

Measuring Inter-racial Friendships: Experimental Comparisons

Tom W. Smith

National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago

GSS Methodological Report No. 91

February, 1999

This research was done for the General Social Survey project directed by James A. Davis, Tom W. Smith, and Peter V. Marsden. The project is supported by the National Science Foundation, Grant No. SBR-9617727.

Introduction

Studies of inter-racial contacts in general and of cross-race friendships in particular have noted substantial discrepancies in the reported levels of black-white socializing (Sigelman, Bledsoe, Welch, and Combs, 1996; Ellison and Powers, 1994). But these acknowledgements of measurement variation have been tangential to the authors' substantive focus and they have not perused the problem. This is unfortunate since the differences in reported levels of inter-racial friendships are large and apparently result from serious, reporting biases.

This paper examines measurement effects that contribute to differences in reported levels of inter-racial friendships and reports on experiments conducted on the 1998 General Social Survey (GSS) to compare different ways of measuring inter-racial friendships.

Alternative Approaches to Measuring Inter-Racial Friendships

Two basic approaches have been used to measure inter-racial friendships. First, the one-step, race-focused approach simply asks something like "Do you have any black/white friends?"¹ This is by far the most frequently used technique (See Table 1 for actual wordings). Second, the network approach asks people to name who their friends are and then asks questions about the characteristics of each listed friend. Race is one of the follow-up items on the attributes of specific friends (See Table 1 for examples).

Past research suggests that the one-step, race-focused approach elicits much higher reports of inter-racial friendships than does the network approach. In the dozen variants using the direct approach between 39% and 94% of blacks reported white friends and between 31.5% and 71% of whites indicated that they had black friends (Table 1). In contrast, the two studies using the network approach recorded much less inter-racial contact. Mary Jackman (Jackman and Crane, 1986; Jackman, 1994) found that 35% of blacks had a white friend and 52% a white acquaintance, while 9-10% of whites had a black friend and 21-26% had a black acquaintance. Similarly, Smith (1996) found that 15% of blacks had a white among their confidants ("people with whom you discussed matters important to you" during the last six months) and 1% of whites had a black confidant.²

¹Because few national studies cover inter-racial friendships involving other racial groups (e.g. Hispanics, Asians, Native Americans), we focus on blacks and whites.

²All studies find that more blacks report inter-racial friendships than whites do. On the 14, national direct, one-step comparisons the inter-racial differences range from 8 to 44 percentage points with a mean of 15.2. For the related three?? questions on inter-racial home visits the differences are 17, 26,

It is likely that reporting biases in the direct approach lead to an overreporting of inter-racial friends. First, cognitively this approach focuses on race as the key characteristic and people search their memories for someone of the specified race who meets (or might meet) the characteristic of being a friend. Second, since inter-racial friendship would be seen as an indication of a lack of prejudice, favorable self-presentation encourages the reporting of inter-racial friendships (Schuman, Steeh, and Bobo, 1985; Krysan, 1998). In particular, some may even infer that if they are "friendly" towards a group, then they must have friends in that group or, conversely, that the failure to report such friends would imply that they were not friendly towards the mentioned group. Finally, because most studies do not define what constitutes a "friend" and because the concept of "friend" is both imprecise and elastic, questions about friends are open to variable and expandable definitions. Together these factors mean that the one-step, race-focused approach will lead to inter-racial friendships being overreported since both cognitively and in terms of self-presentation people are striving to maximize mentions and there is much latitude in what constitutes a friend.

For the network approach measurement effects are considerably different. One is asked to identify specific individuals as friends. This both taxes memory and makes the mentioning of a large number of friends considerably more burdensome. Typically this means that people will mention their core friends first and add to the list until either all appropriate people have been mentioned or until satifcing occurs. When people are then asked about characteristics of the listed friends, they accurately report attributes that they know (e.g. gender, race, marital status, etc.)

and 35 percentage points. For the two-step studies the differences are 25-26 percentage points for friends and acquaintances in the Jackman study and 13.5 percentage points for confidants on the GSS. This finding is not surprising given that blacks make up approximately 12% of the population. If all friendships were reciprocal, then the ratio of inter-racial friendship would reflect the distribution of the racial groups in the population which would mean that a higher proportion of blacks would report inter-racial friends than whites would. For example, if there were 12 blacks and 88 whites and 5 blacks had white friends and if each of these five whites in turn considered themselves friends of the blacks who thought of them as friends, then 41% of blacks (5/12) would have inter-racial friendships while only 6% of whites (5/88) would. Of course, friendships don't have to be reciprocal and non-overlapping. However, given the distribution of blacks and white inter-racial friendships would tend to apply to a greater proportion of the minority group than to the majority group and that is in fact just what the figures indicate. Also, differential definitions of what constitutes a friend might also affects the reports by blacks and whites.

and give less complete and less accurate accounts of other attributes (education, party identification, income, etc.). Race in particular is collected for almost everyone with little apparent error.

