), the status may have generalised symbolic value, so that people automatically assume that its bearer possesses other undesirable traits allegedly associated with it. Thus, the homosexual may be assumed to be sexually promiscuous, chemically dependant, have low self-esteem, and be a paedophile (Becker, 1963).

The concept of social distance encapsulates a distancing or ostracism of those labelled deviant by non-deviant individuals . According to Ericson (1977) the greater the degree of perceived "deviance", the greater is the likelihood that "non-deviant" individuals will prefer not to socialise with the deviant individual/group.

Labelling theory posits that social distance and the master status phenomenon are highly correlated. The two processes are interdependent in that following designation of "deviant," the deviant individual will experience social ostracism (Goffman, 1963; Schur, 1979).

The central focus of the present study is an investigation of "master status theory" (Hughes, 1945; Becker, 1963) in relation to perceptions of non-deviant and deviant social groups (Jenks, 1986).

Richard Jenks has contributed a great deal in the area of master status theory and its usefulness in the investigation of social deviance (Jenks, 1985; 1986; 1988). The aim of the present investigation is to replicate and extend Jenks' (1986) study of "non-deviant's" perceptions of "deviants."

Jenks investigated peoples' perceptions of two deviant and two non-deviant social groups - homosexuals and atheists, and Republicans and Catholics, respectively. Support was found for the argument that specific deviants, namely homosexuals and atheists, come to be labelled as general deviants, thus supporting the master status theory.

One of the major weaknesses of Jenks study, is the failure to ensure that deviance is the construct under investigation. In response, the present study extends Jenks (1986) investigation by incorporating a second independent measure of the construct - social distance.

The present study's use of both the "master status phenomenon" and "social distance" for the investigation of deviance is a conceptual improvement over Jenks (1986). Given the strong theoretical relationship between these two components of labelling theory (e.g. Schur, 1979; Ericson, 1977) it can be assumed that "deviance" is the construct being examined when complimentary results are elicited.

The present study extends Jenks' (1986) investigation in a second way by assessing perceptions of three deviant and two non-deviant social groups. The deviant social groups used in the present study are: male homosexuals, single-mothers who have never married, and men who sexually abuse children. The two non-deviant social groups are: Anglicans actively involved in their religion, and Labour Party supporters.

The rest of the introduction to this thesis is organised as follows.

Chapter One presents a review of issues pertinent in the conceptualisation of deviance. Of prime interest are the alternative theoretical orientations to the study of deviance. From the relativistic tradition, it is outlined that the present study adopts the labelling perspective of deviance. Next, relevant tenets of the labelling perspective are reviewed. Two of these tenets, master status phenomenon and social distance as a consequence of stigma are outlined as the theoretical framework of this study.

In Chapter Two the master status phenomenon is described - its conceptual evolution and applications of the theory in the assessment of a variety of deviant social groups. Also outlined are a number of criticisms regarding methodological issues.

Next, Jenks' (1986) investigation of non-deviants' perceptions of deviants is outlined as the focus of the present study. A number of weaknesses of Jenks' study are described.

The later section of Chapter Two is a description of the present study, and how the intended study differs from Jenks' (1986) investigation.

Finally, Chapter Three outlines the hypotheses for the study.

BACKGROUND: CONCEPTUALISING DEVIANCE

At a societal level, the term "deviance" encapsulates cheating, unfairness, crime, sneakiness, malingering, cutting corners, immorality, dishonesty, betrayal, corruption, wickedness, and sin (Cohen, 1966; Liska, 1981). Unfortunately the commonalities underlying these behaviours are difficult to identify, and hence, at present there exists no consensual theoretical conceptualisation of "deviance" (Kitsuse, 1980; Terry & Steffensmizer, 1988).

To follow is a review of those factors held responsible for the lack of conceptual clarity. Two areas are identified: alternative theoretical orientations, and the diversity of topics grouped under the rubric of deviance.

ALTERNATIVE THEORETICAL ORIENTATIONS

At present the deviance domain consists of two main theoretical orientations, the normative and the relativistic.

The normative orientation defines "deviance" in behavioural terms. Deviance is seen as behaviour in violation of normative expectations, and the statistical infrequency of the behaviour is stressed (Terry et al., 1988; Archer, 1985). Utilising this model, homosexuals are defined as deviant as they are said to constitute ten per cent of the population (Plasek & Allard, 1984). Statistical infrequency as a criteria for socially "deviant" status, is however, insufficient. The orientation fails to exclude non-socially stigmatised minorities. For example, according to this criteria, the millionaire is seen as deviant as normatively they constitute a small percentage of the population.

The normative perspective was first challenged in the early 1960's with the emergence of the "relativistic" position (Orcutt, 1983), emphasising that deviance is not merely difference. Variation was not in itself enough to produce an instance of deviance. Instead the relativistic model envisioned

deviance to be behaviours or conditions that are subject to negative attributions (Archer, 1985). Within the relativistic framework deviance is defined as a form of "undesired differentness" (Goffman, 1963). The undesired quality of deviance is reflected in definitions that stress the reactions with which institutions and non-deviants respond to the deviant (Archer, 1985).

The difficulty in reaching a point of consensual conceptualisation of deviance, can be understood in light of the conflict between the two orientations (Orcutt, 1983). Each perspective focuses attention on quite different aspects of deviant phenomena. The normative definition focuses on persons who engage in norm-violating behaviour. The relativistic orientation emphasises not the deviant, but the social audiences that define them as deviant (Orcutt, 1983). Further, contrasts are seen with the differing emphases placed on questions of research and the theorising on deviance. The normative definition highlights the importance of identifying who breaks norms and explaining why they commit deviant acts. The relativistic definition rejects this etiological focus, addressing instead the need for research and theory on how social audiences go about defining others as deviant.

THE DIVERSITY OF DEVIANCE

The lack of conceptual clarity can also be traced to theoretical disputes arising from the extraordinary diversity of topics studied under the rubric of deviance (Archer, 1985). The adjective "deviance" has been applied to a wide range of acts and conditions. A sample of the areas covered within the domain includes: physical disability, homosexuality, mental retardation, alcoholism, obesity, psychoses, violence, criminality, and cannibalism (Archer, 1985).

Despite both the normative and relativistic orientations attempts to establish etiological and comprehensive theories applicable to all types of deviance, the heterogeneity of deviant behaviours has meant that the establishment of comprehensive theories to encompass all forms of deviance has been

impossible. Differences across specific types of deviance are obvious and important. Although alcoholics and paedophiles are both seen as deviant, the qualities and effects of their deviance are remarkably different. This has meant that middle-range theories (or theories applicable to specific forms of deviance) have been particularly useful (Archer, 1985; Merton, 1967). Logically, since deviance occurs in a variety of concrete forms, attempts to offer operational definitions that encompass the commonalities of each form of deviance are similarly impossible by any approach other than one utilising the statistical infrequency of each behaviour.

In spite of previous conceptual confusion, Archer (1985) has isolated three elements common to all conceptions of deviance. These include:

- i) The importance of conceptions (concrete or imagined, implicit or explicit) of normalcy against which an instance of deviance is contrasted.
- ii) The stigma and other negative imputations that are directed at the incumbents of deviant roles.
- iii) The degree to which forms of deviance are seen as "problematic" (regrettable, deserving of sympathy) "actionable" (morally intolerable, deserving of social control or therapeutic intervention), or both.

The present study adopts a relativistic orientation in its study of deviance that includes these common elements. The following definition is incorporated as the present study's conceptualisation of deviance with the aim of attaining clarification of the construct.

Deviance is a perceived behaviour or condition that is thought to involve an undesirable departure in a compelling way from a

putative standard. These behaviours and conditions are seen either as merely regrettable or as actionable in the sense that they produce the belief that something ought to be done about them (Archer, 1985, p.748).

A number of theoretical frameworks have arisen from the relativistic orientation, these are collectively referred to by a number of descriptive terms: social construction theory, social reaction theory, the new criminology, secondary deviance, and labelling theory. This presentation adopts the most popular of these -labelling theory.

LABELLING THEORY

Labelling theorists examine the dynamic of socially defining particular activities or people as deviant. They purposely withdraw any focus from the individual and his/her actions. The analysis centres on the reactions of others - the "definers" - to an individual or act which is perceived in a negative way. The theory directs attention specifically to the processes involved in making rules, their situational application, and their effects on individuals. Thereby, theorists propose an examination of labellers' subjective definitions of deviant behaviour and the resulting consequences of these definitions for labelled persons. Labelling theorists further shift the emphasis of their investigation away from the individual's action toward the means in which institutionalised processes of social control and social definitions define who and what is deviant (Traub & Little, 1985; Archer, 1985).

Two now famous studies, Rosenhan's (1973) and Rosenthal and Jacobson's (1968) are excellent examples of the impact of social labels, expectations, and stereotypes. Rosenhan (1973) investigated labelling and pseudopatients, while Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) investigated the effect of labelling on teacher expectations of school children who had received labels of "expected I.Q. gains."

From the labelling perspective, the most interesting aspect of the Rosenhan study is that the behaviour and biographies of the pseudopatients were interpreted in terms of the deviant label. Once the pseudopatients had been diagnosed as psychotic, things that were otherwise unremarkable were retrospectively interpreted as consistent with the deviant condition. In the context of the clinical label, aspects of the pseudopatients' description of commonplace changes in personal relationships were recorded as "considerable ambivalence in close relationships." Rosenhan concluded that psychiatrists unintentionally reconceived or even distorted the pseudopatient's behaviour or biography to fit and justify the psychiatric label (Rosenhan, 1973).

Rosenthal and Jacobson's (1968) study again demonstrates the power of labelling. Of interest to labelling theory is the fact that targeted children tended to show statistically significant IQ gains. Scores of follow-up studies have verified Rosenthal et al's (1968) basic finding (Rosenthal & Rubin, 1978), and have begun to elaborate some of the mechanisms that produce this labelling effect. Most notably, teachers seem to treat the positively labelled children differently from other children, for example, by paying more attention to their behaviour, giving them different verbal and non-verbal feedback, or simply exerting more effort (Meichenbaum, Bowers & Ross, 1969; Zanna, Sheras, Cooper & Shaw, 1975; Rosenthal, 1976, 1985; Harris & Rosenthal, 1985).

DEVELOPMENT OF LABELLING THEORY

Labelling theory developed from the integration of the work of a number of theorists. The essence of these theorists' contributions will now be described.

Tannenbaum (1938) was the first to describe a process involving the subtle transference from a definition of "acts" committed by an individual as evil to the description of the "individual" as evil. The result is that most of the individual's behaviour comes to be looked on with suspicion. Similarly, as society's definition of the individual changes from one who occasionally

misbehaves to one who is "delinquent," the individual's definition of him/herself changes.

Secondly, Lemert (1951) proposed "primary" and "secondary deviance" in an attempt to account for the impact of the labelling process on individuals. Primary deviation denotes individuals, who although they may engage in deviant acts are regarded by themselves and others as fundamentally "normal." Such individuals manage to hold conventional status and roles. Secondary deviance, however, is believed to result if societal reaction to the individual's behaviour becomes severe enough and results in the internalisation of the deviant label, so that the individual views him/herself as a "deviant person." Entwined within the concept of secondary deviance, is the suggestion that the individual has organised his/her life and identity around their designated deviance.

Lemert (1951) asserts that during the ensuing socialisation process the individual will acquire in varying degrees the following characteristics: a morally inferior status; specialised knowledge and skills associated with the labelled deviant's designated "subculture"; and similarly, there is an adoption of a world view shared by members of his/her subculture.

Becker (1963) was the first to incorporate the term "label" in order to describe the quality and consequences of societal reactions to deviance. He asserts that the dominant or controlling social group(s) create deviance, by making rules whose infraction constitutes deviance.

Finally, Erving Goffman in a similar vein to Lemert (1951), outlined the impact of the stigma that deviants experience in interactions with non-deviants (Goffman, 1963). Goffman developed general conceptions about stigma and deviance. He included within his scope a wide variety of stigma, but all have in common the fact that the stigmatised individual possesses "an undesired differentness" (p. 5) and is "therefore disqualified from full social acceptance"

(p. v).

Thus labelling theory arose from a number of theoretical contributions. The theorists shared a common concern with the societal influences involved in the naming and labelling of individuals as deviant.

A major criticism of the labelling approach rests on the theoretical diversity which gave rise to the theory. Critics feel that the theory's progressive development has resulted in a formulation which lacks theoretical consistency and clarity (Dotter & Roebuck, 1988). In an attempt to present contemporary labelling theory's underlying framework, the basic tenets of the theory will be outlined.

COMPONENTS OF LABELLING THEORY

The following tenets are the foundational components of contemporary labelling theory.

i) Deviance is a social definition. That is, it is not "given" in any behaviour, act, or status. It must be defined intentionally by "significant" actors in society or social group (Conrad & Schneider, 1980).

ii) The concept of deviance is impossible without an interaction between deviants and non-deviants (Archer, 1985). It is the dominant or controlling social group which decides what is deviant or not. Becker (1963) outlines that rules are forced on social groups by social groups with more power to make and enforce them. Those belonging to more powerful groups in society, in terms of social class, age, ethnicity, profession, and gender, can impose their categories of deviance on less powerful groups (Conrad & Schneider, 1980). Thus favourable social position assures greater ability to enforce rules either legal or extralegal (Dotter et al., 1988).

Becker (1963) captures this political process in his analysis of the natural history of the Marijuana Tax Act. He suggests the applicability of rules depends on "moral entrepreneurs" who, wanting the rules enforced, bring violations to the attention of others. Eventually the activities of the "potential" deviant become the object of political and legal scrutiny.

iii) Deviant labels are attached to individuals in ways that can be incomplete, arbitrary, or systematically biased. These labels are attached to only some of those who could be labelled (Archer, 1985). Lemert (1951) outlined that the deviant may become a secondary deviant contingent on "how much deviation he [sic] engages in, by the degree of its visibility, by the particular exposure to societal reaction, and by the nature and strength of the societal reaction" (p. 23).

iv) The social processes resulting in the singling out, defining, labelling of, and reacting to the individual deviant will have consequences (Archer, 1985; Palenski & Launer, 1987). These effects may be at the level of self-conception. For example, Goffman (1963) identified personal consequences for individuals who realise their own stigma, including possible feelings of self-doubt and disapproval, refocussing of personal goals, and changes in self-conception and affiliative patterns. Similarly Fein and Beck (1982) attribute these personal consequences to patterns of interaction among stigmatised persons and between stigmatised and "normal" persons - those without stigma.

The consequences may be interpersonal - tainting or colouring face-to-face interactions between deviants and non-deviants (Archer, 1985). Goffman (1963) outlines that when the stigmatised person's deviant attribute can be perceived s/he is likely to feel that to be present among "normals" nakedly exposes him/her to invasions of privacy and judgment.

v) The stigma attached to the deviant label results in the tendency for social distance to be initiated and maintained by the non-deviant (Goffman, 1963;

Ericson, 1977; Hiller, 1982; Glanz, 1988).

vi) Deviant labels result in a master status (Becker, 1963), whereby the deviant status creates an attributional heuristic that unfairly and inaccurately subsumes individual variation and treats a wide range of behaviours as merely symptomatic of the deviant condition. The deviant label assumes a status that is the most salient interpersonal feature of a deviant individual and in terms of which everything about the individual tends to be interpreted (Archer, 1985). Likewise, Goffman (1963) posits that people "tend to impute a wide range of imperfections on the basis of the original one" (p. 5).

The two final tenets, namely "social distance as a reaction to stigma" and the "master status" phenomenon, are the two theories utilised in this study. The theories establish a framework for the investigation of non-deviants' perception of deviants. While the master status theory is the central focus of this study, social distance as a consequence of stigma is incorporated to strengthen the theoretical rationale. The relationship between master status and social distance as a consequence of stigma, and the utility of incorporating social distance as a consequence to stigma will be outlined in the following chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

MASTER STATUS AND THE PRESENT STUDY

Chapter One outlined the development of labelling theory and its foundation within the relativistic perspective. Two central sub-theories of labelling theory were identified, the master status phenomenon and social distance as a consequence of the stigma from being labelled "socially deviant."

This chapter outlines the master status theory's origins and applications, with special attention given to weaknesses of the studies that have focused upon master status theory. Next, the theoretical relationship between master status and social distance is established. The importance of this relationship is outlined in reference to the establishment of construct validity. Lastly, the focus of the present study is outlined.

