

6

Ethnic Images and Social Distance Among Pacific Islanders in Hawaii¹

Dorri Nautu and Paul Spickard

Some people say Tongans are "hardworking and friendly,"² others that they are "morose, dour, . . . [and] quick tempered." The problem with Samoans, according to some, is that they are "hot tempered, ferocious, and arrogant, difficult to get along with." Some say they are "intimidating" or "irresponsible." On the other hand, some see no problems with Samoans at all, and say they are "family oriented, friendly, . . . [and] generous."

People who live and work in Laie, Hauula, and Kahuku, three villages on the Windward coast of the island of Oahu, thirty-five miles from Honolulu, hear phrases like these spoken almost daily. Their communities are cauldrons of mixed Pacific Islander ethnicity. These three towns are dominated demographically and culturally by Hawaiians, Samoans, Tongans, Fijians, Maoris, and other Pacific peoples, along with a smaller number of people from the United States mainland and from Asia.

The present study constitutes an attempt to understand some things about that mix of Pacific peoples. Specifically, the interest of the moment is in the images that various Pacific Islanders in Hawaii have of one another, and of the affinity for or distance from each other they feel. A team of researchers went house to house through the three towns, talking with people, passing out questionnaires, collecting them, and then tabulating them. The results are presented here.

Social Distance. The questionnaire employs a modified form of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale to test respondents' perceptions of social distance between themselves and other ethnic groups. The Bogardus Scale is a venerable tool of sociologists and

social psychologists, developed by Emory S. Bogardus of the University of Southern California over four decades, for measuring and comparing attitudes toward various minorities in the United States.³ The Bogardus Scale traditionally asks six questions (changed to seven for this survey), to determine the degree of intimacy or distance the respondents feel between themselves and the group about whom they are being questioned. The questions used in this survey are:

1. Would you marry a _____?
2. Would you have a _____ for a close friend?
3. Would you have several _____ families live in your neighborhood?
4. Would you work beside a _____ in an office or classroom?
5. Would you have a _____ casual acquaintance?
6. Would you allow a _____ to be a citizen of your country?
7. Would you allow a _____ to visit your country?

If a person answers yes to all seven questions, she receives a score of one. If that person says, no, she would not marry someone from that group, but yes, she would admit that person to all the other types of relationship, then her score is two. If she would not have a person from that group for a mate or a close friend, but would accept such a person as a neighbor, co-worker, and the rest, then the score is three. And so on down the list.

Ethnic Groups. The questionnaire asked the respondents to rate and describe twelve ethnic groups that are present in this part of Hawaii in at least small numbers. They are not the only groups here, but they include all the major groups and a sample of the rest. The groups about which respondents were asked are: Hawaiians, Koreans, Tongans, Caucasians, Fijians, Japanese, Samoans, Filipinos, Maoris, Blacks, Tahitians, and Chinese.

Images. The second part of the questionnaire tried to understand what lay behind the ethnic social distances expressed in

part one. It did this by employing an adjectival test to elicit images that the respondents had of each of the groups included in the questionnaire. That is, for each ethnic group, the respondents were asked, "Can you give me a few descriptive words that generally are true of _____?"

It is important that the reader understand the investigators' purpose in seeking out these images. Such a technique tends to call up stereotypes about the groups in question, not rational analyses of their character. The investigators did not ask people to call up these images because they are true. Stereotypes come from odd places and are frequently vicious. They testify more to power relationships between groups than they do to actual character qualities that members of a group may share. But nearly all people hold stereotypes about other groups of people, be they Tahitians or politicians or hockey players. Positive or negative, those stereotypes are the subtexts that undergird and shape our encounters, the lenses through which we see the people we meet, at least initially. It is important to know clearly what stereotypes people of various ethnic groups have of others. In this case, it is important to know what images Pacific Islander Americans have of each other.

