

CHAPTER III
PRESENTATION OF RESULTS



Since there were four variables, each of which consisted of two levels, for any stimulus person in Form B, these variables formed a 2x2x2x2 factorial design. Furthermore, since each subject had to rate all these sixteen stimulus persons one at a time, the multifactor repeated-measure model of analysis of variance described by Winer¹ were highly applicable. Due to unequal sample size, the least-squares solution described by Winer² was also adopted.

The responses of the Thai and the second-generation Chinese considered as a group were first analysed together and then separately. These results are presented in Tables 2, 3, and 4. The responses were analysed together again; this time the second-generation Chinese were treated as three separate groups: the high Chinese, the medium Chinese, and the low Chinese. Finally, the responses of each of the three subgroups were analysed separately. The results of the latter analyses are presented in Tables 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

For the over-all analyses, the interactions between the ethnic groups and the characteristics of the stimulus persons are of primary interest. But in the separate analyses, all

¹B.J. Winer, Statistical Principles in Experimental Design, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1962, pp. 298-378.

²Ibid.

the effects are of interest.

Table 1 shows the mean social distance score each ethnic group expressed towards each stimulus person. It is interesting to note that the orderings of these stimulus persons on the continuum of favorableness versus unfavorableness by the Thai and by the second-generation Chinese considered either as a group or as three separate subgroups are almost identical. Stimulus person $A_2B_1C_1D_1$ received least social distance from all subjects. $A_2B_1C_1D_1$ was characterized by having a desire for a moderate amount of wealth, striving for fame and prestige, considering education important and as a means to upward mobility, and being benevolent. Stimulus person $A_2B_2C_1D_1$, who differs from $A_2B_1C_1D_1$ in that $A_2B_2C_1D_1$ does not want fame and prestige, was placed at the second most favored position. Stimulus person $A_1B_1C_1D_1$, who differs from the most favored in that he desires an excessive amount of wealth, was placed at the third by all subjects. Stimulus person $A_1B_2C_1D_1$, who differs from the second most favored in that he desires an excessive amount of wealth like $A_1B_1C_1D_1$, was placed at the fourth.

The stimulus person most rejected by all subjects was $A_1B_2C_2D_2$. He was characterized by having a desire for an excessive amount of wealth, not striving for fame and prestige, considering education unimportant and as no means to upward mobility, and not being benevolent. Stimulus person $A_1B_1C_2D_2$, who received the second greatest social distance, differs from the most rejected in that he strives for fame and prestige. The third greatest social distance receiver, stimulus person

Table 1
 Mean Social Distance Scores Expressed Toward the Sixteen
 Stimulus Persons by the Thai and by the
 Second-Generation Chinese

Stimulus Persons	Thai	All Chinese	Low Chinese	Medium Chinese	High Chinese
A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ D ₁	40.64	39.99	43.42	39.34	36.86
A ₁ B ₁ C ₁ D ₂	58.19	55.68	58.00	55.18	53.49
A ₁ B ₁ C ₂ D ₁	63.78	60.11	56.80	62.49	59.82
A ₁ B ₁ C ₂ D ₂	77.84	79.53	75.52	80.67	81.94
A ₁ B ₂ C ₁ D ₁	42.14	45.04	44.02	45.24	45.65
A ₁ B ₂ C ₁ D ₂	63.81	65.72	62.03	67.16	67.35
A ₁ B ₂ C ₂ D ₁	66.56	67.75	67.93	66.14	69.73
A ₁ B ₂ C ₂ D ₂	78.31	84.63	78.18	87.99	86.32
A ₂ B ₁ C ₁ D ₁	35.14	31.26	33.33	30.95	29.18
A ₂ B ₁ C ₁ D ₂	56.61	52.75	51.18	55.67	49.68
A ₂ B ₁ C ₂ D ₁	60.98	56.57	58.07	55.86	55.68
A ₂ B ₁ C ₂ D ₂	73.13	73.73	68.63	76.42	74.99
A ₂ B ₂ C ₁ D ₁	38.31	37.12	37.86	36.62	36.86
A ₂ B ₂ C ₁ D ₂	59.81	62.76	61.50	62.98	63.55
A ₂ B ₂ C ₂ D ₁	63.99	60.86	61.80	57.17	65.28
A ₂ B ₂ C ₂ D ₂	77.34	77.83	74.35	80.70	76.91

A₂B₂C₂D₂, differs from the most rejected in that he desires a moderate amount of wealth. And the fourth greatest social distance receiver, stimulus person A₂B₁C₂D₂, differs from the third most rejected in that he strives for fame and prestige.