MASTER STATUS THEORY

EVOLUTION OF THE THEORY

The master status theory evolved from a concept formulated by Hughes in 1945. Hughes' initial conceptualisation incorporated the use of both master and auxiliary traits in his attempt to describe the social consequence of the appearance of "new kinds of people" in "established professions." His treatise focused on those attributed with minority status such as women and Black Americans and the social dilemma resulting from their appearance in domains which were previously white, Anglo-Saxon, male and Protestant.

Hughes (1945) noted that most statuses have one dominant trait, an identifying characteristic which serves to distinguish those who belong from those who do not. Thus the doctor, whatever else s/he may be, is a person who has a certificate stating that s/he has fulfilled certain requirements and is licensed to

practice medicine - this is a master trait. Secondly, Hughes outlined that a doctor in Western society is informally expected to possess a number of auxiliary or secondary traits. Thus most people expect a doctor to be upper-middle class, white, male, and Protestant (Becker, 1963). Hughes' proposed that the incongruity between master traits and auxiliary traits often results in the denial of the individual into the status position. Thus, a Black doctor may be denied recognition of the utility of their training and consequently be restricted in the areas of employment e.g. working among the lower socio-economic levels.

Hughes (1945) used the phenomenon to focus on statuses that were desirable, noting that entry into the particular status may be denied because of a lack of proper auxiliary traits. Becker (1963) however, adopted the concept of master status for the analysis and interpretation of deviance, pointing out that deviant labels can be easily viewed as master statuses in the eyes of others, as well as in the eyes of the actor.

Becker (1963) also pointed out that possession of one deviant trait may have generalised symbolic value, so that people automatically assume that its bearer possesses other undesirable traits (auxiliary traits) allegedly associated with it. This "deviant focused" conceptualisation has come to be known as the master status theory.

A case study cited by Goffman (1963) offers an example of the negative generalisation inherent to the phenomenon. An ex-prisoner gives an account of being defined in terms of his stigma:

And I always feel this with straight people - that whenever they're being nice to me, pleasant to me, all the time really, underneath they're only assessing me as a criminal and nothing else. It's too late for me to be any different now to what I am, but I feel this keenly, that that's their only approach, and

they're quite incapable of accepting me as anything else (Parker & Allerton, 1962, p. 111: cited in Goffman, 1963, p. 14).

The interviewee recalls a second instance whereby his master status, that of being a criminal, coloured a "non-deviant's" image of the literary interest of a felon.

"You know, it's really amazing you should read books like this, I'm staggered I am. I should've thought you'd read paper-back thrillers, things with lurid covers, books like that. And here you are reading Claud Cockburn, Hugh Klare, Simone de Beauvoir, and Lawrence Durrell!"

You know, he didn't see this as an insulting remark at all; in fact, I think he thought he was being honest in telling me how mistaken he was. And that's exactly the sort of patronizing you get from straight people if you're a criminal. "Fancy that!" They say. "In some ways you're just like a human being!" I'm not kidding, it makes me want to choke the bleeding life out of them (Parker & Allerton, 1962, p. 111: cited in Goffman, 1963, p. 14-15).

APPLICATIONS OF THE MASTER STATUS THEORY

Master status theory has been utilised in relation to a huge diversity of topics, however few studies have focused solely on the analysis of master status theory itself. Studies have addressed as a master status: race (St John & Bates, 1990); infertility (Miall, 1985); chronic illness (Gerhardt, 1990a); renal failure (Gerhardt, 1990b); epilepsy (Schneider & Conrad, 1981); homophobia (Plasek & Allard, 1984; Jenks 1988); run-aways (Palenski & Launer, 1987); sexual harassment (Fain & Anderton, 1987); criminality (Ericson, 1977; Kelly &

Pink, 1982; Glanz, 1988); obesity (Hiller, 1981; Hiller, 1982); deviants in social interactions (Frable, Blackstone, & Scherbaum, 1990); the intrapsychic effects of stigma (Fein & Nuehring, 1982; Elliot, Ziegler, Altman, & Scott, 1982); drug addiction and the drug addict (Movahedi, 1978); cognition and stereotyping (Ferree & Smith, 1979); mental illness (Huffine & Clausen, 1979) swingers (Jenks, 1985); and, non-deviants' perceptions of deviant and non-deviant social groups (Jenks, 1986).

Seven studies have focused solely on the master status theory in relation to varying forms of social deviance (Hiller, 1981, 1982; Miall, 1985; Jenks, 1985, 1986, 1988; Glanz, 1988). There is notable variability among these studies in their choice of methodology in the assessment of the master status theory.

Glanz (1988) investigated the extent that master status is applied to Black ex-prisoners by members of the Black community. Master status was formally operationalised "by the tendency of respondents to disallow a range of civil rights and privileges to ex-prisoners." The study's underlying assumption was that respondents who tended to disallow a wide range of rights and privileges to ex-prisoners did so because the offender label had "permeated" the character of the labelled individual.

Jenks employed the master status concept in the investigation of non-swingers' perception of swingers (1985); non-deviants' perceptions of two non-deviant and two deviant social groups (1986); and, in relation to "non-gays" perception of "gays" (1988). He utilised a methodology whereby subjects were presented with a list of traits and asked to estimate the applicability of each trait for the average member of each group. For example, Jenks (1988) asked non-homosexual subjects to estimate the applicability of each of the following traits for the average homosexual: use of hard drugs, need of psychological counselling, and educational level.

Jenks never presented a formal operationalisation of "master status". In his study of swingers (1985), "master status" was determined by the discrepancy between non-swinger stereotypes of swingers and non-swingers self-reports. In his study of "non-gays" perceptions of "gays" (1988), heterosexuals' stereotypes of gays were validated against empirical research documenting the gay life-style. Finally, Jenks (1986) attempted to identify "master status" through the statistical difference in "non-deviant" respondents' stereotypes of two non-deviant and two deviant social groups (Jenks, 1986). The master status phenomenon was imputed when the majority of deviant traits/characteristics were attributed to the deviant social groups at a statistically significant level.

Miall (1985) utilised both interview and questionnaire in her investigation of the stigma of involuntary infertility as a master status. Cumulative frequencies were used to reflect general trends of responses.

Hiller (1982, 1981) tested the degree of generalisation from being overweight to other personality attributes. She incorporated a projective technique, whereby subjects were required to write short stories about an overweight or normal weight stimulus character. Similar to Miall (1985), Hiller analysed the general trends occurring throughout subjects responses.

CRITIQUE

Three main weaknesses can be located in these studies' analyses of the master status theory. The weaknesses include a failure to establish construct validity (i.e. that deviance is the construct under investigation), a failure to establish replicable criteria for the confident determination of the presence of the master status phenomenon, and lastly, experimental bias.

THE MASTER STATUS PHENOMENON AND ITS VALIDATION AS A MEASURE OF DEVIANCE

Due to its ambiguous nature, "deviance" remains a difficult concept to operationally define. Further ambiguity arises when an assumed component of the theory, such as the master status phenomenon, is the focus of the investigation. A weakness with the majority of the outlined studies that have investigated master status theory, is a failure to ensure validity of their theoretical constructs.

The primary weakness of the outlined studies is a failure to ensure that the master status phenomenon was measured in relation to deviance and not some other unidentified variable. Master status has proven a robust phenomenon, and is applicable to deviant and non-deviant status. For instance, Hughes' (1945) study demonstrated the versatility of the theory in eliciting auxiliary traits expected of desirable positions, whereas the theory is equally applicable to analyses of deviance perceptions and labelling (Becker, 1963).

INSUFFICIENT CRITERIA

Implicit in each of the studies focusing upon master status theory, is the assumption that cumulative increments of negative traits associated with deviance are sufficient for the applicability of the master status phenomenon. Unfortunately, the field is void of a criterion other than Jenks (1985; 1986; 1988) use of significant statistical difference between the perceptions of deviant and non-deviant groups. There exists no methodology which encompasses a defined criterion, or which establishes a cut-off for what is seen as sufficient for a designation that master status and associated auxiliary traits are present in subjects' perceptions and/or attributions of deviance.

EXPERIMENTAL BIAS

Inherent to these studies is the issue of experimental bias. There is a danger that items presented to subjects impose rather than investigate the stereotype under investigation (Plasek & Allard, 1984). For example, the item: "Homosexuals are dangerous as teachers or youth leaders because they try to get sexually involved with children" (Jenks, 1988), imposes upon the respondent that the homosexual constitutes a basic kind of person. Instead researchers should aim to encourage the respondent to communicate the full extent of their attitudes/beliefs concerning the social group under investigation (Plasek et al., 1984).

A second aspect of experimental bias, is the researchers' potentially biased interpretation of elicited responses. In none of the studies was the respondent given the freedom of explaining the degree to which they felt each attribute/trait was perceived as intrinsically "deviant." The experimenters were left to assimilate the responses within the framework of the experimental model. For example, Jenks' (1985, 1986, 1988) methodology restricted respondents from qualifying their attributions as deviant or non-deviant traits.

Jenks (1988) presented subjects with an array of behaviours, and requested respondents to estimate the degree of applicability of each behaviour for their perceptions of the average homosexual. Even though the subjects perceived 75.8% of gays to use alcohol "some of the time," and 62% of gays to smoke marijuana "some of the time," and finally 60.6% of gays to use hard drugs "some of the time," it is left to the researcher to determine whether these behaviours are perceived as deviant or not. In this light the researcher can be criticised as interpreting responses within the very cultural/societal norms attributed as responsible for the durability and formation of the social stereotypes s/he is investigating.

Despite these weaknesses, the master status phenomenon has continually

proven robust. The present study is an extension of Jenks' (1986) study and his assessment of non-deviants' perception of deviant and non-deviant social groups.

JENKS (1986)

Jenks assessed stereotypical perceptions of two deviant social groups, namely homosexuals and atheists, and two non-deviant social groups, Republicans and Catholics. He designed a questionnaire with items focusing on the following characteristics, perceived: years of education; social class; use of drugs; satisfaction with job; life satisfaction; satisfaction with friends; need of psychological counselling; degree of permissiveness of parents; and, the political affiliations of each group (liberal or conservative) (see Appendix One).

Subjects were asked to assess the degree of applicability of each trait/characteristic for the "average member" of each deviant and non-deviant social group.

It was hypothesized that within American culture, differences in attributed characteristics occur among groups as a consequence of whether the group is believed to be deviant or not. Jenks hypothesized that atheists and homosexuals would be viewed as deviant, whereas Catholics and Republicans would be viewed as non-deviant. No perceived difference was expected in reports concerning Catholics and Republicans.

Based on the statistical difference between perceptions of deviant and non-deviant groups, Jenks assumed the applicability of the master status proposition, that specific deviants come to be labelled as general deviants. Both homosexuals and atheists were seen as significantly different from Catholics and Republicans in areas removed from their deviance - either sex or religion.

Jenks conducted a series of t-tests between each of the four variables for each item. Homosexuals and atheists were seen as having significantly less years of education than the two non-deviant social groups. Both deviant social groups were seen as having more permissive parents, to be more liberal, to have less control over their lives; to be currently lower in social class, to be more in need of psychological counselling, and to use drugs more often than the two non-deviant social groups. With the exception of parental permissiveness, the homosexual was placed farther away from Catholics and Republicans than were atheists (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1
Perception on Five Issues for Deviant and
Non-deviant Groups

Issue	Group			
	Homosexuals	Atheists	Catholics	Republicans
Lower class membership	32%	27%	18%	21%
In need of counselling	65%	39%	23%	26%
Use drugs a great deal	46%	38%	33%	28%
Parents were permissive*	3.1	2.8	3.9	3.6
Politically liberal*	1.2	1.8	3.4	3.6
Control over lives*	2.3	1.8	1.5	1.5

Note. Responses could be given along a 5-point continuum; the lower the number, the more permissive (liberal).

Respondents were also asked to indicate, along a 5-point continuum, how satisfied they thought members of the four groups were with their friends, jobs, and in general with their lives (see Table 2.2).

Table 2.2
Perception on Satisfaction Measures for Deviant
and Non-deviant Groups

Satisfaction Measure	Group			
	Homosexuals	Atheists	Catholics	Republicans
Friends	2.2	2.4	1.7	1.8
Job	2.9	2.7	2.1	2.0
Life, in general	2.5	2.5	1.7	1.8

Note. * Responses could be given along a 5-point continuum; the lower the number, the greater the satisfaction.

Homosexuals and atheists were perceived as being more dissatisfied than Republicans and Catholics on all three variables.

CRITIQUE OF JENKS' STUDY

Further to the criticisms outlined previously, there are two major criticisms of Jenks (1986) study. Firstly, much of contemporary social perception research has recognised the benefits of eliciting stereotypes from respondents' existing prototypes (Anderson, 1985; Hamilton et al., 1986). Jenks (1986) can be criticised for his exclusive use of broad social categories that may or may not have been removed from subjects existing social stereotypes. Secondly, the strength of construct validity of Jenks study is uncertain. Each of these areas will now be addressed.

Prototypes

A number of criticisms have been made of research focusing on various trait associations (Hamilton et al., 1986). A major criticism is the uncertainty that the incorporated categories are prototypical (Rosch, Mervis, Gray, Johnson, & Boyes-Braem, 1976) for the subject group.

According to prototypical theory, originally established by Rosch (1975), categories evolve in a hierarchical structure. Objects in the perceiver's stimulus world are classified into broad categories, which in turn can have several subcategories, and so on (Hamilton et al., 1986). Illustrative is the classification of persons into broad categories of sexual orientation, such as heterosexual/straight and homosexual/gay. This may be useful for general differentiations, but proves inefficient as the individual becomes more aware of the variety of subgroups contained under the rubric of sexuality.

With regard to homosexuals the perceiver may establish certain subordinate categories such as male and female homosexuals. From male homosexuals, further subordinate categories may be established such as: gay Maori; gay Pakeha; middle-class gays; promiscuous gays; and, gays on welfare.

The superordinate category is considered too broad to provide an optimal basis for categorisation (Brewer, Dull, & Lui, 1981; Cantor & Mischel, 1979; Deaux & Lewis, 1984; Deaux, Winton, Crowley, & Lewis, 1985). Consequently it is argued that subordinate levels are commonly employed in processing information about stimulus objects (Hamilton et al, 1986).

This viewpoint has important implications for understanding and researching social stereotypes. The approach implies that most stereotyping occurs at a subordinate level, and that processing information about, for example, homosexuals is guided by these more specific conceptions (Hamilton et al., 1986). It becomes important to determine the nature of the subcategories composing the cognitive structure, the beliefs associated with each one, the degree of differentiation between them, and the conditions under which each categorical level, as well as subtype, is most likely to be employed (Hamilton et al., 1986).

Jenks (1986) employed the superordinate social categories of homosexuals, atheists, Catholics, and Republicans. According to Rosch's theory, the utility of such elicited responses is lessened in that subjects are required to relate beliefs/attitudes towards social categories of which they may i) have no retrievable stereotype; and, ii) have difficulty in retrieving a stereotype. There being various existing subordinate categories that may compete and thereby make it difficult for the respondent to elicit a stereotype that is valid to his/her usual cognisance (Tajfel et al., 1981; Hamilton et al., 1986).

Construct validity

Jenks (1986) questioned respondents about the degree to which they felt atheism, homosexuality, Republicanism and Catholicism were "wrong" or "never wrong." Although unstated it is assumed that Jenks was attempting to ascertain the validity of his classification of social categories into deviant and non-deviant groups.

Also, and although not explicit, the degree to which social groups were classified as "wrong" was the only means employed to determine that "deviance" was the underlying construct being investigated.

Given earlier criticisms of a failure of studies to ensure that deviance is the primary construct under investigation, it is noteworthy that Jenks has attempted to establish construct validation. However, Jenks' rationale appears to rest on the loose association between a social group being perceived as "wrong" and the assumption of synonymy between perception as "socially wrong" and "deviant" status.

It is this study's contention that the assumed synonymy between a social group being perceived as "wrong" and therefore attainment of "deviant " status is an inadequate means of validation that deviance is being investigated. This study therefore recognises the need for the incorporation of a second independent measure for the establishment of construct validity.

THE PRESENT STUDY

In response to the above criticisms, the present study differs from Jenks' (1986) on two major counts. Firstly, this study has attempted to move away from superordinate or broad level social categories. Secondly, a social distance measure has been incorporated in an attempt to establish construct validation.