Note, too, that this study does not focus on White Americans' views of Pacific Islanders, nor vice versa. It focuses primarily on the three largest groups of Pacific Islander Americans—Hawaiians, Samoans, and Tongans—and their images of other groups, in particular their perceptions of each other. Pacific Islander Americans are a diverse collection of peoples who deserve to be studied in their own right, not simply as foils for White Americans. From time to time in what follows the paper will comment on Pacific Islanders' views of non-Islanders, and on non-Islanders' views of Hawaiians, Samoans, Tongans, or other Pacific Islanders. But the main focus here is on these three Island groups and their interaction.

The Sample. The survey totalled 495 responses. One hundred thirty-six of the respondents identified themselves as Haoles (that is, Whites), 104 as Samoans, 124 as Hawaiians, forty-four as

Tongans, forty-one as Asians of various sorts, and twelve as other kinds of Polynesians. One hundred four of those who identified themselves as one sort of Pacific Islander or another also listed themselves as having a second or third identity on the basis of ancestry and inclination. At certain points in the analysis, that group is treated separately as Mixed Polynesians.⁴

Patterns in Social Distance Perceptions

Nearly all the people in this survey, of whatever ethnic group, expressed more positive attitudes toward all other groups than did people who have taken part in other social distance surveys in other places and times. The social distance numbers are distinctly lower (that is, they show less social distance between groups) in this study than in previous studies by other investigators—about 2.1 on the average, as opposed to about 3.0 in the other surveys.⁵ Except for Haoles (Whites) and some Samoans, it was very unusual for anyone in this survey to say anything really negative or stereotypical about any other group. Haoles were frequently more forthcoming with negative and stereotypical comments than the other people surveyed here. The reasons for these characteristics of the present study are a bit obscure, although it may be that Pacific Islander Americans are not given over to expressing negative prejudices as freely as are people from other groups. It may also be that the predominant ethos of the Hawaiian Islands, which stresses public expressions of interethnic harmony, may constrain people to say nice things. Finally, the lack of negative responses in this survey may also be related to the high percentage of Mormons among both researchers and respondents. It may be that members of this interracial religious community actually have fewer prejudices than do other sorts of people, or it may be that they are just less willing to express the prejudices they have.

Table 1 shows the social distance that the main groups surveyed expressed, on the average, toward all groups. Some groups—Whites and people of Mixed Polynesian descent—ranked almost every group highly. Other groups—Asians—ranked almost

Table 1
Average Social Distance Ratings
by Various Groups

Nearby	White	1.578
	Mixed Polynesian	1.756
	Hawaiian	1.840
Medium	Samoan	2.127
	Other Polynesian	2.177
	Asian Composite	2.240
	Tongan	2.294
	Japanese	2.463
	Chinese	2.484

n = 495

everyone fairly low. This pattern may testify to a generally open and accepting attitude on the part of Whites, or a consciousness of commonality with many peoples on the part of Mixed Polynesians, or a general sense of being cut off on the part of the Asian groups in these communities

On the other hand, the degree of social closeness may simply relate to the degree of a person's or a group's acculturation to America. Table 2 gives the birthplaces of the majority of our respondents, by their ethnic self-identification. Table 3 gives their citizenship. What leaps out immediately from these tables is that those groups who consistently rate other groups the closest—Whites, Mixed Polynesians, and Hawaiians—are most thoroughly American. Nearly all the Whites and all the Hawaiians are American-born, and 88 percent are U.S. citizens. Samoans in the sample, who rank in the middle on their overall social distance rating of others, are 49 percent American-born and 75 percent U.S. citizens. The Tongans surveyed, by contrast, expressed greater average social distance from all the other groups. Just 26 percent of the Tongan are American-born, and only 35 percent are U.S. citizens. A

Table 2
Birthplace

	Island/Asian Homeland	Hawaii	Total U.S.	Other	Total
White	0	21	119	8	127
Mixed Polynsn.	20	67	75	2	97
Hawaiian	0	114	121	0	121
Samoaan	46	35	48	4	98
Other Polynsn.	12	0	0	12	12
Tongan	27	10	10	1	38
Asian	14	15	17	1	32