Under the network approach, there is little opportunity to intentionally over or underreport inter-racial friends. However, with the network approach there is a tendency to minimize the number of reported friends. First, thinking of and individually naming friends takes more time and effort than a summary reporting of whether certain types of friends exist. In order to reduce the burden of the task, respondents may intentionally limit their mentions.³ Second, the very fact that the question asks for the names of specific friends may implicitly intensify and narrow what the respondent believes should be covered. For example, being asked to name your "close friends" may make the respondent think of a more restricted group than merely being asked to think about ones "close friends." People may reason something like, "You want me to list my close friends that means you want me to tell you who I'm really close to." Third, the network approach is designed to collect follow-up information on a discrete number of alters. As a result, the item is typically structured to record a set and fairly limited number of mentions. So even if R has numerous nominees and is willing and able to mention all of them, the question itself will truncate mentions.

If inter-racial friends tend to be towards the periphery of friendships (but legitimately classified as friends), the truncating nature of the network approach would mean that they would be underreported. However, this possible underreporting would not be explicitly racial, but would be a function of the more marginal nature of such friendships interacting with the limiting nature of the network approach.

Variations in Reports of Inter-Racial Friendships within Approaches

In addition to the large differences that exist between the two basic measurement approaches, there is also considerable variation within these approaches. The one-step approach encompasses 12 different wordings asked across 18 surveys and 27 years and levels of reported inter-racial friendships range from 39% to 94% of blacks reporting white friends and between 31.5% and 71% of whites indicating that they had black friends. This large range in inter-racial socializing results from at least three

³The amount of effort involved in the network items becomes much greater when the series of follow-up questions about their attributes are asked. But at the name-generator stage the respondent is presumably unaware of the follow-up questions and therefore would not strategically limit the number of friends mentioned to reduce the amount of additional information that will be solicited during the follow-up questions.

factors: 1) variations in wording, 2) changes over time, and 3) contextual differences.

First, variations in wordings contribute to differences in reported levels of inter-racial friendships. While all of the questions ask about "friends," they differ notably in how this basic concept is modified and/or defined. Terminology includes references to "current, closest friends," "close, personal friend," "close friend(s)," "good friend," "fairly close personal friend," someone "you can really call a friend," "a friend socially," and "a friend you see socially." Only one study defines what is meant by these phrases. In the National Study of Black Americans, a "good friend" is someone "to whom you can say what you really think".⁴

Since the items ask only about whether there is at least one inter-racial friend, the broader the definition, the more integration should be reported. For example, among ones three best friends a positive response would depend on at least one-third of these friends being of another race, but among ones 100 close and slight friends, a mere 1% would legitimately yield a positive response.⁵ As a result, the percentage reporting friendships will increase with the breadth of the definition of friends being employed. However, while the relative circumference of the friendship circle can be inferred for some of the terms used (e.g. "current, closest friends" is clearly more restrictive than "close friend"), in many other cases the comparative breadth is uncertain (e.g. is a "good friend" broader or narrower than "a close, personal friend"?). Because of the uncertainty over the inclusivity of terms, it is hard to rigorously use this important factor to account for differences in reported levels of inter-racial friendships.

In addition, other differences in wordings contribute to the

⁴The possible importance of supplying definitions for vague terms is illustrated by the fact that in Sigelman's Detroit study (1996) "good friend" was defined quite differently as "adults you enjoy getting together with at least once a month and any other adults who live elsewhere that you try to keep in close touch with by calling or writing." Thus, a common phrase, "good friends," may be defined in quite different ways by both researchers and respondents.

⁵Finding a member of another race among one's friends increases as the net widens for two reasons. First, inter-racial friends are probably on average more prevalent among distant friends than among near friends. Second, even if there is no association between proximity and the racial composition, one's probability of reporting an inter-racial friend still increases. With a hit rate of .125 (about the black proportion of adults) for a group member and no relationship between number of attempts and hits, there is about one chance in three of having at least one group member among three tries (i.e. friends) and about a 74% chance of having one among 10 tries (i.e. friends).

wide variation in responses. While most questions refer to current friendships of the respondent alone, one item asks about friendships among the respondent or members of his/her immediate family (Q. A) and another inquires whether one "ever had" an inter-racial friend (Q. G). Both of these factors should lead to more reports of inter-racial friendships.

Second, racial integration has increased over the last quarter century and at the minimum inter-racial friendship became more prevalent from the 1970s to the 1980s. There are three over time comparisons for both blacks and whites using identical items. Five of these show increases in inter-racial friendship (see Table 1 for details):

Percentage Point Change in Inter-racial Friendships

	Blacks		Whites	
	Change	Change per Annum	Change	Change per Annum
1970-78	+10	+1.3	--	--
1976-78	--	--	+ 4	+2.0
1981-97	+14	+0.9	+17	+1.1
1989-96	- 6	-1.2	+ 7	+1.0

Further indication of an increase in inter-racial socializing comes from three GSS time trends on inter-racial contacts (Table 2). Both blacks and whites report more integration in their neighborhoods, churches, and dinner guests over the last 25 years.⁶ That means that time has to be held constant in any comparison across different wordings.