SOCIAL GROUPS USED IN THE PRESENT STUDY

Three socially deviant groups are incorporated as opposed to the two deviant groups in Jenks' (1986) study. Respondents were required to relate their perceptions of the following three deviant groups: male homosexuals; single mothers who have never married; and, men who sexually abuse children. Similar to Jenks, two non-deviant groups were incorporated: Labour Party supporters; and Anglicans actively involved in their religion.

The categories have been clearly defined in an attempt to ensure that elicited associations are restricted to the social schema under assessment (Fiske et al, 1991). The category of single-parenthood was assumed to be too broad in that both male and female single parents are placed within the category. From historical evidence single-motherhood has always been a stigmatised social group within the New Zealand context (Levesque, 1986; Tennant, 1989). Contemporary evidence indicates that since enactment of the Domestic Purposes Benefit (1973) there has been a shift in stigma away from single-motherhood per se, to single-mothers who have never married (Else, 1991). The degree of stigma once associated with the divorced and widowed mothers has reduced greatly (Else, 1991; Elsworth, 1988). In this light the present study focuses on "single-mothers who have never married."

The third socially deviant group, has been restricted to "men who sexually abuse children." According to Saphira (1985) the vast majority of reported paedophile offences are committed by men, and male paedophilia appears to be the common stereotype. In this regard the "male" specification has been made to reduce any potential confusion for respondents, and possible confounds for the study's conclusions.

The last two social categories used are "Anglicans actively involved in their religion," and "Labour Party supporters." Unfortunately, there is no evidence to validate the restricted labelling of these two categories. It is assumed that there is a distinction in people's perceptions whether a member of a specific denomination is an active or a nominal member. Similarly, a distinction is made between Labour Party voters, and Labour Party supporters, in that there is a connotation of "active" involvement in the latter group.

DEVIANCE AND ITS VALIDATION AS A CONSTRUCT - THE USE OF SOCIAL DISTANCE AS AN INDEPENDENT MEASURE OF DEVIANCE

As noted previously, a major weakness of those studies that have investigated the master status phenomenon is a lack of certainty regarding construct validity.

According to Bohrnstedt (1977) construct validity is achieved by incorporating another independent measure of the construct. Of the above studies, only Hiller (1982) has incorporated an independent measure. A second study by Ericson (1977) has presented a model similar to Hiller's to ensure theoretical validity. Both studies incorporated as their theoretical rationale a second component of labelling theory -social distance as a consequence of the stigma from being labelled "deviant."

Ericson (1977) assessed the degree of social distance between the "deviant" criminal and those reacting to him/her. His investigation was based the following hypothesis:

The greater the social distance between the person whose behaviour is in question and those reacting to it, the more likely deviant identity will be imputed (p. 17).

Similarly, Hiller (1982) utilised a social distance scale in her study of people's perceptions of the "overweight." She found it useful in determining what deviant physical characteristics were most influential in deciding preference for friendship.

Social distance refers to the degree and grades of understanding and feeling that persons experience regarding each other (Bogardus, 1967). The underlying premise of social distance measurement is that the more prejudiced an

individual toward a particular social group, the greater the social distance s/he insists on maintaining between him/herself and members of that group (Dawes, 1972).

Labelling theorists contend that one of the outcomes of the labelling process is the stigmatisation of the individual by society (Schur, 1980). Goffman (1963) proposes that stigma tends to spread in diminishing waves from the stigmatised individual to his/her immediate family and close associates. This phenomenon has been referred to as "contamination," and Schur (1980) suggests that "normal" members of society generally fear possible contamination by associating with deviants, as if by association they will be perceived to possess some of the deviant's characteristics, and come to be labelled as deviant (Glanz, 1988). Consequently, greater social distance is established and maintained by non-deviants in order to escape possible contamination by association.

Thus, utilising a social distance scale will achieve a more robust interpretation of the master status phenomenon. Resting on the rationale that both the master status phenomenon and social distance as a consequence of stigma are theoretically interdependent, a utilisation of a measure of each ensures that deviance is the primary construct under investigation. In this regard assurance is gained that deviance is the construct being investigated when deviant social groups are jointly attributed with deviant auxiliary traits (as in Jenks (1986) study) and increased social distance to a greater extent than attributions to non-deviant social groups.

JUSTIFICATION OF DEVIANT AND NON-DEVIANT GROUPS

To follow is justification for the present study's hypothesis which places "single-mothers who have never married", "male homosexuals", and, "men who sexually abuse children", in the category of social deviants. Similar justification is offered for the inclusion of "Anglicans who are actively

involved in their religion," and "Labour Party supporters" into the non-deviant social categories.

The five social categories used in the present investigation were chosen with little empirical support. Their inclusion, however, is supported by historical documentation, some empirical research, and/or assumptions based on logic.

SINGLE MOTHERS WHO HAVE NEVER MARRIED

According to Elsworth (1988) much of society has continually failed to recognise the existence of stigma experienced by single mothers. As qualification for the inclusion of single mothers as a socially deviant category, the following review assesses societal reaction to single mothers, and especially single mothers who have never married. Included is a review of the historical context of the years approaching the enactment of the Domestic Purposes Benefit (1973), and contemporary evidence gleaned from personal reports concerning the place of single mothers in society, from the viewpoint of both single mothers and those who find single motherhood an anathema.

MID-1950's TO 1973

One single mother who had a child in the late 1950's recalls the reactions she encountered:

The stigma attached to being an "unmarried mother" had to be fully appreciated. The unfortunate woman was branded as immoral, humiliated, and treated like dirt by some hospital staff, and condemned by many self-righteous people, irrespective of the circumstances or calibre of such a woman (Individual submission appended to submission no. 47, Jigsaw (in.), to Statutes Revision Committee, re Adult Adoption Information Bill, 1981: cited in Else, 1991, p. 6).

Some professionals took a kind of moral eugenics approach, believing that most mothers were lower-class girls who were inherently over-sexed, immoral or both (Else, 1991). Jane Rowe pointed out in her 1966 handbook for adoption workers that unmarried mothers were psychologically deficient.

People do not take this kind of risk without strong cause and, since common-sense reasons would almost always favour avoiding out-of-wedlock pregnancy, these causes must be psychological (Rowe, 1959: cited in Else, 1990, p. 12).

The more "deviant" their behaviour, the more disturbed they were perceived as being.

White girls who have illegitimate babies by black men are often emotionally ill as well as socially deficient (Rowe, 1966: cited in Else, 1990, p. 12).

Three distinct but related issues caught the public's attention in the late sixties - the rising illegitimacy rate, the problem of "unwanted children," and the needs of unmarried mothers (Elsworthy, 1988). Numerous editorials, articles and letters in newspapers, and a number of government reports attest to the importance of these subjects. The way the issues were analysed and the solutions offered by the public shaped governmental response.

Attention focused on New Zealand's high illegitimacy rate compared with the rest of the world and on the sheer number of ex-nuptial births (e.g., Waikato Times, 25 June, 1965: cited in Elsworthy, 1988). Ex-nuptiality was assumed by most commentators to be a "social problem."

First ex-nuptiality was seen as undermining marriage. Mr Riddiford (M.P.) made this quite clear:

The distinction between legitimacy and illegitimacy is due to the honour given to permanent monogamous wedlock (New Zealand Parliamentary Debates, 7 July, 1966: cited in Elsworthy, 1988, p. 134).

The second factor was the belief that ex-nuptial children were likely to be future deviants, criminals or wards of the State (Else, 1991; Elsworthy, 1988). This attitude is reflected in many of the beliefs outlined below.

The dominant analysis of the causes of ex-nuptial child bearing was a judgmental one and concerned itself mostly with feminine morality. In their annual report the Child Welfare Division commented:

... illegitimacy is essentially a moral problem, and as such is a matter for the individual (Child Welfare Division, 1968: cited in Else, 1991, p. 7).

A 1965 Southland Times editorial supported this view:

While placement of the illegitimate babies is the immediate and important task, serious thought should be given to the lowering of the moral standards which has led to a rising exnuptial birth rate (Southland Times, July, 1965: cited in Elsworthy, 1988, p. 35).

Even those who were sympathetic to the problems of unmarried mothers were careful to denounce the rise in ex-nuptial births:

Mrs Tombleson (M.P.) emphasised that she in no way condoned the cause of the problem, which had a social and moral basis (The National Observer, July, 1965: cited in Elsworthy, 1988, p.35).

However, Elsworthy (1988) outlines that changing public perception of the unmarried mother and her needs resulted in the leniency in attitude towards

state financial assistance. Those in favour of a benefit for unmarried mothers stressed that after the birth of an ex-nuptial child, moral blame must be put aside and the interests of the child put first. Supporters of the Bill felt that it was in the child's best interests that the mother could support and care for the child adequately (Elsworthy, 1988). The Christchurch Parents' Centre emphasised this:

We all need to be reminded that the girl who so often bears all the guilt and suffering is only one partner, and the innocent child of irregular union faces a future of deprivation and instability through the accident of its birth (Submission to the Royal Commission of Enquiry into Social Security in New Zealand, 1972: cited in Elsworthy, 1988, p.31).

Behind the focus on the child lay two beliefs. One important factor was the "innocence" of the child as compared to the "guilt" of the mother, stressed in the Christchurch Parents' Centre statement above. The Benefit was justified in terms of the deserving child rather than the mother who did not appear so blameless (Elsworthy, 1988). The second factor underlying this emphasis was the importance people attached to the future of the citizenry of the country. The Plunket Society quoted from "Crime in New Zealand" to show how many delinquents were the product of one parent homes. Plunket supported the belief because of the importance of a good home, which it believed:

assists children to grow into stable and effective citizens and reduces the incidence of emotional and social illness (Submission to the Royal Commission of Enquiry into Social Security in New Zealand, 1972: cited in Elsworthy, 1988, p. 44).

CONTEMPORARY ATTITUDES

There exists less contemporary accounts of stigma directed towards single mothers than in the years approaching the enactment of the Domestic Purposes

Benefit. It appears that reasons for social indignation have changed from that of the immorality inherent in sex before marriage, to indignation that unmarried-mothers rely on the State for financial support, and concern about the competency of the single mother in her role as a mother (Else, 1991).

Although the form of indignation has changed there still exists a strong moral reaction to single motherhood. However, this is combined with the indignation against State financial support.

Gone are the days, it seems, when it was a disgrace to become an unmarried mum. Why do these girls not get walkie-talkie dolls if they feel that way inclined, instead of just having a child as a plaything? We have, I believe, a very high birth rate of late and most are to unmarried mums. We, the taxpayers, will foot the bill. The old and the helpless who have paid taxes all their lives will be squeezed further in order to keep these people. Is it any wonder we have prisons filled to capacity and our churches and Sunday schools empty? For these people are generally the ones who have never had a real home and don't know the meaning of security (Sandy Clevedon, 1988, p. 88).

In reaction to social stigma that she has experienced the following single mother writes:

I have not had a so-called rough upbringing, and to generalise about solo mothers as not having real homes and lacking security is far too dramatic. You will probably find a lot of solo mothers not in this category.

Why should we feel it a disgrace to be an unmarried mother? I think we should be proud we are accepting responsibility, and grateful society allows us the chance. We had the choice whether to adopt or have an abortion. That choice is ours alone, one not to be taken lightly (Jill

Brailey, 1989, p. 90).

A second single mother, replies to what she feels society accuses her of "guilty of the crime of fertility."

You make me look at my children whom I love with all my heart and you make me feel bad because I have not handed them over to you [the involuntary childless].

Maybe you did have a husband and a home and could have given the children you wanted to adopt more material possessions than a woman in my position could do. But that does not mean that if my children were with you they would be better people (Viewpoint, 1989, p. 85)

Lastly, this single mother relates her experience of prejudice and discrimination:

I am constantly struck by the stigma that goes with being a lone parent. I live in an affluent area where the only criteria for acceptance, it seems, is a nice home, plenty of material possessions, but most of all that important ingredient - a husband, the provider. Nothing a solo parent does can really improve her status.

I notice the cold shoulder most where I should feel comfortable - the school picnic, the gym club, swimming club. I'm not pining to be asked to dinner parties, I simply need to be accepted as a caring and contributing member of the community. The friendship only goes so far, not often through the front door. Children suffer too from the clobbering machine. Any deviation from good behaviour and the unspoken comment will be: "Well, I mean, what can you expect..." It's a pity society lumps all solo parents into the same category as unable benefit bludgers. Well some are, but most are trying to do a good job bringing up their family against current social negativity (Happy But

There is some empirical support for the stigma reported in these letters and vignettes. Part of the Department of Social Welfare's assessment of the "Stepping Out Program," required benefit recipients to report the main things they dislikes about being on a benefit. Only 5.0% said there was nothing they disliked. Some 40.0% mentioned financial constraints, and 41.0% cited the social stigma that beneficiaries face. Those on the Domestic Purposes Benefit were more likely to mention social stigma, and were more likely to say people who are prejudiced against beneficiaries caused them problems - 43.0% compared to 10.0% of Widows Benefit recipients, and 24.0% of those on the Unemployment Benefit (Rochford, & Pawakapan, 1990).

SUMMARY

New Zealand has a moral legacy of the sanctity of marriage. Aligned with this is a legacy of social and political chastisement for being an "unwed" mother. Although contemporary evidence of the negative attitudes toward single motherhood is less prevalent than in previous eras, it is the hypothesis of the present study that there remains a strong social stigma against single motherhood. It is beyond the aims of the present investigation to assess why these negative beliefs exist. This study aims to clarify the extent of these negative beliefs, by assessing respondents' perceptions of "single mothers who have never married."

MEN WHO SEXUALLY ABUSE CHILDREN

Numerous myths abound about the paedophile (Saphira, 1985; Frances Levy, 1987; Groth, 1978). Images of the paedophile are that he is a stranger, an old man, insane or retarded, an alcohol or drug addict, sexually frustrated and impotent or sexually jaded, and looking for new "kicks." He is gay and recruiting little boys into homosexuality, or he is "straight" and responding to

the advances of a sexually provocative little girl. The last myth is perhaps the most insidious and destructive, as the victim is blamed for being victimised, and the offender is not held responsible for his behaviour. He is sometimes regarded as a brutal sex fiend, or as a shy, passive, sexually inexperienced person (Groth, 1978).

These are popular notions, they offer the advantage of making the paedophile as different and unlike the "ordinary" person - ourselves, parents, children, relatives, friends, and teachers as possible.

Studies of convicted paedophiles, have shown that the majority of offenders are men. In a San Francisco study (Russell, 1983: cited in Saphira, 1985), 96% of abusers were male. In an Adelaide study (Farrelly & Sebastian, 1984: cited in Saphira, 1985), 97% were male.

In reality the character of the paedophile defies the simplicity of the common stereotype. The paedophile comes from all walks of life. Notably most convicted paedophiles tend to come from lower socio-economic groups, but this is more an artefact of underenumeration than a predisposition of the group to offend (Saphira, 1985). Notably there is usually less police involvement with fathers, step-fathers, foster-fathers or teachers (Rosier, Nov., 1989; Saphira, 1985; Levy, 1987).

In contrast to the myth that the paedophile is an old man, the average age of offenders is around forty years, though most began offending in their twenties, and many are married with children (Saphira, 1985; Groth, 1978).

Rather than being a stranger, the majority of offenders know their victims at least casually (Groth, 1978), only about 12% are strangers, and 45% will be relatives (Saphira, 1985). One in five paedophiles will be a father, step-father, or foster-father (Saphira, 1985).

The role of alcohol in the commission of the offence appears to be overemphasised. Less than a third of the cases cited by Groth (1978) could be described as alcohol or drug dependent. The majority of offenders do not abuse alcohol or drugs and were not intoxicated at the time of the offences (Groth, 1978).

Finally, the stereotype of the paedophile as a "retardate" is unsupported. Groth (1978) found that there is no significant difference in intelligence between paedophiles and the general population. Likewise, the Adelaide study found a surprising number of abusers had a tertiary education and a wide range of occupations (Farrelly et al., 1984: cited in Saphira, 1985).

SUMMARY

It is impossible to identify a paedophile typology. As the preceding review has outlined, the paedophiliac is found cross-sectionally throughout the community. What is encouraging is the degree of material that aids in the identification of victim symptomatology (e.g. Russel, 1984; Hauggard & Reppucci, 1988; Kempe & Kempe, 1984; Saphira, 1985, 1987).

