

SOCIAL CLASS IDENTIFICATION

SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS IDENTIFICATION
AND
OBJECTIVE SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

By
JOHN GOYDER, M.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy
McMaster University
November 1972

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1972)
(Sociology)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario.

TITLE: Subjective Social Class Identification and
Objective Socio-Economic Status

AUTHOR: John Goyder, B.A. (Bishop's University)
M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor P. C. Pineo

NUMBER OF PAGES: xii, 221

ABSTRACT

SUBJECTIVE SOCIAL CLASS IDENTIFICATION AND OBJECTIVE SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

by John C. Goyder

This study was concerned with investigating the weak relationship between objective measures of socio-economic status and self-perceived social class status, measured by the subjective class identification question.

Empirical tests were attempted of some of the factors frequently mentioned in the social class literature, but previously untested. Survey research data from both Canada and the United States were used here.

Factors such as methodological considerations, ignorance of class, or egalitarian ideology did not appear to account for the incongruences between subjective and objective class. But evidence was found that ego-involvement, or the difficulty people have in viewing themselves objectively, is an important factor in explaining this problem.

It was hypothesized that minority status would tend, among religious, racial and ethnic groups, to displace the socio-economic correlates of class identification. This did not occur uniformly. It was suggested that the use of objective socio-economic criteria for class identification is a

value shared most strongly by Jews and white Protestants, and less by Catholics and black Protestants.

In a longitudinal analysis, support was found for the hypothesis that the relationship between subjective and objective class becomes stronger during economic depression.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the helpful and conscientious guidance supplied by my supervisor, Peter C. Pineo. Thanks are due also to the other members of my thesis committee, Roy Hornosty and Charles Johnston.

For help with various aspects of the data processing, I would like to acknowledge the aid of Mrs. Lillian Giavedoni. Mrs. Marianne Bayley and John Stephens of the McMaster Computer Centre wrote recoding programs that were a great help in the study.

Pam Bryant of the Comparative Industrial Societies Programme helped me in locating data for secondary data analysis, and Frank E. Jones arranged, on behalf of C.I.S.P., the purchase of data for my use. The permission by Peter C. Pineo and John Porter to use the National Study data is gratefully acknowledged. Acknowledgement is due as well to the National Opinion Research Center Library, the Roper Public Opinion Center, and the Michigan Consortium for Political Research for making data available.

I would like to thank Marnie Goyder for typing the manuscript. For generous financial aid I would like to record my appreciation to the Ontario Government's Ontario Graduate Fellowship programme and to the Canada Council.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	20
II. SUBJECTIVE CLASS IDENTIFICATION IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES	27
Canadian/American Similarities	28
Comparison of the National Study with the Four City Study	39
The Perceived Criteria for Class Identification among Canadians	46
Summary	53
III. THE METHODOLOGY PROBLEM	55
Closed-Response and Open-Ended Class Identification Questions	55
Other Correlates of Class Identification	70
Summary	82
IV. THE EGO-INVOLVEMENT HYPOTHESIS	84
Ego-Involvement	85
Ego-Involvement and the Intensity Dimension	106
Summary	109
V. MINORITY STATUS AND CLASS IDENTIFICATION IN THE UNITED STATES	111
Minority Status and Social Stratification	112
The Data	117
Results	121
Summary	137

Chapter	Page
VI. MINORITY STATUS AND CLASS IDENTIFICATION IN CANADA	139
Results of the Replication	140
Measures of Particularism-Universalism	157
Summary	165
VII. THE DEPRESSION HYPOTHESIS	167
The Depression Hypothesis	168
Trends between 1945 and 1969	172
Trends among Protestants and Catholics	183
Summary	189
VIII. CONCLUSION	191
APPENDICES	201
BIBLIOGRAPHY	217

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
II-1	Class identification of respondents in the National Study (Canada) and the N.O.R.C. Study (U.S.), in percentages	30
II-2	Zero-order correlations of social class identification with measures of socio-economic status, for the National Study and the N.O.R.C. Study, excluding farmers	33
II-3	Class identification of respondents in the National Study and the Four City Study, in percentages	40
II-4	Zero-order correlations of class identification with measures of socio-economic status for male respondents in the National Study (excluding farmers) and all respondents in the Four City Study	42
II-5	Criteria for determining class membership, named by respondents in the Four City Study, in percentages	49
II-6	Assignment of occupational groups into social classes, by respondents in the Four City Study, in percentages	53
III-1	Class identification of respondents in the Four City sample, in percentages, for open-ended and closed-response class questions	58
III-2	Class identification of Hamilton respondents in the Four City Study, in percentages, to open and closed response class questions, and of respondents in the Hamilton Pretest Study to an open response question	60
III-3	Zero-order correlations of class identification with measures of socio-economic status, for the total Four City sample, Hamilton respondents in the Four City sample, and the Hamilton Pretest	62

Table		Page
III-4	Number of social classes perceived by respondents in the National and Four City Studies, in percentages	64
III-5	Strength of feeling of belonging to a social class, in percentages, for subjective classes in the Four City Study	66
III-6	Zero-order correlations of class identification with measures of socio-economic status, for the Four City Study, using simple and detailed class categories	68
III-7	Zero-order correlations and partial correlations controlling for income, of social class identification with consumer goods, for respondents in the Four City Study	73
III-8	Zero-order correlations, and partial correlations controlling for income, of class identification with other self-rankings, for respondents in the Four City Study	76
III-9	Zero-order correlations, and partial correlations controlling for occupation, of class identification with other self-rankings, for respondents in the National Sample	79
III-10	Zero-order correlations, and partial correlations controlling for occupation, of class identification with social characteristics of respondents in the National Study	82
IV-1	Social classes assigned by respondents in the Four City Study to themselves, their best friend, wife, father, and father-in-law, in percentages	90
IV-2	Zero-order correlations of class, as evaluated by respondents in the Four City Study, of themselves, their best friend, wife, father, and father-in-law, with occupation and education	95
IV-3	Class self-identification and evaluation of the class status of occupational groups, by occupation, for respondents in the Four City Study, in percentages	100

Table		Page
IV-4	Zero-order correlations of class identification with occupation, education, and income, for respondents in the Four City Study, grouped according to their strength of identification with a social class . . .	107
IV-5	Zero-order correlations of class identification with occupation, education, and income, for respondents in the Four City Study, grouped according to their perception of changes in class consciousness over the past 20 or 30 years	109
V-1	Percentage identifying with the Middle Class, and mean occupational status, for white Jews, Protestants, and Catholics, and black Protestants	122
V-2	Percentage of respondents identifying with the Middle Class, by occupational status, religion, and race	123
V-3	Zero-order correlations of occupation, education, and income with class identification (corrected for restricted range in the independent variables) for white Jews, Protestants, Catholics, and black Protestants	129
V-4	Zero-order correlations of occupation with class identification (corrected for restricted range) for Protestants and Catholics by country of birth and community size	135
VI-1	Percentage identifying with the upper/upper-middle, middle, and working/lower classes, for Protestants and Catholics in the National Study	141
VI-2	Zero-order correlations of class identification with measures of socio-economic status, by religion and ethnicity, for respondents in the National Study	145
VI-3	Zero-order correlations of class identification with measures of socio-economic status, by religion and ethnicity, for respondents in the Four City Study	150

Table		Page
VI-4	Zero-order correlations of class identification with self-ranking variables, by religion and ethnicity, for respondents in the National and Four City studies . . .	154
VI-5	Percentage distribution of responses to four universalism-particularism questions, by religion and ethnicity, for respondents in the Four City Study	161
VI-6	Inter-correlations of four measures of universalism-particularism, for respondents in the Four City Study	164
VII-1	Zero-order correlations of class identification with occupation, education, and income, by year of study	173
VII-2	Zero-order correlations of class identification with occupation and education, by age of respondent and year of study	181
VII-3	Zero-order correlations of class identification with occupation and education, for Protestants and Catholics between the periods 1945-56 and 1960-69, and by respondent's age.	184
VII-4	Percentage distribution of responses in the Four City Study to the question: "How conscious are people today of belonging to a social class compared to people 20 or 30 years ago?"	188
C-1	Correlations of male head's occupation with education, income, and father's occupation	215
C-2	Distribution of categories of selected variables in U.S. samples	216

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A	Fieldwork in the Four City Study	201
B	Four City Study questionnaire	204
C	Validity checks for the combined sample	213

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the consistent themes in theories of social class is the expectation of a close relationship between objective and subjective measures of class status.¹ We expect that people know where they belong in the class structure, and that they can identify their class according to the objective realities of this structure. Class "false consciousness", or self-perceived class that disagrees with objective status, is usually seen as a kind of deviant case that has to be explained by special circumstances.² Yet, this theory has proved very difficult to demonstrate empirically; in actual research situations, a surprisingly high proportion of people seem to report a class status that disagrees with the position they objectively belong in

¹The term "subjective" is intended to refer to those ideas coming from the individual, while "objective" refers to measures external to the individual. This distinction is considered in greater detail later.

²For instance, Barber refers to the "problem of 'false consciousness'" noting the importance of ideology which he says is "in fact somewhat 'distorted' views of social reality." See, B. Barber, Social Stratification (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1957), pp. 197-198. An interesting example of false consciousness in Canada is seen in Porter's discussion of "The Canadian Middle Class Image". See, J. Porter, The Vertical Mosaic (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), p. 5.

according to sociologists.³ The purpose of this thesis is to examine some of the reasons for this anomaly.

The expectation of congruence between self-perceived and objective social class is seen, by Marx and Engels, as a certainty in the long run. Their theory of historical materialism held that throughout history material economic conditions had determined all other aspects of life, including men's ideas. In industrial society it was argued that the characteristics of capitalism would necessarily cause a simplification of the class structure into two classes; the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.⁴ Those owning no capital, the proletarian working class, would become increasingly conscious of their class status as industrial working conditions worsened. At the advanced stage, according to Marxian theory, this rudimentary class consciousness would become translated into unified proletarian political action, so that ". . . the workers begin to form combinations (trade unions) against the bourgeois; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts."⁵

³It is assumed that sociologists do, in fact, accurately reflect reality, so that the objective categories used for classifying people do mark off levels of power, prestige, opportunity, etc.

⁴K. Marx and F. Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party", Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy, ed. L. S. Feuer (Garden City: Doubleday & Co. Inc., 1959), p. 8.

⁵Ibid., p. 16

The final stage, for Marx and Engels, is full revolutionary class warfare with the proletariat overthrowing the bourgeois ruling class.

Max Weber distinguished three types of stratification; class, status, and party. Class was the simple aggregation of people sharing similar objective opportunities for economic success due to their common position in a market economy.⁶ Unlike Marx, he did not insist on the inevitability of class consciousness which was congruent with objective economic position: "The rise of societal or even of communal action from a common class situation is by no means a universal phenomenon."⁷

Status groups, for Weber, were normally groups sharing some feeling of communality, and status in these groups could be based on any criteria that could be socially evaluated. Yet despite the conceptual possibility of non-economic criteria for status honour, Weber notes the high probability that these criteria will be based upon economic differentiation.

This honor may be connected with any quality shared by a plurality, and, of course, it can be knit to a class situation: class distinctions are linked in the most varied ways with status distinctions. Property as such is not always recognized as a status qualification, but in the long run it is, and with extraor-

⁶M. Weber, From Max Weber, ed. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 181.

⁷Ibid., p. 183.

dinary regularity.⁸

Weber also specified the non-political consequences of class more clearly than Marx. Without necessarily getting into class warfare on the political front, people might confine their social interaction to people of the same class.⁹ He noted, for instance, that families might exhibit their knowledge of their class standing by dancing only with families of the same class.

The assumption that people can categorize themselves accurately into different classes according to their objective economic status is seen in the functional theory of stratification. This theory, as proposed by Davis and Moore, holds that the need to fill different occupational roles is the basic determinant of stratification.¹⁰ They note, ". . . the main functional necessity explaining the universal presence of stratification is precisely the requirement faced by any society of placing and motivating individuals in the social structure. As a functioning mechanism a society must somehow distribute its members in social positions and induce them to perform the duties of these positions."¹¹

⁸Ibid., p. 187.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰K. Davis and W. E. Moore, "Some Principles of Stratification", Class, Status, and Power, ed. R. Bendix and S. Lipset (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 47-53.

¹¹Ibid., p. 47.

People performing functionally important occupational roles are rewarded with prestige which contributes to the "self-respect and ego-expansion" of the incumbent.¹² Consequently, a congruence is expected between the objective standing of an occupation, based on its functional importance and the amount of training it requires, and the social standing the incumbent attributes to it.¹³

Thus, although such theories as Marxism and functionalism are directly contradictory in many ways, with one predicting the eventual end of social class and the other postulating the universal functional necessity for inequality, they both assume that people have an accurate perception of their objective class status.

Even when social class is defined in purely subjective terms the expectation remains that objective conditions are closely linked with subjectively perceived class. This is seen in Richard Centers' work. He found the class conception of earlier scholars such as Marx unsatisfactory because of their failure to distinguish clearly enough between the objective and subjective components of class. He wrote, "Marx and his followers' usage of the word class in a dual sense is

¹²Ibid., p. 48.

¹³Ibid. This, of course, is because of the social nature of the self. Barber argues that the sharing of common criteria for ranking actually contributes to the integration of a society because, "Men have a sense of justice fulfilled and of virtue rewarded when they feel that they are fairly ranked as superior and inferior by the value standards of their own moral community." Barber, p. 7.

particularly unfortunate, for it appears to have begotten two opposing schools of thought, with a variety of compromises in between."¹⁴ Centers called the two schools the "subjectivists", who placed primacy in shared interests and consciousness of kind as the fundamental determinants of social class, and the "objectivists", who placed primacy in objective socio-economic criteria.

He argued that the objective and subjective components of class must be conceptually distinct. The objective component was called "stratum". This referred solely to the objective position resulting from economic differentiation. Social class, for Centers, was defined in strictly subjectivist terms:

Classes are psycho-social groupings, something that is essentially subjective in character, dependent upon class consciousness (i.e. a feeling of group membership), and class lines of cleavage may or may not conform to what seems to social scientists to be logical lines of cleavage in the objective or stratificational sense. . . . Class, as distinguished from stratum, can well be regarded as a psychological phenomenon in the fullest sense of the term. That is, a man's class is a part of his ego, a feeling on his part of belongingness to something; an identification with something larger than himself. 15

Yet Centers recognized that there was a high probability of coincidence between class and stratum, in that the

¹⁴Richard Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes (New York: Russell & Russell, 1961), p. 23.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 28-29.

subjective feeling of class membership was likely to be based upon objective factors. He called this his "interest group theory of social classes":

This theory implies that a person's status and role with respect to the economic processes of society imposes upon him certain attitudes, values, and interests relating to his role and status in the political and economic sphere. It holds, further, that the status and role of the individual in relation to the means of production and exchange of goods and services gives rise in him to a consciousness of membership in some social class which shares those attitudes, values and interests.¹⁶

The first serious attempt to demonstrate with research data that people actually do hold an accurate perception of their objective class status was made by Centers in 1945.¹⁷ He tested his interest group theory of class by interviewing a random national sample of 1097 white American males.