Third, various contextual effects undoubtedly influence reporting levels. Race-of-interviewer effects are quite common and often substantial in magnitude (Anderson, Silver, and Abramson, 1988a; Anderson, Silver, and Abramson, 1988b; McCutcheon, 1987; Schaeffer, 1980; Schuman, Steeh, and Bobo, 1985). In terms of both cognitive and self-presentational processes being interviewed by a member of another race typically increases liberal, pro-integration responses. Since these are the same factors that encourage over reporting in the one-step approach already, they would tend to further heighten these effects. Since little is known about the racial composition of the interviewing staffs for the surveys under study here, variations across studies due to this factor are

⁶Sigelman, et al (1996) finds that whites report more integration in Detroit between 1968/69 and 1992 for schools, jobs, neighborhoods, and home visits. Blacks report more integration from schools and neighborhoods and not change for jobs and home visits.

uncertain.

Also, it is likely that the prior content of the survey will influence responses. For example, prior items about racism and prejudice should increase self-presentation bias by encouraging the reporting of inter-racial friends to counteract implications of bigotry. Conversely, prior items about family and neighbors should decrease reports of inter-racial friends by priming memories of groups of people who tend to be of the same race as the respondent. A similar context effect has been demonstrated on the GSS. Questions about whether one attended an integrated church got lower reports of integration after items referring to one's neighborhood than after items without a focus on the neighborhood (Smith, 1991). It is believed that the preceding neighbor questions helped to focus people's reports on their local congregation, rather than their denomination as a whole and naturally integration would be less in the former than in the latter.

Controlling for time by looking at surveys done during approximately the same period shows that in two surveys in 1976-78 from 44 to 67% of blacks reported a white friend. Inclusivity clearly contributed to this variation since the item asking about having someone of another race who you can "really call a close friend" got 44% while the more inclusive reference to someone you can "really call a friend" got 67%. In 1979-81 another two surveys found rates of 57% and 69%. This also probably resulted from inclusivity since the lower rate referred to "good friends...to whom you can say what you really think" and the higher rate to "fairly close personal friends." In 1988-89 four surveys had rates of from 80 to 94%. In these cases inclusivity does not seem to be a major explanation for the variation since the more exclusive "current, closest friends" yielded a somewhat higher rate (88%) than the broader "fairly close personal friends" (80%). Contextual factors probably play a role in these differences.

For whites the two surveys in 1976-78 rank as one would expect due to inclusivity (31.5% for "really call a close friend" and 44% for "really call a friend"). In 1988-89 the rates ran from 44 to 67% and the narrowest reference ("current, closet friends") did yield the lowest reported level (44%) with the broader terms getting higher rates ("close, personal friend" - 62%; "close friends" - 67%; and "fairly close personal friend" - 66%).

For the network approach items, there are only two observations and they are very different in format and 10 years apart in time so no meaningful comparison is possible. However, the comparisons between "good friends" and acquaintances on the 1975 Jackman study does strongly follow in line with the inclusivity principle.

1998 Experiments

The prior non-experimental work reviewed above clearly shows that reported levels of inter-racial friendships vary dramatically across approaches and within approaches due to the specific friendship stimulus, context, and period effects. But because the

different levels of inter-racial friendships vary in many uncontrolled ways (approach, wording, house, time, etc.), it is impossible to isolate and quantify the magnitude of the differences. To do so a series of experiments were conducted on the 1998 GSS.

The 1998 GSS (Davis, Smith, and Marsden, 1999) is a full-probability sample, employing in-person interviews, of adults 18+ living in households in the United States. It had a total sample size of 2832 and a response rate of 76%.

Three versions of the inter-racial friendship question were employed on different random samples. First, half of the sample received a network approach very similar to that used on the 1988 GSS and described above (see Appendix 1: Question Wording). People were asked to name their close friends (i.e. "good friends they feel close to") and up to five nominees were recorded.⁷ Second, one-sixth of the sample were asked a simple, direct question similar to most of those listed in Table 1. Third, the last two-sixths were administered a three-step procedure that asked about 1) having close friends, 2) how many close friends one had, and finally 3) how many of them were white/black. The direct and three-step versions asked non-blacks about black friends and blacks about white friends. The network approach inquired about the race of friends and the analysis was done using the non-black/black and black/white dichotomies as utilized by the other two methods.

For reasons delineated above in the discussion of past studies, two hypotheses were formulated:

1. More people would report having an inter-racial friend on the simple, direct approach, there would be an intermediate level on the three-step approach, and the lowest level would come from the network approach.
2. People would report that a higher proportion of their friends were inter-racial on the three-step approach than on the network approach. (The simple, direct approach does not yield an estimate of this.)

Table 3 confirms the first hypothesis. For all races the three methods produced large differences in the reported level of inter-racial friendships. 6% of whites reported a black friend under the network approach, 24% with the three-step approach, and 42% using the direct approach. For blacks the corresponding levels were 15%,

⁷The network item was asked as part of the replication of the GSS's 1988 module on religion and was funded by the Lily Endowment. The follow-up item on race of friends and the two other experimental items were supported by the GSS grant from NSF.

45%, and 62%.⁸

Table 4 confirms the second hypothesis. For each race the three-step method produces higher estimates of the % of all friends who are from the other race than does the network approach. The three-step method estimates that 9% of the friends of whites are black while the network approach puts the level at 2%. For blacks the respective figures are 26% and 10%.