The result of the analysis of variance, as shown in Table 2, indicates that the Thai and the second-generation Chinese subjects did not show significant differences in the social distance expressed toward all stimulus persons. This would suggest that ethnic group affiliation of the subjects (E) alone does not account for significant variance and that significant variance is accounted for by characteristics of the stimulus person or the interactions between these characteristics and the subjects' ethnic group affiliation.

As expected, the A, B, C, and D effects were significant ($p < .001$) for all subjects. Those stimulus persons who have a desire for a moderate amount of wealth (A₂), who strive for fame and prestige (B₁), who consider education important and as a means to upward mobility (C₁), and who are benevolent received less social distance from both the Thai and the second-generation Chinese. On the other hand, those stimulus persons who have a desire for an excessive amount of wealth (A₁), who do not strive for fame and prestige (B₂), who consider education unimportant and as no means to upward mobility (C₂), and who are not benevolent (D₂) received greater social distance.

The significant interaction between A and E ($p < .05$) indicates that the effects of A for the Thai and for the second-generation Chinese are different. The Thai subjects were less

Table 2
 Analysis of Variance of Social Distance Scores Expressed
 by the Thai and by the Second-Generation
 Chinese Considered as a Group

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
<u>Between Subjects</u>	166	146,428.1048		
Ethnic groups(E)	1	262.8735	262.8735	.2967
Error (a)	165	146,165.2313	885.8498	
<u>Within Subjects</u>				
A	1	14,623.8776	14,623.8776	91.5782***
A x E	1	964.6596	964.6596	6.0409*
A x subjects	165	26,348.4003	159.6872	
B	1	17,026.5812	17,026.5812	57.9900***
B x E	1	1,995.0848	1,995.0848	6.7949**
B x subjects	165	48,446.0215	293.6122	
C	1	300,900.4584	300,900.4584	618.5963***
C x E	1	16.4125	16.4125	.0337
C x subjects	165	80,260.0666	485.4246	
D	1	221,847.4584	221,847.4584	424.0362***
D x E	1	996.9509	996.9509	1.9055
D x subjects	165	86,324.7782	523.1804	
AB	1	5.4794	5.4794	.0776
AB x E	1	117.7073	117.7073	1.6687
AB x subjects	165	11,638.5008	70.5363	
AC	1	18.9465	18.9465	.2185
AC x E	1	48.5340	48.5340	.5598
AC x subjects	165	14,305.4570	86.6967	
AD	1	434.1052	434.1052	5.8289*
AD x E	1	67.4270	67.4270	.9053
AD x subjects	165	12,288.1553	74.4736	
BC	1	509.6890	509.6890	5.3635*
BC x E	1	118.2561	118.2561	1.2444
BC x subjects	165	15,679.7424	95.0287	

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
BD	1	262.1890	262.1890	2.2741
BD x E	1	28.7943	28.7943	.2497
BD x subjects	165	19,022.9542	115.2906	
CD x	1	4,441.6262	4,441.6262	34.4856***
CD x E	1	823.6348	823.6348	6.3948*
CD x subjects	165	21,251.4265	128.7965	
ABC	1	10.1890	10.1890	.1188
ABC x E	1	249.6818	249.6818	2.9118
ABC x subjects	165	14,148.3167	85.7473	
ABD	1	4.2848	4.2848	.0490
ABD x E	1	11.0562	11.0562	.1266
ABD x subjects	165	14,402.5965	87.2884	
ACD	1	891.0363	891.0363	10.2085**
ACD x E	1	199.9256	199.9256	1.3739
ACD x subjects	165	14,401.7256	87.2831	
BCD	1	868.0872	868.0872	5.1662*
BCD x E	1	110.7905	110.7905	.6593
BCD x subjects	165	27,725.0598	168.0306	
ABCD	1	268.4914	268.4914	3.5038
ABCD x E	1	50.4185	50.4185	.6579
Total	2671	1,133,226.6673		

*p < .05
 **p < .01
 ***p < .001

sensitive to the stimulus person's values concerning wealth than the second-generation Chinese, as shown in Table 3.