Table 3
Citizenship

	Island/Asian Homeland	U.S.	Other	Total
White	0	126	4	130
Mixed Polynsn.	8	79	3	90
Hawaiian	0	108	0	108
Samoaan	20	69	3	92
Other Polynsn.	9	2	1	12
Tongan	23	13	1	37
Asian	8	20	0	28

reasonable interpretation of these data might be that those groups who have interacted the longest and most thoroughly with outsiders feel the least social distance in general. Tongans, like Asians, are toward the other end of the spectrum in the sample—not high acculturated, and rather high on social distance from other groups.⁶

Table 4
Ethnic Social Distance:
How Tongans Rank These Groups

	Group	Mean	SD
Close	Tongan	1.273	0.872
Nearby	Hawaiian	1.805	1.167
	Maori	1.897	1.501
Medium	Fijian	2.100	1.411
	Samoan	2.154	1.725
	Tahitian	2.256	1.860
	White	2.375	1.904
	Filipino	2.395	1.868
	Black	2.410	1.965
Somewhat Distant	Japanese	2.725	1.987
Distant	Korean	3.043	2.033
Distant	Chinese	3.184	2.264

Average social distance = 2.294
n = 44

Tongans' Perceptions of Their Neighbors

Table 4 shows the ethnic distance that the Tongans surveyed felt toward various groups. The survey suggests that Tongans living in these communities feel a strong kinship for Maoris and Hawaiians, and something approaching disaffection for Asians. Other groups—Fijians, Samoans, Blacks, Tahitians, and Whites—fall somewhere in between.

These conclusions are reflected in the adjectives Tongan respondents used to describe various sorts of non-Tongans. Tongans described Maoris as "good" and "nice looking and kind," but also said, "I do not like their accent." Tongans described Hawaiians, the other high-ranking group, as "generous," "kind-hearted," "happy and very creative, also friendly." All this suggests warmth and fellow-feeling for these two groups of Pacific Islanders.

The middle-level groups received slightly less enthusiastic Tongan endorsements. Of Fijians, one Tongan commented, "They do not care how they smell, but they are good people." Another said they were "funny"; another, "friendly and hard working"; another, "warrior and healthy." But another said of Fijians that they are "very loyal people, but always look down [on] my people." One Tongan liked Samoans a lot. She wrote: "They're happy and friendly people, and I prefer them in many ways [to] my own people." Another Tongan, however, said that Samoans "are nice people only when they want to [be]." Others said Samoans are "wild, dangerous," and "cause too much trouble."

The Tongan image of African Americans was quite indistinct, which makes sense, for there are very few people of African descent in Tonga, and not many more in Hawaii. Those who responded gave neutral answers or called Blacks "friendly" or "athletic." Tongan respondents also did not have much to say about Tahitians. Scattered respondents described Tahitians as "nice" or "relaxed" or "happy." Contrast that to White respondents, who remarked repeatedly about how "sexy" Tahitians were and what good dancers they were ("good *okole* [buttocks] shakers" is how one Haole described Tahitians). Tongans did not have a great deal to say about Filipinos. Some found them "friendly [and] hard-working," while others thought them "dangerous" (the latter is a common perception of Island Japanese, dating back to the 1920s, when Japanese and Filipinos worked together on sugar and pineapple plantations).