As discussed above, the lower number of inter-racial friends from the network approach may in part come from it capping the number of friends at five. Several examinations were done to consider this impact. First, the three-step item on the 1998 GSS and a similar item from the 1986 GSS ("Thinking now of close friends - not your husband or wife or partner or family members - but people you feel fairly close to... How many close friends would you say you have?") were analyzed to ascertain the size of friendship networks. The 1998 three-step item indicated that 67% had five or fewer friends and the 1986 item found that 60% had five or fewer friends. This suggests that the network item could cover all friends for a majority of people, but missed some friends among 33-40% of the population.

Second, on the network scale we looked at the % with inter-racial friends by their order of mention. This showed little meaningful difference. Among whites the black friends were 2.0% of the first mentioned friends, 1.8% of the second, 2.7% of the third, 2.6% of the fourth, and 1.8% of the fifth. For blacks the corresponding numbers were 11.7%, 13.0%, 8.3%, 10.4%, and 12.5%. This does not support the idea proposed earlier that inter-racial friends would be more common as friendships became less strong.⁹

Third, we truncated the three-step approach to those with 5 or fewer friend and compared it to the network figures. As Table 5 shows, this does slightly reduce the difference between the three-step and network figures, but the differences remain statistically

⁸For both races these levels of inter-racial friends measured by the direct approach are lower than that measured by other recent polls using the direct approach. The GSS found that 42% of Whites had a Black friend compared to estimates of 60%, 69%, and 71% in 1996 and 1997 (Table 1) and that 62% of Blacks had a White friend compared to reports of 75%, 77%, and 83%.

⁹Of course this may result from the fact that order of mentions is not a good measure of closeness or intensity of friendships. An analysis of ethnic identity on the GSS suggests that first mentions are more central than later mentions, but that the association between earlier mentions and more importance is only moderate. Of those mentioning two ethnic background and then choosing one that they felt closest to, 68% chose their first mention. Of those mentioning three ethnicities and selecting one they were closest to, 56% picked their first mention, 20% their second, and 23% their third. This suggests that first mentions are more central, but doesn't indicate any favoritism of 2nd over 3rd mentions.

significant.

The preceding three analyses suggest that the network approach limitation on number of friends is only a minor factor in explaining the large differences in reported levels of inter-racial friendships by method.

Finally, we considered whether the three methods produced different relationships with related variables as well as the large difference in marginals described above (Table 6). Seven other variables that we expected would be related to level of inter-racial friendships were analyzed. As expected, the % of whites reporting a black friend was higher in the South than in the non-South, among students, followed by full-time employees compared to those keeping house and retired, among those in integrated residential and work situations than in segregated circumstances, among those favoring less social distance in marriage and residence than among those wanting greater space between blacks and whites, and among those feeling close to rather than remote from blacks. These relationships showed up under each method, and in general each method showed a similar pattern (if much different absolute levels). However, the not all results were parallel across the three methods. For example, those keeping house had the lowest level of inter-racial friends under the three-step approach, while the retired had the lowest under the network and direct approaches. Furthermore, the relationship with labor force status was statistically significant only for the network approach. Thus, the three methods show reasonably similar, but not always equivalent, patterns with other variables.

Summary

Levels of inter-racial friends differ notably according to what method is used to measure friendships. The direct, race-focused approach shows the highest level of integration, followed by the three-step approach, and then with the network method indicating the least integration. It is likely, but not provable, that the simple, direct approach considerably overreports the true level of inter-racial friendships and that the network method produces the most accurate figures. As a result, the use of the direct item (and similar items measuring other inter-racial socializing and integration) to test the contact hypothesis and other theories about race relations is suspect (Belanger and Pinard, 1991; Desforges, Lord, Shawna, Mason, Van Leeuwen, West, and Lepper, 1991; Ellison, 1994; Ford, 1986; Hamberger and Hewstone, 1997; Patchen, 1994; Powers and Ellison, 1995; Ramirez and Soriano, 1993; Ray, 1983; Riordan and Ruggiero, 1980; Robinson, 1980; Robinson and Preston, 1976; Sigelman and Welch, 1993; Smith, 1994). Furthermore, even the simple time trends on inter-racial friendships are questionable since they rest on the systematic measurement error being constant over time.

Table 1

Inter-racial Friendships

% Reporting Friend of Opposite Race

ONE-STEP, RACE-FOCUSED MEASURES

	Blacks	Whites
A. % with you or a member of your immediate family now having contact with "a friend socially" who is black/white		
1970	39	--
1976	50.0	34.2
1978H	--	38.2 ^a
1978R	49	40

^a1978H from the POII database at the University of North Carolina and 1978R from the Roper Center's POLL database report different figures for whites.