MALE HOMOSEXUALS

There is some debate concerning the extent of homophobic attitudes and behaviour in New Zealand society. The following review addresses societal attitudes since 1985, laying the foundation for the present study's focus which incorporates male homosexuals as a socially deviant group.

Homosexual Law Reform shook the country between 1985 and 1986. Assessing the protests against reform, elucidates the attitudes of many of the general public during this period. The strength of opposition to Reform led to the largest petition ever presented to Parliament to date (835 000 signatures) (Lee, 1986, July 3). The arguments forwarded by the Coalition of Concerned Citizens (1985) echo the protests that occupied the media and many Parliamentary debates of the time. These arguments were as follows:

- a) The typical homosexual lifestyle is harmful to the individual and society and as such, should not be encouraged.
- b) If homosexual behaviour is declared by law to be legal and valid, it will result in a growth of homosexuality in this country.
- c) The proposed Homosexual Law Reform Bill goes much further than simply de-criminalising behaviour, in that it will allow for homosexual acts upon young boys who are at an impressionable age, and it will compel acceptance of declared homosexuals under all circumstances, despite a broad level agreement to the contrary.
- d) Despite the claims of "gay" leaders, homosexuals are typically unhappy people who often hate themselves and society. If homosexuality is accepted as valid and no concern to the rest of society, it will tend to eliminate hope and motivation for those homosexuals who would really like to become normal.

e) There are a number of transmissible diseases, carried in very high proportions by and through the typical homosexual lifestyle, which pose a threat to the lives of those inside and outside the homosexual "scene," and these diseases may spread more rapidly if homosexuality is condoned and allowed free reign by the laws of our society.

f) There is a link between the acceptance of homosexuality and other negative social changes that affect us all.

g) When considered with the Revised Health Education Syllabus, society, and in particular the majority of parents who are aware of the connection, must be concerned at the implications in the classroom, wherein children will become subject to homosexual influence and propaganda (Coalition of Concerned Citizens, 1985, p. 12-13).

Thus, the homosexual was seen as deviant in every sense. The sexual issue sparked a huge controversy. However, the debate often had little to do with the issues at hand. The opposition thoroughly disparaged homosexuality and the homosexual, and failed to recognise the social consequences of the existing legislation on the lives of gay men and women.

A series of studies conducted since 1986 gives a second indication of the increasing degree of social acceptance of homosexuals and homosexuality.

A collection of surveys was presented by the New Zealand AIDS Foundation in its submission concerning the Human Rights Commission Amendment (1991). A Heylen Survey conducted in 1986 found that 75.5% of respondents disagreed that the law should allow an employer to dismiss someone because they found out this person was a homosexual. The level of disagreement increased slightly in 1989 (AGB: McNair Survey, 1989: cited in N.Z. AIDS Foundation, 1991) whereby 76.3% disagreed, there being a marked increase in 1990 to a level of 90.0% disagreement.

The Department of Health's 1989 survey of the "Public Perceptions of AIDS," (Kilgour, Maskil, & Lungley, 1990) reported that women tended to be more accepting of homosexual men teaching in school (women 77%: men 65%), and were more likely to feel they should be judged on their personal merits like everyone else (women 78.0%: men 68%).

The 1989 results suggest slightly more positive attitudes toward homosexual men than responses reported in 1987 (AGB: McNair Survey, 1987: cited in Kilgour, Maskil, & Lungley, 1990). In the earlier survey nearly one-third of respondents (32.0%) thought homosexual men should not teach in schools, and 64.0% felt that they should be judged on their own merits. Encouragingly, the majority of respondents in the 1989 survey (94.0%), agreed that homosexual men are to be found in all walks of life. This is a marked increase from the earlier survey where only two-thirds agreed.

Overt discrimination is most frequently directed against those who conform to the stereotypes of gay men, for example, effeminacy (N.Z. AIDS Foundation, 1991). However, homosexual and bisexual men are generally physically indistinguishable from heterosexual men (Berger, Hank, Rauzi, & Simkins, 1987). Their relative social invisibility is a direct reflection of the virulence of prejudice against them by a minority in our community (N.Z. AIDS Foundation, 1991).

There are numerous reports of the prevalence of "overt" discrimination. On November 30th, 1991, two gay men were kicked and beaten shortly after leaving an Auckland gay nightclub (Man to Man, 18 December, 1991). Likewise numerous similar "gay bashings" were recently reported in OUT! Magazine (April/May, 1992) and in a 1988 survey conducted by the N.Z. AIDS Foundation, (1988: cited in N.Z. AIDS Foundation, 1991) which investigated discrimination against homosexual and bisexual men in Auckland. Respondents reported that 70% had received verbal abuse because of their sexual orientation, 21% had been physically assaulted, 32% had been

threatened, and 40% had been fearful for their safety.

Reports concerning discrimination in relation to employment, showed that 12.0% lost employment because of their sexual orientation, likewise 15% were denied employment, 15% denied promotion, 29.0% were harassed in the workplace, and finally, 31.0% were treated differently from heterosexual workmates (N.Z. AIDS Foundation, 1991). The results from this study are consistent with other studies conducted in New Zealand (Gay Task Force, 1985a; Gay Task Force, 1985b; Rosser & Ross, 1988).

In relation to housing, 9.0% reported that they had been denied accommodation because of their sexual orientation, and a further 9.0% reported that they had lost accommodation as a result of being gay (N.Z. AIDS Foundation, 1991).

A major stumbling block to homosexuals reaching a status of "social equality" is the existing human rights legislation. Through the legislation homosexuals are denied protection from discrimination as a result of the Human Rights Commission Act (1977). As a result it is legal to discriminate against the homosexual in the areas of employment, accommodation, and the provision of goods and services (OUT! Magazine, December, 1990).

Such discriminatory legislation establishes a bench mark for what is and is not acceptable in our society, and in this way can have a powerful effect on the attitudes of those who discriminate. Thus, an important inroad in the struggle against prejudice is the removal of the legal discrimination against homosexuals (N.Z. AIDS Foundation, 1991).

SUMMARY

Given the results of National surveys conducted since 1986, the strength of the public's negative attitudes towards homosexuals and homosexuality appear to have consistently lessened with progressing years. However, despite what appears to be a wider "acceptance" of homosexuals and homosexuality by the public, there still remains a section of New Zealand society who continue to discriminate against homosexuals in a variety of forms. These various forms of discrimination can all be grouped under the umbrella of a denial of human rights.

ANGLICANS

Little evidence is available to validate the category of "Anglicans actively involved in their religion." The present study assumes that Anglicans (Church of England) who are involved in their religion will be perceived as attempting to live a life in line with the profession of their faith. In this regard fewer socially defined "deviant" traits are expected to be allocated to this category.

The Anglican denomination was selected in favour of other Christian denominations because this denomination has consistently been recorded as the largest denomination (in terms of affiliation) in census records (Department of Statistics, 1992).

Thus, it is assumed that the majority of New Zealanders have had some contact and knowledge of Anglican Church goers and have thereby have formulated stereotypes of an Anglican actively involved in their religion.

LABOUR SUPPORTERS

Following National's election in November 1990, there have been a number of broken election promises (Labour Research Unit, 1991) and negative social and

economic ramifications for many New Zealand citizens (Labour Research Unit, 1992). From constituents there has ensued an increasing dissatisfaction with Governmental policy (e.g., Evening Post 9.2.92.: cited in Labour Research Unit, August, 1991: Labour Research Unit, 1991), and increasing support for the Labour Party.

From these observations it is assumed that this study's sample will find Labour as a non-deviant social group, attributing positive traits to the category.

CHAPTER THREE

SUMMARY AND HYPOTHESES

The present study is an investigation of the master status theory in relation to perceptions of deviant and non-deviant social groups. Two measures are employed in the investigation. The first is a measure of the master status phenomenon (Becker, 1963; Jenks, 1986). The second is a measure of social distance. Social distance is employed as a means of assessing construct validity (that it is the master status phenomenon in relation to deviance that is being measured). The underlying rationale rests on the premise that social distance is concomitant with being perceived as deviant. As Ericson (1977) has outlined the greater the degree of perceived deviance the greater the likelihood of preference not to socialise with the deviant group.

This study has two hypotheses and one research question.

Hypothesis One: Master Status Attributions

That the three deviant social groups, namely "men who sexually abuse children," "single mothers who have never married," and "male homosexuals," will have attributed to them deviant trait/characteristics to a significantly higher extent than the non-deviant social groups, namely "Anglicans actively involved in their religion" and "Labour Party supporters."

Hypothesis Two: Social Distance as a Consequence of Stigma

That three deviant social groups will be less preferred as friends than the two non-deviant social groups. The hierarchical placement of social groups on the social distance scale will support overall attributions of deviant traits found in the measure of the master status phenomenon (Jenks, 1986), thereby establishing construct validity.

Research Question

As an exploratory question, it is of interest to ascertain respondents' degree of self-perceived knowledge regarding the five social groups under investigation. It is assumed that the more valid subjects believe their beliefs and attitudes, the more resistant their beliefs and attitudes are to change (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). This question gains importance in regard to future education and attempts to change destructive stereotypes.

CHAPTER FOUR

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were chosen from two separate populations. They were classified as:

- i) Palmerston North College of Education (P.N.C.E.) Student sample; and the
- ii) Massey Student sample.

The P.N.C.E. sample comprised 52 voluntary first year students.

The second sample comprised 56 voluntary first year psychology Massey University students.

Subject Elimination

Participants were eliminated on two grounds. Firstly, mirroring Jenks (1986) rationale, subjects who indicated that they were single parents, and/or bisexuals/homosexuals/lesbians were eliminated, as the study required that perceptions investigated were from a "non-deviant" sample (Jenks, 1986), i.e. those subjects who indicated membership to "deviant" social groups were eliminated, with the aim of reducing "ingroup bias" of elicited perceptions.

Secondly, subjects were eliminated if the questionnaire was insufficiently completed. In this regard the first section of the questionnaire (measurement of master status attributions), was sufficiently completed by the majority of respondents. Unfortunately a high proportion of subjects failed to sufficiently complete the second section of the questionnaire (Thurstone's (1927b) pair comparison scale). Because of the forced-choice nature of the scale, subjects who failed to answer three or more pair comparisons were eliminated.

Due to the high degree of incompleteness of the second section, the two scales were treated independently. The second measure was deemed as exploratory, there being insufficient subject response to formulate strong conclusions.

Of the 56 participants in the Massey Student sample, three were eliminated because they were bisexual, a further two felt that labelling or boxing people was unethical and therefore declined to participate further.

Because of the high degree of incompleteness, 15 were eliminated from the second section.

Fifty-two subjects participated in the P.N.C.E. Student sample. Of these 4 reported that they were bisexual, 1 felt that the research was unethical and therefore declined further participation, and a further 6 were single mothers.

Similar to the Massey sample there was vast incompleteness of the second section, and 11 were eliminated.

Following elimination, the final sample consisted of 51 of the Massey Student sample, and 41 of the P.N.C.E. Student sample who completed the master status measure. Thirty-six of the Massey Student sample and 30 from the P.N.C.E. completed the social distance measure

Demographic Information

In the P.N.C.E. Student sample, respondents ranged in age from 18 to 32, with the mean age of 21 years. The Massey Student sample ranged in age from 18 to 49 years, with a mean of 22 years.

There were 7 males and 34 females in the P.N.C.E. Student sample. Males and females were more proportionately represented in the Massey Student sample, with 24 males and 27 females.

Thirty-two percent of the P.N.C.E. Student sample reported that they were actively involved in their religion/spirituality. Similarly, 31 percent of the Massey Student sample reported active involvement.

In response to questions regarding ethnic affiliation, 92 percent of the P.N.C.E. Student sample identified as New Zealand European, 7 percent identified themselves as Maori, and 1 percent identified themselves as British. Ninety-one percent of the Massey Student sample identified as New Zealand European, a further 5.8 percent as Maori, and finally 3.2 percent as Western Samoan.

Procedure

Different procedures were followed for each of the two sample groups, each is summarised as follows.

Summary of Procedure - P.N.C.E. Student Sample

Respondents were obtained by two primary means. Pamphlets inviting student participation were placed in students locker three days before data collection, which occurred in mid-September of 1991.

P.N.C.E. tutors and lecturers with student contact on the day of data collection, reminded students that research was being conducted on "how we perceive different groups in our society." Tutors and lecturers were also asked to reiterate that P.N.C.E. encourage their participation.

Nine first year students volunteered.

The second means of gathering subjects, was to enlist volunteers from the P.N.C.E. student hostel. Forty-two resident first year students volunteered to participate in the study. Questionnaires, with unattached consent forms (see

Appendix Two), were left with the residential students for four days. Respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire alone and without consultation.

On completion of the questionnaire, respondents were debriefed about the nature and purpose of the study.

Summary of Procedure - Massey Student Sample

Volunteers were requested from students attending a first year introductory psychology lecture. Participants were given the same outline of the study as the P.N.C.E. Student sample, and told that the study would take approximately 30 minutes to complete. No one chose not to participate. Consent forms were presented and collected before the questionnaire was administered.

Upon completion of the questionnaires, respondents were debriefed about the nature and purpose of the study.

Materials

Subjects were presented with a consent form and a 15 page questionnaire.

Questionnaire Content

The questionnaire included three measures. The first was a measure of the master status phenomenon. The second was a paired-comparison scale (Thurstone, 1927b) to measure interpersonal social distance. The third measure consisted of demographic items.

Instructions for completing the questionnaire were printed on the front page.

Section One - Master Status Measure

Questionnaire Items

Items similar to those used by Jenks (1986) were utilised in the present study. There were significant alterations in grammar due to cultural differences. In parts the only similarity to Jenks' items and the present study's items was the underlying trait/characteristic Jenks was investigating. The present study's format differs markedly from Jenks, in that visual scales are incorporated. The following review describes the rationale for those items incorporated into the present investigation, and the change in format from Jenks' (1986) study.

Jenks (1986) employed a 24 item scale (see Appendix One). As previously outlined, 15 items measured subjects' estimates of a number of characteristics for each of the four groups employed. The remaining 7 items focused on subjects' attitudes toward various issues: political party identification and philosophy, religious identification, homosexuality, atheism, Catholicism, and Republicanism.

The present study incorporates 15 items assumed to be associated with deviance. Similar to Jenks (1986), items focused on educational level; use of alcohol, marijuana, and hard drugs; need for psychological counselling; estimates of social class membership; parental disciplining techniques - either permissive or restrictive; group members' competency in their main daily activities; satisfaction with work, friends, and life satisfaction in general.

A number of items employed by Jenks (1986) were deemed inapplicable to the New Zealand context, and/or their construct validity was judged too dubious to support their inclusion in the present investigation. Those items eliminated from the present study are as follows: religious identification; estimation of the size of each social group in America; political party identification; and, degree of liberality and conservativeness.

Religious Identification

Perceived religious identification as used by Jenks (1986) was judged too specific to the American context. Jenks attempted to determine the perceived membership of homosexuals and Republicans within the categories of: Catholic, Jewish, Protestant, and no religion. It was felt that particular religious affiliation, within the context of New Zealand, does not appear to be an appropriate measure of deviance.

In response the present study required subjects to estimate the perceived morality of the average member of each group. In doing so, the focus of the item turned to specific denominations, to address the underlying "immorality" associated with the acts of deviants, i.e. homosexuals (Bowman, 1983) and single mothers (Else, 1991).

Estimated Percentage of the Population of Each Group in America

Jenks (1986) required subjects to estimate the percentage of the population of each of the four groups. This item was eliminated from the present study as estimated size is not believed to be a measure of deviance according to the relativistic position (Orcutt, 1981).

Political Party Identification

Jenks (1986) required subjects to determine which political category (Democrat, Republican, Independent, or none) was most applicable for each deviant group. According to sociologist Paul Green (personal communication, August 17, 1991) the existence of the Right and Left Wing division is evident in American society. The differing policies and attitudes attributed to each political party is in contrast with the strong similarities in policies in the major

New Zealand parties. Thus, this item was eliminated from the present study in response to its inappropriateness for contemporary New Zealand society.