The interaction between B and E is significant ($p < .01$). The effects of B for the Thai and for the second-generation Chinese are different. Again, the Thai subjects were less sensitive to the stimulus person's values concerning prestige than the second-generation were. See Table 4.

Nevertheless, the interactions between C and E and between D and E are not significant. This indicates that the effects of values concerning education and benevolent for the two groups are not different.

The CxD interaction is highly significant ($p < .001$) for all subjects. The CxDxE interaction is also significant ($p < .05$). The Thai reject those who consider education unimportant, whether they are benevolent or not, more than the second-generation Chinese do. See Table 5.

Two other significant but not relevant two-factor interactions are AxD and BxC. Both are significant at the .05 level. There are two other three-factor interactions: AxCxD at the .01 level and BxCxD at the .05 level respectively.

Table 6 is the summary of the analysis of variance of social distance scores expressed toward sixteen stimulus persons by the Thai subjects. The A, B, C, and D effects are all significant ($p < .001$). Characteristic C accounts for the greatest variance. The variance is almost two times as much as the variance accounted for by D, and about fifty times as much as

Table 3

Mean Social Distance Scores Expressed, by the Thai and by the Second-Generation Chinese, Toward Stimulus Persons Who Desire an Excessive Amount of Wealth (A_1) and Those Who Desire a Moderate Amount of Wealth (A_2)

Ethnic Groups	Characteristics of Stimulus Persons		Total
	A_1	A_2	
Thai	61.78	58.51	120.29
Second-Generation Chinese	62.36	56.66	119.02
Total	124.14	115.17	239.31

Table 4

Mean Social Distance Scores Expressed, by the Thai and by
the Second-Generation Chinese, Toward Stimulus Persons
Who Seek (B₁) or Ignore (B₂) Fame and Prestige

Ethnic Groups	Characteristics of Stimulus Persons		Total
	B ₁	B ₂	
Thai	56.64	61.65	120.29
Second-Generation Chinese	56.25	62.77	119.02
Total	114.89	124.42	239.31

Table 5

Mean Social Distance Scores Expressed by the Thai and by
the Second-Generation Chinese Toward Stimulus Persons
with Combinations of Values Concerning
Education (C) and Benevolence (D)

Ethnic Groups	Characteristics of Stimulus Persons				Total
	C ₁ D ₁	C ₁ D ₂	C ₂ D ₁	C ₂ D ₂	
Thai	39.29	59.99	64.25	84.25	237.88
Second-Generation Chinese	38.39	59.26	60.86	78.98	237.49
Total	77.68	119.25	125.11	153.23	475.37



Table 6
 Analysis of Variance of Social Distance Scores
 Expressed by the Thai

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
Subjects	69	45,177.3215	654.7437	
A	1	2,983.5572	2,983.5572	16.9790***
A x subjects	69	12,124.6928	175.7201	
B	1	2,544.0572	2,544.0572	11.8014***
B x subjects	69	14,874.4428	215.5716	
C	1	123,942.4322	123,942.4322	246.5960***
C x subjects	69	34,680.3178	502.6133	
D	1	78,892.8572	78,892.8572	183.1850***
D x subjects	69	29,716.3928	430.6723	
AB	1	45.6035	45.6035	1.2792
AB x subjects	69	2,459.7715	35.6488	
AC	1	66.0571	66.0571	.6227
AC x subjects	69	7,319.5677	106.0806	
AD	1	52.2892	52.2892	.7108
AD x subjects	69	5,075.8358	73.5628	
BC	1	40.3000	40.3000	.6672
BC x subjects	69	4,167.5750	60.3996	
BD	1	40.9000	40.9000	.4000
BD x subjects	69	7,054.9750	102.2460	
CD	1	4,227.6571	4,227.6571	50.2917***
CD x subjects	69	5,800.3250	84.0626	
ABC	1	99.4321	99.4321	.9704
ABC x subjects	69	7,069.5681	102.4575	
ABD	1	1.4179	1.4179	.0112
ABD x subjects	69	8,669.5821	125.6461	