Assuming a high degree of technical competence in the sampling and completion of the interviews, the results of this

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Important work in the subjective aspect of social class was done, before Centers' study, in the early community studies. The principal exponents of this type of research were Robert and Helen Lynd, August Hollingshead, and Lloyd Warner and his associates. However, these studies did not deal with self-perceived class. Instead, they relied on a reputational approach where key informants would classify others in the community into classes. For details, see L. Warner, M. Meeker, and K. Eells, Social Class in America (New York: Harper and Row, 1960). There was research on class identification before Centers' study in 1945, but this was seriously flawed methodologically, and Centers' work was designed to correct this. See, H. Cantril, "Identification with Social and Economic Class", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38, 74-80.

type of survey can be generalized, with considerable confidence, to apply to the entire sampled population. The odds on the representativeness of the findings for the whole sampled population can be calculated statistically, and other things being equal, the random error decreases as the number of cases increases.

Centers measured subjective class (i.e. class as he had defined it) by means of a "class identification question". This question asked, "If you were asked to use one of these four names for your social class, which would you say you belonged in: the middle class, lower class, working class, or upper class?"¹⁸

Respondents in the study were also asked about their socio-economic status (such indicators as occupation, education, and interviewer's rating of wealth), their criteria for class identification, political attitudes according to a conservatism-radicalism battery, and assorted other attitudinal and factual items.

The results, published in The Psychology of Social Classes, showed that subjective class identification was, as expected, largely consistent with objective socio-economic status. Centers noted:

. . . facts are in essential harmony with the trend to be expected. . . People at opposite poles of the occupational order have such widely different class identifications that there can be no mistaking the

¹⁸Centers, p. 76.

fact that the members of the strata at the top of the occupational order, in overwhelming majority, declare themselves to be members of classes to which only small minorities of the lowest occupational strata will claim membership. The converse is equally true, or nearly so at least.¹⁹

Yet, although the predicted pattern held, there was also a considerable proportion of people who identified with classes that were inconsistent with their objective status. Cuber and Kenkel drew attention to this, noting, "Interestingly enough, almost one fourth of all people who chose the working class as their own were business, professional, or white-collar workers. This, of course, is a sizable minority."²⁰ One gets a clearer overall idea of the degree of coincidence between the objective and the subjective measures of class by calculating the strength of correlation between the two.²¹ In the 1945 study, the Pearsonian correlation

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 108-109.

²⁰J. F. Cuber and W. F. Kenkel, Social Stratification in the United States (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), pp. 258-259.

²¹Throughout this thesis, the Pearsonian product-moment correlation will be used as the measure of association between variables. Although most of the data does not fully satisfy the conditions required for this statistic, the current view in sociology seems to be that the violation of these conditions does not seriously affect the results. Parts of the analysis were replicated using Spearman and Kendall tau-beta rank order correlations, with no important changes in the findings. See, S. Labovitz, "The Assignment of Numbers to Rank Order Categories", American Sociological Review, 35, 515-524.

between class identification and respondent's occupational status was .54.²² Squaring this coefficient tells us that only 29 percent of the variation in class identifications can be explained by variation in occupational status.

Kahl agrees that while Centers' data did seem to indicate that both class consciousness and political attitudes are functions of occupational status, ". . . there is much causation left entirely unexplained after occupation has been accounted for, inasmuch as the correlations between occupation and the other variables, though significant, are not high."²³

Kahl and Davis compared the inter-correlations of nineteen measures of social class, including self-identified class.²⁴ Although their sample was quite small (N= 219) and covered only men living in Cambridge, Massachusetts, the large number of class measures included in the survey makes this data useful. Davis and Kahl found, as Centers had, that

²²This was calculated directly from the data set for the Centers study. Centers used tetrachoric correlations in his analysis of the data. These use less information than the Pearsonian correlation, as the variables are all dichotomized. They seem to have been frequently used in the pre-computer age. Tetrachoric correlation coefficients are generally higher than the corresponding Pearsonian correlations.

²³J. A. Kahl, The American Class Structure (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), p. 166.

²⁴J. A. Kahl and J. A. Davis, "A Comparison of Indexes of Socio-Economic Status", American Sociological Review, 20 (June, 1955), 317-325.

respondents' occupation and education were the two most important correlates of class identification.²⁵ Income (which was not asked in the Centers' study) was a surprisingly weak predictor of class identification in the Kahl-Davis data, the tetrachoric correlation being only .34.²⁶

Many of the other objective class measures also had only weak associations with self-identified class. These included: respondent's mother's education, interviewer's rating of residential area, census tract (rated by mean monthly rent), father's occupation, wife's education, and interviewer's rating of the house. However, the authors discovered that the occupational status of the respondent's friends was almost as important a predictor of class identification as the respondent's own occupation.

Lawson and Boek reported on research on mothers in New York State in which the inter-correlations of nine measures of class status, including subjective class identification, were analyzed.²⁷ The relationships between class identification and the objective class measures were even weaker in this data than in Centers' sample. However, Cen-

²⁵Ibid., p. 318.

²⁶Centers had an interviewer's rating of wealth, which correlated fairly strongly with class identification.

²⁷E. D. Lawson and W. E. Boek, "Correlations of Indexes of Families Socio-Economic Status", Social Forces, 39 (December, 1960), 149-152.

ter's finding that the male head's occupation was the strongest single predictor of subjective class was corroborated. Income, as in the Kahl-Davis data, was found to be only weakly correlated with class identification. Composite status indices such as the Warner Index of Status Characteristics (occupation, house rating, source of income, dwelling area) or the Hollingshead Index of Social Position (occupation, education, residential area) added little explanation of the variation in class identification that was independent of the respondent's occupation.

Haer was also interested in the relationship between objective and subjective class measures. He investigated the association between class identification and the Warner Index of Status Characteristics, using samples from Los Angeles, Spokane, and Tallahassee.²⁸ The problem, Haer noted, was that "Warner obtains a ranking of individuals in terms of a composite of objective socio-economic symbols, Centers in terms of verbal designations of affiliation . . . the social scientist well might ask whether the resulting labels are comparable".²⁹

²⁸J. L. Haer, "A Comparative Study of the Classification Techniques of Warner and Centers", American Sociological Review, 20 (1955), 689-692. The data for Los Angeles was collected by Centers, and his analysis is reported in, R. Centers, "Toward an Articulation of Two Approaches to Social Class Phenomena: II The Index of Status Characteristics and Class Identification", International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research, (Summer, 1951), pp. 159-177.

²⁹Haer, American Sociological Review, 20, 690.

The familiar pattern was found again in Haer's data. There was an association between objective and subjective class measures, but there remained a large amount of unexplained variation in the class identifications. Summarizing his findings, Haer wrote:

I.S.C. scores and identification responses for individuals in the three cities vary in such a way that I.S.C. scores indicative of high position generally tend to accompany identification responses indicative of high position. The coefficients of improvement, which represent the percentage of improvement in the prediction of identification responses gained through knowledge of I.S.C., were 46, 40, and 28 percent for the Los Angeles, Spokane, and Tallahassee samples respectively . . . the amount of improvement in each case is not large . . .³⁰

This problem has been a continuing interest for students of social stratification. One of the most recent studies on the relationship between subjective class identification and objective socio-economic status was carried out by Hodge and Treiman.³¹ They analyzed data from a national U.S. sample of 923 cases, collected by the National Opinion Research Council in 1964. Hodge and Treiman investigated the relationship of class identification with occupation, education, income, possession of capital, union membership, and the occupational status of friends of the respondent. The variables with the highest partial regression coefficients

³⁰Ibid., p. 691.

³¹R. W. Hodge and D. J. Treiman, "Class Identification in the United States", American Journal of Sociology, 73, 535-547.

with class identification were occupation of the main earner, and status contacts. These findings agreed with Kahl's conclusions regarding the importance of the status of friends of the respondent, although different measures, sampling population, and statistics were used in the two studies. Ownership of capital and union membership had only a minor relationship with class identification, after holding the other S.E.S. variables constant.

The multiple correlation of occupation, education, income, low status contacts, and high status contacts with class identification was .49 and the authors noted that this was " . . . a value which indicates that the five variables under consideration fall far short of a full explanation of patterns of class identification."³²

We can see, from these research reports, that Centers' findings in 1945 were not flukes. In fact, Centers himself did further studies which confirmed his earlier findings on the strength of association between subjective class identification and objective measures of socio-economic status.³³

³²Ibid., p. 547.

³³See, R. Centers, "Class Consciousness of the American Woman", International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research, 3, 399-408; "Nominal Variation and Class Identification: The Working and the Laboring Classes", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 45, 195-215; "The Intensity Dimension of Class Consciousness and Some Social and Psychological Correlates", The Journal of Social Psychology, 44, 101-114.

The "error" in class identification has frequently been attributed to problems in the self-identification question. It is generally conceded that Centers made an important methodological advance in the measurement of self-perceived class status. The earlier subjective class identification studies, by Fortune Magazine and Hadley Cantril, offered respondents only three class choices; upper, middle, and lower.³⁴ It was found that some 80 percent of the respondents chose the middle class, and this was interpreted by popular writers of the time as evidence of the classlessness of American society.³⁵ Centers noticed the inadequacy of the question in this form and changed the wording of the choices by adding "working class" to the set of possible replies.

With this modification, the majority of respondents in Centers' samples chose the working class.³⁶ Centers noted, "The answers will convincingly dispel any doubt that Americans are class conscious, and quite as quickly quell any glib assertions like Fortune's "America is Middle Class".³⁷

³⁴H. Cantril, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38, 74-80. For a summary of the Fortune results see, M. Strunk, ed., "The Quarter's Polls", Public Opinion Quarterly, (June, 1940), 351-352. The Fortune results showed 10.6 percent of the respondents chose the working or labouring class in the open-ended part of the question, but this choice was not offered in the closed-response version.

³⁵Cantril, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38, 74-80.

³⁶Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes, p. 76.

³⁷Ibid.

Despite this improvement in the question many reviewers of Centers' work remained dubious about the validity of a closed-response question administered in an opinion poll setting.

H. J. Eysenck argued:

. . . Centers takes as a genuine expression of firmly held opinion what a person says in a forced-choice type of situation. The error of this belief has been demonstrated by the present writer in his studies of social stereotypes, in which it was shown that a person's reply to a forced-choice question may be quite contrary to his true opinion.³⁸

Kornhauser expressed similar sentiments: "Grave doubts must be entertained about the adequacy and meaning of self-classification, based as it is on responses to a single simple check-list question the very form of which presupposes that people do think of themselves as belonging to a class."³⁹

Much of the empirical work that has followed The Psychology of Social Classes has been concerned with these methodological problems. Centers himself did further work in this area and reported on the results of two follow-up studies conducted in 1947 and 1948.⁴⁰ In this research he used two forms of the class identification question. In one version, the usual class choices, upper, middle, working, and lower, were offered, but in the other version the choice

³⁸H. J. Eysenck, "Social Attitude and Social Class", British Journal of Sociology, 1 (March, 1950), 56-66.

³⁹A. Kornhauser, "Public Opinion and Social Class", American Journal of Sociology, 55 (Jan., 1950), 339.

⁴⁰Centers, "Nominal Variation . . .," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 45, 195-215.

"labouring" was substituted for working. Fewer people chose the labouring than the working class, and those who did choose the labouring class tended to be more exclusively manual workers than respondents identifying with the working class.

Neal Gross showed that self-perceived class varies according to whether an open-ended or closed-response identification question is used. In his study in Minneapolis in 1950, Gross presented his respondents, at different stages in the interview schedule, with three forms of class identification question. These were, the Cantril form (upper, middle, and lower), the Centers form (upper, middle, working, and lower), and an open-ended form in which the respondents were first asked to name the different social classes in Minneapolis and then to indicate which one they belonged in.⁴¹ With the open-ended format, 34 percent of the respondents denied the existence of classes or else could not say which one they belonged in, but this total dropped to 7 percent using the Centers question. Also, only 11 percent chose the working class in the open-ended question, but 45 percent of the sample picked this class when it was suggested to them by the wording of the Centers question. Gross concluded:

These findings may be viewed as a documentation of the obvious but frequently forgotten proposition

⁴¹N. Gross, "Social Class Identification in the Urban Community", American Sociological Review, 18, 398-404.

that all scientific data and research findings are artifacts of the techniques employed by the investigator. It has been demonstrated that different class identification findings pertaining to the same population emerge from the use of different cues offered respondents in the interview situation.⁴²

In their Massachusetts sample, Kahl and Davis asked both an open-ended class identification question and a variation of the Centers question.⁴³ The results of the open-ended question differed substantially from the modified Centers question but agreed largely with Gross' results with the open-ended form. They found that 18 percent of their sample denied the existence of social classes or were unable to categorize themselves using the open-ended question, but the refusal rate dropped to 2 percent using the modified Centers form. Also, in the Cambridge data, the percentage choosing the working class was 14 percent with the open-ended form and 47 percent with the modified Centers form.⁴⁴

It has never been conclusively demonstrated, though, that objective class measures have a stronger association with the open-ended measure of class identification than with the closed-response question. Kahl and Davis seemed to feel that it made little difference, noting, "The closed answers provided more information than the open because they forced

⁴²Ibid., p. 403.

⁴³Kahl and Davis, American Sociological Review, 20, 323-324.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 324.

the common man group to sub-divide itself and the doubters to commit themselves. Yet these forced answers appeared consistent with the earlier free answers if interpreted with occupational data at hand."⁴⁵ Clearly, this methodological issue must be considered in any study of the relationship between objective and subjective class.