Liberality and Conservativeness

Jenks (1986) attempted to measure the perceived degree of liberality and conservativeness as a personality variable. Because of the item's lack of clarity, the item was eliminated from the present study. Jenks (1986) neglected to offer a rationale for the items inclusion.

Introduced Items

Several items judged more applicable than those eliminated from Jenks' (1986) investigation were introduced into the present investigation. These items measured the perceived degree of sexual promiscuity, self-esteem, and personal control of the five social groups. An attempt to strengthen and clarify the concept of "personal control" was made by describing the concept as, "having control over one's own destiny."

Format

Jenks' (1986) questionnaire failed to incorporate visual scales in his attempt to measure respondents' attitudes (see Appendix One). Subjects were presented with verbal directions and required to visualise the rating scale and respective anchors, on which they were asked to judge each of the four groups. Unfortunately, the scale lacked the concrete nature of visual scales, and is criticised as ambiguous and a poor measure (Lindeman & Merenda, 1979; Popham, 1984; Wiersma & Jurs, 1990).

In contrast, the present study incorporated a series of visual rating scales. Three types of scales were utilised. The first is an ordinal scale for the measurement of perceived educational level of the five social groups. The

second is a percentage scale, whereby subjects were required to estimate the degree, in terms of percentage, of social groups' involvement in a variety of drug taking acts, and finally, each group's need of psychological counselling. The third is a 7-point likert-type scale. The utility of each scale type is well documented (Wiersma & Jurs, 1990; Anastasi, 1988; Edwards & Kenney, 1966).

It is proposed that these visual rating scales reduce response ambiguity and increase the efficiency in obtaining subjects' true attitudes, countering many of the above criticisms.

Section Two: Social Distance Scale

The present study utilised Thurstone's (1927a; 1927b) method of pair comparisons in order to create a social distance scale. The method is derived from Thurstone's law of comparative judgment (1927a), a theory and algorithm for measuring subjective magnitudes. The theory has been applied to such areas as the measurement of attitudes, nationality preference, and the judged seriousness of crimes and offences (Thurstone, 1927; Coombs, 1966).

The paired comparison scale was considered to be the optimum instrument for investigating social distance towards a variety of social categories because of the measure's "forced-choice" format (Guilford, 1954). This is beneficial in that subjects are forced to focus attention on only two items at a time, thereby making it a simple discrimination task.

A second benefit of using the pair comparison method, is that in principle the scale generates data with interval properties. Thereby the distance between groups is comparable.

The scale is assumed to be unidimensional. The dimension used to elicit social distance (interpersonal distance) was preference for close friendship. Close

friendship was qualified as "a meaningful and intimate relationship." The category of "friendship" has been used in previous studies (e.g. Lietz, 1981) for the measurement of social distance.

Twelve social groups were used to establish pairs for the comparison. Included within these twelve are the five groups used in the study's investigation of the master status theory. The remaining seven social groups are as follows: bigamists; prostitutes; atheists; benefit recipients; Maori; heterosexual males; and finally, New Zealand Europeans (see Appendix Two).

These groups were randomly selected from a rank ordering (most deviant to least deviant) of 30 social groups presented by Lietz (1981). Some categories used by Lietz (1981) were deemed inappropriate in the New Zealand context (i.e. Black person, Welfare recipient, White person, and Jew). Each of these categories were renamed in a more culturally appropriate manner (i.e. Maori, Benefit recipient, New Zealand European, and Western Samoan).

The main reason for their inclusion, was to present a framework in which the 5 social groups under investigation could be placed in relation to other social groups. These groups provide a basis for comparison, although they are not the primary focus of this study.

For the purposes of the present study the order of presentation of pairs (i.e. bigamist versus prostitute) was not deemed important. Therefore, ignoring order, the number of possible pairs ($n(n-1)/2$) was 66 pair comparisons.

Respondents were asked to judge the most preferred social category of each pair. From these judgments, the number and proportions of times each stimulus is judged higher on the scale than every other stimulus can be placed in a proportion matrix. From these proportions, a social distance ranking is gained.

Ethics

The P.N.C.E. Ethics Committee objected to the forced-choice format of the social distance scale and the consequential need for subjects to attempt every item (Guilford, 1954). The Committee felt that it was unethical in "socially sensitive issues to subject respondents to pressure to respond." Because of the perceived value of the instrument, it was decided to utilise the scale but amend instructions so not to encourage subjects to respond to each item.

Unfortunately, many respondents failed to complete this section. Only 36 of the Massey Student Sample, and 30 of the P.N.C.E. Students Sample completed the scale. Despite the high degree of elimination, the value of the paired comparison scale was recognised, and was maintained as an exploratory measure.

Pilot Study

A pilot version of the questionnaire was administered to fifteen first year Massey students who were not involved with the introductory psychology paper. None of the students reported fatigue and had similar understandings of what each question asked.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

This chapter is divided into two sections. Section One reviews the results of the master status measure. Section Two outlines the results of the social distance measure.

Section One: Master Status Measure

Computer analysis involved processing the data with SPSS/PC+, the Statistic Package for the Social Sciences (Norusis, 1990).

In contrast to Jenks' (1986) who utilised both ANOVA and t-test for the comparison of deviant and non-deviant groups, the present analysis employed the non-parametric equivalents, namely the Friedman ANOVA, the Mann-Whitney *U*, and the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranked test.

Non-parametric statistics were utilised because some of the distributions were highly skewed (e.g. Table 5.2) and because of the ordinal nature of the first scale of the questionnaire (see Appendix Two) (Krauth, 1988; Sprent, 1989).

The analysis utilised the following statistics:

1. Descriptive statistics, including means (*M*) and standard deviations (*SD*).
2. Mann-Whitney *U* test was used to test whether the Massey and Teacher College sample were drawn from the same population. The test allows for the comparison of independent samples.

3. The Friedman Two-way ANOVA was used to test for the existence of significant differences in subjects' perceptions of the five social groups on each deviant trait/characteristic.

4. The Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank test is the non-parametric equivalent of the paired t -test. The test was employed to test the hypothesis that there is a significant difference in subjects' attribution of deviant traits/characteristics for the deviant and non-deviant social groups. The test was employed because the data are difference scores from two related samples.

For all analyses the minimum significance or alpha level was set at $p = .05$.

The socio-economic level item, which asked respondents to attribute perceived percentage distribution of each group to low, middle, or high social class, was eliminated because of low response rate (25%). Fourteen items remained following this items elimination.

The similarity in distribution of Massey and Teacher College samples' responses was tested. A Mann-Whitney U test was conducted on each of the 14 items, i.e. educational level to test for differences between the Massey and Teacher College samples.

No significant difference was found below the .05 probability level. Both sample's data was therefore collapsed.

Attribution of Deviant Traits

The first objective of the present study was to examine whether there exists a significantly higher difference in the attribution of deviant trait/characteristics between the deviant and non-deviant social groups.

In order to answer the question whether there are significant differences in how the five groups are rated on each characteristic a Friedman T was conducted on each of the 14 items. The results of the analysis revealed the responses toward the five social groups to be significantly different. There was some question that sexual abusers, as an extreme group may have distorted the results. As such the procedure (Friedman T) was repeated following the removal of the sexual abuser group. Responses remained consistent with the first test. The four social groups were seen as significantly different.

The results of the first Friedman T analysis appear in Tables 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 in relation to the specific trait/characteristic under investigation.

The Friedman analyses addressed the question of whether there is an overall difference in the ratings of the 5 groups. It was decided that the most effective means of analysis was to conduct a Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed rank test between the lowest scoring deviant and highest scoring non-deviant groups for each trait/characteristic. For example, subjects may have rated the five social groups in the following order (from highest to lowest) on a deviant trait/characteristic: i) sexual abusers, ii) single-mothers, iii) homosexuals, iv) Labour supporters, and v) Anglicans. Given this order, it is argued that a comparison between the lowest rated deviant group (homosexuals) and the highest ranked non-deviant group (Labour supporters) would establish whether there is a significant difference between the deviant and the non-deviant groups.

Educational Level

Subjects had been asked to indicate what they believed to be the highest educational qualification for the average member of each social group. A Friedman T revealed the scores to be significantly different, $X^2 (4, N = 92) = 112.6, p < .05$. These results appear in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1
Means and Standard Deviations for Perceived
Highest Educational Qualification

	Group					X^2
	Sexual Abusers	Homosexuals	Single mothers	Labour Supporters	Anglicans	
Highest educational qualification	3.7 (2.2)	5.8 (2.2)	3.2 (1.8)	4.7 (2.2)	5.3 (2.2)	(112.6)*

Note. Responses elicited from a 9-point ordinal scale, lower the responses the lower the level of perceived highest educational qualification. *SD* are in parentheses. $N = 92$.

* = $p < .05, df = 4$

The social groups were attributed with the following order of increasing educational levels: single mothers were attributed with the lowest educational level ($M = 3.2$); followed by child sexual abusers ($M = 3.67$); Labour supporters ($M = 4.7$) and Anglicans ($M = 5.3$), and finally, homosexuals were attributed with the highest educational qualification level ($M = 5.8$).

Drug Use and Need of Psychological Counselling

Respondents were asked to indicate what percentage of each group fit into various categories: (a) drinking alcohol; (b) smoking marijuana; (c) use of hard drugs; and, (d) need of counselling. The three deviant groups were attributed with a higher percentage of involvement with each trait. That is a higher proportion of sexual abusers, single mothers, and male homosexuals were perceived as using more alcohol, marijuana and hard drugs than Labour supporters and Anglicans. Similarly, each of the deviant groups were perceived as needing more psychological counselling than the two non-deviant groups. These results appear in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2
Means and Standard Deviations for Perception on Four
Issues for Deviant and Non-deviant Groups

Issue	Groups					χ^2
	Sexual Abusers	Homosexuals	Single mothers	Labour Supporters	Anglicans	
Drink alcohol	74.3 (18.3)	57.9 (20.2)	57.4 (20.2)	56.4 (52.5)	40.9 (20.8)	121.80*
Smoke marijuana	41.9 (22.3)	39.4 (21.0)	33.8 (19.5)	27.2 (18.8)	18.0 (15.4)	134.65*
Use hard drugs	26.2 (19.8)	22.5 (18.8)	18.0 (15.5)	13.7 (12.6)	9.9 (13.2)	144.45*
In need of counselling	91.1 (15.1)	44.3 (28.3)	41.1 (25.3)	19.2 (15.6)	17.1 (14.5)	258.48*

Note. Higher the means represent higher attribution of the deviant trait/characteristic. SD are in parentheses. $N = 92$.
* = $p < .05$, $df = 4$.

A series of Wilcoxon matched-pairs sign-ranked tests revealed that on the marijuana, hard drugs measures, and need for psychological counselling measures, the three deviant groups were found to be significantly different from the non-deviant groups to a $p < .05$ level. No significant difference between deviant and non-deviant groups was found on the alcohol variable, where no significant difference was found between single mothers ($M = 57.4\%$) and Labour supporters ($M = 56.4\%$) $p < .712$.

Morality, Parental Disciplining Technique, Competency, Self-esteem, Sexual Promiscuity, and Control Over Life

Subjects were asked to rate on a 7-point Likert-type scale each groups: degree of morality; the type of parental disciplining technique, either restrictive or permissive; the level of competency of the average group member in their main daily activities; group members level of self-esteem; group members level of sexual promiscuity; and finally, group members' control over their lives. These results appear in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3
Means and Standard Deviations for Perception on Five
Issues for Deviant and Non-deviant Groups

Issue	Group					χ^2
	Sexual Abusers	Homosexuals	Single mothers	Labour Supporters	Anglicans	
Level of immorality	4.8 (1.5)	4.8 (1.3)	3.8 (1.1)	2.6 (1.1)	1.2 (1.3)	212.01*
Parents were permissive	2.7 (1.8)	3.4 (1.4)	4.1 (1.5)	3.1 (0.7)	3.8 (1.1)	62.00*
Level of incompetency	4.2 (1.6)	3.0 (1.4)	3.7 (1.4)	2.6 (1.1)	2.4 (0.9)	106.03*
Low of self-esteem	4.8 (1.3)	3.6 (1.2)	4.2 (1.1)	2.5 (1.1)	1.9 (0.9)	211.08*
High sexual promiscuity	5.4 (1.7)	4.2 (1.4)	4.8 (1.2)	4.0 (0.9)	2.2 (1.0)	107.18*
Personal control	5.1 (1.6)	3.7 (1.4)	4.5 (1.3)	3.0 (1.0)	2.9 (1.0)	135.29*

Responses could be given along a 7-point continuum.

Note. Higher the mean, the higher the attribution of the deviant trait/characteristic. SD are in parentheses. $N = 92$.

* $p < .05$, $df = 4$.

The three deviant groups were perceived in a more negative light than the non-deviant groups on all variables except the parental disciplining technique measure.

Excluding the parental disciplining technique measure, a series of Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranked tests between the lowest rated deviant and the highest rated non-deviant groups revealed that the three deviant groups were rated as significantly different to the non-deviant groups at a level of $p < .05$.

No consistent trend appeared in the parental disciplining measure. Sexual abusers' parents were attributed with the most restrictive disciplining measures ($M = 2.7$). Next, Labour Supporters ($M = 3.1$), followed by homosexuals ($M = 3.4$). Finally, single mothers' parents were attributed with the most permissive style of parental disciplining technique ($M = 4.1$).

Satisfaction Measures

Finally, subjects were asked to assess the five group's degree of satisfaction. Three satisfaction measures were utilised. Perceived: life satisfaction; satisfaction with friends; and, satisfaction with work.

Table 5.4 shows that on both the life and work satisfaction measures, the three deviant groups were attributed with a lower degree of satisfaction than the non-deviant groups. Again Wilcoxon analyses between the lowest rated deviant and the highest rated non-deviant groups, showed that a significant difference existed between the deviant and the non-deviant groups at a level of $p < .05$. On both variables sexual abusers were rated as the least satisfied followed by single mothers, homosexuals, and Labour supporters and Anglicans.

Table 5.4
Means and Standard Deviations for Perception on Satisfaction
Measures for Deviant and Non-deviant Groups

Group						
Satisfaction Measure	Sexual Abusers	Homosexuals	Single mothers	Labour Supporters	Anglicans	χ^2
Friends	1.5 (1.3)	3.7 (1.5)	4.4 (1.3)	4.0 (1.1)	4.4 (1.0)	121.73*
Work	2.0 (1.4)	3.4 (1.3)	2.4 (1.3)	3.9 (1.2)	4.1 (1.0)	134.65*
Life	1.1 (1.2)	3.0 (1.3)	2.3 (1.3)	3.8 (1.1)	4.2 (1.1)	144.45*

Responses could be given along a 7-point continuum.
Note. Lower the mean, lower the degree of satisfaction attributed on each measure. SD are in parentheses. $N = 92$.
* = $p < .05$, $df = 4$.

No consistent trend was found with the item that assessed groups' "satisfaction with friends." Sexual Abusers were attributed with the lowest level of satisfaction with friends ($M = 1.5$). Homosexuals were ranked next, followed by Labour supporters ($M = 4.0$). Finally single mothers and Anglicans were equally attributed with the highest degree of satisfaction with their friends ($M = 4.4$).

SUMMARY

On all but four of the 14 measures - educational level, alcohol use, satisfaction with friends and group members parents' style of disciplining, the deviant social groups were attributed to a statistically significant extent with deviant traits/characteristics than the non-deviant social groups.

Section II: Social Distance Scale

Because of the previously established high correspondence between responses of the Massey and P.N.C.E samples, again the data were collapsed for the analysis of the social distance measure.

It will be recalled that in the proposed analysis of the paired comparison scale, it was decided that subjects who failed to answer 2 or more pair comparisons were eliminated. Of the 92 respondents used in the master status measure, 66 sufficiently completed the paired comparison scale.

Ideally, Thurstone's (1927b) methodology allows for the establishment of an interval scale. However, the present data yielded a number of proportions of 1.00 (where subjects always selected one item over items paired with it). To use derived proportions as a method of pair comparison interval scaling (according to the law of comparative judgment (Thurstone, 1927b)) requires proportions to be converted to z-scores. However, a proportion of 1.00 yields a z-score of infinity and cannot be placed on a finite scale. Therefore, it was decided to restrict the present analysis to ordinal presentation and interpretation of results.