B. % with any "fairly close personal friend" who is black/white

1981	69	54
1986	69	--
1989R	80	66 ^b
1989SW1	82	66
1989SW2	74	61
1997	83	71

^b1989R is as reported in the Roper Center's POLL database. 1989SW1 is as reported in Sigelman and Welch (1991) based on those who answered the question. 1989SW2 is as reported in Sigelman and Welch (1991) without exclusions. In this survey some unspecified errors occurred on the first night of interviewing that led to about 7% of the respondents not being asked the question. This is why the 1989SW2 figures are lower. Excluding all first-night interviews produces estimates identical to 1989R figures which excludes not asks and no answers. It is unclear how Sigelman and Welch (1991) got the 82% figure reported for blacks.

C. % with any "close personal friend" who is black/white

1989	83	62
1996	77	69

Table 1 (continued)

	Blacks	Whites
D. % with contact with "a friend you see socially" who is black/white		
1971		
A great deal	---	6.7
Some	---	21.0
Almost no	---	71.3
Not sure	---	1.1
E. % with someone "you can really call a friend" who is black/white		
1976	66.9	44.2
F. % with someone "you can really call a close friend" who is black/white		
1978	43.7	31.5
G. % with "good friend...to whom you can say what you really think"		
1979-80	57	---
H. % ever had "close friend" who is black		
1981	--	44
I. % with "any close friends" who are black/white		
1988	94	67
J. % any of "current closest friends" who are black/white		
1989	88	44
K. % "good friends...get together at least once a month..."		
1992 (Detroit)	43	27
L. % any "close friends" who are black/white		
1997	75	60

Table 1 (continued)

NETWORK MEASURES

A. % with "good friend...adults you enjoy getting together with at least once a month or so and any other adults who live elsewhere that you try to keep in close touch with by calling or writing"/ [acquaintances] "people you keep in touch with or get together with occasionally"

	Blacks	Whites
1975		
Good Friend	34.8	9.4-9.8 ^c
Acquaintance	52.1	21.4-25.9

^cThe first figures are reported in Jackman and Crane (1986) and the later figures in Jackman (1994).

B. % "people with whom you discussed matters important to you" who are black/white

1985	14.7	1.2
------	------	-----

VISITS BY FRIENDS TO YOUR HOME

A. Black/White friend visited during last 2 months

1978	48	22
------	----	----

B. Black/White friend visited during last 12 months

1989	78	43
1998	65	50

C. Black/White friend visited during past year

1995	65	48
------	----	----

D. You visited black/white friend's home during last 12 months

1989	76	40
1998	72	45

Table 1 (continued)

ONE-STEP, RACE-FOCUSED MEASURES

A. Do you or does any member of your immediate family now have contact or not with a white person who is any of the following...A friend socially?

Louis Harris and Associates 3/70
CS=1600

Do you or does any member of your immediate family now have contact or not with a black/white person who is...A friend socially?

Louis Harris and Associates 5/76
W=1371
B=286

Louis Harris and Associates 10-11/78
W=1673 (UNC=1666)
B=783

B. Do you yourself know any black/white person whom you consider a fairly close personal friend?

ABC/WP 2-3/81
W=1426
B=446

ABC/WP 9-10/89
W=1249
B=371

ABC/WP 6/97
T=1137
B-OS=DK

Do you yourself know any white person whom you consider a fairly close personal friend?

ABC/WP 1/86
B=1022

C. Do you yourself know any black/white person whom you consider a close personal friend?

Gordon S. Black Corp. 9/89
W=806 <See 8/89 Black>

ABC 4-5/96
T=1116

Table 1 (continued)

Do you yourself know any white person whom you consider a close personal friend?

Gordon S. Black Corp. 8/89
B=601 <See 9/89 Black>

Do you yourself know any black/white person whom you consider a close personal friend?

ABC 4-5/96
CS=1116
B-OS=518

D. Would you say you have a great deal of contact with blacks/whites, some contact, or almost no contact with blacks/whites as: A friend you see socially.

Louis Harris and Associates 2/71
CS=1600
[Data by race not available]

E. Is there any black/white person whom you can really call a friend or isn't there?

Louis Harris and Associates 5/76
W=1379
B=284

F. Is there any black/white person whom you can really call a close friend or isn't there one?

Louis Harris and Associates 10/78
W=1669
B=721

G. Do you know any white person who you think of as a good friend-- that is, someone to whom you can say what you really think?

National Survey of Black Americans, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, 1979-80
B=2107

H. At the present time, do you come into contact with blacks in any of the following ways...Have you ever had a close friend who was black?

Yankelovich, Skelly, and White 1-3/81
CS=1072
B+Jewish-OS=143

Table 1 (continued)

I. Do you have any close friends who are black/white, or not?

AP/MG 6-7/88

W=317

B=530

J. Are any of your current, closest friends black/white?

NBC 8/89

CS=1500

B-OS=381

K. I would like to ask you some questions about people you consider your good friends. By good friends, I mean adults you enjoy getting together with at least once a month and any other adults who live elsewhere that you try to keep in close touch with by calling or writing. Are any of these good friends black/white?

Detroit Survey 7-11/92

T=1,124

L. Here are some questions about the contact you have with whites/blacks. Thinking of your close friends, are any of them white, or not?

Gallup 1-2/97

T=3036

W=1643

B=1260

NETWORK MEASURES

A. I would like to ask you some questions about the people you consider your good friends--by good friends I mean adults you enjoy getting together with at least once a month or so and any other adults who live elsewhere that you try to keep in close touch with by calling or writing.