It was when they got down to Caucasians that Tongan respondents' comments began to slip into solidly negative territory. One Tongan called Haoles "very tight people." Another said that Whites "don't know when to mind their own business." A third

said that Whites "think they know better than others." A fourth called Whites "selfish and moneyhead." The Tongan respondents ranked the Japanese distant, but admired them for being "clean and smart," "rich," "innovative, hard-working, dependable," although several regarded the Japanese as "sneaky." To one person, Koreans were just "all right, but I don't really get along with Orientals." To others, however, Koreans were "respectful," "hard-working," "humble," and "one of the most polite people I know." The predominant image of Chinese was common not only to several Tongan commentators, but to respondents of other ethnicities as well. That image described Chinese as "hardworking [and] intelligent," but also "tight" and "sneaky [and] smart," as good at business, but "not giving" and "not appreciative." This last, the accusation of failing at generosity, is perhaps the unkindest cut a Tongan can administer to another human being. Altogether, this set of images and social distance choices suggests that Tongans in Hawaii feel considerable affinity for certain other Pacific Islander groups such as Maoris and Hawaiians; that they feel somewhat removed from other Pacific Islanders such as Samoans and Fijians; and that they feel quite distant from Whites and Asians.

Samoans' Perceptions of Their Neighbors

Table 5 shows the ethnic distance that the Samoans surveyed felt toward various groups. Hawaiians, Tahitians, and Tongans are the groups to which Samoans felt the closest. The Samoan respondents described Tahitians as "very easy people to get along with," "nice, friendly," and "good people." While there is not much clarity of definition in such an amorphously positive evaluation, it is worth noting that Samoans did not describe Tahitians with any of the sexual imagery that Whites used.

Samoans seemed to like and admire Tongans. A couple labeled them "aggressive," but far more used words like "humble," "hard working," "proud," "have a lot of love for others," and "culturally strong" that suggest admiration and fellow-feeling. That fel-

Table 5
*Ethnic Social Distance:
 How Samoans Rank These Groups*

	Group	Mean	SD
Close	Samoan	1.082	0.371
	Hawaiian	1.732	1.246
Nearby	Tahitian	1.763	1.155
	Tongan	1.844	1.364
	Maori	2.052	1.707
Medium	Fijian	2.130	1.491
	White	2.192	1.866
	Chinese	2.383	2.080
	Black	2.417	1.945
Somewhat	Japanese	2.543	2.019
Distant	Filipino	2.634	1.977
	Korean	2.750	2.123

Average social distance = 2.127

n = 104

low-feeling went so far that some said Tongans "are just like Samoans." Only a few repeated a joke among local Samoans that Tongans "eat dogs and horses.

Samoans had some of the same things to say about Hawaiians. To one, they are "no different from Samoans." Other responses stressed the "spirit of aloha," and the recent Hawaiian cultural renaissance, saying Hawaiians are "trying to find their identity" and are "proud of their ancestry." Several Samoans respondents described Hawaiians as "caring [and] kind-hearted." But others said they have "no ambition" and "think . . . highly of themselves."

This accusation of selfishness is common in Samoans' estimations of the groups who appear lower down on their social distance scale. Maoris were characterized as "too high maka maka—they act like Whites." Samoans admired Maoris for being "strong in their culture" and "family oriented," but resented them too, calling them "nosey, stuck up" and "judgemental of others." Whites were "intelligent [but] conceited, arrogant," "aggressive, snobbish." They are "forever trying to change things," "don't know when to mind their own business," and "tend to discriminate." Perhaps the worst accusation, given the emphasis on family ties in Pacific Island cultures, was the statement that among Whites the "importance of family is not always stressed." It was an unusual Samoan respondent who reminded herself that Whites "are human beings, too."

Despite their low placement on the social distance scale, Fijians held the respect of Samoans in ways that Whites did not. They were represented to be "very friendly," "quiet people," who "get along with other people [and are] cool and mellow." One went so far as to say that "if they need help they can be citizens of Western Samoa." Like Tongans, Samoans had little specific to say about African Americans. They repeatedly admired what they took to be superior Black athletic prowess, and also depicted Blacks as "straightforward, down to earth," and "oppressed."