Other explanations frequently suggested for the relatively weak relationship between subjective class identification and objective class measures seem to dwell on three factors; egalitarian ideology, ego-involvement, and simple ignorance of class. These three factors recur in almost all of the commentaries and critiques of Centers' research. For instance, Gordon writes:

In view of the presence of the factors of ego-involvement and a cultural ideology which predisposes to avoiding or minimizing verbalizations of class differences in American society, self-identification as to class made in a poll-type interview may be safely calculated to be the least reliable method of ascertaining class structure, even psychologically defined On the one hand, some individuals will claim a class position or identification which represents only wish-fulfilment or fantasy and is sociologically and psychologically without much meaning On the other hand, some individuals of higher objective position, more inclined to be influenced by equalitarian ideology, and reluctant to divulge more valid status or class feelings may phrase their class affiliation in a poll study of this kind below their more intimately felt class position.⁴⁶

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 325.

⁴⁶M. M. Gordon, Social Class in American Sociology (Durham: Duke University Press, 1958), p. 197.

Similarly, Hodges argues: "Whether blinded by ideological biases, delusions, mobility aspirations, or simply ignorance, a significant minority tend to place themselves in class positions which are in marked contrast to their objective positions in the class hierarchy."⁴⁷

L. Reissman also notes these factors: "Self-evaluations do not always match the evaluations made by others. For various reasons, be they ignorance, bias, or delusions, some place themselves in a higher class than others would, just as some class themselves lower."⁴⁸

The Problem

Although class identification has been explored in other industrial countries, no research of this type has previously been done in Canada.⁴⁹ The first priority in this study was to investigate the subjective class structure in Canada according to self-identified class choices. Next,

⁴⁷H. M. Hodges, Social Stratification, Class in America (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1964), p. 87.

⁴⁸L. Reissman, Class in American Society (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1963), p. 141.

⁴⁹For an international comparison of class identification data, see, W. Buchanan and J. Cantril, How Nations See Each Other: A Study in Public Opinion (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1955). For more recent British data, see, M. Abrams, "Social Class and Politics", Class, ed. R. Mabey (Tonbridge: Tonbridge Printers Ltd., 1967); W. G. Runciman, Relative Deprivation and Social Justice (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966); D. Glass, Social Mobility in Britain (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954).

Centers' analysis of the relationship between objective and subjective class was replicated using Canadian data. It was found that Canada is similar to the United States both in the basic distribution of class choices, and in the strength of relationship between class identification and objective measures of socio-economic status.

However, it was intended to do more than simply replicate these class identification findings from U.S. studies. We have seen that, in the United States, it has become clearly established that the relationship between subjective class identification and objective socio-economic status is far from complete. And, it was shown that various things, such as poor methodology, egalitarian ideology, ego-involvement, and ignorance of class, have been suggested as explanations of this anomaly. Yet these have not been systematically evaluated with empirical research data. As Barber notes:

The social scientist abdicates his task if he does not study both class identifications and the class structure, looking always for the relations between these two independent variables . . . How many of these 'wrong' self-placements are the product of ignorance, how many of ideological distortion, we do not know, because survey studies have not tried to sort out their different sources.⁵⁰

This study attempts to fill this gap. It is shown in Chapter II that few people in Canada are ignorant about the meaning of class. They are able to name criteria for class position, usually specifying objective socio-economic

⁵⁰Barber, pp. 209-210.

characteristics such as occupation, education, income, or wealth. Also, they can accurately assign occupational positions into social classes. Thus, ignorance of class or egalitarian ideology do not account for the incongruence between objective and subjective class. The relative merits of open-ended and closed-response class identification questions are considered in Chapter III. It is demonstrated that objective S.E.S. is more strongly related to responses using the closed than the open question. Also, improving the detail of the closed question by adding categories causes no important increase in the strength of association between the objective and subjective class measures. Thus, it is concluded that the error in class identification cannot be explained by methodological flaws. Also, non-S.E.S. social characteristics are found to be only minor correlates of class identification.

In Chapter IV the hypothesis of ego-involvement is tested. These tests do lend some support to the hypothesis; there does seem to be a large amount of distortion and idiosyncrasy involved in self-evaluation.

The hypothesis that minority status displaces objective socio-economic status as a criterion for class identification is examined in Chapters V and VI. In Chapter V data from several U.S. studies are used to test this hypothesis. It is found that, as anticipated, minority status is a criterion for class identification among Jews and blacks, and to

a lesser extent, among white Catholics. However, contrary to the expected pattern, the relationship between objective S.E.S. and subjective class identification is found to be as strong among Jews as among white Protestants. It is only among blacks and white Catholics that minority status seems to cause a reduction in the strength of relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S.

It is suggested that the belief that self-evaluations of class status should be made according to universalistically applied, objective socio-economic criteria may be a middle class value shared by Jews and white Protestants, but not by white Catholics or by blacks.

In Chapter VI parts of this analysis are replicated using Canadian data. Here also, the relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. is stronger among Protestants than among Catholics. This holds for both English and French-speaking Catholics, although the correlations are lowest among the French. [An attempt to operationalize the universalism-particularism pattern variable indicates greater universalism among Catholics than among Protestants. This evidence supports the view that a close congruency between objective S.E.S. and self-evaluated class is characteristic of middle class culture.]

Trends in the relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. are examined in Chapter VII. It is hypothesized that the relationships are higher during

economic depression than during prosperity. Although some methodological problems are encountered in this analysis, it is tentatively concluded that there is empirical support for this hypothesis. The congruence between objective and subjective class is found to be highest among those who experienced the 1929 depression during their working careers. Thus, data from 1945-1969 indicate a decline in the relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S.

The main form of evidence used in this dissertation is survey research material. The main strength of this type of evidence is that it provides a picture representative of the whole sampled population, and comparison between studies is easy. A major weakness is that the respondents are usually contacted by "remote control" through interviewers or by mail. One learns only a small amount of information about each respondent and this can lead to over-simplification and false impressions. Data from both Canada and the United States are used. The "Four City Study" of Hamilton, Sudbury, Ottawa, and Hull (and a pretest in Hamilton, called the "Hamilton Pretest") were designed specifically for use in this study.⁵¹

The remaining data were drawn from other studies obtained for secondary analysis. The Pineo-Porter National Study of 1965 was used as an additional source of Canadian

⁵¹For details of fieldwork, see Appendix A.

data.⁵² Several American national samples were also used for secondary analysis. These were; the Centers Study in 1945, a N.O.R.C. Study in 1949, the Michigan Survey Research Center Election Studies in 1952, 1956, 1960, 1964, and 1968, a N.O.R.C..Study in 1964, and a Gallup Study in 1969.⁵³

To conclude, a note on terms. Throughout this introduction, and in the following chapters, terms like "error in class identification" or "accuracy in class identification" are used. It should be understood, of course, that this refers to a fallible conception of reality as perceived by the sociologist as an observer. It is certainly not the contention here that seemingly idiosyncratic class self-identifications are necessarily meaningless. The "definition of the situation" approach has proved its worth in sociology. A completely idiosyncratic class identification may be very important in understanding certain kinds of individual action. Yet there does seem to be justification for accepting, as a working assumption, the proposition that reality is objective and external to the individual and that social class is based

⁵²The permission of Peter Pineo and John Porter to use this data is gratefully acknowledged.

⁵³I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the National Opinion Research Center Library, the Roper Public Opinion Research Center, and the University of Michigan Consortium for Political Research in making these data available.

on objective S.E.S. differentiation.⁵⁴

Of course, the term "objective" can be confusing too. It is assumed throughout that the heart of this distinction between subjective class and objective class lies in the fact that subjective class identification comes directly from the individual, but that the objective measures of socio-economic status are derived from societal conventions. Strictly speaking, it may be argued that there is no such thing as objective stratification, for all stratification is based upon human differentiation and evaluation, and therefore stems from the consciousness of individuals. But, with Durkheim, we may consider the consensual rankings accepted by society over a long period of time as "social facts", having external objective reality from the point of view of the individual. In this sense, the ranking of, say, occupations in order of social standing forms an objective dimension of stratification.

⁵⁴In accounting for group behaviour, objective class seems to be the most useful. For instance, in a recent study Kohn found occupation to be the most effective variable in accounting for orientations and values. M. L. Kohn, Class and Conformity (Homewood: The Dorsey Press, 1969). A similar conclusion was reached by Haer. J. L. Haer, "Predictive Utility of Five Indices of Social Stratification", American Sociological Review, 2 (October, 1957), 541-546.

CHAPTER II

SUBJECTIVE CLASS IDENTIFICATION IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

This chapter describes the replication, using Canadian data, of some of the aspects of subjective social class identification that have become well established in the United States, but have previously been unexplored in Canada.¹ The distribution of responses, by two samples of Canadians, to a class identification question is shown, together with findings on the major socio-economic correlates of class identification, the criteria named by people as determinants of class status, and the perceived occupational composition of subjective social classes.

Data on class identification in the Pineo, Porter National Study (hereafter referred to as the "National Study") of Canadians are compared with corresponding findings from the N.O.R.C. Study #466, a national study of the United States

¹This Chapter and Chapter VI are expansions of a paper read at the annual meeting of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, June, 1971, at St. John's, Newfoundland. See P. C. Pineo and J. C. Goyder, "Social Class Identification of National Sub-groups", forthcoming in "Social Stratification in Canada", ed. J. E. Curtis and B. Scott (Prentice-Hall).

reported on by Hodge and Treiman.² This comparison is particularly useful as these are closely related studies, sharing many common elements in research design and content.³ There appears, from this analysis, to be considerable uniformity between the two countries. Attention is directed as well, in this chapter, to examining the congruency between the data in the National and Four City Studies. This comparison is important because the National Study is characterized by relatively high methodological rigour but only a small number of questions dealing with class identification, whereas the Four City Study is a less rigorous piece of survey research, but was designed specifically for the purpose of testing hypotheses about class identification. Reassuring congruence is found between these two Canadian studies, in the comparison of the common class identification data, raising confidence in the validity of the more experimental data in the Four City Study.

Canadian/American Similarities

A comparison is made here between the class identifi-

²For details on the fieldwork for the National Study, see P. C. Pineo and J. Porter, "Occupational Prestige in Canada", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 4, 24-40. The analysis by Hodge and Treiman of the class identification data in the N.O.R.C. Study appears in, R. W. Hodge and D. J. Treiman, "Class Identification in the United States", American Journal of Sociology, 73, 535-547.

³The National Study borrowed most of the research design from the N.O.R.C. Study. Both studies were mainly concerned with the public evaluation of occupational prestige.

cation data in the National Study and the N.O.R.C. Occupational Prestige Study of 1964 (hereafter referred to as the "N.O.R.C. Study"). The data shown here are from my secondary analysis of the National Study and the N.O.R.C. data.⁴

An identical closed-response class identification question was used in both studies. The wording was, "If you had to pick one, which of the following five social classes would you say you were in -- upper class, upper-middle class, middle class, working class, or lower class?" The responses to this question, for the two studies, are shown in Table 1. For both Canadians and Americans, the middle class was the most frequent choice, followed by the working class. Among the Canadians in the National Study, 49 percent identified with the middle class and 30 percent with the working class. In the N.O.R.C. sample of American respondents, the middle class was chosen slightly less frequently (by 44 percent) and the working class slightly more frequently (by 34 percent). However, the upper-middle class, chosen by 16 percent of the American respondents, was somewhat less popular among Canadians (chosen by 13 percent). A small proportion in each study (2 percent) chose the upper class or the lower class. The refusal rate on the class identification question, while

⁴Some of the data shown here differ slightly from those in the paper because only published results were available at that time, and in the secondary analysis the coding of some variables was changed, and farmers were excluded from the tabulations.

low in each sample, was minimally higher in the National Study (3 percent) than in the N.O.R.C. Study (1 percent).

TABLE II-1.--Class identification of respondents in the National Study (Canada) and the N.O.R.C. Study (U.S.), in percentages

	National Study	N.O.R.C. Study
Upper Class	2	2
Upper-middle Class	13	16
Middle Class	49	44
Working Class	30	34
Lower Class	2	2
Don't know	0 ^a	0 ^b
No such thing	1	1
No answer	2	0 ^c
N	793	923

^a3 cases.

^b2 cases.

^c3 cases.

The mean class position (scoring upper class equal to 1, upper-middle equal to 2, middle equal to 3, working equal to 4, and lower equal to 5) for respondents in the Canadian and in the American study is almost identical (Student's t in the difference of means test = .83, p .05).⁵ However, based

⁵These are the class means excluding farmers.

on a socio-economic index combining occupation of male head, education of male head, and family income, the American respondents hold significantly higher socio-economic standing. It appears, from this anomaly, that class evaluations are based on a national rather than an international frame of reference, so that Canadians judge their class status in relation to other Canadians rather than according to their standing in North American society as a whole.

In both the National Study and the N.O.R.C. Study it was possible to calculate the correlations of class identification with several socio-economic characteristics. These results are shown in Table II-2. In these calculations all farmers were excluded because it was impossible in the National Study to distinguish between farm owners and farm labourers, or between types of farm owners. This separation of

⁶The index was based on the proposition that if the single measures of S.E.S. have independent effects, the cumulative effect would show up in higher relationships involving the index than for single measures. Each variable was coded on four categories, and the values were added without weightings, giving a range of values from 3 to 12. In the National Study, the coding of occupation was; all professional and proprietary equal 4, clerical, sales and skilled equal 3, semi-skilled and unskilled equal 2, and farmers equal 1. The coding for income in the National Study was; income over \$8,000 equals 4, \$6,000 to \$7,999 equals 3, \$4,000 to \$5,999 equals 2, and \$0 to \$3,999 equals 1. The coding for education in the National Study was; post-secondary education equals 4, completed high school equals 3, two years of high school equals 2, and elementary school equals 1. In the N.O.R.C. Study the categories for income were identical, while those for education and occupation were equivalent but slightly different.

non-farmers and farmers in both studies follows Centers' usage in all his class identification studies.⁷ The data for education and occupation in each study do not necessarily pertain to the respondent. Respondents could be either male or female, and they were questioned both about their own S.E.S. characteristics, and those of their spouses. Variables pertaining to males and females were then constructed from the responses. For instance, the occupation of the male head constituted the occupation of male respondents or the occupation of female respondents' husbands.⁸

The coefficients in Table II-2 indicate that, as pre-

⁷Centers wrote, in the Psychology of Social Classes: "It has appeared sound practice, because of the great differences in conditions of life that obtain between urban and rural peoples, to note, nominally at least, a distinction between urban and rural strata in the tables and graphs. In a sense they almost constitute separate cultures, and mingling of the two samples might tend to obscure important differences in each". R. Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes (New York: Russell and Russell, 1961), p. 52.