As presented previously, the twelve social groups used to elicit social distance preferences are as follows:

Anglican	Homosexual Male
Atheist	Labour Supporter
Benefit Recipient	Maori
Bigamist	New Zealand European
Child Sexual Abuser	Prostitute
Heterosexual Male	Single mother

It will be remembered that respondents were asked to judge the most preferred social category of each pair. From these judgments, the number and proportions of times each stimulus was judged higher on the scale than every other stimulus was placed in a proportion matrix. These results are presented in Table 5.5. From these proportions, an ordinal social distance ranking is gained.

The stimuli are presented in increasing order of rank of the final scale values. Each cell contains the proportion of subjects who judged the row stimuli (x) as more preferable than the column stimuli (y). It is assumed that a stimuli when paired with itself will yield a proportion of 0.50 (Torgerson, 1958; Guilford, 1954).

For illustrative purposes, "Labour supporters" (row: x) are preferred as close friends when compared to "benefit recipients" (column: y) 69 percent of the time (or a proportion of 0.690). Likewise, "atheists" (row: x) are preferred as close friends when compared to "single mothers" (column: y) 37 percent of the time (or a proportion of 0.370).

An ordinal ranking of the 12 social groups are presented in the right most column of Table 5.5. ($\sum(P)$). Because we are only dealing with the raw proportions of the method of pair comparisons, the derived proportions are only ordinal. The proportions have been summed. The larger the proportion value, the greater is the preference for the corresponding category as preference for friendship. What this means is that the largest proportion (N.Z.

Europeans, with a proportion of 9.770) is indicated as the most preferred category for friendship, and the smallest proportion (Child Sexual Abusers, with a proportion of 0.680) is indicated of the least preferred group for friendship, the remaining categories fall between these two extremes.

Table 5.5. Proportion matrix for 12 Social Groups Judged in
Terms of Preference as Close Friends by the Massey and
P.N.C.E. Student Samples

X	Y												SUM(P)
	Sexual Abuser	Bigam- mist	Prosti- tute	Homoe- sexual Male	Athei- st	Benefi- t Reci- pient	Single mother	Maori	Labour Suppo- rter	Angli- can	Hetero- sexual Male	NZ Europ- ean	
Sexual Abuser	0.500	0.030	0.030	0.030	0.060	0.030	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.680
Bigamist	0.970	0.500	0.510	0.340	0.140	0.060	0.030	0.030	0.060	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.640
Prostitute	0.970	0.490	0.500	0.340	0.310	0.340	0.230	0.260	0.060	0.090	0.110	0.140	3.840
Homosexual Male	0.970	0.660	0.660	0.500	0.400	0.310	0.230	0.310	0.170	0.260	0.230	0.140	4.840
Atheist	0.940	0.860	0.690	0.600	0.500	0.310	0.370	0.430	0.370	0.310	0.170	0.110	5.660
Benefit Recipient	0.970	0.940	0.660	0.690	0.690	0.500	0.400	0.460	0.310	0.400	0.260	0.140	6.420
Single-mother	0.970	0.970	0.770	0.770	0.630	0.600	0.500	0.490	0.370	0.260	0.230	0.140	6.700
Maori	1.000	0.970	0.740	0.690	0.570	0.540	0.510	0.500	0.430	0.400	0.310	0.110	6.770
Labour Supporter	1.000	0.940	0.940	0.830	0.630	0.690	0.630	0.570	0.500	0.260	0.340	0.260	7.590
Anglican	1.000	1.000	0.910	0.740	0.690	0.600	0.740	0.600	0.740	0.500	0.310	0.260	8.090
Heterosexual Male	1.000	1.000	0.890	0.770	0.830	0.740	0.770	0.690	0.660	0.690	0.500	0.430	8.970
NZ European	1.000	1.000	0.860	0.860	0.890	0.860	0.860	0.890	0.740	0.740	0.570	0.500	9.770

Note. N = 66.

With regard to Table 5.5., of prime interest is the ranking of the 5 social groups that were used in the master status measure (Section I). From the proportions in Table 5.5., it can be seen that the five social groups are hierarchically ranked from the least preferred to most preferred. The three "deviant" social groups (child sexual abusers, male homosexuals, and single mothers) were ranked as less preferred for friendship than the two non-deviant groups (Labour Supporters and Anglicans).

Of the three deviant groups, child sexual abusers were the least preferred group for friendship, next homosexual males, followed by single mothers.

Separating the deviant and non-deviant social groups, Maori were less preferred than Labour supporters, and more preferred than single mother. Next Anglicans were the most preferred for friendship.

Of secondary interest is the rank position of the eight incorporated social categories. In increasing order of preference for friendship, bigamists and prostitutes were ranked more preferred than child sexual abusers, followed by homosexual males. Next atheists and benefit recipients were more preferred, followed by single mothers. Maori were less preferred than Labour supporters and Anglicans. Finally, the most preferred social groups were heterosexual males and New Zealand Europeans.

Knowledge of the Five Groups

Finally, respondents were questioned regarding their knowledge of - homosexuality, sexual abuse, single parenting, Anglicans, and Labour supporters. The mean response on all items fell at a level comparable to 50 percent or over of knowledge. These results appear in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6
Means and Standard Deviations for Subjects' Degree of
Knowledge of the Deviant and Non-deviant Groups

	Group				
	Sexual Abusers	Homosexuals	Single parents	Labour Supporters	Anglicans
Level of knowledge	3.8 (1.6)	4.0 (1.5)	4.3 (1.6)	3.6 (1.4)	4.3 (1.6)

Note. Responses could be given along a 7-point continuum, lower the responses the lower the level of knowledge. *SD* are in parentheses. *N* = 92.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

The present study investigated the master status theory in relation to perceptions of deviant and non-deviant social groups. Two measures were employed. The first was a measure of the master status phenomenon (Jenks, 1986). The second was a measure of social distance (Thurstone, 1927b).

Social distance was employed to establish construct validity, the underlying rationale being that social distance is concomitant with being perceived as deviant. As Ericson (1977) has outlined the greater the degree of perceived deviance the greater the likelihood of preference not to socialise with the deviant group.

Two hypotheses were formulated for this study. The first addressed the assessment of the master status theory, the second addressed the existence of greater interpersonal social distance from deviant social groups than non-deviant groups.

HYPOTHESIS ONE: MASTER STATUS ATTRIBUTIONS

That the three deviant social groups, namely "men who sexually abuse children," "single mothers who have never married," and "male homosexuals," will have attributed to them deviant trait/characteristics to a significantly higher extent than the non-deviant social groups, namely "Anglicans actively involved in their religion" and "Labour Party supporters."

The hypothesis that three socially deviant groups would be attributed to a significantly higher extent with deviant traits/characteristics than the non-deviant social groups was supported.

Collectively, the three deviant social groups were found to be significantly different from the non-deviant groups on the following deviant traits/characteristics. The deviant social groups were perceived as using more marijuana and hard drugs; to be in greater need of psychological counselling; to possess more immoral standards; to be more incompetent; to possess lower self-esteem; and to be more sexually promiscuous than the non-deviant social groups. They were also perceived to have lower satisfaction with their work and lower life satisfaction in general.

Of the fourteen deviant traits/characteristics, no significant difference was found between deviant and non-deviant social groups on the following traits/characteristics: level of education, use of alcohol, parental disciplining techniques experienced by members (in childhood) of each social group, either permissiveness or restrictive, and satisfaction with friends.

Three explanations can be put forward to explain why the above deviant traits/characteristics' were not rated as consistently deviant.

Discriminant Validity

First, it may be assumed that these items were not adequate for discriminating between non-deviant and deviant social groups, in that there was as much within-group variation as there was between-groups. For example the "parental disciplining" item. "Men who sexually abuse children" and "Anglicans" were both perceived to have undergone a restrictive style of discipline from their parents. In contrast "single mothers who have never married" and "Labour Party supporters" were perceived to have had a permissive style of parental discipline. Male homosexuals were not perceived to have encountered an extreme of either permissive or restrictive disciplining styles.

Heterogeneity

Logically, people may perceive these groups as being different from one another on one or more dimensions. Therefore it is unreasonable to expect all items to be consistently attributed to all forms of deviance.

Appropriateness of Non-Deviant and Deviant Social Groups

The final possibility for the above traits/characteristics failure to be rated as deviant may be rooted in the fact that the social groups that were used were not representative of deviant or non-deviant social groups, and therefore it is understandable that deviant attributions were not consistently elicited. For example Labour supporters were typically rated marginally in the items used in this study, therefore it is questionable whether this social group had been correctly identified as a non-deviant social category.

Support for the Master Status Theory

These results support Becker's (1963) and Jenks' (1986) formulation of the master status theory. Similar to Jenks (1986) the present study found support for the argument that within New Zealand student culture, specific deviants come to be labelled as general deviants. Men who sexually abuse children, single mothers who have never married, and, male homosexuals were seen as significantly different from Labour supporters and Anglicans actively involved in their religion in areas removed from their deviance (i.e. abuse, sexuality, or parental/marital status).

HYPOTHESIS TWO: SOCIAL DISTANCE

That three deviant social groups will be less preferred as friends than the two non-deviant social groups. The hierarchical placement of social groups on the social distance scale will support overall attributions of

deviant traits found in the measure of the master status phenomenon (Jenks, 1986), thereby establishing construct validity.

The hypothesis that the three socially deviant groups would be less preferred as friends than the two non-deviant social groups was supported.

Each non-deviant social group was placed in higher preference for social intimacy (most preferred as a friend) than the non-deviant social groups. This hierarchical placement supports Schur's (1979, 1980), Ericson's (1977), Goffman's (1963), and Glanz's (1988) findings that the greater the degree of perceived deviance the greater the likelihood of preference not to socialise with a deviant social group.

Based on the previous demonstrations for the robustness of the master status theory and the strong relationship in the present study between the attribution of deviant auxiliary traits and the social distance measure, it can be assumed that the present study possessed construct validity (in the sense that one can confidently assume that deviance was the construct under investigation) (Bohrnstedt, 1977).

Secondly, the strong relationship between the master status attributions and the hierarchical placement of non-deviant social groups in preference to non-deviant groups, lends robustness to the initial assumption that the three designated deviant social groups were regarded as "deviant" by respondents.

RESEARCH QUESTION

This study also included a research question regarding respondents' reported degree of knowledge regarding the five social groups under investigation. It was assumed that the more subjects believe their beliefs and attitudes to be valid, the more resistant they are to change (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). It was found that on all items that subjects felt that they had a higher than average

degree of knowledge regarding each social group. Implications of this finding may reflect the respondents' assumption that their beliefs/attitudes are realistic, and that they are unaware of the inaccuracy of their cognitive sets.

WEAKNESSES OF THE STUDY

A number of weaknesses can be identified in the present study. These include such methodological issues as: a lack of control in obtaining responses, a lack of certainty regarding subjects' prototypes, the possibility of socially desirable responses, weaknesses with the social distance measure, no criterion for the qualification or disqualification of respondents' perceptions, and a lack of qualification as to whether respondents viewed each trait as deviant or not. Finally weaknesses at a conceptual level are identified.

Control

The P.N.C.E. and the Massey samples did not experience a standardised administration of the questionnaire. The Massey sample was supervised throughout the completion of the questionnaire. In contrast, due to the difficulty in gathering the P.N.C.E. sample in one place questionnaires were left with subjects and collected later in the week. Although this lack of control is a possible confound, the high correlation between both samples' responses suggests that this has not significantly compromised this study's findings.

Imposition of Prototypes on Subjects

The present study's methodology relied upon the presentation of various social categories to respondents for the elicitation of attitudes/beliefs toward each social group. Each of these categories was ordained and defined by the researcher. A major weakness with this approach is the lack of acknowledgment of the subjects' own prototypes (Rosch, 1978; Anderson, 1985; Hamilton et al., 1986).

In the master status measure, the five social groups were listed with characteristics assumed specific enough to elicit the particular schema under investigation. However, no attempt was made prior to data collection to validate whether the social categories used were prototypical of the subject group. Social categories were imposed upon respondents. In this sense the present study can be criticised for failing to measure prototypes held by subjects.

Social Desirability

Anastasi (1988) indicates that "faking good" and "faking bad" are potential and common biases in attitude assessment, and are especially evident in "socially sensitive" areas (Hamilton et al., 1986).

The original questionnaire incorporated the Crown and Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (1964: cited in Robinson & Shaver, 1973) to account for potential socially approved responses. On the basis of "unethical deception," the social desirability scale was removed at the request of the P.N.C.E. Research Committee. However, given McCrae and Costa's (1983) critique of the social desirability concept, the failure to include a scale to check for possible response bias is not seen as a major problem to the utility of the results of this study.

Social Distance Measure

Despite the information gleaned from the social distance measure, the low subject response rate restricts the scale to an exploratory measure and is non-representative of the subjects sampled.

The large number of incompleted items may be traced to the study's failure to ensure a forced-choice format, as outlined by Thurstone (1927b; Guilford,

1954), and/or to potential subject fatigue (Guilford, 1954) and possibly boredom in completing a 66 item scale.

Forced-choice Format

At the request of the P.N.C.E. Research Committee, the scale was reworded to relieve subjects of the need to complete every item. Subjects who failed to complete more than two items were eliminated from the study, as the scale is believed to loose utility with more than two incompleted items (Thurstone, 1927b; Guilford, 1954).

The large number of incompleted items may also be attributed to a low preference differentiation between some social categories. Despite the fact that participants in the pilot study reported no difficulty in completing the scale, some subjects in the actual study reported a great difficulty in deciding between some social groups in preference for friendship. The discrepancy between reports of subjects in the pilot study and the actual study may be attributed to a small group situation where subjects in the pilot were too willing to please.

Fatigue

Within the framework established by Guilford (1954) the paired comparison scale used in this study was limited to 12 social categories. According to Guilford (1954) too many social categories will result in subject fatigue and disinterest. Within this framework, 66 paired comparison items were used. None of the pilot study's subjects reported fatigue or disinterest when questioned. However, in the actual study a number of subjects reported a loss of interest while completing this scale.

Qualification of Traits as Deviant

As outlined previously, in this and other studies assessing the master status theory, subjects have never been given the opportunity to state whether, or to what degree, they felt the deviant traits under investigation were inherently deviant. Therefore room was made for researchers' potentially biased interpretation of elicited responses.

The use a qualitative component would aid experimental interpretations of respondents' ratings and therefore lessen experimental bias.

With regard to the present study, the most salient example of possible response confusion is the item that assessed parental disciplining techniques. Respondents perceived both "Anglicans" and "child sexual abusers" to have experienced "restrictive" styles of parenting techniques, in contrast "Labour Party supporters" and "single mothers who have never married" were perceived to have experienced "permissive" parental discipline. Interpretation of possible perceived deviance of this trait requires further information from the subjects as to whether they viewed either style as deviant, or deviant for only some groups.

IMPLICATIONS

Despite the weaknesses outlined, the present study supports the robustness of the master status theory in relation to social deviance.

As outlined, the majority of previous studies which have focused upon the master status theory in relation to social deviance have failed to ensure construct validity (Hiller, 1981; Miall, 1985; Jenks, 1985, 1986, 1988; Glanz, 1988). The major contribution this study makes to the field of deviance research is the utility of incorporating a social distance scale to ensure that deviance is the theoretical construct under investigation.

As previously outlined, labelling theory asserts that a theoretically interdependent relationship between the master status phenomenon and social distance as a consequence of stigma exists. An implication of the present study is the documentation of this relationship.

Beyond its theoretical implications this study has some utility in monitoring a small section of New Zealand society's attitudes toward a number of stigmatised social groups. Although it is acknowledged that the sample is far from representative, the fact that this thesis' results is reflection of a predominantly white, middle-class social group is meaningful, in the sense that this group is believed to be in a prime position to benefit from social resources.

Given Else's (1991) claims that there is a lack of acknowledgment of the strength of stigma directed towards single mothers, this research will hopefully be personally validating for those who feel that they haven't been "heard".

Encouragingly, the strength of homophobia, at least within the tertiary-level student sample, is greatly less than previous reports from America (DeCecco, 1985) and New Zealand (Bowman, 1983). The degree to which homophobia has actually lessened is uncertain due to the general "trait" focus of the present study. Lack of extremity in many subjects' responses is encouraging, but should not distract us from the everyday reality of discrimination towards homosexuals.

