


The Greek Review of Social Research

Vol 32 (1978)

32



The "white" ethnic racism" thesis: Application to Greek Americans

Nicholas P. Petropoulos

doi: [10.12681/grsr.448](https://doi.org/10.12681/grsr.448)

Copyright © 1978, Nicholas P. Petropoulos



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Petropoulos, N. P. (1978). The "white" ethnic racism" thesis: Application to Greek Americans. *The Greek Review of Social Research*, 32, 90-102. <https://doi.org/10.12681/grsr.448>

the «white ethnic racism» thesis

Application to Greek Americans

by

Nicholas P. Petropoulos

*Indiana-Purdue University
Indianapolis*

The Greeks of the United States fall in the category called «new immigrants». The new immigrants originated in southern and eastern Europe and came to the United States between 1880 and 1930. They are contrasted with the «old immigrants», originating in northern and western Europe, who came to the United States during the early part of the 19th century. Besides the Greeks, the new immigrants included Italians, Poles, Hungarians, Albanians, Yugoslavians, Serbians, Armenians, Romanians, Lithuanians and Jews from Russia, etc. These groups came to the US for either economic or political reasons, and they settled in the urban industrial areas of the North. New immigration came to a halt with the national origins quota act of 1924 which discriminated against the southern and eastern European immigrants.

Generally, the working-class descendants of the new immigrants constitute the contemporary «white ethnic» group (Weed, 1973, pp. 17-24). I say «generally» because the term «white ethnics» has also come to include other ethnic groups besides the descendants of the «new immigrants». It also includes the working-class descendants of Irish and German-Catholic immigrants who are from northern and western Europe.

During the late 1960s and the early 1970s, the term white ethnics became associated with racism. The theory goes something like this: the white ethnics were just in the process of consolidating their hard-won socioeconomic status when the blacks—the former slaves—began catching up with them. In other words it was the white ethnics' status insecurity and relative deprivation which converted them into racists. Is this theory correct or is it a new version of the «working-class racism» thesis?

To evaluate the «white-ethnic racism» thesis, one can analyze the relevant verbal attitudes and behavior of the white ethnics, preferably in comparison to native white Anglo-Saxon Protestants. Greeley and Sheatsley (1971, pp. 7-8) compared various ethnic groups in the North on a racial integration scale. They found the Irish and German Catholics to be most tolerant, followed by northern Protestants (Anglo-Saxon, German, Scandinavian and others), and then by Catholics of southern and eastern European origin (mostly Italian and Poles); they noted a

— The present report is based on data collected in conjunction with my dissertation research on *Social Mobility, Status Inconsistency, Ethnic Marginality, and the Attitudes of Greek Americans toward Jews and Blacks* (University of Kentucky 1973). I would like to express my appreciation to Professor A. Lee Coleman for acting as chairman of my doctoral committee, to the respondents for their participation in the study, and to the Indiana-Purdue University (Indianapolis) Computer Center for assistance in the statistical analyses. More detailed information about the research can be obtained by requesting the author's dissertation (Order No. 73-20, 607) from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

very slight difference (less than one-half percentage point) between the latter two ethnic groupings. The researchers then introduced two relevant controls: When they took education into account, the same ordering as above persisted for the *low* educational groups, with the Italian Catholics showing the lowest pro-integration sentiments. For the *high* educational groups, all the ethnic groups, except the Slavs (mostly Poles), had a higher integration score than the WASPS (Greeley, 1972, p. 216). The second control they introduced was degree of area integration based on the theory of threat competition. Among the eight ethnic groups, five had lower pro-integration scores in an integrated than in a non-integrated setting. Comparing ethnic groups in non-integrated areas, the authors noted very little difference between Anglo-Saxon Protestants and southern Europeans, although the Slavs had the lowest integration score. The comparison that the authors overlook is the difference among ethnic groups in integrated areas. Here the results show the southern Europeans and the Slavs to be the lowest in integration scores, except for the Scandinavian Protestants. In both ecological conditions, the Jews have the highest integration score. However, the control for percentage integration does not effectively control for education.

Two other studies making gross comparisons of ethnic groups observed results challenging the white ethnic thesis. One study of college students (Triandis & Triandis, 1960, p. 114) found higher social distance (toward races, religions, nationalities, and occupational groups) among the «high-ethnic» students (i.e., Americans of northern and western European background) than among the «low-ethnic» students (i.e., Americans of southern and eastern European background) after they controlled for socioeconomic status and religion. These differences were noted at all three class levels and within the three religious groups—Protestants, Catholics and Jews. In a sense this study is a more accurate comparison since it also controls the confounding factor of religion. On the other hand, it is less relevant to the white-ethnic racism thesis insofar as it deals with general social distance.

The second study (C.F. Krickus, 1971, p. 29) contradicting the white ethnic racism thesis is a 1970 Harris study commissioned by the Urban League. A press release by the Urban League reported that native Americans, i.e., white Anglo-Saxon Protestants, were more likely than the white ethnics to «think blacks are pushing too fast for racial equality...disapprove of the Supreme Court's 1954 school decision; and...favor separate schools for blacks and whites». The surprising outcomes led Whitney Young to conclude that «some Americans may be projecting their own prejudices to minorities

of recent foreign origin». Since no reference is given to the original Harris survey the writer has no way of knowing which ethnic groups were used or whether any statistical controls were used.

Besides a gross operation of ethnicity, ethnic generation has also been investigated as a determinant of intergroup attitudes. In this case, the assumption is made that white ethnics are more likely to predominate among the first three generations than among succeeding generations. A 1944 comparison (Stember, 1961, pp. 55, 99, 148) of native Americans with those who had at least one foreign parent showed that the latter were more tolerant on stereotypes about Negroes, job equality, freedom of movement, and acceptance of Negroes as fellow workers, as nurses or in restaurants. The only exception was the acceptance of Negroes as next-door neighbors. In this area, the native Americans were more acceptant. These outcomes were observed under controlled conditions of education.

It may be argued that the results of the above study are contingent to the war period, a time when the US economy was in good shape and/or when all the minority groups (American blacks and the children of new immigrants) were engaged in the superordinate task of defeating Nazism. Recent studies might possibly show different outcomes. Nonetheless, a more current study by Lipset and Raab (1970, pp. 434-440) noted the first three generations were lower on anti-Negro prejudice than the subsequent generations. These findings, however, apply to the national context. When those respondents from the southern and border states were excluded from the analysis, there was hardly any difference between the first three and subsequent generations.