⁸In the National Study, education was coded into 4 years of elementary or less, 5 years of elementary or more, 1 or 2 years of high school, 3 years of high school, 4 or 5 years of high school, vocational or technical school, some university, university degree, post-graduate degree or professional school. Income was coded in intervals of two thousand dollars, and occupation was coded into 9 socio-economic categories, described in Pineo, Porter, Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 4, 35. The education and income codes in the N.O.R.C. Study were virtually identical to those in the National Study, while the occupation codes for the N.O.R.C. Study were: Professional, technical and kindred workers; Farmers and farm managers; Managers, officials and proprietors, except farm; Clerical and kindred workers and Sales workers; Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers; Operatives and kindred workers; Service workers; Farm labourers and foremen; Labourers, except farm and mine.

dictors of class identification, socio-economic status characteristics are of similar importance in Canada and the United States. The collective effect of the three main indicators of S.E.S., male head's occupation, male head's education, and family income, when combined into the S.E.S. Index, produces a correlation with class identification of .42 in the National Study and .38 in the N.O.R.C. Study. This means that only about 18 percent and 14 percent respectively of the variation in class identification by respondents in the National and N.O.R.C. Studies can be accounted for by variations in the S.E.S. Index. Thus, the same pattern of a relatively weak association between subjective class identification and objective S.E.S. found in the United States appears to hold in Canada also.

TABLE II-2.--Zero-order correlations of social class identification with measures of socio-economic status, for the National Study and the N.O.R.C. Study, excluding farmers

	National Study	N.O.R.C. Study
Occupation of male	.38 (622)	.36 (780)
Occupation of female	.34 (463)	.34 (629)
Occupation of male's father	.18 (394)	.15 (500)
Occupation of female's father	.24 (402)	.26 (543)

TABLE II-2--Continued

	National Study	N.O.R.C. Study
Occupation of best friend of respondent	.40 (333)	a
Occupation of relative res- pondent feels closest to	.25 (275)	a
High status contacts	a	.27 (828)
Low status contacts	a	-.32 (828)
Income of family	.37 (637)	.31 (813)
Education of male	.35 (651)	.35 (790)
Education of female	.32 (620)	.26 (779)
Education of male's father	.33 (574)	.19 (603)
Education of female's father	.29 (566)	.20 (675)
Education of best friend of respondent	.36 (508)	a
Education of relative res- pondent feels closest to	.26 (550)	a
Index of occupation, income, and education	.42 (607)	.38 (757)

^aQuestion not asked.

The only measure of S.E.S. that is a significantly
(at the .05 level) stronger predictor of class identification

in one country than the other is education of male's father ($r = .33$ in Canada and $.19$ in the United States) but this exception is unimportant compared with the general pattern of congruency in the results for the two studies. However, it does appear that the relationships between class identification and S.E.S. are slightly stronger in Canada than in the United States. Comparing the coefficients in Table II-2, only one measure of S.E.S. predicts class identification more strongly in the United States than in Canada. In both countries, the correlation of class identification with male education is $.35$, but for the seven other measures of S.E.S., the relationships with class identification are stronger for Canadians than for Americans. This difference is probably too small to be of any theoretical importance.

In their analysis of the N.O.R.C. data, Hodge and Treiman found, as Kahl and Davis had previously, that the S.E.S. status of friends was an important predictor of class identification. Status contacts were measured in the N.O.R.C. Study by asking the respondents if they had any relatives, friends, or neighbours having jobs appearing in a list of eight occupations.⁹ The replies were coded into high and low status contact variables in the following manner:

⁹The occupations on the list were; Professionals, Businessmen, Farmers or Farm workers, Skilled craftsmen, Office workers, Unskilled workers, Sales people, Factory workers.

The high status contact variable was constructed by giving the respondent one point if he has any friends who are professionals or businessmen, a point if he has any neighbours who are in either of these groups, and a point for having any relatives in either of the groups. The low status contact variable was derived in a similar manner: the respondent receives a point for having any friends who are factory or unskilled workers and additional points for having any neighbours or relatives in these occupational categories.¹⁰

In my secondary analysis of the N.O.R.C. data, these two variables were constructed according to these instructions, and the zero-order correlations of high and low status contacts with class identification are seen in Table II-2. The multiple correlation of both high and low status contacts with class identification is .36, and Hodge and Treiman demonstrated the strong independent relationship between these variables and class identification, holding constant the respondent's own socio-economic status.¹¹

A different status contacts question was used in the National Study. Respondents were asked the occupation and education (as well as the gender, language, ethnicity, and religion) of their best friend, and the relative (other than their father, mother, husband or wife) that they feel closest to. It can be seen in Table II-2 that the socio-economic status of both the best friend and the closest relative have substantial zero-order relationships with class identification. Occupation of best friend, correlating .40 with class identifi-

¹⁰Hodge and Treiman, American Journal of Sociology, 73, 545.

¹¹Ibid., p. 547.

cation, is the most powerful single predictor in the Table. This strong relationship was diminished, but not eliminated, by the introduction of controls. The partial correlation of class identification with occupation of best friend, holding constant family income, and occupation and education of the male head, is .20, while the zero-order correlation of .25 between class identification and closest relative's occupation is reduced to .11 after partialling out occupation, education, and income.¹²

The creation of high and low status contacts variables in the N.O.R.C. data did not allow for the comparison of the relative strengths of the socio-economic status of friends and relatives in predicting class identification. To achieve this, in the secondary analysis of the data separate status contact variables were created for relatives, friends, and neighbours. The status of respondents' friends was

¹²There is a problem in calculating these partial correlations whether to include only the cases that are complete for each variable entering into the calculation, or whether instead to use the data that are complete for each pair of variables being inter-correlated. The decision can have an important effect on the value of the partial coefficient, if the refusal rate is high on one question, as was the case in the National Study for the best friend and closest relative question. The coefficients shown in the text are based on the cases complete on male occupation, education, and income, but incomplete on best friend's closest relative's occupation. If only the complete data for all five variables are used, the partial correlation of class identification with best friend's occupation holding constant male's occupation, education, and income is .17 while the corresponding partial between closest relative's occupation and class is .06.

measured by treating the incidence of a friend in each occupation on the list as a separate indicator. Respondents received a score of 1 if they had a friend in a particular occupation and a score of 0 if not, so there were eight separate indicators of the S.E.S. of friends of the respondent. The same method was used to create indicators of the status of respondents' relatives and neighbours.

The multiple correlations of class identification with the set of eight indicators of the socio-economic status of relatives, friends, and neighbours were .37, .38, and .34 respectively. It appears from this that the socio-economic status of relatives, friends, and neighbours is of roughly equivalent importance in determining class identification in the American data. The multiple-partial correlation of class identification with the eight indicators of relatives' socio-economic status, holding constant family income and male head's occupation and education, is .24. The independent effect of friends' S.E.S. with the same controls is almost the same, as a multiple-partial correlation of .26 was found between class identification and the eight indicators of friends' S.E.S., holding constant family income, male head's occupation and male head's education.¹³ Thus, although the

¹³The problem of non-responses was not serious in the calculation of these partials, as the response rate on the status contacts question was very high.

gross effect of best friend's occupational status on class identification was slightly weaker in the N.O.R.C. Study than in the National Study, the independent effect was somewhat stronger. It appears from this that while the status contacts question used in the National Study was less cumbersome to analyze than the N.O.R.C. question, the latter version was superior as a predictor of class identification.

It should not be too surprising that the level of awareness of objective, socio-economic class status is so similar in Canada and the United States. It is frequently held that modern industrial societies hold many important characteristics in common and the comparative study described here seems to indicate another case where this is true.

Comparison of the National Study with the Four City Study

The frequency distribution of class choices by respondents in the National Study and the Four City Study is shown in Table II-3. In both these Canadian studies the same question, described earlier, was used. These distributions for the two samples exhibit a degree of congruence that would not necessarily be assumed considering the methodological differences between the two studies. The National Study sampled Canadians from all parts of the country, using interviewers to collect the data, and a respectable completion rate of 64 percent was achieved. The Four City Study sampled only people living in Hamilton, Sudbury, Ottawa, and

Hull. Using a mailed questionnaire with telephone and post-card follow-up, the return rate was only 32 percent.¹⁴

TABLE II-3.--Class identification of respondents in the National Study and the Four City Study, in percentages

	National Study	Four City Study
Upper Class	2	1
Upper-middle Class	13	13
Middle Class	49	47
Working Class	30	27
Lower Class	2	0 ^b
Don't know	0 ^a	2
No such thing	1	4
No answer	2	5
N	793	1104

^a3 cases.

^b1 case.

The greatest divergence between the two studies occurs in the proportions declining the class identification question. The "Don't know" response rose from under one-half percent in the National Study to 2 percent in the Four City

¹⁴This is the percentage when people who had moved and were not traceable were excluded from the denominator of the calculation.

Study. Similarly, in the National sample the proportion affirming that there is no such thing as social class was only 1 percent of the total, but 4 percent of the Four City respondents chose this alternative. Outright refusals to answer the class identification question numbered 2 percent of the National sample and 5 percent of the Four City respondents. Altogether, 3 percent of the National Study respondents declined to categorize themselves in a social class, yet in the Four City Study this figure rose to 11 percent. It may be that the lower refusal rate in the National Study is due to the fact that the only choices offered the respondent when the question was read out by the interviewer were the five class labels, but in the Four City Study the declining options appeared in the questionnaire.

The zero-order correlations of class identification with measures of S.E.S. for the National and Four City studies are shown in Table II-4. As noted earlier, in all correlations in the National Study involving class identification and occupation, farmers are excluded. In the Four City Study this policy was not followed, as the occupations were coded into Blishen scores which have an accurate score for farm labourers.¹⁵ Farm owners were assigned their Pineo-

¹⁵For details on the construction of Blishen scores see, B. R. Blishen, "A Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada", B. Blishen et al., Canadian Society (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1969), pp. 741-754. In all the calculations in the Four City Study the first digit only of the

Porter prestige score (44.1) since there is no Blishen score for this category. The occupation question in the Four City Study was designed to allow the coders to distinguish between farm owners, workers on a family farm, and paid farm labourers.¹⁶ All the respondents in the Four City Study were males. In order to improve the accuracy of the comparison, the coefficients for the National Study were calculated for male respondents in the sample only.

TABLE II-4.--Zero-order correlations of class identification with measures of socio-economic status for male respondents in the National Study (excluding farmers) and all respondents in the Four City Study

	National Study	Four City Study
Occupation of respondent	.37 (298)	.42 (954)
Occupation of respondent's wife	.29 (182)	.28 (477)
Occupation of respondent's father	.10 (199)	.21 (868)
Occupation of wife's father	.19 (175)	.15 (688)

Blishen occupation scores was used. Education, in the Four City Study, was coded into years of formal education completed and income was coded in intervals of two thousand dollars.

¹⁶When Hodge and Treiman analyzed the N.O.R.C. data they coded occupation into Duncan socio-economic scores, which are the American equivalent of Blishen scores. With this coding they did not feel it necessary to separate out farmers from the sample.

TABLE II-4--Continued

	National Study	Four City Study
Occupation of respondent's best friend	.38 (233)	.31 (613)
Income of family	.37 (296)	.36 ^a (945)
Income of wife	b	.19 (426)
Education of respondent	.35 (300)	.37 (962)
Education of wife	.28 (269)	.22 (837)
Education of respondent's father	.20 (252)	.24 (733)
Education of wife's father	.28 (269)	.26 (627)
Education of respondent's best friend	.34 (232)	.27 (768)
Index of occupation, income and education	.42 (291)	.44 (904)

^aRespondent's income.

^bQuestion not asked.

The results in Table II-4 show a pattern of close congruence for the two studies in the strengths of the different socio-economic predictors of class identification. The relationships between class identification and respondent's education and income are almost identical in the two studies. Respondent's occupation correlates 5 points higher with class

identification in the Four City Study ($r = .42$) than in the National Study ($r = .37$). This may be due to the greater accuracy in measuring the socio-economic status of occupations in the Four City Study due to the use of Blishen numbers. The other socio-economic correlates of class identification generally hold equivalent strength in both studies. One exception is that the socio-economic status of the best friend of the respondent predicts class identification more accurately in the Four City sample than in the National Study.¹⁷

It was noted earlier that the Four City Study, unlike the National Study, is a wholly urban sample. Also, while the National Study achieved a completion rate of nearly two-thirds the attempted interviews, only one third of the questionnaires sent out to Four City respondents were returned completed. If people who are responsive to mailed questionnaires and who live in Hamilton, Sudbury, Ottawa, or Hull have ideas about social class that differ greatly from the rest of the Canadian population, it is probable that the data shown in Tables II-3 and II-4 would reveal substantial differences between the Four City Study and the National

¹⁷One possibility that seemed a likely explanation for this discrepancy was that Four City respondents were listing their wives as their best friends. However, when female best friends were excluded from the calculation, the correlation of class identification with occupation of best friend remained .31.

Study. As it was found that the two studies compare closely in the distribution of class choices and in the strength of the socio-economic correlates of class identification, it appears likely that the special characteristics of the Four City Study do not cause serious distortions in the results.

It does not follow axiomatically that the Four City results can be generalized to hold for the Canadian population, but the congruence between these results and those for the National Study, which is a better, though not perfect, estimator of the population parameters, is reassuring. The Four City Study was designed as a replication of the aspects of the National Study pertaining to class identification. But also it was intended that the Four City Study would collect some more unusual data on subjective social class. These data are important for the testing of some of the hypotheses discussed later, and if the basic results for the Four City Study agree with those in the methodologically more rigorous National Study, then there are grounds for hoping that the more experimental Four City data is reliable also.

The relationships between S.E.S. and class identification are similar in Hamilton, Sudbury, and Ottawa, but differ in Hull. For instance, the correlation of class identification with respondent's occupation is .44, .46, .46, and .28 in Hamilton, Sudbury, Ottawa, and Hull respectively. The low coefficient in Hull is due, as is shown later, to the high proportion of Catholics in that town. This is despite differ-

ing mean S.E.S. levels in the cities. The mean scores on the aggregate S.E.S. index (occupation, education, income) were Hamilton 6.90, Sudbury 7.46, Ottawa 8.15, Hull 7.03. Thus, the Ottawa sample had the highest mean S.E.S. and the Hamilton sample the lowest. The mean class scores were, respectively, 3.32, 3.23, 3.03, and 2.95 in Hamilton, Sudbury, Ottawa, and Hull. The congruence between the Ontario cities provides some evidence that if other Ontario towns had been substituted for the research similar results would have been found. Also, it seems likely that the criteria and standards for class identification extend beyond the municipal level. If this were not so, it would be expected that the correlations of class identification with S.E.S. would be higher in individual towns than in the sample as a whole.¹⁸

The Perceived Criteria for Class Identification Among Canadians

Centers was interested in learning the criteria the public themselves (rather than social scientists) perceive as

¹⁸Warner used towns as the unit of analysis, and although he argued that he selected typical American communities for his research, he recognized: "Class varies from community to community. The new city is less likely than an old one to have a well-organized class order; this is also true for cities whose growth has been rapid as compared with those which have not been disturbed by high increases in population from other regions or countries or by the rapid displacement of old industries by new ones". Haer found that, "The relationship between objective status characteristics and class awareness becomes closer with increases in size and, presumably, heterogeneity of cities". J. Haer, "A Comparative Study of the Classification Techniques of Warner and Centers", American Sociological Review, 20, 691. Clearly, the relation of city size and type to objective economic class consciousness requires more detailed investigation.

the factors determining social class status. In these investigations he used closed and open-ended questions, asking both the criteria determining membership in the respondent's own self-identified class and the criteria determining membership in other classes. The results from these different questions showed little agreement.