[A Friends Sheet listed the first name of each good friend and people filled each person's race along with other background information.]

Are there any other people you keep in touch with or get together with occasionally?

If Yes:

Which of the categories on this card best describes how many blacks and whites are among these people? [All black, Mostly black, About half and half, Most white, All white]

Table 1 (continued)

Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, Fall, 1975

W=1648^d

NW=266

^dJackman (1994; p. 157) Whites - friends=1520; Whites - acquaintances=1332; Blacks - friends=158; Blacks - acquaintances=119 "Excludes respondents with no friends or with missing data on either number of friends or race of any friends. Excludes respondents with no acquaintances or with missing data on either existence of acquaintances or racial composition of acquaintances."

B. From time to time, most people discuss important matters with other people. Looking back over the last six months - who are the people with whom you discussed matters important to you? Just tell me their first names or initials. IF LESS THAN 5 NAMES MENTIONED, PROBE: Anyone else? ONLY RECORD FIRST 5 NAMES.

Is (NAME) Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, or something else?

General Social Survey, 1985

W=1338

B=152

O=44

VISITS BY FRIENDS TO YOUR HOME

A. Among the friends who have visited your home in the last two months, was any one of them a white person?

NBC 3/78

CS=1207

B. Has a black/white friend visited your home during the last twelve months?

NBC 8/89

CS=1500

B-OS=381

ABC/WP 6/97

CS=1137

B-OS=DK

C. In the past year, did you happen to have any black/white friends to your home or didn't you?

NBC 6/95

W=859

B=311

Table 1 (continued)

D. Have you, yourself, visited the home of a black/white friend during the last 12 months?

NBC 8/89
CS=1500
B-OS=381

ABC/WP 6/97
CS=1137
B-OS=DK

Table 2

Trends in Inter-racial Socializing

A. % with Neighbor of Other Race

	Blacks ^a	Whites
1972	----	30.0 (1281)
1978	76.3 (300)	46.3 (1303)
1994	81.9 (531)	60.1 (2346)
1996	78.2 (361)	62.0 (2194)
1998	80.7 (330)	62.3 (2113)

B. % with Church Member of Other Race

1978	39.9 (283)	33.8 (1121)
1994	49.4 (153)	44.4 (348)

C. % with a Dinner Guest of Other Race

1973	----	20.0 (1296)
1980	50.7 (298)	26.6 (1313)
1994	52.2 (262)	35.0 (1662)
1996	---- (115) ^b	40.1 (760)

Wordings:

Are there any (blacks/whites) living in this neighborhood now?
Do (blacks/whites) attend the church that you, yourself attend most often, or not?

During the last few years, has anyone in your family brought a friend who was a black/white) home for dinner?

^aFor Parts A and B black figures are from 1978-80 and 1993-94. For Part C black figures are from 1980-82 and 1993-94.

^bToo few to percentage.

Table 3

% with Other Race Close Friend Mentioned

Respondent's Race	Measurement Method			Prob.	N
	Direct	3-step	Network		
A. Three Races					
White	42.1	24.0	6.0	.0000	2230
Black	61.9	45.1	15.2	.0000	377
Other	64.4	37.5	8.3	.0000	202
B. Blacks and Non-Blacks					
Black	61.9	45.1	15.2	.0000	377
Non-Black	43.9	25.0	6.2	.0000	2431
N	450	900	1459		

Source: GSS1998

Table 4

% of Close Friends of Other Race

Respondent's Race	<u>3-step</u>	<u>Network</u>	<u>Prob.</u>	<u>N</u>
A. Three Races				
White				
Method1	8.9	2.2	.0000	1762
Method2	8.7	2.2	.0000	1760
Black				
Method1	26.2	10.0	.0001	288
Method2	26.2	10.0	.0001	288
Other				
Method1	18.9	3.6	.0000	149
Method2	17.9	3.6	.0000	148
B. Blacks/Non-Blacks				
Black				
Method1	26.2	10.0	.0001	288
Method2	26.2	10.0	.0001	288
Non-Black				
Method1	9.5	2.3	.0000	1910
Method2	9.3	2.3	.0000	1909
N	805	1392-1393		

Source: GSS1998

Table 5

Inter-racial Friendships
Among Those with Less Than 6 Close Friends

A. % with Other Race Close Friend Mentioned

Respondent's Race	<u>3-step</u>	<u>Network</u>	<u>Prob.</u>	<u>N</u>
Three Races				
White	15.5	6.0	.0000	1616
Black	35.5	15.2	.0001	296
Other	26.5	8.3	.004	149

B. % of Close Friends of Other Race

Respondent's Race	<u>3-step</u>	<u>Network</u>	<u>Prob.</u>	<u>N</u>
Three Races				
White				
Method1	7.9	2.2	.0000	1526
Method2	7.6	2.2	.0000	1525
Black				
Method1	25.6	10.0	.0001	259
Method2	25.6	10.0	.0001	259
Other				
Method1	23.2	3.6	.0000	129
Method2	23.2	3.6	.0000	129