Lipset and Raab also compared their generations to anti-semitism. On the national basis, they observed results contrary to their anti-Negro prejudice outcomes. There was decreasing anti-semitism with increasing generational status. The immigrant generation was the most anti-semitic, and those beyond the third generation were least anti-semitic. Comparable outcomes, in regard to anti-semitism, were also noted by Selznick and Steinberg (1969, pp. 104-105). However, the latter two investigators also found a correlation between generation and age or education: the immigrant generation was older and less educated. The generational differences were greatly reduced when education and age were separately taken into account.

The white-ethnic racism thesis can also be assessed through a behavioral analysis. The behavioral analysis focuses on emergent forms of organization or on institutionalized electoral behavior among white ethnics. As far as emergent organizations are concerned, there is evidence that some white ethnics have been

recruited to such organizations as the Jewish Defense League, the Italian American Civil Rights League (Levy & Kramer, 1973, pp. 96-100, 159-161), the National States Rights (Nazi) Party (Cowan, 1976), the ROAR (Restore Our American Rights) organization of South Boston, the National Association for the Advancement of White People and other «white power» or «ethnic power» organizations. These organizations have been most evident in desegregating communities. But to conclude that these organizations represent the modal behavior of all white ethnics or even of a particular white ethnic group may be premature. In addition, there is evidence of new cooperative organizations involving blacks and white ethnics—such as the Black Polish Conference of Cleveland, the Calumet Community Congress of Gary, and Ed Sadlowski's «Steel Workers Fight Back» movement.

The electoral behavior of ethnic groups might be more representative than spontaneous collective episodes. New immigrant groups and their descendants have usually voted for the mainstream Democratic Party. As late as 1968 most of the white ethnics (Italians, Poles, the Irish, the Jews) overwhelmingly supported Democratic candidates. Most recent statistical evidence (Levy & Kramer, 1973, pp. 226-227) shows that Richard Nixon made tremendous inroads into the white ethnic groups in the 1972 election. The Italian and Irish Catholics gave him a majority of their vote, with the Italians giving Nixon a greater majority than they gave Eisenhower in the 1950s. In addition, there was a greater percentage change between 1968 and 1972, in favor of Nixon, on the part of the Jews, Irish and Italian Catholics, than there was among Protestants. Yet despite the greater shift of the white ethnics toward Nixon, there were still more Protestants than Catholics who voted for Nixon.

The statistical shifts between 1968 and 1972 can be subjected to a variety of interpretations. One of these interpretations pertains to the upward mobility and economic arrival of the white ethnics. The economic explanation, however, is not feasible since the amount of shift appears incommensurable with the available short time-span. It is more likely that blue-collar white ethnics were persuaded by Nixon's populist «southern strategy» and «law and order» campaign. The white ethnics must have felt that Nixon would put the brakes on the racial minority movements for economic equality.

Electoral politics are confounded with a number of ideological, economic, sociological, and personality issues. Consequently, it may not provide the best test for the white-ethnic racism thesis. A more direct test may be voting in open housing referenda. Howard Hamilton (1970, p. 718) observed that twice as many

persons of German and British stock as those of Polish background planned to vote for open—housing in the Toledo referendum held one week after the survey. Although the data are supportive of the white-ethnic racism thesis, the difference could possibly be accounted for by education—a relevant factor not controlled by Hamilton.

In the present review, there are some «contradictions» between the attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. Generally, the attitudinal studies show less support for the white-ethnic racism thesis than the behavioral studies. These contradictions may be due to several reasons. First of all, there is not always a correspondence in the meaning of ethnicity. The electoral study makes gross distinctions based on religious categories whereas the attitudinal studies rely either on gross nationality groups or on generational data. Secondly, the fact that some studies control for education while others do not may also make a difference. Thirdly, the white ethnics may view electoral behavior as more pivotal and crucial than racial attitudes. Finally, the differences may actually be due to temporal changes, i.e., the intervening deterioration of the economy. If the last interpretation is correct, the white ethnics would be more negative toward racial minorities even on the level of attitudes—assuming the other methodological points are taken into account.

methods

To assess the association between ethnicity and prejudice, the writer used data collected from 152 second-generation Greek American males from Cincinnati, Ohio. Three sample sources were used in an attempt to get a better distribution of responses: the Orthodox Church membership list, the Cincinnati Telephone Directory, and nominations by the respondents themselves. The majority of the respondents (73%), however, were located via the church membership list. The respondents were interviewed by the writer, either at their homes or at their workplace, during the summer of 1970.

An interview schedule, alternating between self-administration and administration by the author, was used to collect the relevant data on ethnicity and prejudice. Since several ethnic indicators were used, their operation will be presented in the results section. At this time, I would like to describe the procedures in the assessment of the Greek Americans' minority attitudes.

The Greek Americans' attitudes toward Jews and blacks served as the indicators of prejudice. To measure their attitudes toward the Jews, the writer used eleven items from the Adorno *et al.* studies (Robinson and Shaver, 1969, pp. 287-294). The eleven items tapped the «seclusive», «intrusive»,

«personally offensive», and «socially threatening» images of the Jews. Illustrative items are as follows: (1) One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and connive, so that a Gentile doesn't have a fair chance in competition; (2) The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a Jewish atmosphere; (3) Persecution of the Jews would largely be eliminated if the Jews would make sincere efforts to rid themselves of their harmful and offensive faults; and (4) There are too many Jews in the various federal agencies and bureaus in Washington, and they have too much control over our national policies. The respondent's attitude toward the individual items was determined by asking him to check one of five agreement (disagreement) categories. Positive responses (i.e., disagreement with the items) were coded high (5) and negative responses (i.e., agreement with the items) were coded low (1). The scores were summated for all the items and were subjected to reliability, validity, and reproducibility (unidimensionality) tests.