The closed-response question was, "In deciding whether a person belongs to your class or not, which of these other things do you think is most important to know: who his family is, how much money he has, what sort of education he has, or how he believes and feels about certain things?" Here, "beliefs and attitudes" was by far the most frequently mentioned (47.4 percent) criterion, followed by education, family, money. Yet, when respondents were asked, "What would you say puts a person in the middle class?", without being offered a list of responses, the results were quite different. Money and income was named most frequently (36 percent), and beliefs and attitudes was mentioned so seldom that it was not even coded. Similarly, the perceived criteria for membership in the working class were things like "working for a living", "manual, common, mill or factory work or labor", "lack of income" etc.

In the Four City Study, the question was made as simple as possible. Respondents were asked, "What things decide what social class a man belongs to?" and several lines were provided for the answers. Given the conflicting results from

the different questions used by Centers, this open-ended format seemed the best approach, since further validation of the closed responses seems necessary before this form can be used with any confidence. Also, by questioning the Four City respondents about the criteria for membership in social classes in general rather than just their own, it was hoped that franker responses would be expressed.

The first four class criteria written down by each Four City respondent were coded and the distribution of responses is shown in Table II-5.¹⁹ Of the 1104 respondents in the sample, 906 listed at least one criterion determining class. Income is the most frequently mentioned among the first class criterion named by the respondents, accounting for 22 percent of the first replies. Education was the first choice of 20 percent of the sample, followed by wealth (the first choice of 17 percent) and occupation (the first choice of 14 percent). The socio-economic criteria, income, education, wealth, and occupation, totalled 73 percent of the first choices. These results are consistent with findings from the Hamilton Pretest, using the same question. Here, 70 percent named S.E.S. criteria first.

The other first choices are split among a number of minor categories, led by "personal qualities" which refers to

¹⁹This set of categories was derived from responses to the same question in the Hamilton Pretest Study.

any personality traits such as honesty, courage, morality, etc.²⁰

TABLE II-5.--Criteria for determining class membership, named by respondents in the Four City Study, in percentages

	First choice	Second choice	Third choice	Fourth choice
Income	22	18	11	6
Education	20	19	11	10
Wealth	17	12	11	7
Occupation	14	15	10	11
Personal qualities	9	12	17	14
Family	5	3	7	9
Lifestyle	2	3	3	5
Social standing	2	2	2	2
Friends & associates	2	4	7	7
Residential area	1	3	5	6
Activities & interests	1	1	2	3
Clubs & associations	0 ^a	0 ^a	2	2
Other	5	7	12	18
N	906	637	555	409

^a2 cases.

²⁰Some of these minor categories are quite broad in meaning. For instance, "family" includes any reference to family name, upbringing, ancestors, etc. Responses that could not be classified in any of the other categories were coded

As one moves from the first criterion mentioned to the second, third, and fourth, the importance of the four socio-economic criteria steadily decreases. On the second choice, the socio-economic criteria accounted for 64 percent of the replies, yet this proportion slipped to 43 percent on the third choice and 34 percent on the fourth choice. In responding to the criteria question, the spontaneous response seems to be to list S.E.S. criteria and then on further reflection to name the subtler, non-socio-economic, criteria.

An anomaly in the data shown in Table II-5 is that the rank order, in terms of importance, of the S.E.S. class criteria does not correspond with the order resulting from the correlations of S.E.S. with class identification. Although the order for the first choices on the criteria question, in descending importance, is income, education, and occupation, the order seen in Table II-4, starting with the strongest predictor of class identification, is occupation, education, and income. While this may reflect an inconsistency between the criteria people state as determining class status and those they actually use in judging their own class, it is also quite possible that this anomaly is merely due to occupation being measured and coded with greater accuracy than education or income, thereby producing the highest correlation with class

as "other". Samples from this category are; language, what sociologists say, speech, appearance, chance, social awareness, being law abiding, etc.

identification.²¹

The finding that people appear to perceive socio-economic criteria for class status seems to render unlikely the hypothesis, noted in Chapter I, that the weak association between objective and subjective class is due to ignorance of class or an ideologically produced distaste for invidious class distinctions.

Another technique for learning the criteria people perceive as determining social class is to question them about the occupational composition of different classes. Centers explained the rationale for this method. "Because of the relative objectivity and intelligibility of occupational labels to the general public, and because it is so essential to determine the meanings of the respective classes in terms of some stratification index, it was decided to try to find out what the occupational composition of each class was."²² In Centers' 1945 study, the respondents were handed a list of occupational titles and asked which of them belonged in their own class. A clear pattern, based upon the manual-non-manual distinction, emerged in the responses. "The upper and

²¹In another question on class criteria used in the Four City Study, 58 percent of the sample thought a man's income was "very important" in determining his social class, 56 percent thought occupation was very important, and 52 percent thought education very important.

²²Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes, p. 78.

middle classes," wrote Centers, "comprise mainly the business and professional people, it is obvious, while the working and and lower classes contain mostly the manual workers."²³

This question was replicated in the Four City Study with slight modifications. The titles of occupational groups, rather than specific occupations, were used, and the Four City respondents were asked to say what social class people in each group belong to.²⁴ The responses to this question are shown in Table II-6. The results concur with Centers' finding that business and professional workers are placed in the middle and upper classes by most people, but the boundary, in terms of occupational criteria, between the middle and working classes is indistinct. Skilled labourers were placed in the middle or upper-middle class by 65 percent of the Four City sample, and in the working class by only 34 percent. Yet clerical and sales workers, the lowest status non-manual group, were categorized as upper-middle or middle class by 58 percent of the respondents and working class by 41 percent. This is an indication of how post-war affluence has eroded the validity of the traditional manual-non-manual distinction.

²³Ibid., pp. 79, 80.

²⁴Centers made these modifications to the question in his 1950 Study.

TABLE II-6.--Assignment of occupational groups into social classes, by respondents in the Four City Study, in percentages

	Upper	Upper- middle	Middle	Work- ing	Lower	N ^a
Professionals	57	38	4	0	0	1011
Owners or executives in large businesses	51	43	5	1	0	1011
Semi-professionals	2	29	60	9	0	1016
Owners or executives of small businesses	4	52	41	3	0	1014
Clerical and sales	0	5	53	41	1	1020
Skilled workers	0	8	57	34	0	1011
Semi-skilled workers	0	3	31	63	3	1017
Unskilled workers	0	0	7	64	29	1018

^aTotals vary because of non-responses.

Summary

In this chapter Canadian and American data on the distribution of responses to a class identification question and the socio-economic correlates of class identification were described. There is a close similarity, according to these aspects of class identification, between the Canadian National Study and the American N.O.R.C. national study of 1964. Closely matching results were found also between the Canad-

ian National Study and the Four City Study of people living in Hamilton, Sudbury, and Ottawa, Ontario, and Hull, Quebec. This was taken as a form of validation of the methodologically weak Four City Study.

It was discovered that respondents in the Four City Study most frequently named socio-economic criteria as determinants of social class status. Also, the Four City respondents were able to distinguish the class status belonging to various occupational roles. This analysis indicated that the line between skilled manual and lower white collar workers is becoming increasingly indistinct. Contrary to Centers' results, the Four City respondents ranked the class of skilled manual workers above that of clerical and sales workers.

These data on people's perceptions of the class structure suggested that people are knowledgeable about the nature of social class, and are willing to make invidious class distinctions. This seems to disprove the hypotheses that name ignorance or egalitarian ideology as reasons for the relatively weak association between subjective class identification and objective S.E.S.

CHAPTER III

THE METHODOLOGY PROBLEM

The data shown in Chapter II established that in Canada, as in the United States, the relationship between objective S.E.S. and subjective class identification is relatively weak according to theoretical expectations. Also, people seem quite knowledgeable about social class and willing to make class distinctions, so these factors do not seem to explain the weak relationship.¹

In this chapter, the possibility that poor methodology accounts for the incongruence between objective and subjective class is examined. As well, consideration is given to the possibility of other correlates of class identification besides the standard S.E.S. indicators used in the analysis so far. It is found that methodology apparently does not account for the incongruence between objective and subjective class and no other important objective correlates of class identification can be located.

Closed-Response and Open-Ended Class Identification Questions

It was seen previously that one of the strongest object-

¹Although no direct research on the ideology of class in Canada was conducted, this inference from the data seen in Chapter II seems to be the obvious interpretation.

ions to Centers' work, voiced by many of his critics, was his use of a closed-response class identification question.²

The objection was that the question in this form presupposes a public consensus on the number and the names of the social classes in a society. Offering the respondents set class categories encouraged the person feeling no identity with any social class to choose a class from the list frivolously. Research by Gross, Kahl and Davis, and others, demonstrated that open-ended class identification questions did result in a different pattern of responses from those produced from Centers' closed-response version.³

Both forms of the question were used in the Four City Study. First, the respondents were simply asked, "What social class do you consider yourself a member of?" After writing the name of the class in a blank space, the closed-response question was asked, with the wording, "If you had to pick one, which of the following five social classes would you say you

²See, for example, M. M. Gordon, Social Class in American Sociology (Durham: Duke University Press, 1958); L. Reissman, Class in American Society (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1963); H. M. Hodges, Social Stratification, Class in America (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1964); T. M. Lasswell, Class and Stratum (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965); B. Barber, Social Stratification (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1957); J. A. Kahl, The American Class Structure (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965).

³See Chapter I.

were in?"⁴ The choices were, upper class, upper-middle class, middle class, working class, and lower class. Also, two other choices, "don't know" and "there is no such thing", were offered. The open-ended responses were coded into these same categories. Eighty-seven percent of the open-ended responses could be fitted easily into the set categories, and the correlation between the two class identification questions in the Four City Study is .69.⁵

The proportion of respondents in the Four City sample identifying with each class, for both forms of the class question, is shown in Table III-1. These data concur with findings by Gross and by Kahl and Davis that the open-ended format results in a higher refusal rate, more frequent middle class identification, and less frequent working class identification.⁶

⁴For the layout of the questions in the Four City Study, see Appendix B.

⁵A response was said to fit well into the categories as long as it was at least a close synonym of one of the closed responses. Responses such as, "lower middle class" or "labouring class" would be considered easily codable into the set categories. A response such as "good class" would be rejected as uncodable. 78% of Pretest class choices fitted well into the categories.

⁶J. A. Kahl and J. A. Davis, "A Comparison of Indexes of Socio-Economic Status", American Sociological Review, 20, 317-325. N. Gross, "Social Class Identification in the Urban Community", American Sociological Review, 18, 398-404.

TABLE III-1.--Class identification of respondents in the Four City sample, in percentages, for open-ended and closed-response class questions

	Closed response	Open ended
Upper Class	1	1
Upper-middle Class	13	6
Middle Class	47	54
Working Class	27	16
Lower Class	0 ^a	1
Don't know, no such thing, no answer, uncodable answer	11	22
N	1104	1104

^a3 cases.

It appeared from the questionnaires for the Four City Study that some people were revising their responses to the class categories in the closed question. As well, everybody could see the closed categories and perhaps be influenced by them. It is difficult to calculate how serious this bias was, but it was probably a mistake to allow the two questions to appear in succession in the questionnaire. In the small pretest using Hamilton respondents, that preceded the fieldwork for the Four City Study, only the open-ended question was used. A comparison of the Pretest results with those for the Hamilton respondents in the Four City sample should give a more accurate picture of the different results produced by the two

types of class question.

Table III-2 shows the distribution of class choices for the respondents in the Pretest and for the Hamilton sample in the Four City Study. The figures for Hamiltonians in the Four City sample show responses to both forms of the class question. The most frequent working class identification was found among Hamiltonians in the Four City Study in answering the closed-response question. Working class identification was lower when these respondents answered the open-ended question, and considerably lower still for people in the Pretest sample. While recognizing the need for caution in interpreting percentages based on such small sample sizes, it does seem that there was a tendency for the responses to the open-ended question by Four City Hamiltonians to fall between the extremes represented by the responses to the closed question by Four City Hamiltonians and the "unbiased" results for the open version used in the Pretest. It appears likely, from this evidence, that the Four City respondents did tend to sometimes revise their answers to the open-ended question, taking the set categories in the closed question as their cue.

It has been argued that the open-ended form is, ipso facto, the valid one on the grounds that a list of set categories influences responses.⁷ If this is true, then the

⁷See, for example, Gross, American Sociological Review, 18, 403.

correlations of class identification with S.E.S. should be higher using the open-ended responses than with the closed-response replies. For one thing, the higher refusal rate on the open question should raise the correlations by minimizing random error caused by ignorance of class. This hypothesis was tested using the Four City Study and the Hamilton Pretest, and the results are shown in Table III-3. The correlations of class identification with five measures of S.E.S. were calculated for the whole Four City sample, using both forms of class question. The same was done for Hamilton people in the Four City sample only, using both forms of class question, and also for the respondents in the Hamilton Pretest.

TABLE III-2.--Class identification of Hamilton respondents in the Four City Study, in percentages, to open and closed response class questions, and of respondents in the Hamilton Pretest Study to an open response question

	Four City Closed response	Four City Open-ended	Pretest Open-ended
Upper Class	2	0 ^a	1
Upper-middle Class	8	6	5
Middle Class	45	50	54
Working Class	37	22	13
Lower Class	0 ^a	2	4
No answer, other, uncodable	9	20	22
N	253	253	157

^a1 case.

According to this test, the assumption that the open-ended format is necessarily superior to the closed version is not supported. Looking at the figures for the whole Four City sample, there is not a single instance where the correlation of class identification with a S.E.S. indicator is higher with the open-ended question. The greatest similarity in the results is in the correlation between respondent's father's occupation and class identification. With the closed question this coefficient is .21 and with the open question it is .20. The greatest discrepancy is in the relationship between class identification and the respondent's education, where the correlation equals .37 with the closed question but only .31 with the open form.