B. Blacks/Non-Blacks

Black				
Method1	25.6	10.0	.0001	259
Method2	25.6	10.0	.0001	259
Non-Black				
Method1	8.8	2.3	.0000	1655
Method2	8.5	2.3	.0000	1654
N	521	1393		

Source: GSS1998

Table 6

% with Inter-racial Friendship for Other Variables
by Method

(Non-Blacks)

Other Variables	Method		
	Direct	Three-Step	Network
Region			
South	55.8	29.9	8.5
Non-South	38.6	22.6	5.1
Prob.	.001	.028	.018
Labor Force Status			
Full-Time			
Employee	46.9	27.1	6.9
Keeping House	35.7	13.0	4.5
Retired	32.8	23.9	2.6
Student	53.8	30.6	12.7
Prob.	.311	.261	.001
Integrated Neighborhood			
Yes	51.5	29.5	7.3
No	35.0	17.7	4.7
Prob.	.004	.000	.081
Race of Coworkers			
All White	36.1	20.1	2.5
Mostly White	47.0	27.4	7.3
Half and Half	60.0	38.0	10.4
Prob.	.031	.065	.070
Relative Marrying Black			
Strongly Favor	58.4	51.9	8.7
Favor	53.4	21.4	9.6
Neither Favor nor			
Oppose	51.0	26.6	4.7
Oppose	40.0	17.9	4.7
Strongly Oppose	21.6	22.8	5.2
Prob.	.000	.008	.329

Table 6 (continued)

Other Variables	Method		
	Direct	Three-Step	Network
Living in Neighborhood 50% Black			
Strongly Favor	70.0	53.7	13.3
Favor	43.8	22.5	8.4
Neither Favor nor Oppose	47.0	26.0	5.2
Oppose	31.0	24.5	4.2
Strongly Oppose	28.6	18.5	2.5
Prob.	.001	.030	.025
Feel Close to Blacks			
Not Very (1-4)	26.4	5.4	4.5
Middle (5)	40.0	19.8	4.3
Very (6-10)	66.0	42.1	10.2
Prob.	.000	.000	.001

Source: GSS1998

Appendix 1: Question Wording

A. Simple, Direct Approach:

ASK IN TERMS OF THE OPPOSITE RACE -- BLACKS ABOUT WHITES AND NON-BLACKS ABOUT BLACKS.

Are any of your good friends that you feel close to Black/White?

- Yes.....1
- No.....2

B. Three-Step Approach:

1. Do you have any good friends that you feel close to?

- Yes... (ASK Q.A).....1
- No.... (GO TO SECTION C)...2

IF YES:

A. About how many good friends do you have?

ASK IN TERMS OF OPPOSITE RACE. ASK NON-BLACKS ABOUT BLACKS AND ASK BLACKS ABOUT WHITES.

B. How many of your good friends are White/Black?

C. Network Approach

1. Many people have some good friends they feel close to. Who are your good friends (other than your spouse)? Just tell me their first names. (LIST NAMES IN GRID BELOW). Is there anyone else?

NAME 1	NAME 2	NAME 3	NAME 4	NAME 5

A. IF FIVE FRIENDS WERE MENTIONED, DID R MENTION ONLY FIVE FRIENDS OR WERE MORE FRIENDS MENTIONED?

- ONLY FIVE MENTIONED 1
- MORE THAN FIVE MENTIONED 2

B. Now let's go back and talk about (NAME). [REPEAT FOR EACH FRIEND]

Is (NAME) a member of your congregation?

NAME 1	NAME 2	NAME 3	NAME 4	NAME 5
Yes 1 (SKIP TO Q.4)	Yes 1 (SKIP TO Q.4)	Yes 1 (SKIP TO Q.4)	Yes 1 (SKIP TO Q.4)	Yes 1 (SKIP TO Q.4)
No 2	No 2	No 2	No 2	No 2
I DON'T BELONG TO ANY CONGREGATION 3	I DON'T BELONG TO ANY CONGREGATION 3	I DON'T BELONG TO ANY CONGREGATION 3	I DON'T BELONG TO ANY CONGREGATION 3	I DON'T BELONG TO ANY CONGREGATION 3
DON'T KNOW 8	DON'T KNOW 8	DON'T KNOW 8	DON'T KNOW 8	DON'T KNOW 8

2. What is (NAME'S) religious preference? Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion or no religion?
3. What specific denomination is that, if any? (INTERVIEWER: PROBE FOR COMPLETE NAME OF DENOMINATION)
4. Is (NAME) Asian, Black, Hispanic, White or something else?