A corrected split-half reliability (odd-even product-moment correlation (r)) of .90 was obtained for the original eleven items. There were no negative inter-item correlations (r), and all the item-total correlations were positive (above .47). The coefficient of reproducibility of the final eight-item measure was .94 (minimal marginal reproducibility = .79) and the item errors were 10% or less, but the items were not all within the 80%-20% marginal frequency range as the distribution was highly skewed toward favorableness. The skewness was partly due to the fact that the «undecided» category was placed in the favorable response. Despite the skewness of the Jewish scale, positive attitudes toward the Jews were cross-correlated with other relevant measures in expected ways. The eight-item scale was correlated (r 's = .34, .36) with positive attitudes toward the Jews as determined by an open-ended question,¹ and it was also more highly correlated with contact with the Jews than with the blacks ($gammas$ (g) = .33, .23, .45 vs. .27, .12, .27). In addition, the scale was more strongly correlated with intimate contact (g = .45) than with formal contact (g 's = .33, .23). While the

measure of attitudes toward the Jews failed to meet all of the methodological criteria, it had adequate reliability and validity to justify its usage in the analysis.

Attitudes toward the blacks were assessed in the same manner as attitudes toward the Jews, except for one difference — the items tapping attitudes toward the blacks contained both positive and negative statements. Illustrative items from the black measure included the following: (1) I would be willing to have a Negro co-worker come over and have dinner with my family; and (2) Even if Negroes get the same social opportunities as white people, they probably will always have lower morals than whites; etc.

The fifteen items measuring attitudes toward blacks were submitted to the same methodological tests as the Jewish measure. The measure had a corrected split-half reliability of .92. It contained no negative inter-item correlations, and all the item-total correlations were above .51. A scale analysis was then executed and three subscales emerged: a social distance scale (containing items as #1 above), a stereotype scale (containing items as #2 above), and an overall scale consisting of a combination of items. The overall scale was highly correlated (r = .94) with the social distance scale and will not be used in the analysis.

Of the two remaining subscales, the nine-item social distance scale had a coefficient of reproducibility of .95 (minimal marginal reproducibility = .80). Moreover, all individual item errors were less than 10%. However, four of the items had frequencies falling outside the conventional 80%-20% limit, and the distribution of scores was skewed toward the favorable pole. In any case, the ordering of items was according to expectancy, with the subjects giving their highest endorsement to formal relations (e.g., 92% said they would vote for a qualified Negro candidate for mayor) and their least endorsement to informal relations with blacks (e.g., 20% would accept intermarriage with a black of the same income level).

The five-item stereotype measure fared better than the social distance measure, as far as reproducibility is concerned. It had a high coefficient of reproducibility (.94), a low minimal marginal reproducibility (.67), no item error above 10%, and marginal frequencies within the 80%-20% limit. The distribution of responses in the stereotype scale was more even, with the respondents being most rejecting (74%) of the Negro racial inferiority stereotype and least rejecting (24%) of the view of contemporary blacks as «using the color of their skin» for political and economic advantage over whites.

To gauge the validity of the black measure, several sources are pertinent. The internal ordering of the social distance items, according to expectancy, points

1. The responses to the open-ended questions [(in a few words, how do you feel about the Jews (or Negroes))] were classified in the five categories of favorableness by the author and two fellow graduate students: one Jewish and one black. The author judged both sets of responses while the two graduate students judged only the responses pertaining to their respective group. Although there was some disagreement between the author and the Jewish rater on the handling of the «positive» Jewish stereotypes, the inter-rater reliability between the author and the Jewish rater was r = .67 (N = 152). Between the author and the black rater, the inter-rater reliability coefficient was .65.

to its validity. Additional confidence comes from «external» criteria. First, the respondents' attitude on the overall measure was highly correlated ($r = .53, .64$) with their attitude as expressed on an open-ended question (see footnote 1). Secondly, the overall measure of attitudes toward blacks was more highly correlated with reported contacts with the blacks than with the Jews (g 's = .48, .26, and .44 vs. .04, .05 and .28); and, furthermore, it was more highly correlated with more informal contact with the blacks (g 's = .48, .44) than with more formal contact with the blacks ($g = .26$). Thirdly, the overall mean tolerance score of eight members of a Byzantine Study Group, who had tried to involve the Greek Orthodox Church in the surrounding black community, was more positive ($X = 11.25$) than that of the general sample ($X = 8.59$). Finally, positive attitudes toward the blacks (overall measure) were associated ($g = .67$) with positive attitudes toward the Jews. Although most of these validity checks were calculated for the overall measure, the strong correlation of the overall measure with the social distance ($g = .97$) and stereotype ($g = .95$) measures also confers validity upon the latter two measures.

results and discussion

The Cincinnati study of Greek-Americans does not permit a comparison of the «new immigrants» with the «old immigrants» since the attitudes of only one new immigrant group were investigated. By necessity, the analysis will be on the microsociological level. Greek ethnicity (or «Greekness») will be viewed as a variable that is reflected in a variety of concrete indicators, e.g., the demographic, attitudinal, cognitive, behavioral, and communal aspects of Greekness. All of these ethnicity indicators will be compared to the Greek-American's attitudes toward Jews and blacks to assess the general ethnicity hypothesis. Then they will also be compared to the respondents' minority attitudes under two conditions of socioeconomic status. The higher order comparison will evaluate more accurately the white-ethnic racism thesis. According to the thesis prejudice is expected to be highest in the most ethnic, low socioeconomic status group and lowest in the least ethnic, high socioeconomic status group.

The respondent's regional background and his ethnic generation constituted the *demographic* indicators of ethnicity. To ascertain regional background, the respondent was asked to report the specific birthplace, village or city, of his father. The respondents' background distribution was as follows: Peloponnesus or southern Greece (46%), Asia Minor and the Islands (27%), northern Greece (Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia and Thrace, 13%), Attica (Athens, 8%),

and the United States (6%). The small number of respondents from Attica were combined with those from Peloponnesus. The association between regional background and tolerance is evaluated in Table 1 (see Variable 1).

Comparing those whose parents were born in the United States with those whose parents came from abroad, it can be seen that the outcomes vary with the type of tolerance. The ethnicity hypothesis is supported only in the case of Negro social distance tolerance: those whose parents came from abroad are less tolerant. In regard to Jewish tolerance, the Asia Minor refugees are the most tolerant and those from northern Greece the least tolerant. The greatest non-support of the ethnicity hypothesis is shown for Negro stereotype tolerance; in this case, those whose parents are born in the United States had the most negative stereotypes of blacks. These observations, however, can only be suggestive due to the paucity of cases in the US category.