The superiority of the closed-response class question, according to this validity test, is seen even more sharply in comparing the Hamilton Pretest with the Hamilton respondents in the Four City sample. For the open-ended Pretest responses, the correlation of class identification with respondent's occupation is extraordinarily low, having a value of only .16. This coefficient is .44 for the Four City Hamiltonians, with the closed question. There are no obvious reasons for such a difference. The occupation question was asked in much the same way in the Pretest and in the main study, and there is no statistically significant difference between the occupational distributions for the two Hamilton samples ($\chi^2 = 3.98$, $DF = 5$, $p > .05$).

TABLE III-3.--Zero-order correlations of class identification with measures of socio-economic status, for the total Four City sample, Hamilton respondents in the Four City sample, and the Hamilton Pretest

	Total Four City		Hamilton Four City	Hamilton Pretest
	Closed response	Open response	Closed response	Open response
Occupation of resp. ^a	.42 (954)	.39 (839)	.44 (228)	.16 (117)
Education of resp.	.37 (962)	.31 (847)	.41 (223)	.23 (115)
Income of respondent	.36 (945)	.34 (832)	.33 (219)	.31 (119)
Occupation of father of respondent	.21 (868)	.20 (761)	.27 (208)	.20 (115)
Education of father of respondent	.24 (733)	.21 (656)	.27 (167)	.21 (109)

Figures in parentheses are the totals used in calculations.

^aIn both the Pretest and the Four City Study all respondents were male.

The closest congruence between the Pretest and the Hamilton section of the Four City sample is in the correlation of income with class identification. Using the open-ended responses in the Pretest, the coefficient is .31, while with the closed responses in the Hamilton Four City sample it is .33. One gets a very different picture of the relative importance of the socio-economic correlates of class identifi-

cation according to whether the open or closed form of the identification question is used. In the Hamilton Four City sample, the rank order of S.E.S. attributes according to strength of correlation with closed-response class identification is, occupation, education, and income. The order is income, education, and occupation according to the Pretest results.⁸ It may be that people's spontaneous reaction to the word social class is to think in terms of income differences, but when they are shown a list of class labels that includes the category "working class" they react instead in terms of occupational status.

The fact that the closed-response class identification question is stronger than the open question in relationships with S.E.S. does not necessarily mean that the particular closed question used is the best possible one. One test of the adequacy of the set class categories was to ask the respondents how many social classes they think exist. This question was used both in the National Study and in the Four City Study and Table III-4 shows the responses. There is close agreement between the two studies in the distribution of responses. The only noteworthy differences are the higher refusal rate for the Four City sample and the higher proportion of National Study respondents thinking there are more than

⁸The rank order using the open-ended responses of Hamilton people in the Four City sample was, occupation, education, and income.

eight classes in Canada. Perceiving a very large number of classes may be equivalent to perceiving none, in the sense that both responses reject the idea of a discrete set of social classes.

TABLE III-4.--Number of social classes perceived by respondents in the National and Four City Studies, in percentages

	National Study	Four City Study
None, no answer	13	19
One class	0	1
Two classes	4	3
Three classes	37	38
Four classes	16	14
Five classes	14	17
Six classes	6	4
Seven classes	1	2
Eight or more	10	2
N	793	1104

The modal response on this question, in both samples, was three social classes. This is consistent with the responses on the closed class question. In the National Study the three categories, upper-middle, middle, and working, accounted for 92 percent of all the answers, and they accounted for 87 percent of all responses in the Four City Study.

The inclusion of the extreme choices, upper class and lower class, seems justified by the fact that 30 percent of the people in the National Study and 31 percent of those in the Four City Study perceived either four or five social classes. Also, in evaluating the class status of occupational roles, respondents frequently used the upper and lower categories.

Another test of the adequacy of the choices in the closed class question is the strength of the feeling of identification people have with social classes. In the Four City Study, people were asked, "How strong is your feeling of belonging to the class you picked in question 35 above [the closed class question]?" The distribution of replies to this question, for each subjective class, is shown in Table III-5. Fifteen percent of those answering the question reported a very strong feeling of belonging to the class they had selected, 37 percent a fairly strong feeling, and 48 percent a feeling that was not at all strong. Richard Centers used this question in his survey in 1950. The American results from this national sample show a much greater strength of class consciousness than in the Four City Study. In Centers' sample 37 percent of those answering the question felt a very strong feeling of belonging to a class, 40 percent a fairly strong feeling, and 23 percent not at all strong a feeling.⁹ This

⁹R. Centers, "The Intensity Dimension of Class Consciousness and Some Social and Psychological Correlates", The Journal of Social Psychology, 44, 101-114.

could reflect either a Canadian/U.S. difference or a change in class consciousness over time.

TABLE III-5.--Strength of feeling of belonging to a social class, in percentages, for subjective classes in the Four City Study

	Upper	Upper- middle	Middle	Working	Lower	Total
Very strong	a	13	13	19	a	15
Fairly strong	a	40	34	40	a	37
Not at all strong	a	47	53	40	a	48
N	11	146	508	293	3	961

^aToo small to percentage.

It is clear from Table III-5 that among the Four City respondents, self-categorized working class people tend to have a stronger feeling of belonging to their class than those identifying with the middle or upper-middle class. Fifty-three percent of the middle class felt a not at all strong feeling of belonging to this class compared to a corresponding proportion of only 40 percent for the working class. Centers' figures agree with this tendency. These findings provide justification for the inclusion of the working class in the list of class choices in the class question. While people do not seem to readily name the working class in the open-ended class question, the high proportion selecting this class in the closed question and the strong feeling of belonging

to this class reported by these people, confirms that this label does articulate a feeling of possessing something other than middle class status.

One other method was used to test the legitimacy of the closed class categories. Respondents in the Four City sample were asked immediately after the closed class identification question whether they felt they belonged in the upper half or the lower half of the class they had picked. Eight percent of the sample declined this question, 29 percent could not specify which half they were in, 40 percent said they belonged in the upper half of their class, and 24 percent placed themselves in the lower half of their class. One would expect that with this refinement of the class question, the relationships between class identification and measures of S.E.S. would be stronger.¹⁰

In Table III-6 the correlations between class identification and S.E.S. attributes are compared using the simple and the detailed class code. The simple code consists of the five basic choices in the closed question. The detailed categories are; upper, upper-middle, upper half of middle, middle unspecified, lower half of middle, upper half of working, working unspecified, lower half of working, and lower.

¹⁰This is particularly so considering the large proportion choosing the middle class in the simple code.

TABLE III-6.--Zero-order correlations of class identification with measures of socio-economic status, for the Four City Study, using simple and detailed class categories

	Simple categories ^a	Detailed categories ^b
Occupation of respondent	.42	.44
Occupation of respondent's wife	.28	.27
Occupation of respondent's father	.21	.21
Occupation of wife's father	.15	.15
Occupation of respondent's best friend	.31	.32
Income of respondent	.36	.38
Income of wife of respondent	.19	.18
Education of respondent	.37	.36
Education of respondent's wife	.22	.23
Education of respondent's father	.24	.27
Education of wife's father	.26	.27
Education of best friend	.27	.27
Consumer index	.27	.29

^aSimple categories: Upper, Upper-middle, Middle, Working, Lower.

^bDetailed categories: Upper, Upper-middle, Upper half of middle, Middle unspecified, Lower half of middle, Upper half of working, Working unspecified, Lower half of working, Lower.

The results in Table III-6 show that the refinement of the class code in this manner adds only a trivial increase in the correlations. The correlation of respondent's occupation with class identification is .42 using the simple class code and .44 with the detailed categories. For most of the other relationships shown in the Table, the differences are only a point or two. In a few instances the detailed code is actually less effective than the simple one. For instance, the correlation of respondent's education with class identification is .37 with the simple code and .36 using the detailed code. It appears from this that attempts to improve the class identification question by adding more choices would not prove effective in raising the correlations between class identification and S.E.S.¹¹

Summing up, the pattern of class choices differs according to whether an open-ended or closed response question is employed. The refusal rate is typically higher on the open-ended version, with a smaller proportion selecting the working class than with the closed form. Relationships between indices of socio-economic status and class identification are stronger with a closed-response question than with the open-ended version. This is taken as evidence of the

¹¹The Michigan University Survey Research Center, in its series of election studies, has developed a similar detailed class code. This code also increases correlations of class with S.E.S. by only a small amount.

superior validity of the closed form for the purposes of this study. The set of categories used in the National and Four City Studies appear to be adequate. The number of choices offered are perceived as legitimate by a majority of the respondents, and the working class, the category showing the greatest differences in size between the open and closed question, is characterized by the strongest feeling of belonging by those choosing the class in the closed class question. Attempts to improve the accuracy of the set categories by asking respondents to specify whether they belonged in the upper or lower half of the class they picked produced only trivial increases in the strength of relationship between class identification and indices of socio-economic status.

Other Correlates of Class Identification

In U.S. studies, there has been no evidence of other strong correlates of class identification besides the standard objective S.E.S. indicators such as occupation, education, and income. Kahl and Davis found such things as interviewer's rating of house and residential area to be only weakly related to self-identified class. Centers investigated the relationship of class identification with a large number of social and economic indicators, finding none as important as occupational status.¹² However, in order to explore this possibil-

¹²J. A. Kahl and J. A. Davis, "A Comparison of Indexes of Socio-Economic Status", American Sociological Review, 20 (June, 1955), 318-319.; R. Centers, The Psychology of Social

ity in Canadian data some items thought to be potential correlates of class identification were included in the Four City Study questionnaire as "longshots".

One of these was a question in which the respondents were asked to say which items on a list of consumer goods they owned or rented. This question on consumption was intended partly as an alternative to the simple income question as a measure of wealth. Consumption is more than merely an indicator of objective wealth though. Veblen coined the term "conspicuous consumption" to denote, "specialized consumption of goods as an evidence of pecuniary strength" ¹³ The symbolic utility of consumer goods, as visible signs of wealth, meant that "conspicuous consumption of valuable goods is a means of reputability to the gentleman of leisure." ¹⁴ For Veblen, this norm of reputability symbolized by consumption was passed down, in industrial societies, from the "leisure class" to those beneath so that, "the observance of these standards, in some degree of approximation, becomes incumbent upon all classes lower in the scale." ¹⁵

Classes (New York: Russell and Russell, 1961), p. 203.

¹³T. Veblen, The Theory of the Leisure Class (New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1953), p. 60.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 64.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 70.

The correlations of each of these consumer articles with class identification are shown in Table III-7. Respondents were assigned the score 1 if they owned or rented the item and 2 if they did not. The coefficients range widely in value and the items having a correlation with class identification that exceeds the .001 significance level are, a second toilet, an automatic clothes washer, an electric clothes dryer, an automatic dishwasher, a second telephone, and a second car. People owning or renting any of these goods tend to categorize themselves in higher social classes than those who do not. The items having a very low correlation with class identification are those possessed by almost all of the respondents. For example, 91 percent of the sample possessed at least one flush toilet and this small variation resulted in a correlation of only .01 with class identification. The correlations are not merely a function of the rarity of the item however. Second flush toilet, possessed by 34 percent of the sample, had a correlation of .18 with class identification, yet colour television, owned or rented by only 26 percent of the sample, had a correlation of .10 with class.

The partial correlations of consumer items with class identification, controlling for income, are shown in the right hand column of Table III-7. While controlling for the effects of income lowers all the zero-order correlations, several of the relationships between class identification and consumer items remain statistically significant at the .05

TABLE III-7.--Zero-order correlations and partial correlations controlling for income, of social class identification with consumer goods, for respondents in the Four City Study

	Zero-order correlation	Income partialled out
One flush toilet	.01	-.02
A second flush toilet	.18 ^c	.06
Refrigerator	.02	-.03
Home freezer	.07 ^a	.01
Automatic clothes washer	.21 ^c	.12 ^c
Electric clothes dryer	.19 ^c	.09 ^a
Automatic dishwasher	.23 ^c	.11 ^b
One telephone	-.03	-.06
A second telephone	.28 ^c	.17 ^c
One black and white T.V.	-.01	.02
A second black and white T.V.	.11 ^b	.06
A colour T.V.	.10 ^b	.04
One car	.04	-.02
A second car	.16 ^c	.09 ^a
Consumer index ^d	.27 ^c	.12 ^c

^a $p < .05$ (one-tailed).

^b $p < .01$ (one-tailed).

^c $p < .001$ (one-tailed).

^dTotal number of the goods owned or rented.

level or better. Possession of a second telephone remains the strongest correlate of class identification. It is difficult to interpret the meaning of this. Although a second telephone is not expensive it is a luxury item that may be perceived as symbolic of "gracious living". We could expect that such indicators would be "fadish" and unstable in the long-run. For instance, some new form of communication may render a second (and first) telephone obsolete and then its value as a predictor of class identification would presumably disappear. From the relatively low correlations of the various consumer goods with income, it appears that consumption level is largely independent of objective wealth.¹⁶ At a modest level, consumption seems to function somewhat as Veblen visualized, as a symbolic indicator of aspired wealth and aspired social class.

Another approach to the problem of finding new correlates of class identification is the use of self-ratings according to other criteria than class. The Four City res-

¹⁶The zero-order correlations of objective income with the consumer items are; one toilet, .09; second toilet, .33; refrigerator, .13; home freezer, .18; clothes washer, .26; clothes dryer, .30; dishwasher, .35; one telephone, .07; second phone, .33; one black and white T.V., .04; second black and white T.V., .15; colour T.V., .17; one car, .16; and a second car, .20. The correlation of income with the aggregate score was .44. This is equivalent to the multiple correlation of income with all the consumer items. The score was derived by adding the number of items on the list the respondent rented or owned.

pondents were asked a subjective income group identification question: "If you had to pick one, which of the following income groups would you say you were in?" They were also asked to evaluate how cultured and refined they thought they were compared to other Canadians. A similar rating was requested on their honesty compared to other Canadians. This series of questions was included on the expectation that a subjective evaluation, such as class identification, might more accurately be predicted by other subjective self-evaluations than by objective socio-economic facts pertaining to the subject. One of the things this series of questions was designed to discover was whether people hold a unified self-conception or whether, subjectively, they can compartmentalize their self-evaluations into the various parts of their identity. That is, does a person who thinks he holds high social class status also see himself as ranking highly according to other criteria not necessarily related to class?