From what is known there is no typology to characterise child sexual abusers (Saphira, 1985). Coupled with the extremity of subjects' elicited deviant perceptions of abusers, there appears a danger in subjects' responses with regard to possible detection of abuse. For example, an individual who has an extreme stereotypical perception of an abuser, will not be aware of the variability of characteristics associated abusers. Thus, the individual may reject the possibility of abuse on the grounds that the abuser fails to adhere to their

stereotype. This has implications with regard for public education to aid the detection of victimisation and awareness of sexual abuse.

FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the outlined weaknesses, future use of models similar to Jenks (1986) will require a number of alterations to methodology. First, the benefit of utilising subjects' prototypes is beneficial in ensuring the elicitation of subjects' "true" stereotypic responses. Secondly, an incorporation of a qualitative component will result in a more efficient and indepth analysis of perceptions. Finally, given the results of this study, the use of social distance scales in conjunction with Jenks' (1986) model would appear a logical addition to previously accepted methodology in the assessment of perceptions of deviant social groups. However, given the difficulties encountered with the paired-comparison scale used in this study, it may be worthwhile utilising some other measure of social distance which is less constrained by time, fatigue, and potential boredom.

The author acknowledges that the robustness of the master status phenomenon has been demonstrated. As such further attempts to determine the robustness of the theory appears an unwarranted endeavour.

The author feels, that to remain within Jenks' quantitative framework poses severe limitations to the indepth assessment of the social construction of deviance. Despite the fact that labelling theory's foundation rests on the premise that deviance is socially constructed, utilisation of this theory has restricted the investigation of deviance to areas that are far from an indepth analysis of who defines and why (Traub et al., 1985). As such, the author's attention has now moved to social constructionalism, where questions believed to be more pertinent can be addressed, such as political, economical, and social consequences of defining certain groups as deviant, the sociological

motivations at the heart of viewing someone as deviant, and who (within society) is given the right to label someone as a "nut", "slut" or "pervert".

REFERENCES

- Alston, J. P. (1974). Attitudes toward extramarital and homosexual relations. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 13, 479-481.
- Anastasi, A. (1988). Psychological testing (6th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Archer, D. (1985). Social deviance. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of social psychology: Vol II (3rd ed.). (pp. 743-804). New York: Random House.
- Auckland gay bashing. (1991, December 18). Man-to-Man: New Zealand's nationwide gay news, p. 6.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). Remembering: A study in experimental and social Psychology. Cambridge: University Press.
- Becker, H. S. (1963). Outsiders. New York: Free Press.
- Berger, G., Hank, L., Rauzi, T., & Simkins, L. (1987). Detection of sexual orientation by heterosexuals and homosexuals. Journal of Homosexuality, 3(4), 83-100.
- Bohrnstedt, G. W. (1977). Reliability and validity assessment in attitude measurement. In G. F. Summers (Ed.), Attitude measurement (pp. 80-99). London: Kershaw Publishing Company.
- Borgadus, E. S. (1967). Measuring social distances. In M. Fishbein (Ed.), Readings in attitude theory and measurement. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Bowman, R. (1983). Beyond the pink triangle: The New Zealand public's attitude towards homosexuality. In M. Hill, S. Mast, R. Bowman, & C. Carr-Gregg (Eds.), Shades of deviance (pp.99-113). Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press.
- Brailey, J. (1989, June 19). Solo and proud. New Zealand Woman's Weekly, pp. 90.
- Brewer, M. B., Dull, V., & Lui, L. (1981). Perceptions of the elderly: Stereotypes as prototypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 56-670.
- Cantor, N. & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypes in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol 12, pp. 3-52). New York: Academic Press.
- Clevedon, S. (1989, April 24). Role models. New Zealand Woman's Weekly, p. 88.
- Clinard, M. (1974). Sociology of deviant behavior. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston.
- Cohen, A. (1966). Deviance and control. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Conrad, P., & Schneider, J. W. (1980). Deviance and medicalization: From badness to sickness. London: C. V. Mosby.
- Coalition of Concerned Citizens. (1985). The social effects of homosexuality in New Zealand. Christchurch: Author.
- Coombs, C. H. (1966). Thurstone's measurement of social values revisited forty years later. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6(1), 85-91.

- Dawes, R. M. (1972). Fundamentals of attitude measurement. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- De Cecco, J. P. (Ed.). (1981). Homophobia in American society: Bashers, baiters and bigots. New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Department of Statistics (1992). New Zealand official year book (95th ed.). Auckland: Author.
- Dominick, C. H., Rochford, M. W., & Robb, M. J. (1988). Solo parents benefits and employment (Research series 5). Wellington: Department of Social Welfare.
- Dotter, D. L., & Roebuck, J. B. (1988). The labeling approach re-examined: Interactionism and components of deviance. Deviant Behavior, 9, 19-32.
- Elliot, G. C., Ziegler, H. L., Altman, B. M., & Scott, D. R. (1982). Understanding stigma: Dimensions of deviance and coping. Deviant Behavior, 3, 275-300.
- Else, A. (1991). A question of adoption. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Elsworthy, S. J. (1988). Social change and the state. Unpublished bachelor honour's thesis, Otago University, Dunedin.
- Ericson, R. V. (1977). Social distance and reaction to criminality. British Journal of Criminology, 17(1), 16-29.
- Fain, T. C., & Anderton, (1987). Sexual harassment: Organizational context and diffuse status. Sex Roles, 17(5-6), 291-311.

- Faraday, A. (1981). Liberating lesbian research. In K. Plummer (Ed.), The making of the modern homosexual (pp. 35-54). London: Hutchinson.
- Ferree, M., & Smith, E. R. (1979). A cognitive approach to social and individual stigma. The Journal of Social Psychology, 109, 87-97.
- Fein, S. B., & Nuehring, E. M. (1981). Intrapsychic effects of stigma: A process breakdown and reconstruction of social reality. Journal of Homosexuality, 7(1), 3-13.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). Social cognition (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Frale, O. E., Blackstone, T., & Scherbaum, C. (1990). Marginal and mindful: Deviants in social interactions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59(1), 140-149.
- Freedman, J. L., & Doob, A. N. (1968). Deviancy: The psychology of being different. New York: Academic Press.
- Garfinkel, H. (1956). Conditions of successful degradation ceremonies. American Journal of Sociology, 61, 420-424.
- Gay bashings on increase. (1992, April/May). OUT! Magazine: New Zealand's Alternative Lifestyle, p. 8.
- Gay Task Force (1985a). Survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence: Wellington. Wellington: Author.
- Gay Task Force (1985b). Survey of anti-gay/lesbian violence: Christchurch. Wellington: Author.

- Gerhardt, U. (1990a). Qualitative research on chronic illness: The issue and the story. Social Science Medicine, 30(11), 1149-1159.
- Gerhardt, U. (1990b). Patient careers in end-stage renal failure. Social Science Medicine, 30(11), 1211-1224.
- Goffman, E. (1959). Presentation of the self in everyday life. New York: Anchor.
- Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Guilford, J. P. (1954). Psychometric methods (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Groth, A. N. (1978). Guidelines for the assessment and management of the offender. In A. W. Burgess, A. N. Groth, L. L. Holmstrom, & S. M. Sgroi (Eds.), Sexual assault of children and adolescents (pp. 25-42). Lexington, MA: Lexington Press.
- Happy But Lonely. (1988, May 2). It's lonely for my kids and me. New Zealand Woman's Weekly, p. 86.
- Haggard, J. J., & Tilly, C. (1988). Characteristics predicting children's responses to sexual encounter with other children. Child Abuse and Neglect, 12(2), 209-218.
- Hiller, G. M. (1985). The salience of overweight in personality characterization. Journal of Psychology, 108, 233-240.
- Hiller, D. V. (1982). Overweight as a master status: A replication. Journal of Psychology, 110, 107-113.

- Hughes, E. C. (1945). Dilemmas and contradictions of status. American Journal of Sociology, 50, 353-359.
- Huffine, C. L., & Clausen, J. A. (1979). Madness and work: Short- and long-term effects of mental illness on occupational careers. Social Forces, 57(4), 1049-1062.
- Jenks, R. J. (1985). Swinging: Areplication and test of a theory. The Journal of Sex Research, 21, 199-210.
- Jenks, R. J. (1986). Perceptions of two deviant and two non-deviant groups. Journal of Social Psychology, 126, 783-790.
- Jenks, R. J. (1988). Nongays' perception of gays. Annals of Sex Research, 1, 139-150.
- Kelly, D. H., & Pink, W. T. (1982). School crimem and individual responsibility: The perpetuation of a myth? The Urban Review, 4(1), 47-69.
- Kilgour, R., Maskil, C. & Lungley, S. (1990). Publiic perception of AIDS: Knowledge, attitudes and behaviour. Wellington: Department of Health.
- Kitsuse, J. I. (1962). Societal reaction to deviant behavior: Problems of theory and method. Social Problems, 9, 247-256.
- Kitsuse, J. I. (1980). The "new conception of deviance" and its critics. In W. R. Gove (Ed.), The labelling of deviance (pp. 381-392). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Krauth, J. I. (1988). Distribution-free statistics: An application-oriented approach. Oxford: Elsevier.

- Labour Research Unit. (1991). The credibility gap: The first six months of the National Government. Wellington: Parliament Buildings.
- Labour Research Unit. (1991, August). National's top 40 broken promises. Wellington: Parliament Buildings.
- Labour Research Unit. (1992, April). The National betrayal: Promises broken by the National Government (Vol I). Wellington: Parliament Buildings.
- Lemert, E. M. (1951). Social pathology. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Levy, F. (1987, November 7). We need this book! New Zealand Woman's Weekly, p. 22-23.
- Lietz, J. J. (1981). Ranking social stigma: Would you want one as a friend. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 53, 353-354.
- Lindeman, R. H., & Merenda, P. F. (1979). Educational measurement (2nd ed.). Glenview, Illinois: Scott & Foresman.
- Liska, A. E. (1981). Perspectives on deviance. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hill.
- Lofland, J. (1966). Deviance and identity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hill.
- Mankoff, M. (1971). Societal reaction and career deviance: A critical analysis. The Sociological Quarterly, 12(2), 204-217.
- Merton, R. K. (1949). Social theory and social structure. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

- Miall, C. E. (1985). Perceptions of informal sanctioning and the stigma of involuntary childlessness. Deviant Behavior, 6, 383-403.
- Movahedi, S. (1978). The drug addict and addiction: Cultural stereotypes and clinical theories. Urban Life, 7(1), 45-66.
- New Zealand AIDS Foundation (1991, February). Submission to the Justice and Law Reform Select Committee on the Human Rights Commission Amendment Bill, 1990. Auckland: Author.
- Norusis, M. J. (1990). SPSS: Advanced statistics guide. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Orcutt, J. D. (1983). Analyzing deviance. Dorsey Press: Homewood, Illinois.
- Palenski, J. E., & Launer, H. M. (1987). The "process" of running away: A redefinition. Adolescence, 22(86), 347-362.
- Parker, I. (1992). Discourse dynamics: Critical analysis for social and individual psychology. London: Routledge.
- Lee, G. (1986, July 1-17). New Zealand parliamentary debates, 472, 2583 - 2585. Wellington: House of Representatives.
- Plasek, J. W., & Allard, J. (1984). Misconceptions of homophobia. Journal of Homosexuality, 10, 23-37.
- Popham, W. J. (1984). Specifying the domain of content or behaviors. In R. A. Berk (Ed.), A guide to criterion-referenced test construction. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

- Robinson, J. P., & Shaver, P. R. (1973). Measures of social psychological attitudes (rev. ed.). Michigan: Survey Research Centre.
- Rochford, M., & Pawakapan, N. (1990). An evaluation of the stepping out programme (Research Series 12). Wellington: Department of Social Welfare.
- Rosch, E. (1975). Cognitive reference points. Cognitive Psychology, 1, 532-547.
- Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd Eds.), Cognition and categorization (pp. 27-48). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Rosch, E., Mervis, C. B., Gray, W., Johnson, D., & Boyes-Braem, R. (1976). Basic objects in natural categories. Cognitive Psychology, 8, 382-439.
- Rosenhan, D. L. (1973). On being sane in insane places. Science, 179, 250-258.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. F. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.
- Rosier, P. (1989, November). Backlash. Broadsheet, pp. 17.
- Rosser, S., & Ross, M. (1988). Discrimination experienced by homosexually active men with reference to AIDS prevention strategies: A two country comparison. Unpublished manuscript.
- Russel, D. E. H. (1984). The prevalence and seriousness of incestuous abuse: Stepfathers vs. biological fathers. Child Abuse and Neglect, 8, 15-22.

- Saal, F., Downey, R. G. and Lahey, M. A. (1980). Rating the ratings: Assessing the psychometric quality of rating data. Psychological Bulletin, 88, 13-428.
- Saphira, M. (1985). The sexual abuse of children (2nd ed.). Auckland: Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand.
- Schneider, J. W., & Conrad, P. (1981). Medical and sociological typologies: The case of epilepsy. Social Science Medicine, 15(3), 211-219.
- Schur, E. M. (1971). Labeling deviant behavior: Its sociological implications. New York: Grune and Stratton.
- Schur, E. M. (1980). The politics of deviance. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Serdahely, W. J. & Ziemba, G. J. (1984). Challenging homophobic attitudes through college sexuality education. Journal of Homosexuality, 10(1/2), 109-116.
- Sprent, P. (1989). Applied nonparametric statistical methods. London: Chapman and Hill.
- St John, C., & Bates, N. A.. (1990). Racial composition and neighbourhood evaluation. Social Science Research, 19, 47-61.
- Terry, R. M., & Steffensmeier, D. J. (1988). Conceptual and theoretical issues in the study of deviance. Deviant Behavior, 9, 55-76.
- Thurstone, L. L. (1927a). A law of comparative judgment. Psychological Review, 34, 273-286.

- Thurstone, L. L. (1927b). Method of paired-comparisons for social values. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 21, 384-400.
- Torgerson, W. S. (1958). Theory and methods of scaling. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Traub, S. H., & Little, C. B. (1985). Theories of deviance (3rd ed.). Illinois: Peacock Publishers.
- Urgent action required... Right now! (1990, December). OUT! Magazine: New Zealand's Alternative Lifestyle, p. 32-33.
- Wiersma, W. & Jurs, S. G. (1990). Educational measurement and testing (2nd ed.). London: Allan & Bacon.

ADDENDUM

- DeCecco, J. P. (Ed.). (1985). Homophobia in American society: Bashers, baiters and bigots. New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Edwards, A. L. & Kenney, M. (1966). Relationship between probability of endorsement and social desirability scale value for a set of 2,824 personality statements. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 238-239.
- Else, A. (1990). A question of adoption. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Fein, S. B. & Beck S. (1982). Intrapsychic effects of stigma - a process of breakdown and reconstruction of social reality. Journal of Homosexuality, 7(1), 3-13.
- Glanz, E. (1988). Criminality as a master status. South African Journal of Psychology, 3, 15-19.
- Hiller, G. M. (1981). The salience of overweight in personality categorization. Journal of Psychology, 108, 233-240.
- Levesque, A. (1986). Prescribers and rebels. In B. Brookes, C. MacDonald & M. Tennant (eds.). Women in history: Essays on European women in New Zealand. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.
- McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. (1983). Social desirability scales: More substance than style. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 51, 882-888.
- Merton, R. K. (1967). Social theory and social structure. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Schur, E. M. (1971). Labeling deviant behavior: Its sociological implications. New York: Grune and Stratton.
- Tennant, M. (1989). Paupers and providers: Charitable aid in New Zealand. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.