If we ignore those whose parents were born in the US, some consistent differences can be noted. Those with an Asia Minor background tend to be more tolerant than those from Peloponnesus on all three types of tolerance. The Asia Minor descendants are more tolerant than the northern Greece descendants only in the case of Jewish tolerance. They have comparable attitudes toward the blacks. Finally, those from northern Greece are slightly more tolerant toward blacks than the Peloponnesians.

The differences among the three regional groups may have historical explanations. The parents of the Asia Minor descendants had been persecuted by the Turks and also had encountered resettlement problems in Greece (Lee, 1953, p. 111; Theodoratus, 1967, 93-97, 207-208; Xenides, 1922, p. 40). It is possible that this history made their descendants more empathetic toward the various minority groups. To some extent, this kind of history is also shared by the northern Greek descendants who were last to be liberated from the Turks.

As to why the northern Greek descendants are more anti-semitic than the Asia Minor descendants, it is not definite. Perhaps it's due to the great competitive struggles between northern Greeks and Salonican Jews. The Jews had been culturally and economically dominant in Salonica until 1913, when the Turks lost Salonica to the Greeks (Cohen, 1926; Gelber, 1955; Stavrianos, 1948).

The regional outcomes may also be subject to other explanations. There was some association between assimilation orientation (a correlate of attitudes toward the Jews) and regional background. The assimilation percentages for the three regional groups were as follows: Peloponnesus (41%), northern Greece (35%) and Asia Minor (50%). On the one

TABLEAU I. *Ethnicity and Tolerance*

<i>1. Father's Regional Origin*</i>					
	US (N = 7)	Peloponnesus and Central Greece (N = 83)	Northern Greece (N = 20)	Asia Minor (N = 42)	Gamma
	%tolerant				
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	57.1	42.2	40.0	61.9	.21
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	85.7	66.3	70.0	69.0	-.01
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	28.6	37.3	50.0	50.0	.23
<i>2. Ethnic Generation</i>					
	Second (N = 126)	Mixed (N = 19)	Third (N = 7)		
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	48.4	42.1	57.1		-.08
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	66.7	73.7	85.7		.25
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	42.9	42.1	28.6		-.10
<i>3. Assimilation Orientation</i>					
	Low (N = 86)	High (N = 66)			
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	39.5	59.1			.38
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	69.8	66.7			.05
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	39.5	45.5			.12
<i>4. Ingroup Differentiation</i>					
	Low (N = 49)	Medium (N = 20)	High (N = 83)		
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	40.8	50.0	51.8		.17
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	67.3	55.0	72.3		.13
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	30.6	40.0	49.4		.31
<i>5. Knowledge of Greek Culture</i>					
	Low (N = 75)	High (N = 77)			
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	52.7	44.2			-.17
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	66.7	70.1			.08
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	40.0	44.2			.09
<i>6. Descent of Wife</i>					
	Single (N = 16)	Non - Greek (N = 63)	Greek (N = 73)		
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	56.3	50.8	43.8		-.15
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	75.0	73.0	63.0		-.21
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	50.0	46.0	37.0		-.18

(continued)

TABLE 1. *Ethnicity and Tolerance*

7. Naming Practice				
	Non-Greek (N = 26)	Mixed (N = 17)	Greek (N = 61)	
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	50.0	52.9	41.0	-.17
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	76.9	76.5	59.0	-.35
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	34.6	47.1	39.3	-.07
8. Number of Greek Mentors				
	Few (N = 82)	Many (N = 70)		
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	50.0	45.7		-.09
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	68.3	68.3		.01
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	45.1	38.6		-.14
9. Number of Years in Greek School				
	0-3 (N = 76)	4-9 (N = 76)		
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	42.1	53.9		.23
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	67.1	69.7		.06
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	32.9	51.3		.36
10. Memberships in Greek Organizations				
	None (N = 105)	1-3 (N = 47)		
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	45.7	53.2		.15
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	68.6	68.1		-.01
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	39.0	48.9		.20
11. Memberships in American Organizations				
	0-1 (N = 65)	2-9 (N = 87)		
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	46.2	49.4		.07
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	67.7	69.0		-.03
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	32.3	49.4		.34
12. Participation in American Culture				
	Low (N = 84)	High (N = 68)		
Jewish Tolerance (JT)	48.8	47.1		-.04
Negro Social Distance Tolerance (NSDT)	66.7	70.6		.09
Negro Stereotype Tolerance (NST)	42.9	41.2		-.03

* For all ethnicity variables, the code values increase from left to right. In two of these variables (father's regional origin and descent of wife), the values do not comprise a strict ordered scale; as a consequence, their respective *gammas* are not totally meaningful.

hand, these data suggest that «Greekness» may reflect the historical enmity toward the Jews and the history of territorial struggles after the collapse of the Ottoman empire. On the other hand, assimilation to the US, or marginality in regard to the Greek culture, may be a factor in tolerance toward the Jews.

The authoritarian explanation was also explored since authoritarianism was correlated with the threotypes of tolerance.² The three regional background groups (Peloponnesus, northern Greece, and Asia Minor) were not in any way differentiated in this personality variable. The differences in prejudice could thus not be accounted for by authoritarianism.

Educational level, a correlate of the three types of tolerance,³ was associated with regional background. The three regional groups were distributed as follows, in terms of percentage high on education: Peloponnesus (47%), northern Greece (40%), and Asia Minor (54.8%). Political refugees have been known to be more educated and urbanized than non-political immigrants (Xenides, 1922, pp. 38-40). Thus, it was felt education could account for the regional effects on prejudice. Education was taken into account. Under the low education status there was a «U-curve» pattern, with the attitudes of Peloponnesians and Asia Minor descendants being more positive than those of the northern Greece descendants. In the high education condition, an inverted U-pattern appeared, with the northern Greece descendants showing most favorability toward the target groups. The higher order outcomes tend to limit the applicability of the minority empathy and culture history interpretations. However, many of the higher order cells had low frequencies and larger samples are needed before definite conclusions can be made.

To determine the respondent's generational status, the birthplace of his parents was ascertained. The majority of the respondents (N= 126) were second generation, i.e., both of their parents were born overseas. The rest (N= 26) were either third generation, (i.e., both of their parents were born in the US) or a mixture of the other two categories. There is no consistent association (Variable 2, Table 1) between generational status and tolerance. In two cases, the associations are negative and insignificant. In the third case, the third generation respondents tend to be more favorable toward blacks (social distance). However, as in the case of regional background, the

lack of variation renders these outcomes inconclusive.