(continued)

Table 6 (continued)

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
ACD	1	72.8893	72.8893	.7101
ACD x subjects	69	7,082.5038	102.6450	
BCD	1	122.3000	122.3000	.6464
BCD x subjects	69	13,053.8430	189.1861	
ABCD	1	256.5893	256.5893	5.0961*
ABCD x subjects	69	3,474.1416	50.3498	
Total	1119	421,189.1956		

*p < .05
 **p < .01
 ***p < .001

the variance accounted for by D, and about fifty times as much as the variance accounted for by A or B.

It could be seen that the Thai subjects were most sensitive to values concerning education. The second sensitive value is that concerning benevolence. In comparison with education and benevolence, the values concerning wealth and prestige seem insensitive even though they are significant.

Table 7 is the summary of the analysis of variance of the social distance scores expressed by the second-generation Chinese considered as a group. The effects of A, B, C, and D are significant ($p < .001$). The variance accounted for by C is moderately greater than the variance accounted for by D, about ten times as much as the variance accounted for by B, and about fourteen times as much as the variance accounted for by A.

Although the AxD and BxC interactions for the Thai subjects and the AxDxE and BxCxE interactions are not significant (as shown in Table 1 and Table 6), the AxD and BxC interactions for the second-generation Chinese are significant ($p < .05$). For these subjects, the effect of D significantly depends upon A. Those stimulus persons who desire an excessive amount of wealth but have no benevolence were strongly rejected. The effect of C significantly depends upon B. Those who neither strive for prestige nor see education important are extremely rejected.

The CxD interaction is significant ($p < .05$). The effect of D depends upon C. The stimulus persons who were most rejected were those consider education unimportant and do not possess benevolence.

Table 7
 Analysis of Variance of Social Distance Scores
 Expressed by the Second-Generation
 Chinese Considered as a Group

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
Subjects	96	100,987.9098		
A	1	12,604.9800	12,604.9800	85.0747***
A x subjects	96	14,223.7075	148.1636	
B	1	16,477.6088	16,477.6088	47.1187***
B x subjects	96	33,571.5787	349.7039	
C	1	176,974.4387	176,974.4387	372.7433***
C x subjects	96	45,579.7488	474.7890	
D	1	143,951.5521	143,951.5521	244.1219***
D x subjects	96	56,608.3854	589.6706	
AB	1	77.5832	77.5832	.8114
AB x subjects	96	9,178.7293	95.6117	
AC	1	1.4234	1.4234	.0195
AC x subjects	96	6,985.8891	72,7696	
AD	1	449.2430	449.2430	5.9796*
AD x subjects	96	7,212.3195	75.1283	
BC	1	587.6451	587.6451	4.9003*
BC x subjects	96	11,512.1674	119.9184	
BD	1	250.0833	250.0833	2.1473
BD x subjects	96	11,180.4586	116.4631	
CD	1	1,037.6039	1,037.6039	6.4468*
CD x subjects	96	15,450.9586	160.9474	
ABC	1	160.4387	160.4387	2.1758
ABC x subjects	96	7,078.7488	73.7369	

(continued)

Table 7 (continued)

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
ABD	1	13.9231	13.9231	.2049
ABD x subjects	96	6,520.5352	67.9222	
ACD	1	1,018.0726	1,018.0726	13.3529** *
ACD x subjects	96	7,319.3649	76.2433	
BCD	1	856.5777	856.5777	5.3193*
BCD x subjects	96	15,458.8804	161.0300	
ABCD	1	62.3206	62.3206	.7137
ABCD x subjects	96	8,381.7211	87.3095	
Total	1551	711,774.5973		

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

In table 8, the summary of analysis of variance of social distance scores expressed by the Thai and by the second-generation Chinese treated as three separate groups, i. e., the low Chinese, the medium Chinese, and the high Chinese is presented. All variances accounted for by the characteristics of the stimulus persons and the interactions among these characteristics are identical with the results of analysis of variance shown in Table 2.