Chinese were described many times as "smart," "hard workers," and "good business people." They were supposed to be "tight with money . . . disciplined." Japanese were, in stereotype, all the things that Chinese were, plus "rich"—the possessors of "too much money." Samoans had little to say about Filipinos except that they were "short" and "hard-workers." Samoans depicted Koreans in the same terms they used to describe Chinese and Japanese, except that several respondents added that Koreans "make great barbecue"—a common food in Hawaii.

This pattern of adjectives suggests that Samoans see most other Pacific Island peoples as similar to themselves and nice to have around. They see Asians as quite different from themselves, as much more able and energetic in academic life and business. But they show little resentment toward Asians. Their resentment is re-

Table 6
Ethnic Social Distance:
How Hawaiians Rank These Groups

	Group	Mean	SD
Close	Hawaiian	1.073	0.291
	Tahitian	1.462	0.970
Nearby	White	1.521	1.111
	Maori	1.667	1.443
	Japanese	1.982	1.528
Medium	Black	2.009	1.367
	Korean	2.009	1.592
	Tongan	2.017	1.631
	Chinese	2.043	1.528
	Fijian	2.070	1.474
	Samoan	2.112	1.855
	Filipino	2.113	1.599

Average social distance = 1.840

n = 124

served primarily for Whites and, secondarily, for that group of Polynesians—Maoris—whom the Samoans perceive as being the most like Whites.

Hawaiians' Perception of Their Neighbors

The social distance choices and patterns of images expressed by the Hawaiian respondents were similar at several points to those of Tongans and Samoans. Table 6 shows the ethnic distance that the Hawaiians surveyed felt toward various groups.

Hawaiians repeatedly stressed beauty when discussing Tahitians, although they did not combine that estimation with the sexual associations that so fascinated Whites. Hawaiians also des-

cribed Tahitians as "family oriented" and "close to Hawaiians in their lifestyle—relaxed." White, also perceived to be close on the social distance scale, were nonetheless quite a contrast in their alleged characteristics. Hawaiians said Whites were "aggressive," "boastful," "loud, overbearing, crass, crude, selfish," and "not to be trusted." A few Hawaiians represented similar Caucasian characteristics as being somewhat less obnoxious; they called Whites "independent, confident," and "smart, outspoken."

Unlike the Samoans, the Hawaiian respondents admired Maoris, for the most part. They said Maoris "have a lot of pride," a "strong sense of pride in their heritage." This may be related to the consciousness of many in Hawaii that Maoris in New Zealand have in recent years achieved a degree of political self-determination and cultural rejuvenation which Hawaiians would like to replicate. Maoris also were presented as "very articulate, sharp with the tongue," "verbal, blunt." The Hawaiian respondents listed Fijians rather far away on the social distance scale, but they did not think ill of them. They described Fijians as "family-oriented" and "energetic." The only negative adjective they used to describe Fijians was "primitive."

Unlike other groups of respondents, several Hawaiians drew a distinction between Japanese from Japan and Japanese from America or from Hawaii. Both were likely to be characterized as "polite and honest," "hard working," and "smart." But Japanese from Japan were likely to be called "rich and greedy," "workaholics," and "very pushy," while Japanese Americans were more frequently thought of as "friendly [and] nice." This doubtless reflects the fact that nearly all the Hawaiians surveyed grew up in Hawaii surrounded by Japanese Americans of the third and fourth generations, and could draw a distinction between Japanese Americans and Japanese from Japan. By contrast, many Samoans and most Tongans came to Hawaii as adults and knew Japanese only as foreign business people and tourists.

As with the other Pacific Islander respondents, Hawaiians tended to draw similar portraits of Koreans and Chinese as they did of Japanese: "quiet, industrious, business oriented," "smart," "studious," and "they know how to make money." Hawaiians' descrip-

tions of Blacks added skill at music and dancing to other Polynesians' admiration of athletic ability, and a few echoed the concern for Blacks' oppression.