The *attitudinal* dimension of «Greekness» was tapped by an assimilation orientation scale. A method similar to that used to assess minority attitudes was employed. The respondent was presented with several questions regarding cultural retention in various areas, e.g., Greek names, schools, spouses, dating, language, heritage, religion and community. The questions were stated in both assimilationist and non-assimilationist ways. An illustrative item is the following: Do you approve of American-born Greeks marrying American women? He was instructed to choose one of the following: Yes, No, Unsure, Don't Care. The «Don't Care» category was defined as more assimilative than the «unsure». A high score was assigned for the assimilationist response, depending upon the direction of the item. The scores were then summated over the original 11 items and the measure was tested for adequacy. The assimilation orientation measure was adequate in every respect, although there was a slight skewness toward cultural retention.⁴

A moderately strong *gamma* association (.38) is obtained between assimilation orientation and tolerance toward Jews (Variable 3, Table 1). The more assimilationist in orientation are more tolerant toward the Jews. Assimilation orientation bears no relationship to attitudes toward the blacks. It is possible that the differential outcomes are due to historical factors and/or the greater integration of the assimilated respondents in the Cincinnati community—the cradle of Reform Judaism and the cauldron of benevolent relations between Christians and Jews.

An exploration of alternative explanations for the assimilation—Jewish tolerance outcome was undertaken. Education was discounted at the outset because of its low correlation ($g = .15$) with assimilation orientation. Authoritarianism was a likely factor due to its association ($g = -.27$) with assimilation orientation: the more assimilated were less authoritarian. When authoritarianism was controlled, the original association was retained and magnified only in the low authoritarian condition (g 's = .65, -.07). «Greekness» is associated with negative attitudes toward Jews only among the less authoritarian respondents. The authoritarian factor does not totally account for the assimilation effect. There seems to be

2. A four item scale (Lane, 1955) was used to measure authoritarianism. As anticipated, the respondents who scored high on the authoritarian scale were more negative toward Jews ($g = -.40$) and toward blacks (g 's = $-.53, -.40$).

3. The *gamma* correlation between educational level and ethnic tolerance were as follows: Jewish tolerance (.28), Negro social distance tolerance (.49) and Negro stereotype tolerance (.69).

4. The corrected split-half reliability for the assimilation orientation measure was .81, the item-total correlations for the 11 items were all above .48 and there were no negative inter-item correlations. In terms of reproducibility, the coefficient of reproducibility was .94 and the minimal marginal reproducibility was .78. The assimilation orientation scale was correlated with several other ethnic variables as anticipated—thus also giving the scale validity.

an interactive relationship between ethnicity and personality.

To measure the *cognitive* aspects of ethnicity, two approaches were used. In the first approach, an index of «in-group differentiation» was developed to tap the respondent's attitudes toward the «Orthodox» and the «cultural» Greek. For a variety of reasons (Vucinic, 1965, pp. 60-62; Ware, 1964, p. 98; Xenides, 1922, p. 132)—such as the writing of the New Testament in Greek, the Ottoman organization of ethnic groups by religion, the role played by the Church in the preservation of Greek culture during the Ottoman rule and during the War of Independence, the demographic predominance of Greek Orthodoxy in Greece, and the lack of separation between Church and State—there has been a tendency among many Greeks to deny «Greekness» to any person of Greek background not espousing the Orthodox faith. This attitude was assessed in the Cincinnati study by posing two hypothetical situations to the respondent. For example, in one situation he was told that Person A goes to the Greek dances but not to the Church services, while Person B attends both. Then, he was asked to indicate if Person A was as true a Greek as Person B. If he said «yes», he was said to be high on ingroup differentiation; conversely, if he said «no», he was low on ingroup differentiation. An index of ingroup differentiation was formed by summing his responses in the two situations. Fifty-three per cent (53) of the second-generation respondents were high on ingroup differentiation (i.e., said «yes» to both situations), while 32% were low on ingroup differentiation (i.e., said «no» to both situations and made Orthodoxy a prerequisite for «Greekness»). The former may be designated as the «cultural» Greeks and the latter as the «religious» Greeks.⁵

The *gamma* correlations between ingroup differentiation and tolerance were all in the positive direction (Variable 4, Table 1): Jewish tolerance = .17; Negro social distance = .13; and Negro stereotype = .31. However, the trend is linear and uniform only in the case of Negro stereotype tolerance. Those who differentiated the ingroup, the «cultural» Greeks, have more positive stereotypes of the blacks.

As one might expect, ingroup differentiation was also associated with authoritarianism ($g = -.31$) and education ($g = .42$)—two important correlates of prejudice. Those who split the ingroup were less authoritarian and more educated. Thus, the ingroup differentiation effects might be accounted for by these correlates. When these two variables were separately

5. The tendency to differentiate the ingroup was associated with a stronger assimilation orientation ($g = .14$) and was accompanied by greater skepticism in religious miracles ($g = -.31$) and in the divinity of Christ ($g = -.29$).

controlled, the initial association between ingroup differentiation and stereotype tolerance was reduced—especially by the addition of the educational factor (g 's = .25 and .05).

The second way to tap the cognitive dimension of ethnicity was through a knowledge of Greek culture test. The test consisted of a series of open-ended questions about Greek history, culture, language, and religion. It was scored by the writer and was then submitted to the usual tests for methodological adequacy. Except for some skewness toward the low knowledge pole, the test met all the methodological criteria.⁶

Level of knowledge about Greek culture is hardly correlated with attitudes toward the two groups (Variable 5, Table 1). The correlations are low and inconsistent (g 's = $-.17$, $.08$ and $.09$). Given the fact that there was a positive association between educational level and level of Greek knowledge ($g = .37$), the outcomes are surprising. In any case, the second cognitive index of ethnicity does not imply as much affective involvement with «Greekness» as does ingroup differentiation.

The *behavioral* dimension of ethnicity refers to the respondent's comparative participation in the two cultures. Level of participation was determined via respondent self-report rather than observation of the respondent's actual behavior. Both individual and summary measures of behavioral ethnicity were employed. The individual-item approach included questions about the nationality of the wife (Greek vs. non-Greek); naming practice (first son receives grandfather's name); the number of intensive contacts the respondent had with Greek grandparents, aunts, or uncles during his childhood; the number of years he attended Greek school;⁷ number of memberships in Greek village, regional and national organizations; and memberships in American social and professional organizations.