Table III-8 shows the correlation of class identification with the three self-rating criteria used in the Four City Study. They differ widely in their strength of association with class identification, indicating low subjective status congruence. Subjective income group identification correlates .54 with class identification, a figure higher than any of the correlations between class and objective S.E.S. indices. Self-rating on culture and refinement has a correlation of .29 with class identification, a coefficient easily signif-

icant at the .001 level with this sample size. On the self-rating according to honesty, however, the correlation with class identification is only .02, indicating no statistically significant relationship at all. The strength of income group as a predictor of class identification may be partly due to the use of categories very similar to those used in the closed-response class identification question.¹⁷ In that respect, people may perceive the two questions as being nearly synonymous.

TABLE III-8.--Zero-order correlations, and partial correlations controlling for income, of class identification with other self-rankings, for respondents in the Four City Study

	Zero-order correlation	Income partialled out
Respondent's rating of his income	.54 ^a	.42 ^a
Respondent's rating of his culture and refinement	.29 ^a	.22 ^a
Respondent's rating of his honesty	.02	.04

^ap < .001 (one-tailed)

¹⁷Cantril first used this question in 1941. In his study the correlation of income group identification with class identification was .49, while the correlation between objective income and class identification was .37. Cantril used a different class code, omitting the working class, and adding the choice lower middle. See, H. Cantril, "Identification with Social and Economic Class", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38, 74-80.

Subjective income group identification maintains its powerful association with class identification independently of the effects of objectively reported income. The partial correlation of subjective income with class identification, controlling for objective income, was .46. The relationship between self-rating on culture and refinement and class identification also retained most of its strength after controlling for objective income, having a partial correlation coefficient of .23.

From data in the National Study it is possible to gauge the strength of some other self-assessments as predictors of class identification. The respondents in this study were asked to rank a number of jobs in terms of their social standing. The preamble to this question began: "Now let's talk about jobs. Here is a ladder with nine boxes on it, and a card with the name of an occupation on each." The interviewers handed the cards to the respondents, who placed them at the top of the ladder if the occupation had the highest possible social standing, at the bottom if it had the lowest possible social standing, or at some position in between according to its standing in relation to the others. Once the cards had been arranged in different ranks on the ladder, the respondents were encouraged to review the entire array and make any changes they wished. This ladder ranking was also performed for a list of industries, ethnicities, and religions. Respondents were scored according to how they rated

the occupation and industry of the male head of their household, their fathers' job, and their own religion and ethnicity.

The zero-order correlations between these self-ratings and class identification are shown in Table III-9. Although these self-ratings were obtained by completely different methods from those described in Table III-8, they also produced some strong correlations with class identification. Respondent's rating of the male head's occupation and industry are the most powerful predictors of class identification, having correlations of .32 and .29 respectively, with class identification.¹⁸ The relationships between class identification and self-rating on ethnicity and on religion are not even significant at the .05 level. It can be seen also that the partialling out of objective occupational status had little effect on the magnitude of these correlations.

It has been clearly shown by students of stratification in Canada that according to objective criteria there are large differences, on the average, between Canadians of different religions and ethnic affiliations.¹⁹ Yet, for individ-

¹⁸The success of subjective industry rank as a predictor of class identification illustrates the advantage of subjective variables. It is very difficult to order types of industries into a scale of prestige, but by creating a purely subjective variable, this problem is avoided.

¹⁹J. Porter, The Vertical Mosaic (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1970).

uals, a person's self-evaluation of his ethnic or religious status appears to be unimportant as a determinant of his class identification. The superiority of the socio-economic self-ratings as predictors of class identification may be partly due to their perceived legitimacy as class criteria because they are essentially achieved attributes. People may deny the legitimacy of ascribed characteristics such as religion or ethnicity simply in conformity with North American achievement values, even though they can distinguish status differences along these dimensions.

TABLE III-9.--Zero-order correlations, and partial correlations controlling for occupation, of class identification with other self-rankings, for respondents in the National Sample

	r	Occupation partialled out	N
Respondent's ranking of his father's occupation	.18 ^a	.17 ^a	693
Respondent's ranking of male head's occupation	.32 ^a	.27 ^a	708
Respondent's ranking of male head's industry	.29 ^a	.24 ^a	339 ^b
Respondent's ranking of his/her ethnicity	.10	.08	345 ^b
Respondent's ranking of his/her religion	.03	-.03	344 ^b

^a $p < .01$ (one-tailed).

^bRanking task done by only half of the sample.

The findings seen in Tables III-8 and III-9 seem to suggest three conclusions. First, class identification does have substantial relationships with other subjective ratings. These vary widely according to the criteria for self-evaluation, and probably according to the methods and categories used in measuring the subjective variables. Secondly, the evidence available indicates a low level of subjective status congruence. The inter-correlations of the subjective variables are generally low.²⁰ Self-conceptions vary according to the criteria for evaluation. Thirdly, subjective socio-economic status is far more important than any of the other subjective variables in predicting class identification. The only non-socio-economic subjective indicator that showed any sizable relationship with class identification was the rating of culture and refinement used in the Four City Study.

For the final part of our search for new correlates of class identification we turn to objective non-socio-economic variables. Table III-10 shows the zero-order correlations, for the National Study, between class identification and a list of the common statistical social categories such as age, gender, ethnicity, etc. There is little relationship between class identification and any of these social variables. The

²⁰The highest correlation between subjective self-rankings used in the National Study was .48 between occupation and industry.

only variables in the list having a relationship with class identification that exceeds the .05 level of significance are community size and religious affiliation. In Canada, Protestants tend to choose higher social classes than Catholics, and people living in large communities attribute higher class status to themselves than those living in smaller communities. However, both are very weak relationships. From Porter, one might have expected a stronger association between religion or ethnicity and class identification. The discrepancy may be due to Porter's use of aggregated data, whereas individual data is used here.²¹ The political preference of respondents in the National Study was gauged by the question: "When it comes to politics, which political party do you usually support? That is, in federal elections do you (would you) usually vote for the Conservatives, the Liberals, the NDP, the Social Credit, or what?" In the National sample, supporters of the federal Liberal Party tend to select slightly higher social classes than supporters of the Conservative Party, but the correlation coefficient fails to meet the .05 significance level.²² None of these social characteristics have a significant relationship with class identification after occupational

²¹Ibid.

²²This concurs with findings by Alford on the low level of class voting in Canada. See, R. Alford, Party and Society (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963), pp. 250-284. The correlation between vote and occupation in the National Study was $-.02$.

status is partialled out.

TABLE III-10.--Zero-order correlations, and partial correlations controlling for occupation, of class identification with social characteristics of respondents in the National Study

Item ^a	r	Occupation partialled out	N
Gender	-.04	-.04	764
Religion	.11 ^b	.04	762
Country of birth	-.01	.06	764
Age	-.03	-.03	754
Mother tongue	.03	-.04	764
Community size	-.12 ^b	-.07	757
Political preference	-.09	-.09	470

^aThe coding of these variables was; Gender-- male, female; Religion -- Protestant, Catholic; Country of birth -- other than Canada, Canada; Age -- years of age in 10 year intervals; Mother tongue -- English, French; Community size -- farm, non-farm under 1,000, 1,000-10,000, 10,000-30,000, over 30,000 (non-metropolitan area), over 30,000 (metropolitan area); Political preference -- Progressive Conservative, Liberal.

^b $p < .01$ (one-tailed).

Summary

In this chapter, two sources of explanation for the incomplete relationship between class identification and S.E.S. were examined. First, the adequacy of the closed-response class identification was tested. It was concluded that this form is superior to the open-ended version for the pur-

poses of this study, and the closed class categories appear to be satisfactory, so far as we can tell. Secondly, other correlates of class identification were considered. The only variable proving to be a stronger predictor of class identification than objective S.E.S. was the indicator of subjective income group identification. Thus, the socio-economic basis of class identification was confirmed. None of the non-S.E.S. variables, either objective or subjective, predicted class identification as accurately as the standard objective S.E.S. indicators such as occupation, education and income.

CHAPTER IV

THE EGO-INVOLVEMENT HYPOTHESIS

Having tentatively eliminated methodology, ignorance of class, and egalitarian ideology as causes of the relatively weak association between objective and subjective class, attention is now turned to ego-involvement, the other cause frequently suggested in the literature on class identification.

This is the hypothesis that the essential cause of the incongruence between class identification and objective S.E.S. is the difficulty people have in viewing themselves dispassionately. According to this view people are more likely to rate the class status of others than their own class according to objective criteria.

The main test of the ego-involvement hypothesis uses data from the Four City Study. This is an indirect test, that compares the class evaluations people make of themselves with those they make of others. Some support is found for the hypothesis. There is evidence that people evaluate the class status of their friends and relatives somewhat more accurately than their own class status. And it certainly is true that they evaluate the class status of occupational roles more accurately than in their self-evaluations. According to data from the National Study, ego-involvement may distort the accuracy of other types of self-evaluation also. Thus, it is

suggested that ego-involvement in self-evaluations is a general tendency, that is not limited solely to class identification.

Ego-Involvement

"Ego-involvement" will be understood as a general term referring to the personal self-interests of the individual. It is not necessarily rational self-interest. Neither is it simple status maximization.¹ It will be assumed that this self-interest may be completely idiosyncratic so far as the outside observer is concerned. In accounting for incongruencies between objective and subjective social class, ego-involvement is clearly distinct from causes outside the individual. The factors discussed previously, such as cultural values, or the absence of a consensus on the meaning of the term class, are essentially external to the individual. Similarly, if people could not assign themselves in social classes because of insufficient differentiation of economic roles, this would also be a matter external to the individual.

The reason for ego-involvement is that the socialization process is not total. The degree to which the thoughts and actions of individuals are socially determined has been

¹For evidence that refutes the notion that people always enhance their status, see, M. Deutsch and L. Solomon, "Reactions to Evaluation by Others as Influenced by Self-Evaluations", Sociometry, 22 (June, 1959), 93-112. The tendency for high S.E.S. people to downgrade their class status suggests this also.

considered by symbolic interactionist theorists.

G. H. Mead was concerned with the social nature of the individual. He believed that it was a characteristic of the human personality, or "social self", that it could look at itself as an object. This capacity was indispensable for rational conduct and could only be achieved by the individual looking at himself as though he were another person. Mead said: "The individual experiences himself as such, not directly, but only indirectly, from the particular standpoints of other individual members of the social group as a whole to which he belongs."² These others, taken together, constituted for Mead the "generalized other" and he noted that "the attitude of the generalized other is the attitude of the whole community."³

Gerth and Mills refined parts of the interactionist theory, placing more emphasis on the conditions limiting the congruence between the self-image and the image held by the generalized other. They redefined the generalized other, stipulating that it did not necessarily stand for the whole society but instead could include only parts of the society.⁴

²G. H. Mead, On Social Psychology, ed. A. Strauss (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 201.

³Ibid., p. 218.

⁴H. Gerth and C. W. Mills, Character and Social Structure (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World Inc., 1964).

Within the context of class identification, this removed the assumption of a society-wide consensus on the criteria for social class position.⁵ Some people might internalize from their generalized other the view that class is determined by simple wealth, but others might hold that length of residence or family name were more important.

Another modification introduced by Gerth and Mills was the notion that, for adults, the self is partially autonomous. They wrote: "For the adult, it is more accurate to say that the attitudes and expectations of others facilitate or restrain the self-image."⁶ This autonomous self-image could be derived from interaction that took place in the distant past, and could conflict with present attitudes. A further factor which re-asserted the autonomy of the self was the ability of people to influence the selection of those who would be "significant others" or people having importance in the determination of the self-concept. While one's associates are partially determined by the institutional constraints of position and career, it is also easy to select as intimates those who reinforce one's self-image. Finally, Gerth and Mills pointed out the possibilities of simple mis-

⁵According to the Four City Study data on the perceived criteria for class, this is a more realistic position. Although the majority of respondents named S.E.S. criteria, some others named a variety of non-socio-economic factors.

⁶Ibid., p. 85.

interpretation of the attitudes of others to oneself.

With this elaboration of Mead's symbolic interactionist theory, making more explicit the limitations on a full societal determination of the self-image, it is easier to see the theoretical rationale for the ego-involvement hypothesis. As Gerth and Mills note, there remains considerable room for autonomous or semi-autonomous self-images.

It was not feasible to create a direct measure of "ego-involvement" and try to observe whether the amount of error in class identification varies according to the amount of ego-involvement. Even then, the test would not be conclusive if ego-involvement were found to be a constant quantity among all respondents. Instead, a comparison was made between the accuracy of the class evaluations people make of themselves and of others. Normally we would expect that ego-involvement would be greatly reduced in the evaluations people make of others. Thus, if the ego-involvement hypothesis holds, the class evaluations people make of others should conform more closely with objective S.E.S. than the self-evaluations of class status.

It is important to remember that it is being assumed that the societal class criteria are the basic objective socio-economic characteristics. According to the results shown in Chapter II, this is an accurate assumption. If there were no such consensus about these criteria, so that the determinants of class position were whatever anybody

wanted them to be, then the ego-involvement hypothesis would be meaningless and untestable. In fact, in such a case we would expect that people are most qualified to evaluate their own class status, and less qualified to evaluate others'.

In the Four City data, it was possible to compare the accuracy of self-evaluated class with the respondent's evaluations of his best friend's and relatives' class, and his evaluation of the class status of various occupational positions. The respondents were asked: "What social class would you say your best friend belongs to -- Upper, Upper-middle, Middle, Working, or Lower?" This question was repeated, asking the class of the respondent's wife, father, and father-in-law. They were also asked to report the respective occupations and educations. Table IV-1 shows the frequency distribution of responses to the four class evaluation questions, together with the respondents' self-placements into classes. This set of questions was somewhat experimental, not having been used in any previous surveys, but the distribution of responses was reasonable. As might be expected, the lowest mean class positions were assigned to the father and father-in-law of the respondent. This is consistent with the fact that they hold the lowest S.E.S.

Although it was feared that people might be sensitive about making these class evaluations about their most intimate "significant others" these fears proved groundless. The refusal rate on this series of questions was in each case

either the same or lower than the refusal rate on the class self-rating question. The two extreme classes, upper and lower, were used somewhat more frequently in the ratings of others than in the self-ratings. For instance, less than one-half of 1 percent of the respondents placed themselves in the lower class, but 5 percent placed their fathers in this class.