It is interesting to note that, among the interactions between the ethnic groups and the characteristics of the stimulus persons, only BxE is significant ($p < .05$). The differences between social distance expressed toward stimulus persons who strive for fame and prestige and that expressed toward stimulus persons who ignore fame and prestige within the Thai, the low Chinese, the medium Chinese, and the high Chinese groups are different. As shown in Table 9, the difference within the Thai group is smaller than those within the second-generation Chinese groups. For the latter, the difference within the high Chinese group is greatest whereas the difference within the other two groups, which are almost equal, fall halfway between the Thai and the high Chinese.

Table 10, 11, and 12 summarize the analyses of variance, performed separately, of the social distance scores expressed by the three second-generation Chinese groups. The B effects in the low Chinese and the high Chinese groups are significant at the .01 level.

Table 8
 Analysis of Variance of Social Distance Score Expressed
 by the Thai and the Second-Generation Chinese
 Treated as Three Separate Groups

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
<u>Between Subjects</u>	166	146,428.1048		
Ethnic groups(E)	3	1,291.0962	430.3654	.4833
Error (a)	163	145,137.0086	890.4110	
<u>Within Subjects</u>				
A	1	14,623.8776	14,623.8776	90.8520***
A x E	3	1,075.9817	358.6605	2.2282
A x subjects	163	26,237.0782	160.9636	
B	1	17,026.5812	17,026.5812	58.1794***
B x E	3	2,738.1281	912.7093	3.1187*
B x subjects	163	47,702.9782	292.6563	
C	1	300,900.4584	300,900.4584	621.5365***
C x E	3	1,364.3426	454.7808	.9393
C x subjects	163	78,912.1365	484.1235	
D	1	221,847.4584	221,847.4584	431.0033***
D x E	3	3,421.8176	1,140.6058	2.2159
D x subjects	163	83,899.9115	514.7233	
AB	1	5.4794	5.4794	.0786
AB x E	3	402.3929	134.1309	1.9256
AB x subjects	163	11,353.8152	69.6553	
AC	1	18.9465	18.9465	.2193
AC x E	3	276.1127	92.0375	1.0656
AC x subjects	163	14,077.8783	86.3673	
AD	1	434.1052	434.1052	5.9267*
AD x E	3	416.5361	138.8453	1.8956
AD x subjects	163	11,939.0462	73.2456	
BC x	1	509.6890	509.6890	5.4800*
BC x E	3	637.7131	212.5710	2.2855
BC x subjects	163	15,160.2854	93.0078	

(continued)

Table 8 (continued)

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
BD	1	262.1890	262.1890	2.2829
BD x E	3	331.4631	110.4877	.9620
BD x subjects	163	18,720.2854	114.8483	
CD	1	4,441.6262	4,441.6262	34.6224***
CD x E	3	1,164.1829	388.0609	3.0249
CD x subjects	163	20,910.8784	128.2875	
ABC	1	10.1890	10.1890	.1194
ABC x E	3	497.1103	165.7034	1.9430
ABC x subjects	163	13,900.8882	85.2815	
ABD	1	4.2848	4.2848	.0497
ABD x E	3	376.0935	125.3645	1.4556
ABD x subjects	163	14,037.5592	86.1199	
ACD	1	891.0363	891.0363	10.1291**
ACD x E	3	262.9530	87.6510	.9964
ACD x subjects	163	14,338.6982	87.9674	
BCD	1	868.0872	868.0872	5.2135*
BCD x E	3	695.3128	231.7709	1.3919
BCD x subjects	163	27,140.5375	166.5063	
ABCD	1	268.4914	268.4914	3.4915
ABCD x E	3	159.6451	53.2150	.6920
ABCD x subjects	163	12,534.3010	76.8975	
Total	2671	1,133,226.6673		