To arrive at a summary measure of participation, the respondent was presented with eight activity areas, e.g., name day (vs. birthday), picnics, musical

6. The corrected split-half reliability for the Greek knowledge test was .78. All the item total correlations were above .51, and there were no negative inter-item correlations. The coefficient of reproducibility was .93, and the minimal marginal reproducibility was .69. The knowledge test was also inversely ($g = -.20$) correlated with assimilation orientation, although the correlation was surprisingly low.

7. Respondents who spent more years in the Greek school knew more about the Greek culture ($g = .47$), expressed less assimilationist attitudes ($g = -.21$), were more likely to have a Greek spouse ($g = -.34$), and tended to follow the traditional naming custom ($g = .25$). However, there was no association ($g = -.08$) between amount of Greek schooling and ingroup differentiation, an unexpected outcome in view of the fact that Greek schooling in the US is under the auspices of the Greek church.

records, clubs, friendships, cooking, dances, ethnic identity. Then, he was asked whether he more often took part in the American or the Greek version of the activity. Five alternatives were provided to him: Greek, American, Equally Both, Other, None. As the last two categories were very infrequent, they were combined with the Greek response. A high score was then assigned to participation in the American culture, an intermediate score to equal participation, and a low score to Greek participation. The scores over the eight items were summated, and the measure was subjected to the usual methodological tests. It was found adequate in reliability and validity, but it did not meet all the criteria for unidimensionality. The final scale scores were fairly well distributed in the six categories, with some skewness toward Greek participation.⁸ The association between the various forms of ethnic participation and tolerance is presented in Table 1 (Variables 6-12).

Overall, the association between the various indices of behavioral ethnicity and tolerance are weak. The summary measure (Variable 12) is not at all correlated with prejudice. The coefficients relating to the individual items are low and inconsistent. In some cases (Variables 6, 7, 8, and 11), «Greekness» is associated with negative attitudes toward Jews or blacks. The positive association ($g = .34$) between membership in American organizations and Negro stereotype tolerance is noteworthy. In other cases (Variables 9 and 10), there is a tendency for «Greekness» to be associated with positive attitudes toward the Jews or blacks. The positive association ($g = .36$) between amount of Greek schooling and stereotype tolerance is a good example.

Membership in American organizations was associated with the respondent's annual income ($g = .36$), his authoritarianism ($g = -.47$), and his general education ($g = .69$). The income and education correlations are consistent with the observation of higher social participation among the upper socioeconomic groups. In any case, education, a strong correlate of Negro stereotype prejudice (see footnote 3), could account for the organization effects. When education was controlled, the original association was substantially reduced (g 's = $-.14$ and $.24$), suggesting that education is the crucial factor.⁹

8. The corrected split-half reliability for the participation scale was .72. There were no negative inter-item correlations, and all the item-total correlations were above .50. The coefficient of reproducibility and the minimal marginal reproducibility were respectively .92 and .65; two of the items, however, had 12% error. The American participation scale positively correlated ($g = .63$) with assimilation orientation.

9. The present study noted a slight association ($g = .20$) between membership in American organizations and membership in Greek organizations. This observation may invalidate, to some extent, the use of organizational memberships *per se* as indicators

of ethnicity. There may be a need to distinguish among types of organizations (e.g., professional, fraternal, ethnic, etc.), and develop ratio indices by comparing American to Greek organizations.

Amount of Greek schooling was also associated with general education ($g = -.31$). When general education was controlled, the association between number of years in Greek school and positive attitudes toward blacks (stereotypes) was retained and magnified only in the high general education condition (g 's = $.06$, $.47$). The most positive respondents toward blacks were those who were high both in Greek schooling and general education. General education did not completely explain the ethnic contribution. Whether this is due to the content of teaching in the Greek schools (i.e., giving the pupils a knowledge of Greek history, the succession of empires in the Middle East, and the minority status of the Greeks under the Turks) or to local selection factors (the church being located in the black Avondale ghetto) is not known.

To summarize, the effects of general ethnicity («Greekness») on prejudice are mixed. In twenty-two cases (out of 36) there is a tendency for «Greekness» to be associated with intolerance. However, only in five cases (involving Variables 2, 3, 4, 7, and 11) are the associations marked ($g = >.25$). On the other hand, a number of associations (e.g., involving Variables 1 and 9) are against the ethnicity thesis. In the latter case, «Greekness» is accompanied by positive attitudes toward the two target groups. In addition, many of the ethnic factors are associated with «non-ethnic» variables (e.g., education and authoritarianism). When these correlates are controlled, the ethnicity associations are either attenuated or are qualified—thus further reducing the effects of general ethnicity on prejudice.

The white-ethnic racism thesis is not precisely tested until socioeconomic status is controlled. To recapitulate, the low socioeconomic status ethnics are expected to be the most intolerant toward Jews and blacks. Socioeconomic status was measured in various ways. In the present report, two economic indicators, annual income of the respondent and the rental-value of his dwelling, were used. To arrive at the present income, he was asked to check one of seven income categories ranging from \$0.00 to \$25,000.+. The median income of the respondents was around \$15,000., and the distribution was highly skewed toward the upper income categories.

Due to the skewness of the income distribution toward the upper income categories, it was felt that a dichotomizing of the income distribution may not provide the best test of the white-ethnic racism thesis. Consequently, it was decided to use the respondent's dwelling rental value which had a better

of ethnicity. There may be a need to distinguish among types of organizations (e.g., professional, fraternal, ethnic, etc.), and develop ratio indices by comparing American to Greek organizations.

distribution. Since some of the respondents were renters, it was necessary to convert house resale value into rental value (Cf. Cuber and Kenkel, 1954, pp. 141-142). The house resale value was divided by ten and the result was then divided by twelve to reduce it to a monthly equivalent. Rental values ranged from under \$100.00 a month to over \$450.00+ a month, with the median lying within the \$200.00-\$250.00 category. There was a strong correlation ($r = .82$) between annual income and rental value.