APPENDIX ONE: Jenks' (1986) Scale

1. What do you think the average number of years of education is for the following groups:

Atheists ____ Catholics ____ Homosexuals ____ Republicans ____

2. What percent of the American population do you think is:

Catholic ____ Homosexual ____ Republican ____ Atheist ____

3. What percent of the two groups listed below do you think have the following religious identifications:

	Homosexuals	Republicans
Catholic	_____	_____
Jewish	_____	_____
Protestant	_____	_____
No Religion	_____	_____

4. What percentage of each group do you think drinks alcohol:

Atheists:	Great Deal____	Some____	Very Little____	Not At All____
Catholics:	Great Deal____	Some____	Very Little____	Not At All____
Homosexuals:	Great Deal____	Some____	Very Little____	Not At All____
Republicans:	Great Deal____	Some____	Very Little____	Not At All____

5. What percentage of each group do you think smokes marijuana:

Atheists:	Great Deal____	Some____	Very Little____	Not At All____
Catholics:	Great Deal____	Some____	Very Little____	Not At All____
Homosexuals:	Great Deal____	Some____	Very Little____	Not At All____
Republicans:	Great Deal____	Some____	Very Little____	Not At All____

6. What percentage of each group do you think uses "hard" drugs:

Atheists:	Great Deal__	Some__	Very Little__	Not At All__
Catholics:	Great Deal__	Some__	Very Little__	Not At All__
Homosexuals:	Great Deal__	Some__	Very Little__	Not At All__
Republicans:	Great Deal__	Some__	Very Little__	Not At All__

7. What percentage of each group do you think needs psychological counseling:

Catholics ____ Homosexuals ____ Republicans ____ Atheists ____

8. What percentage of each group do you think belongs to the following social classes:

	Upper Class	Middle Class	Lower Class
Homosexuals:	_____	_____	_____
Republicans:	_____	_____	_____
Atheists:	_____	_____	_____
Catholics:	_____	_____	_____

9. What percentage of the two groups listed below do you think have the following political party identifications:

	Atheist	Homosexuals
Democratic	_____	_____
Independant	_____	_____
Republican	_____	_____
None	_____	_____

10. On a five point scale where 1 is Very Liberal and 5 is Very Conservative what do you think the average of the four groups would be:

(Note: As a rough guideline you might use 2 for Liberal, 3 for Moderate, and 4 for Conservative. You may, however, use any number, including fractions)

Republicans:	_____
Atheists:	_____
Catholics:	_____
Homosexuals:	_____

11. On a five point scale with 1 being Very Permissive and 5 being Very Restrictive, what do you think the average would be for these groups in terms of their parents method of disciplining them when they were children:

Atheists: _____
Catholics: _____
Homosexuals: _____
Republicans: _____

12. On a five point scale with 1 being Great Deal and 5 being NOne, what do you think the average would be for these groups in terms of having control over their lives:

Catholics _____ Homosexuals _____ Republicans _____ Atheists _____

13. On a five point scale with 1 being Very Satisfied and 5 Very Dissatisfied, what do you think the average would be for the following groups in terms of their life satisfaction:
(Note as a rough guide you might use 2 as being Satisfied, 3 as Neither satisfied or Dissatisfied, and 4 as Dissatisfied. Again, fractions may be used)

Homosexuals _____ Republicans _____ Atheists _____ Catholics _____

14. Using the same guidelines as in Question 13, what do you think the average would be for the following groups in terms of their satisfaction with their friends:

Republicans ____ Atheists ____ Catholics ____ Homosexuals ____

15. Again using the same guidelines as above, what do you think the average would be in terms of satisfaction with their jobs:

Atheists ____ Catholics ____ Homosexuals ____ Republicans ____

1. Your age: ____

2. Sex: Male ____ Female ____

3. With which religious group do you identify: (Check One)

Catholic ____ Protestant ____ Jewish ____ Other ____ None ____

4. With which political party do you identify: (Check One)

5. Which best describes your political and social philosophy: (Check One)

Very Conservative ____ Conservative ____ Moderate ____ Liberal ____ Very Liberal ____

6. Which best describes your opinion on homosexuality: (Check One)

Always Wrong ____ Usually Wrong ____ Wrong Only Sometimes ____
Never Wrong ____

7. Which best describes your opinion on Catholicism: (Check One)

Always Wrong ____ Usually Wrong ____ Wrong Only Sometimes ____
Never Wrong ____

8. Which best describes your opinion toward Republicanism: (Check One)

Always Wrong ____ Usually Wrong ____ Wrong Only Sometimes ____
Never Wrong ____

9. Which best describes your opinion toward atheism: (Check One)

Always Wrong ____ Usually Wrong ____ Wrong Only Sometimes ____
Never Wrong ____

APPENDIX TWO: Questionnaire Used In the Present Study

RESEARCH ON PERCEPTIONS AND BELIEFS OF FIVE DIFFERENT SOCIAL GROUPS

CONSENT FORM

What would I have to do?

Participants will be asked to complete a questionnaire concerning their perceptions and beliefs of five different groups. This should take around 30 minutes to complete.

What can I expect from the researchers?

All participants:

- * have the right to refuse to answer any particular question, and withdraw from the study at any time.
- * provide information on the understanding that it is confidential to the researchers. All questions are identified only by code number, and are seen by the researchers. It will not be possible to identify individuals in any published reports.
- * will receive a summary of the research findings after the information has been analyzed.

The details of the study have been adequately explained to me, and I wish to participate under the conditions set above.

signature of participant _____

signature of researcher _____

date _____

MASSEY UNIVERSITY

Please read the following instructions carefully.

The aim of this study is to investigate some of the views people hold.

We are interested in knowing your perception and beliefs concerning five groups.

These five groups are:

- Male homosexuals
- Single-mothers who have never married
- Anglicans who are actively involved in their religion
- Men who sexually abuse children
- and, Labour Party supporters

If possible, please attempt all the questions and be careful not to skip any pages. However, if you do not wish to answer any particular item please skip it and move on to the next.

Finally, we require your own responses, please do not confer with others as you answer the question.

Your answers are completely anonymous. Should you wish to withdraw at this point please feel free to do so. Otherwise thank you for your continued participation.

1. Please indicate what you think is the highest educational qualification for average member of each group. For each group circle only one qualification level.

Office the
Use

--	--	--

Labour Supporters

- No school qualification 1
- School Certificate Pass 2
- Sixth Form Certificate, University Entrance 3
- Higher School (or leaving) certificate 4
- University Bursary, Scholarship 5
- Trade Certificate 6
- Professional Certificate or diploma 7
- Bachelors degree 8
- Postgraduate degree, or diploma 9

☐

Homosexuals

- No school qualification 1
- School Certificate Pass 2
- Sixth Form Certificate, University Entrance 3
- Higher School (or leaving) certificate 4
- University Bursary, Scholarship 5
- Trade Certificate 6
- Professional Certificate or diploma 7
- Bachelors degree 8
- Postgraduate degree, or diploma 9

☐

Single-Mothers

- No school qualification 1
- School Certificate Pass 2
- Sixth Form Certificate 3
- Higher School (or leaving) certificate 4
- University Bursary, Scholarship 5
- Trade Certificate 6
- Professional Certificate or diploma 7
- Bachelors degree 8
- Postgraduate degree, or diploma 9

☐

☐

1111

For the next five questions please indicate what percentage of each group, you think, would engage in the following behaviours listed.

Sexual Abusers

Anglicans

Homosexuals

0% 50% 100%

Labour Supporters

0% 50% 100%

Single-mothers

0% 50% 100%

3. What percentage of each group do you think smokes marijuana?
 Please place a cross (X) anywhere on the following scales.

Single-mothers	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Sexual Abusers	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Anglicans	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Homosexuals	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Labour Supporters	_____		
	0%	50%	100%

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

4. What percentage of each group do you think uses "hard drugs"? (Hard drugs are: cocaine; opium; LSD; and/or heroin) Please place a cross (X) anywhere on the following scales.

Labour Supporters	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Single-mothers	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Sexual Abusers	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Anglicans	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Homosexuals	_____		
	0%	50%	100%

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

5. What percentage of each group do you think is likely to need psychological counselling? Please place a cross (X) anywhere on the following scales.

Homosexuals	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Labour Supporters	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Single-mothers	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Sexual Abusers	_____		
	0%	50%	100%
Anglicans	_____		
	0%	50%	100%

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

6. What percent of each group do you think belongs to the following social classes?

	Upper Class	Middle Class	Lower Class
Labour Supporters	____%	____%	____%
Single-mothers	____%	____%	____%
Anglicans	____%	____%	____%
Homosexuals	____%	____%	____%
Sexual Abusers	____%	____%	____%

For each of the following items, circle the number which best reflects your beliefs about the following groups.

7. Please circle how moral you think the average members of each group are.

Homosexuals	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Immoral	Very Moral
Labour Supporters	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Immoral	Very Moral
Single-mothers	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Immoral	Very Moral
Anglicans	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Immoral	Very Moral
Sexual Abusers	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Immoral	Very Moral

8. Parental disciplining techniques can range from "restrictive" to "permissive". Please indicate the type of general parental discipline likely to have been experienced by the group members (in childhood).

Sexual Abusers	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Restrictive Permissive	
Homosexuals	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Restrictive Permissive	
Labour Supporters	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Restrictive Permissive	
Single-mothers	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Restrictive Permissive	
Anglicans	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Restrictive Permissive	

9. In general, how competent do you think the members of each group believe they are in their main daily activities (e.g. work)? (competent = believe they are effective in what they do).

Anglicans	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Competent Incompetent	
Sexual Abusers	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Competent Incompetent	
Homosexuals	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Competent Incompetent	
Labour Supporters	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Competent Incompetent	
Single-mothers	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Competent Incompetent	

☐☐☐☐☐

12. What do you think would be the average for the following groups in terms of having personal control over their lives? (Personal control is having control over one's own destiny)

Homosexuals	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Great Deal		None
Labour Supporters	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Great Deal		None
Single-mothers	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Great Deal		None
Anglicans	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Great Deal		None
Sexual Abusers	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Great Deal		None

13. What do you think the average would be for the following groups in terms of their life satisfaction?

Sexual Abusers	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Very Satisfied		Very Unsatisfied
Homosexuals	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Very Satisfied		Very Unsatisfied
Labour Supporters	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Very Satisfied		Very Unsatisfied
Single-mothers	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Very Satisfied		Very Unsatisfied
Anglicans	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
Very Satisfied		Very Unsatisfied

14. How satisfied do you think the following groups are with their friends? (Satisfaction in terms of the depth and genuineness of friendship rather than the number of friends).

[illegible][illegible]

Homosexuals 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7
Very Satisfied Very Unsatisfied

Sexual Abusers 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7
Very Satisfied Very Unsatisfied

Labour Supporters 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7
Very Satisfied Very Unsatisfied

15. How satisfied do you think the following groups are in terms of satisfaction with their work (each groups main activity).

Labour Supporters 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7
Very Satisfied Very Unsatisfied

[illegible]

Homosexuals 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7
Very Satisfied Very Unsatisfied

[illegible]

Sexual Abusers

Very Satisfied Very Unsatisfied

To follow is a column of combinations of different groups. Based on the views you hold for the following groups circle which person in the pair you would most prefer to have as a friend. You are encouraged to answer every item. It is acknowledged that these pairs are difficult. If you choose not to respond to a particular pair then skip it and move to the next.

- 1 Single-mother OR Anglican
- 2 Prostitute OR Male Homosexual
- 3 Labour Supporter OR New Zealand European
- 4 Prostitute OR Benefit Recipient
- 5 Maori OR Single-mother
- 6 Labour Supporter OR Benefit Recipient
- 7 Homosexual Male OR Maori
- 8 Heterosexual Male OR Benefit Recipient
- 9 Heterosexual Male OR Child Sexual Abuser
- 10 Maori OR Anglican
- 11 Single-mother OR Benefit Recipient
- 12 Prostitute OR New Zealand European
- 13 Child Sexual Abuser OR Homosexual Male
- 14 Homosexual Male OR New Zealand European
- 15 Single-mother OR Labour Supporter
- 16 Labour supporter OR Bigamist

SM AN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PR MH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LS NZ	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PR BE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MA SM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LS BE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MH MA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HE BE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HE CS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MA AN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SM BE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PR NZ	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CS MH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MH NZ	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SM LS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LS BI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17 Bigamist OR Child Sexual Abuser

18 Atheist OR Homosexual Male

19 Single-mother OR Heterosexual Male

20 Heterosexual Male OR Maori

21 Atheist OR Benefit Recipient

22 Bigamist OR Homosexual Male

23 Bigamist OR Prostitute

24 Labour Supporter OR Atheist

25 New Zealand European OR Heterosexual Male

26 Prostitute OR Anglican

27 Child Sexual Abuser OR Anglican

28 Atheist OR Child Sexual Abuser

29 Anglican OR Bigamist

30 Benefit Recipient OR Child Sexual Abuser

31 Atheist OR Prostitute

32 Prostitute OR Heterosexual Male

33 Single-mother OR Bigamist

34 Child Sexual Abuser OR Prostitute

BI CS

☐☐

AT MH

☐☐

SM HE

☐☐

HE MA

☐☐

AT BE

☐☐

BI MH

☐☐

BI PR

☐☐

LS AT

☐☐

NZ HE

☐☐

PR AN

☐☐

CS AN

☐☐

AT CS

☐☐

AN BI

☐☐

BE CS

☐☐

AT PR

☐☐

PR HE

☐☐

SM BI

☐☐

CS PR

☐☐

35 New Zealand European OR Maori

NZ MA

☐

36 Anglican OR Labour Supporter

AN LS

☐

37 Benefit Recipient OR Bigamist

BE BI

☐

38 New Zealand European OR Child Sexual Abuser

NZ CS

☐

39 New Zealand European OR Single Mother

NZ SM

☐

40 Heterosexual Male OR Bigamist

HE BI

☐

41 Prostitute OR Single-mother

PR SM

☐

42 New Zealand European OR Benefit Recipient

NZ BE

☐

43 Bigamist OR Atheist

BI AT

☐

44 Homosexual Male OR Heterosexual Male

MH HE

☐

45 Atheist OR Maori

AT MA

☐

46 Benefit Recipient OR Anglican

BE AN

☐

47 New Zealand European OR Atheist

NZ AT

☐

48 Benefit Recipient OR Homosexual Male

BE MH

☐

49 Anglican OR Atheist

AN AT

☐

50 Maori OR Labour Supporter

MA LS

☐

51 Homosexual Male OR Labour Supporter

MH LS

☐

52 Anglican OR New Zealand European

AN NZ

☐

53 Bigamist OR Maori

BI MA

☐☐

54 Maori OR Prostitute

MA PR

☐☐

55 Anglican OR Heterosexual Male

AN HE

☐☐

56 Labour Supporter OR Heterosexual Male

LS HE

☐☐

57 Labour Supporter OR Child Sexual Abuser

LS CS

☐☐

58 Homosexual Male OR Anglican

MH AN

☐☐

59 Homosexual Male OR Single-mother

MH SM

☐☐

60 Prostitute OR Labour Supporter

PR LS

☐☐

61 Single-mother OR Atheist

SM AT

☐☐

62 Single-mother OR Child Sexual Abuser

SM CS

☐☐

63 New Zealand European OR Bigamist

NZ BI

☐☐

64 Heterosexual Male OR Atheist

HE AT

☐☐

65 Maori OR Benefit Recipient

MA BE

☐☐

66 Child Sexual Abuser OR Maori

CS MA

☐☐

Personal Information

These details will be used for statistical purposes only and will not be used to identify you.

Gender: Male / Female (circle one) ☐

Age: Year born:

Religion / Spirituality: Do you affiliate with a particular Christian church? ☐

If yes please specify which denomination

If not Christian, with which religion or form of spirituality/belief do you identify?
Please specify

Are you actively involved in your religion?
Yes / No (please circle) ☐

Country of birth: Please specify

Ethnic Group: Please state which ethnic group/s you identify with.

Education:

Please indicate what is your highest educational qualification at this point in time.

- No school qualification 1
- School Certificate Pass 2
- Sixth Form Certificate, University Entrance 3
- Higher School (or leaving) certificate 4
- University Bursary, Scholarship 5
- Trade Certificate 6
- Professional Certificate 7
- Bachelors degree 8
- Postgraduate degree 9

☐

Education continued:

How many years have you been at P.N College of Education? (please specify)

☐

What is your subject major(s)

☐

Sexual Orientation:

Please circle one. Bisexual / Gay / Heterosexual / Lesbian / other (please specify)

☐

Parental status:

We are interested to know whether or not you are a parent. Please circle which category best applies to you.

Not a Parent / Single-Parent / Two Parent Family/ other (please specify)

☐

Knowledge of Groups:

How knowledgeable are you of the following groups:

Homosexuality	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
No Knowledge		
Knowledgeable		
Sexual Abuse	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
No Knowledge		
Knowledgeable		
Single-parenting	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
No Knowledge		
Knowledgeable		
Anglicans	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
No Knowledge		
Knowledgeable		
Labour Supporters	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7	<input type="checkbox"/>
No Knowledge		
Knowledgeable		

Thank you for participating