Several Hawaiians referred to each of the other groups as "skinny" and "short." Each, that is, except Tongans and Samoans. These they described as "big and strong." But in other respects, Hawaiians drew a contrast between the two other major Pacific Islander groups. Several Hawaiians said Tongans were "more humble and smarter than Samoans." Others described Tongans as "friendly and [the ultimate Polynesian compliment] willing to give anything." A few Hawaiians did not like Tongans much, calling them "not trustworthy," and "ignorant," but these were the minority.

Contrast this relatively benign view of Tongans (and the relatively small social distance the Hawaiians expressed toward Tongans) with the somewhat greater social distance and much more negative images Hawaiians expressed toward Samoans. To the Hawaiian respondents, Samoans were "loud," "bossy," "headstrong, temperamental," "aggressive, intimidating." A few characterized Samoans as "generous" and "fun but lazy." One made a specific reference to community politics when she said that Samoans "think they own Laie, and can run all the Hawaiians out of this once beautiful community." Another called Samoans "troublemakers, proud, messy, dirty."

The Hawaiians surveyed, then, admired and felt kinship with Tahitians, Maoris, and Tongans. They respected but felt rather distant from the Asian groups. They expressed formal social closeness with Whites, compared to rather extreme social distance from Samoans. But they spoke vehemently against both these latter groups.

What Does It All Mean?

This study offers a rough measure of social distance, plus a catalogue of images. It suggests patterns of interrelationships between Tongans, Samoans, Hawaiians, and other groups. It does not, how-

ever, offer definitive explanations for how these attitudes came to be.

Tongans who live in Hawaii seem to view Maoris and Hawaiians as close kin, or at least as pleasant and compatible people. Other Pacific Islanders—Fijians, Samoans, Tahitians—they put at a somewhat more distant remove. They seem to perceive a rather significant barrier between themselves and Whites and Asians. About those groups, they do not have much that is good to say.

Samoans feel close to Tongans and other Pacific Islanders, with the exception of Maoris. They feel more distant from Asians, although they express little resentment toward Asians. Their resentments toward Whites, by contrast, are quite pronounced.

Hawaiians resent Whites too, but they resent Samoans fully as much, and they feel great social distance from Samoans. They express a similar pattern of admiring social distance from Asians to that described by Samoans. Hawaiians rank the other Pacific Islander groups except Fijians as more or less close and friendly.

An anomaly that appears in these data is the difference between the social distance expressed by each of these Pacific Islander groups toward Whites and the specific images of Caucasians they described. All three ranked Whites near the middle or higher on the social distance scale, yet all reserved their sharpest verbal barbs for Caucasians. It may be that the preponderant power of Whites, even in multiethnic Hawaii, leads Pacific Islanders to express strong resentments against what they see as domineering White attitudes. At the same time, when asked if one would marry a White person or have a White friend that same sense of White power may act as an attractant. One may say, in effect, "I don't much like the Haoles as a group, but if I could find one I liked, I might marry one."

Finally, a few words must be said about the Samoan perception of Tongans and Hawaiians as something like close kin. The Hawaiians and Tongans in the sample did not have as reciproc-

cally close a feeling for Samoans. Samoans ranked Tongans fourth at 1.884 and Hawaiians second at 1.732. Tongans ranked Samoans fifth at 2.154; Hawaiians ranked Samoans eleventh out of twelve at 2.112. The descriptions given suggest that Samoans tend to think of Tongans and Hawaiians as friendly, like-minded people. By contrast, Tongans see Samoans as somewhat more distant and not altogether attractive, and Hawaiians express a rather distinct resentment toward Samoans.

What may be the sources of these apparent disparities in mutual perceptions cannot be determined from the present survey, although hypotheses are easy to come by.⁷ For example, there is some suggestion in the data that local politics may have exacerbated Hawaiian resentment of Samoans. At least some Hawaiians in these Windward Oahu towns expressed a sense that their land and community had been invaded by more numerous and aggressive Samoans. If that be an accurate interpretation of Hawaiians' negative feelings toward Samoans, it is still unclear why the situation has not created a reciprocal Samoan feeling against Hawaiians. An inquiry into the sources of friction and of differences of perception between these Pacific Islander groups in Hawaii must await a future study.