The associations between ethnicity and the three types of tolerance, under two conditions of socioeconomic status, are presented in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

TABLE 2. *Ethnicity and Jewish Tolerance by Income or Rental Value*

	Income		Rental Value	
	Low (N=70)	High (N=82)	Low (N=83)	High (N=69)
Father's Regional Origin	.19	.16	.10	.28
Ethnic Generation	.23	-.55	.16	-.37
Assimilation Orientation	.42	.35	.55	.14
Ingroup Differentiation	.32	.03	.30	-.02
Knowledge of Greek Culture	-.15	-.11	-.25	.06
Descent of Wife ¹	-.06	-.17	-.22	-.06
Naming Practice ²	-.42	-.07	-.14	-.25
Number of Greek Mentors	.13	-.28	.21	-.42
Years in Greek School	.18	.44	-.09	.57
Memberships in Greek Organizations	.16	.13	.08	.21
Memberships in American Organizations	.13	.11	.25	-.25
Participation in American Culture	-.11	-.01	.13	.08

1. Sixteen cases (unmarried) were dropped from the analysis. The low income *gamma* is based on 60 cases while the high income coefficient is based on 76 cases. The respective number of cases for the low and high rental value *gammas* are 70 and 66.

2. Forty-eight of the respondents who were either not married, or had no sons, were excluded from the analysis. The low income *gamma* is based on 38 cases while the high income *gamma* is based on 66 cases. The respective number of cases for the low and high rental value *gammas* are 47 and 57.

Let us first examine Table 2 which presents the higher order *gamma* associations for attitudes toward Jews. Looking first at the income analysis (and the relative direction of the coefficients), only in six of twelve cases (ethnic generation, assimilation orientation, ingroup differentiation, knowledge of Greek culture, naming practice, and years in Greek school) is «Greekness» associated with anti-semitism in the low income category. In the remaining six cases, «Greekness» is either associated with tolerance or there is hardly a difference between the high and low income coefficients. Turning now to rental value status, ten of the twelve low rental-value coefficients are consistent with the white ethnic racism thesis, i.e., «Greekness» is associated with more anti-semitic attitudes. The two exceptions include father's regional origin, naming practice, and number of Greek men-

TABLE 3. *Ethnicity and Negro Social Distance Tolerance by Income or Rental Value*

	Income		Rental Value	
	Low (N=70)	High (N=82)	Low (N=83)	High (N=69)
Father's Regional Origin	.15	-.15	-.18	.22
Ethnic Generation	.43	.01	.61	-.28
Assimilation Orientation	-.04	-.09	-.20	.09
Ingroup Differentiation	.11	.12	.15	.13
Knowledge of Greek Culture	.11	.13	.00	.24
Descent of Wife ¹	-.30	-.14	-.54	.12
Naming Practice ²	-1.00	-.14	-.50	-.02
Number of Greek Mentors	.22	-.15	.28	.30
Years in Greek School	.73	-.25	.10	.04
Memberships in Greek Organizations	.03	-.04	.32	-.32
Memberships in American Organizations	.07	.09	.06	.06
Participation in American Culture	.15	.01	.16	-.03

1. See footnote 1, Table 2.

2. See footnote 2, Table 2.

TABLE 4. *Ethnicity and Negro Stereotype Tolerance by Income or Rental Value*

	Income		Rental Value	
	Low (N=70)	High (N=82)	Low (N=83)	High (N=29)
Father's Regional Origin	.25	.28	.22	.31
Ethnic Generation	.06	-.39	-.12	-.03
Assimilation Orientation	.35	-.08	.15	.07
Ingroup Differentiation	.51	.13	.66	-.23
Knowledge of Greek Culture	.00	.14	.06	.26
Descent of Wife ¹	-.35	-.06	-.39	.04
Naming Practice ²	.01	.07	-.04	.00
Number of Greek Mentors	.21	-.41	.09	-.38
Years in Greek School	.37	.37	.36	.35
Memberships in Greek Organizations	.28	.09	.17	.22
Memberships in American Organizations	.43	.25	.49	.10
Participation in American Culture	.23	-.25	.14	.06

1. See footnote 1, Table 2.

2. See footnote 2, Table 2.

tors. A greater number of coefficients are consistent with the white ethnic intolerance thesis when rental value than when annual income is used as the index of economic status.

The white-ethnic racism thesis, however, has been more relevant to the blacks as a target group. It is presumably the challenge by the demanding black minority in the late 1960s which threatened the insecure status of the white ethnics. Tables 3 and 4 present the associations between ethnicity and attitudes toward blacks (social distance and stereotypes) for two conditions of economic status. Focusing on social distance tolerance, there are only five cases (ethnic generation, assimilation orientation, descent of wife, naming practice, and participation in American culture) where «Greekness» is associated

with intolerance for the low income group. Using the second economic index, rental value, «Greekness» is associated with intolerance in six cases (father's regional origin, ethnic generation, knowledge of Greek culture, descent of wife, naming practice, and participation in the American culture). The outcomes in regard to social distance toward blacks were somewhat less supportive of the thesis than those in regard to attitudes toward the Jews.

With respect to acceptance of black stereotypes, «Greekness» is associated with intolerance in seven comparisons (assimilation orientation, ingroup differentiation, knowledge of Greek culture, descent of wife, naming practice, membership in American organizations, and participation in the American culture) — under low income status. When rental value is used as the index of economic status, the outcomes are comparable, except for the addition of two more supportive cases (father's regional origin and membership in Greek organizations) where the association in the low status condition is less positive. Generally, there seems to be more consistent support for the white-ethnic racism thesis when the nature of tolerance deals with stereotypes about blacks than when it deals with social distance attitudes toward blacks or with attitudes toward the Jews. There is also more statistical support for the thesis when the control variable is rental value than when it is annual income. As was indicated at the outset, the rental value index met better the conditions of the white-ethnic racism thesis. However, it is also possible that the two types of economic status have differential substantive meaning to the Greek-American respondents — especially since rental value is more overtly tied to home ownership than annual income.

A number of other qualifications are pertinent in regard to the higher-order analysis. First, some of the ethnicity variables (e.g., knowledge of Greek culture, membership in American organizations, etc.) were, as stated in the elementary analysis, correlated with educational status. The small size of the sample did not permit a simultaneous control of both types of status. As a consequence, some ambiguity remains as to the meaning of those specific outcomes in Tables 2-4. Secondly, the lack of a random sample prevented any testing of the magnitude of the differences between the two higher-order correlations. The use of sign and direction are at best crude indicators. Because of these shortcomings, the outcomes are only suggestive.

summary and conclusions

The present report used data collected predominantly from second-generation Greek-Americans to

test the white-ethnic racism thesis. The thesis states that the descendants of «new immigrant» groups — especially their working class descendants, are prejudiced toward minorities, particularly toward blacks. Two approaches were used to evaluate the thesis.