*p < .05
 **p < .01
 ***p < .001

Table 9

Mean Social Distance Scores Expressed, by the Thai and by the Second-Generation Chinese Treated as Three Separate Groups, Toward Stimulus Persons Who Seek (B_1) or Ignore (B_2) Fame and Prestige

Characteristics of Stimulus Persons	Ethnic Groups			
	Thai	Low Chinese	Medium Chinese	High Chinese
B_1	58.65	55.67	57.28	55.29
B_2	61.65	61.02	63.23	64.06
Differences	3.01	5.35	5.95	8.77



Table 10
 Analysis of Variance of Social Distance Scores
 Expressed by the Low Chinese

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
Subjects	29	33,639.3105		
A	1	2,886.1021	2,886.1021	21.4926***
A x subjects	29	3,894.2104	134.2831	
B	1	3,429.3521	3,429.3521	10.6639**
B x subjects	29	9,325.9604	321.5848	
C	1	42,243.7688	42,243.7688	81.5121***
C x subjects	29	15,029.2937	518.2515	
D	1	29,909.4188	29,909.4188	94.5376***
D x subjects	29	9,174.8937	316.3756	
AB	1	65.2688	65.2688	.5937
AB x subjects	29	3,188.0437	109.9325	
AC	1	121.0021	121.0021	1.6984
AC x subjects	29	2,066.0604	71.2434	
AD	1	17.2521	17.2521	.2930
AD x subjects	29	1,707.0604	58.8641	
BC	1	26.6021	26.6021	.3991
BC x subjects	29	1,932.9604	66.6538	
BD	1	14.3521	14.3521	.1131
BD x subjects	29	3,679.4604	126.8779	
CD	1	910.2520	910.2520	4.7080*
CD x subjects	29	5,606.8105	193.3382	
ABC	1	397.8520	397.8520	3.6177
ABC x subjects	29	3,189.2105	109.9727	

(continued)

Table 10 (continued)

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
ABD	1	308.8020	308.8020	3.4947
ABD x subjects	29	2,562.5105	88.3624	
ACD	1	408.9000	408.9000	5.6503*
ACD x subjects	29	2,098.6625	72.3676	
BCD	1	462.2000	462.2000	4.4144*
BCD x subjects	29	3,036.3625	104.7021	
ABCD	1	122.9396	122.9396	1.1670
ABCD x subjects	29	3,054.6229	105.3318	
Total	479	184,509.4980		

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

Table 11
 Analysis of Variance of Social Distance Scores
 Expressed by the Medium Chinese

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
Subjects	40	32,513.6891		
A	1	5,910.2000	5,910.2000	51.0216***
A x subjects	40	4,633.4875	115.8371	
B	1	5,802.6000	5,802.6000	28.6041***
B x subjects	40	8,114.3375	202.8584	
C	1	78,433.0000	78,433.0000	142.4407***
C x subjects	40	22,025.4375	550.6359	
D	1	77,213.1000	77,213.1000	84.7475***
D x subjects	40	36,443.8375	911.0959	
AB	1	272.5000	272.5000	3.2741
AB x subjects	40	3,329.0625	83.2265	
AC	1	106.7000	106.7000	1.2788
AC x subjects	40	3,337.3625	83.4340	
AD	1	779.0000	779.0000	9.0082**
AD x subjects	40	3,459.0625	86.4765	
BC	1	528.0000	528.0000	3.7898
BC x subjects	40	5,572.8125	139.3203	
BD	1	532.0000	532.0000	3.1944
BD x subjects	40	5,436.3125	135.9078	
CD	1	57.7000	57.7000	.3878
CD x subjects	40	5,950.1125	148.7528	
ABC	1	5.4152	5.4152	.1124
ABC x subjects	40	1,926.7723	48.1693	

(continued)

Table 11 (continued)