NAME 1	NAME 2	NAME 3	NAME 4	NAME 5
Asian 1	Asian 1	Asian 1	Asian 1	Asian 1
Black 2	Black 2	Black 2	Black 2	Black 2
Hispanic 3	Hispanic 3	Hispanic 3	Hispanic 3	Hispanic 3
White 4	White 4	White 4	White 4	White 4
Something else 5 (SPECIFY)_____	Something else 5 (SPECIFY)_____	Something else 5 (SPECIFY)_____	Something else 5 (SPECIFY)_____	Something else 5 (SPECIFY)_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

References

- Anderson, Barbara A.; Silver, Brian D.; and Abramson, Paul R., "Interviewer Race and Black Voter Participation," Public Opinion Quarterly, 52 (Spring, 1998a), 53-83.
- Anderson, Barbara A.; Silver, Brian D.; and Abramson, Paul R., "Interviewer Race and Attitudes of Blacks," Public Opinion Quarterly, 52 (Fall, 1998b), 289-324.
- Belanger, S. and Pinard, M., "Ethnic Movements and the Competition Model: Some Missing Links," American Sociological Review, 56 (1991), 446-457.
- Desforges, Donna M.; Lord, Charles G.; Shawna, L. Ramsey; Mason, Julie A.; Van Leeuwen, Marilyn D.; West Sylvia C.; and Lepper, Mark P., "Effects of Structured Cooperative Contact on Changing Negative Attitudes toward Stigmatized Social Groups," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60 (1991), 531-544.
- Ellison, Christopher G. and Powers, Daniel A., "The Contact Hypothesis and Racial Attitudes among Black Americans," Social Science Quarterly, 75 (June, 1994), 385-400.
- Ford, W. Scott, "Favorable Intergroup Contact May Not Reduce Prejudice: Inconclusive Journal Evidence, 1960-1984," Sociology and Social Research, 70 (1986), 256-258.
- Hamberger, Jurgen and Hewstone, Miles, "Inter-ethnic Contact as a Predictor of Blatant and Subtle Prejudice: Tests of a Model in Four West European Nations," British Journal of Social Psychology, 36 (June, 1997), 173-190.
- Jackman, Mary R., The Velvet Glove: Paternalism and Conflict in Gender, Class, and Race Relations. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Jackman, Mary R. and Crane, Marie, "'Some of My Best Friends Are Black...': Interracial Friendship and White Racial Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, 50 (Winter, 1986), 459-486.
- Krysan, Maria, "Privacy and the Expression of White Racial Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, 62 (Winter, 1998), 506-544.
- McCutcheon, Allan L., "Racial Differences in Survey Validity," Unpublished report, 1987.
- Patchen, Martin, "Beyond 'Prejudice' and 'Racism': Subjective Determinants of Behavior towards Outgroups," Paper presented to the American Sociological Association, Los Angeles, August, 1994.

- Powers, Daniel A. and Ellison, Christopher G., "Interracial Contact and Black Racial Attitudes: The Contact Hypothesis and Selectivity Bias," Social Forces, 74 (September, 1995), 205-226.
- Ramirez, Albert and Soriano, Fernando I., "Differential Patterns of Intra- and Interethnic Interaction in Social Power Systems," Journal of Social Psychology, 122 (June, 1993), 307-316.
- Ray, John J., "Racial Attitudes and the Contact Hypothesis," Journal of Social Psychology, 119 (1983), 3-10.
- Riordan, Cornelius and Ruggiero, Josephine, "Producing Equal-Status Interracial Interaction: A Replication," Social Psychology Quarterly, 43 (1980), 131-136.
- Roberts, Robert E. T., "Black-White Intermarriage in the United States," in Inside the Mixed Marriage: Accounts of Changing Attitudes, Patterns, and Perceptions of Cross-Cultural and Interracial Marriages, edited by Walton R. Johnson and D. Michael Warren. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994.
- Robinson, James Lee, Jr., "Physical Distance and Racial Attitudes: A Further Examination of the Contact Hypothesis," Phylon, 41 (1980), 325-332.
- Robinson, Jerry and Preston, James, "Equal Status Contact and Modifications of Racial Prejudice," Social Forces, 54 (1976), 900-924.
- Schaeffer, Nora Cate, "Evaluating Race-of-Interviewer Effects in a National Survey," Sociological Methods and Research, 8 (May, 1980), 400-419.
- Schuman, Howard; Steeh, Charlotte; and Bobo, Lawrence, Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Sigelman, Lee; Bledsoe, Timothy; Welch, Susan; and Combs, Michael W., "Making Contact? Black-White Social Interaction in an Urban Setting," American Journal of Sociology, 101 (March, 1996), 1306-1332.
- Sigelman, Lee and Welch, Susan, Black Americans' Views of Racial Inequality: The Dream Deferred. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Sigelman, Lee and Welch, Susan, "The Contact Hypothesis Revisited: Black-White Interaction and Positive Racial Attitudes," Social Forces, 71 (March, 1993), 781-795.
- Smith, Christopher B., "Back and to the Future," Sociological Inquiry, 64 (Fall, 1994), 438-455.

Smith, Tom W., "Context Effects in the General Social Survey," in Measurement Error in Surveys, edited by Paul Biemer, et al. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1991.

Smith, Tom W., "Research on Inter-group Contacts: Substance and Methods," Unpublished report, May, 1992.

Smith, Tom W. and Tourangeau, Roger, "A Proposal to Study Misreports of Sexual Partners by Men and Women," NSF Funded Grant, 1991.

Williams, Robin M., Jr., "The Sociology of Ethnic Conflicts: Comparative International Perspectives," Annual Review of Sociology, 20 (1994), 49-79.