In the first approach, a number of ethnic indicators (e.g. demographic, attitudinal, cognitive, and behavioral) were compared to the respondent's level of tolerance toward Jews and blacks. Some association between «Greekness» and prejudice was noted. There was no uniformity, however, across indicators, with some ethnic indicators (e.g. low assimilation orientation) being correlated with intolerance toward the Jews and other ethnic indicators (e.g. number of years in Greek school) being associated with rejection of stereotypes about blacks. In addition, there were few strong correlations between the various ethnic indicators and prejudice. Finally, some of the associations between ethnicity and prejudice were not robust when more traditional correlates of prejudice, such as educational level and authoritarianism, were controlled. Thus, the ethnic factors had a limited predictive capacity. This, however, does not mean that the «universal» correlates of prejudice, such as education and authoritarianism, cannot interact with cultural tradition to produce a high level of racism.

The white-ethnic racism thesis was also tested under standardized conditions of economic status. Two indices of economic status, reported annual income and the rental value of the respondent's dwelling, were used. Once again there was no uniform support for the thesis. There was more support for the thesis («Greekness» associated with prejudice under low economic status) when rental value, rather than income, was used as the economic variable. In part this may be due to the better distribution of the rental value than the income factor. It may also be a function of the differential meaning of the two status indicators to the Greek-American respondents. The rental value status is more interwoven with house ownership which is a more tangible and overt indicator of status than income. In addition, housing has been associated with fears about desegregation.

There was more support for the white-ethnic racism thesis in the case of stereotypes about blacks than attitudes toward the blacks (social distance) or attitudes toward the Jews. This may be due to the fact that the stereotype measure contained content evoking the Greek-American's «bootstrap attitudes». According to this attitude, the descendant of the new immigrant claims that his ancestors were also the victims of nordic prejudice, but diligence, individual effort, and patience led to their contemporary success. Thus, they feel they can not be sympathetic with a

group who they think is demanding rewards without commensurate efforts.

The «bootstrap» mentality assumes a parallelism of experiences between the white ethnics and racial minorities. This parallelism, however, breaks down when other objective factors are taken into account. First, the degree of prejudice against white ethnics cannot match the degree of overt, organized racism against blacks. In part, this is the result of the ethnics being a «cultural» rather than a «racial» minority. In part, it is due to the fact that the blacks have had the stigma of slavery at the hands of the «dominant» WASP group. Finally, the «white ethnics» came to the US at a time (1880-1930) when the country was industrializing and offered much opportunity for entrepreneurial success. When the blacks really began «arriving» in the US (i.e. when their genuine liberation began in the 1940s and 1950s), the US technology was exceedingly complex and the business opportunities were more limited. These factors, however, are rarely considered by the descendants of white ethnics whose relative status is being challenged by the just demands of the racial minorities.

The findings of the present study — and the attendant interpretations — can only be suggestive. There is a need to obtain better variation on the ethnicity variables such as generational status and regional origin. Along the same lines, better variation must be sought in the prejudice measures. In the present study, two of these measures (attitudes toward the Jews and social distance attitudes toward the blacks) were not as well distributed as the black stereotype measure. Thus, some of the findings may be due to methodological rather than theoretical reasons. These problems can be rectified if research is carried out in large Greek communities such as Chicago and New York. The white-ethnic racism thesis can, of course, also be tested on other «white-ethnic» groups from Southern and Eastern Europe, both on the micro- and macrosociological levels of analysis.

REFERENCES

- Cohen, I.
1926 «Whose Glory Is Departed», *The Menorah Journal* 12, October, 522-527.

- Cowan, P.
1976 «How the Battle for White Power Touched Off a Border War», *The Village Voice*, August 23, 1976.
- Cuber, J. F. and W.F. Kenkel
1954 *Social Stratification in the US*. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Gelber, N.M.
1955 «An Attempt to Internationalize Salonica 1912-1913», *Jewish Social Studies*, 17, April, 105-120.
- Greeley, A. M.
1972 «Political Attitudes among American White Ethnics», *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), Summer, 213-220.
- Greeley, A.M. and P.B. Sheatsley
1971 «Attitudes toward Racial Integration», *Scientific American*, 225, December, 13-19.
- Hamilton, H.
1970 «Voting Behavior in Open Housing Referenda», *Social Science Quarterly*, 51(3), December, 715-729.
- Krickus, R. F.
1971 «The White Ethnics: Who Are They and Where Are They Going?», *City Magazine*, May-June, 23-37.
- Lane, R.
1955 «Political Personality and Electoral Choice», *American Political Science Review*, 49, 173-191.
- Lee, D.D.
1953 «Greece», in M. Mead (Ed.), *Cultural Patterns and Technical Change*. Paris, UNESCO, 77-114.
- Levy, M.R. and M. S. Kramer
1973 *The Ethnic Factor*. New York and Schuster.
- Lipset, S.M. and E. Raab
1970 *The Politics of Unreason*. New York, Harper.
- Robinson, J. and P.R. Shaver
1969 *Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes*. Ann Arbor, Survey Research Center Institute.
- Selznick, G. J. and S. Steinberg
1969 *The Tenacity of Prejudice*. New York, Harper.
- Stember, C. H.
1961 *Education and Attitude Change*. New York, Institute of Human Relations.
- Stavrianos, L.S.
1948 «The Jews of Greece», *Journal of Central European Affairs*, 8, October, 256-269.
- Theodoratus, R.
1967 *The Influence of the Homeland on the Social Organization of a Greek Community in America*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Washington.
- Triandis, H. C. and L. M. Triandis
1960 «Race, Social Class, Religion and Nationality as Determinants of Social Distance», *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 61, July, 110-118.
- Vucinich, W.S.
1965 *The Ottoman Empire: Its Record and Legacy*. Princeton, N.J., D. Van Nostrand Co.
- Ware, T.
1964 *The Orthodox Church*. Baltimore, Penguin Books.
- Weed, P.
1973 «Components of the White Ethnic Movement», in J.A. Ryan (Ed.), *White Ethnics: Life in Working Class America*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, 17-24.
- Xenides, J.
1922 *The Greeks of America*. New York, George A. Doran Co.