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
ABD	1	68.3546	68.3546	1.6704
ABD x subjects	40	1,636.8329	40.9208	
ACD	1	221.6000	221.6000	2.9418
ACD x subjects	40	3,013.0875	75.3271	
BCD	1	3.5000	3.5000	.0271
BCD x subjects	40	5,153.9375	128.8484	
ABCD	1	31.3653	31.3653	.2846
ABCD x subjects	40	4,407.1972	110.1799	
Total	655	316,918.3766		

*p < .05
 **p < .01
 ***p < .001

Table 12
 Analysis of Variance of Social Distance Scores
 Expressed by the High Chinese

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
Subjects	25	33,806.6875		
A	1	3,920.0000	3,920.0000	17.5479***
A x subjects	25	5,584.6875	223.3875	
B	1	7,988.7000	7,988.7000	12.9875**
B x subjects	25	15,388.2375	615.5295	
C	1	57,645.6000	57,645.6000	200.7973***
C x subjects	25	7,177.0875	287.0835	
D	1	39,253.9000	39,253.9000	114.5793***
D x subjects	25	8,564.7875	342.5915	
AB	1	24.5000	24.5000	.2576
AB x subjects	25	2,376.9375	95.0075	
AC	1	1.3000	1.3000	.0239
AC x subjects	25	1,354.8875	54.1955	
AD	1	2.1000	2.1000	.0306
AD x subjects	25	1,715.0875	68.6035	
BC	1	551.5000	551.5000	3.9529
BC x subjects	25	3,487.9375	139.5175	
BD	1	6.4000	6.4000	.0627
BD x subjects	25	2,549.5375	101.9815	
CD	1	410.2000	410.2000	2.8858
CD x subjects	25	3,553.4875	142.1395	
ABC	1	4.6000	4.6000	.0707
ABC x subjects	25	1,625.3375	65.0135	

(continued)

Table 12 (continued)

Sources of Variation	d.f.	S.S.	M.S.	F
ABD	1	1.8083	1.8083	.0385
ABD x subjects	25	1,168.6337	46.7453	
ACD	1	450.6000	450.6000	5.2997*
ACD x subjects	25	2,125.5875	85.0235	
BCD	1	975.4000	975.4000	4.1354
BCD x subjects	25	5,896.5375	235.8615	
ABCD	1	17.2423	17.2423	.6254
ABCD x subjects	25	689.1952	27.5678	
Total	415	209,318.5000		

*p < .05
 **p < .01
 ***p < .001

The rest of the main effects are all significant at the .001 level.

For the low Chinese, the variance accounted for by C is about one and one-third times as much as the variance accounted for by D, twelve times as much as the variance accounted for by B, and fourteen times as much as the variance accounted for by A.

For the medium Chinese, the variance accounted for by C is almost equal to the variance accounted for by D, but about thirteen times as much as the variance accounted for by A or B.

For the high Chinese, the variance accounted for by C is about one and one-half times as much as the variance accounted for by D, seven times as much as the variance accounted for by B, and fourteen times as much as the variance accounted for by A.

Among the two-factor interactions, the CxD in the low Chinese group is significant at the .05 level; the AxD in the medium Chinese is significant at the .01 level. None of these interactions are found to be significant in the high Chinese group.

The AxCxD interaction in the low Chinese and high Chinese groups, along with the BxCxD interaction in the low Chinese group are significant ($p < .05$)

It could be seen that all subjects consistently rejected the stimulus persons who desire an excessive amount of wealth, who ignore fame and prestige, who consider education unimportant and as no means to upward mobility, and who are not benevolent.

On the contrary those stimulus persons who desire a moderate amount of wealth, who strive for fame and prestige, who consider education important and as a means to upward mobility, and who are benevolent were accepted.

For all subjects, the most sensitive effects are values concerning education and benevolence. The effects of values concerning wealth and prestige are less for the second-generation Chinese but least for the Thai.

The results presented in this chapter indicate that the second-generation Chinese, as a group, differ from the Thai in the weights they put on values concerning wealth and prestige. But when the second-generation Chinese were treated as three separate groups, i.e., the low Chinese, the medium Chinese, and the high Chinese, and then compared with the Thai, only the weights on prestige is different.