Notes

¹The research for this article was undertaken with the assistance of Blossom Fonoimoana, Inoke Funaki, Karina Kahananui Green, Finau Hafoka, David Hall, Debbie Hippolite Wright, and Ina Nautu. The authors are also indebted to Ruth Latukefu, Keith Roberts, Franklin Ng, and Max Stanton for comments on an earlier version of the article.

²All quotations are from the questionnaires described below.

³E.S. Bogardus, "Social Distance and Its Origins," *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 9 (1925), 216-26; E.S. Bogardus, "Measuring Social Distances," *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 9 (1925),

299–308; E.S. Bogardus, *Social Distance* (Los Angeles, 1959); E.S. Bogardus, *A Forty Year Racial Distance Study* (Los Angeles, 1967); E.S. Bogardus, "Comparing Racial Distance in Ethiopia, South Africa, and the United States," *Sociology and Social Research*, 52 (1968), 149–56; R.L. Brown, "Social Distance and the Ethiopian Students," *Sociology and Social Research*, 52 (1967), 101–115; S.R. Crull and B.T. Bruton, "Bogardus Social Distance in the 1970s," *Sociology and Social Research*, 63 (1979), 771–83; James Dyer, et al., "Social Distance among Racial and Ethnic Groups in Texas," *Social Science Quarterly*, 70 (1989), 607–15; Louk Hagendoorn and Joseph Hraba, "Social Distance toward Holland's Minorities," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 10 (1987), 317–33; H. Lever, "Ethnic Preferences of White Residents in Johannesburg," *Sociology and Social Research*, 52 (1968), 157ff; C.E. Muir and L.W. Muir, "Social Distance between Deep-South Middle-School 'Whites' and 'Blacks'," *Sociology and Social Research*, 72 (1988), 177–80; M.G. Pass, "Prison Inmates Express Less Social Distance from Minorities than Do College Students," *Sociology and Social Research*, 71 (1987), 209–10; R.T. Schaefer, "Social Distance of Black College Students at a Predominantly White University," *Sociology and Social Research*, 72 (1987), 30–32; R.R. Sell, "International Social Distances at Egyptian Elite Universities," *Sociology and Social Research*, 72 (1987), 62–66.

⁴One hundred ten said they were men, 172 women. Two hundred eleven held U.S. citizenship. Fifteen were Tongan citizens, eight New Zealanders, seventeen Samoans, and the rest were citizens of various other nations or did not indicate their citizenship. One hundred six were born in Hawaii, another ninety-four on the U.S. mainland, forty-nine in the Pacific Islands, and the rest at various other points on the globe. Seventy-seven had not graduated from high school, twenty-eight graduated from high school and then did not go on to further schooling, one hundred attended some college, and seventy graduated from a college or university.

⁵See footnote 3.

⁶It should be noted that, while this may be a reasonable interpretation of the Tongan situation, it does not explain why the

Asian groups felt such considerable social distance. The Asian birthplace and citizenship data fell between the Samoans and Mixed Polynesians.

⁷One colleague has suggested that the Samoan-Tongan relationship may be a bit like the United States-Canada relationship. The larger, more powerful group may see the smaller (and, in the Tongan case, more recent to arrive on the scene) group as essentially "just like us." At the same time, the smaller group may draw rather more sharply their own distinction between themselves and their larger neighbor. Outsiders, in either the Canadian/American or the Tongan/Samoan case, may not be able to tell the groups apart and may wonder what all the fuss is about. While this analogy to North America has some attraction to it for explaining the mutual difference of perceptions between Tongans and Samoans, it does nothing at all to help us understand a similar—even sharper—difference of perceptions between Hawaiians and Samoans.