TABLE IV-1.--Social classes assigned by respondents in the Four City Study to themselves, their best friend, wife, father, and father-in-law, in percentages

	Respond-ent	Best friend	Wife	Father	Father-in-law
Upper Class	1	2	1	1	1
Upper-middle Class	13	18	11	11	8
Middle Class	47	50	51	28	37
Working Class	27	23	26	45	40
Lower Class	0 ^a	1	1	5	3
No answer, don't know	11	7	10	11	11
N	1104	968 ^b	976 ^c	1104	976 ^c

^a3 cases.

^bExcludes those not reporting a best friend.

^cExcludes respondents who were single or widowed.

Another apprehension was that the various class ratings might be too highly inter-correlated to permit a test of

the ego-involvement hypothesis. If the correlations of the classes assigned to friends and relatives by the respondents with the respondents' self-evaluated class had all been 1.00, then we would already know from the data shown in Chapter II that the strongest single predictor of any of these class evaluations was respondent's occupation. Such a case would, of course, make the test of the ego-involvement hypothesis impossible. If self-identified class were governed by ego-centric, personal considerations, then this would be equally true of the other class ratings.

There was some reason to expect substantial inter-correlations among the various class ratings. It is widely held among sociologists that the family is the basic, indivisible, unit of social stratification. For instance, in Human Society Kingsley Davis writes:

With reference to the class hierarchy the family is a unit: its members occupy the same rank. This is because one of the family's main functions is the ascription of status. It could not very well perform this function if it did not, as a family, occupy a single position in the scale. Children are said to 'acquire their parents status,' with the implication that the two parents have a common status to transmit and the child gets this status automatically as a member of the family.⁷

This theory applies mostly to the wife of the respondent. The Four City sample was composed of working adults, who could be expected to be at least partly independent of

⁷K. Davis, Human Society (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1961), p. 364.

their parents's status. But a very strong association between the class assigned by the respondent to his wife and his self-identified class did seem likely. Although this was found to be a high correlation ($r = .66$) it may be surprising to some that it was not higher.⁸ Also, it is intriguing that the relationship between respondent's self-rated class and the class he assigned to his best friend was almost as strong ($r = .65$).⁹ In contrast, the class ratings of the respondent's father and father-in-law were more independent of the respondent's own class status, each correlating .39 with the respondent's class self-evaluation.¹⁰

The test of the ego-involvement hypothesis may be somewhat hampered by the strong association between self-identified class and the class assigned to the respondent's wife and best friend. As noted above, strong inter-correlations among class evaluations necessarily means that if ego-involvement influences the accuracy of self-evaluated class it also influences the other ratings. Of course, this is less likely to be a problem with father's and father-in-law's class

⁸As expected, when the sample was limited to full-time working wives only, this correlation was lower ($r = .63$, $N = 222$) rather than higher.

⁹This has some objective basis. The correlation of respondent's occupation with best friend's occupation was .52. The correlation between husband's and wife's occupation was .30.

¹⁰Respondents appeared to perceive greater class inheritance among their wives than among themselves. The correlation of the class assigned by the respondent to his wife cor-

as these have weaker correlations with respondent's class. This is not to mention the possibility of direct ego-involvement in the class evaluations of best friend and relatives. The status of people close to one is a part of one's own status.

It would have been desirable, had it been possible, to obtain class ratings of people who were not intimately associated with the respondent. The probability is that such ratings would be more independent of the respondent's self-rated class than those used here. Of course, very large technical problems would be associated with this kind of question.¹¹

Due to the possibility of ego-involvement in the rating of wife's and best friend's class (and to a lesser degree in the rating of father and father-in-law), the test used here was a conservative one. Another factor that makes this a conservative test is the probability of greater error in the reporting of the S.E.S. characteristics of friends and relatives than in the reporting of the respondent's own objective S.E.S. Other things being equal, one would expect, because of this error, to see greater idiosyncrasy in the class evaluations made by the respondent of the others than in his own

related .57 with the class assigned to the wife's father.

¹¹If distant relations had been tried, the non-response might have increased greatly, and the accuracy of reporting S.E.S. characteristics would probably have become unacceptably poor.

class identification.

Bearing this in mind, we find at least partial support for the ego-involvement hypothesis. Table IV-2 shows the correlations of the class ratings with occupation and with education. As expected, according to the ego-involvement hypothesis, there is a tendency for greater conformity with objective S.E.S. in the ratings of others than in the respondents' self-ratings. This is particularly true using education as the predictor of class. Here there is only one exception to the predicted pattern: the correlation of the respondent's wife's education with his rating of her class is .34, compared with a correlation of .37 between the respondent's education and self-rated class. When occupation is the predictor of social class there are two exceptions to the expected pattern. Respondents rely less on objective occupational status in evaluating their wives' ($r = .28$) and their fathers-in-law's ($r = .37$) class than in evaluating their own class status ($r = .42$). The other class evaluations are all more congruent with objective S.E.S. than the corresponding self-evaluation. The largest difference is between the correlation of father-in-law's class with his education ($r = .49$) and respondent's education and self-identified class ($r = .37$).

Although occupation is the better predictor of self-identified class, the respondent's evaluation of his best friend's and relatives' class appears to be more influenced by their respective educational achievements. This may be

due to high measurement error in ascertaining these occupations.¹²

TABLE IV-2.--Zero-order correlations of class, as evaluated by respondents in the Four City Study, of themselves, their best friend, wife, father, and father-in-law, with occupation and education

	r class, occupation	r class, education
Respondent's class	.42	.37
Best friend's class	.44	.41
Wife's class	.28	.34
Father's class	.44	.47
Father-in-law's class	.37	.49

The particularly low congruence between the respondent's evaluations of his wife's class and her objective S.E.S. cannot readily be explained. Some of the wives in the Four City sample worked only part time. It was felt that this might account in part for the weak relationships, but when the calculations were limited to full-time working wives, only trivial increases in the correlations resulted.¹³ It may be

¹²There was a high incidence of vague occupation titles given in response to these questions. We were forced, in coding the occupations, to accept a certain amount of guessing and estimation.

¹³In the Four City sample, 230 of the 976 wives worked full-time, and another 148 worked part-time. Among the full-time working wives, the correlation of the class

that Davis is correct in excluding wives from the stratification system, although with the increasing proportion of working wives in North American society, the validity of this assumption may be declining. The relatively high correlations between best friend's objective S.E.S. and his class status according to the respondent suggest that the high error in the evaluations of wife's class is not merely a statistical artifact of the error in self-evaluated class, in the sense noted previously.¹⁴

Because of the problems with the first test of the ego-involvement hypothesis, a second method was tried. The rationale was the same as in the first test, but this time self-identified class was compared with respondents' evaluations of the class status of various occupational roles. Thus, according to the same logic as used in the test described above, an affirmative test of the ego-involvement hypothesis required that less error be observed in the ratings of occupational roles than in the self-ratings.

It will be recalled from Chapter II that in the Four City Study the respondents were asked to categorize people having various occupational levels into social classes. The

assigned by the respondent to his wife with her occupation and education was .33 and .35 respectively. The strongest predictor of the wife's class (full-time working wives only) was her income ($r = .37$).

¹⁴It is interesting also, to recall that best friend's and wife's occupation predicts respondent's self-identified class with just about equal strength ($r = .31$ and $.28$ respect-

wording of this question was: "What social class would you say people in semi-professional jobs (such as commercial artists, librarians, T.V. announcers, Y.M.C.A. directors) belong to?" The choices were upper, upper-middle, middle, working, and lower. The question was repeated for the following occupational groups; clerical and sales, semi-skilled workers, owners or executives in large businesses, professional workers, owners or managers of small businesses, unskilled workers, and skilled workers. (For the layout of these questions, see Appendix B). Thus eight separate rankings were performed.

This question required of the respondents a consciousness of two aspects of the status hierarchy. First, the question assumed a consciousness of the relative ranks of the broad occupational groups used. Secondly, the question assumed that the respondents could distinguish different levels of class status. Of course, these assumptions were safe ones, given existing knowledge about the public ranking of occupational prestige, and prior research in subjective social class. If both assumptions had not been met, the question would have produced no clear pattern of responses.¹⁵ As it was, the respondents were able to differentiate

ively).

¹⁵The order of appearance of the occupation group titles was "scrambled" so as to disguise from the respondents our own expectations regarding the status ordering of the groups.

clearly the class status of people in the various occupational groups. This was seen in Table II-6 in Chapter II.¹⁶

When the occupations were arranged objectively, in the order they appear in Table II-6 of Chapter II, it was found that there was very little error in the class rankings.¹⁷ The correlation between the objective status of the occupational groups, and the class status assigned to them by the respondents, was .81.¹⁸ Recalling that respondent's self-identified class correlated only .42 with occupational status, we see here strong support for the ego-involvement hypothesis. This data suggests that, as predicted by the hypothesis, people do evaluate the class of others more accurately than their own.

This data was reorganized in order to show this same

¹⁶The mean social class scores of the occupational groups were; professional workers, 1.48; owners or executives in large businesses, 1.56; semi-professionals, 2.78; owners or managers of small businesses, 2.45; clerical and sales, 3.38; skilled workers, 3.26; semi-skilled workers, 3.65; unskilled workers, 4.21.

¹⁷The objective ranking (which is in fact a mixture of arbitrary decisions by the researcher and data from occupational prestige scores), is; professional workers, owners or executives in large businesses, semi-professionals, owners or managers of small businesses, clerical and sales, skilled workers, semi-skilled workers, and unskilled workers. This scale was taken with slight changes from one devised by John Porter and discussed in P. C. Pineo and J. Porter, "Occupational Prestige in Canada", The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 4, 24-40.

¹⁸Centers had a similar type of question in his 1950 sample, and these rankings also seemed to correspond with objective reality. See, R. Centers, "Social Class, Occupation, and Imputed Belief", The American Journal of Sociol-

result in a slightly different way, and in greater detail. This is shown in Table IV-3. The upper panel gives class self-identification by occupational status. Respondents' occupations were recoded to match the occupational categories used in the occupational rating question, but this caused only a slight change in the relationship between self-identified class and occupational status.¹⁹ The lower panel in Table IV-3 shows the rankings of the class status of occupations. In order to equalize the variance in the independent variable in the comparison, the data shown in Chapter II were rearranged slightly so that the class rankings of each occupational group by only those respondents having occupations within that group were used. For instance, the rankings of people in professional occupations were made by Four City respondents having professional occupations.

ogy, 58 (May, 1953), 546.

¹⁹The matching required some improvisation. For the "professional" category the following Census of Canada occupational classification codes were included; 101-109, 111-119, 121-129, 131-139, 140, 141, 145-147, 151-153, 161-169, 181, 184, 186, 188; the "large business" category included codes 001-010; the "semi-professional" category included codes 171-176, 142-144, 148, 149, 182, 183, 191, 192, 195, 196, 198, 199, 407, 431, 433, 455, 520, 541, 543, 581; the "small business" category was excluded; the "clerical and sales" category included codes 201-249, 301-339. To differentiate between skill levels of manual workers, it was necessary to establish arbitrary divisions using the Blishen numbers of the occupations, according to the following scheme: skilled workers, Blishen numbers over 35; semi-skilled, 30-34; unskilled, 29 or less. The correlation of class identification with occupation coded according to this scale was .44.

TABLE IV-3.--Class self-identification and evaluation of the class status of occupational groups, by occupation, for respondents in the Four City Study, in percentages

Occupational group	Class self-identification					N
	Upper	Upper-middle	Middle	Working	Lower	
Professional	2	29	65	5	0	125
Large business	0	30	60	10	0	162
Semi-professional	2	15	67	15	0	98
Clerical, sales	3	12	60	24	0	145
Skilled labour	1	9	52	38	1	168
Semi-skilled	0	4	38	58	0	175
Unskilled	1	1	31	65	1	81
Total	1	15	53	31	0	954

Class assigned to occupational groups						
Professional	46	51	2	0	0	127
Large business	39	54	6	2	0	166
Semi-professional	1	21	71	7	0	101
Clerical, sales	0	9	60	30	1	143
Skilled labour	0	39	44	16	1	176
Semi-skilled	1	2	36	59	2	175
Unskilled	0	0	13	62	26	86
Total	13	27	33	24	3	974

It can be seen that the seemingly idiosyncratic class identifications made by many of the respondents are almost non-existent in the ranking of occupational groups. For instance, 5 percent of the professionals identified with the working class, yet none felt that people in professional jobs belonged to this class. At the other end of the occupation scale, 31 percent of the unskilled labourers in the sample identified, contrary to our expectations, with the middle class, but only 13 percent of these unskilled labourers classified unskilled labourers in the middle class.

Another important contrast between these two sets of class evaluations is the greater use of the upper and lower classes in the stratification of the occupational roles question. Professionals and businessmen were frequently placed in the upper class (46 and 39 percent respectively), yet only 2 percent of the professionals and none of the businessmen actually classified themselves in this class. Similarly, we see 26 percent of the unskilled labourers saying that unskilled labourers are lower class, but only 1 percent categorizing themselves as lower class.

Comparing the total distributions of class choices, it can be seen that if people evaluated their own class in the same way that they evaluate others in the same occupational group as themselves, a different subjective class structure would result. Although the middle class would remain the largest single class, the working class would be

smaller, comprising only 24 percent of the population. The upper-middle and upper classes would be much bigger (27 and 13 percent of the population respectively), although the lower class would remain a very small class.

One problem with this test of the ego-involvement hypothesis is that the two types of class evaluation are not perfectly comparable. The rating of occupational groups requires an evaluation of the class status of a role, rather than a specific person. In contrast, self-identified class (or the rating of friends and relatives) requires an evaluation of a specific person, and the various role statuses held by the person may all be considered. It might be expected that the accuracy of class self-evaluation would increase if the respondent were asked, "What social class would you say you belong to, according to your occupation?"

However, it is not certain that this would be the case. When the sample was limited to those naming occupation as the first criterion for class position, there was scarcely any change in the correlation of class identification with objective occupational status.²⁰ In fact, the criteria named by the respondent appear to have little to do with the strength of the various S.E.S. indicators as

²⁰For those naming occupation as the first class criterion, the correlation of class identification with occupation, education, and income respectively was .50, .46, and .52.

predictors of class identification.²¹

Further evidence that limiting the criteria for class evaluation would not increase the accuracy of class self-identification comes from data in the National Study. The public evaluation of occupational prestige is widely acknowledged as a reliable measure of subjective social stratification.²² Studies of occupational prestige have revealed an impressively high consensus on the social standing of different occupations. In the National Study, which was the first large-scale investigation of occupational prestige in Canada, Pineo and Porter found a correlation of .93 between the prestige scores and the Blishen scores (1951) of 57 "very closely" matching occupation titles.²³ As Blishen scores (1951) are based on the average education and income of incumbents of each occupation, this high correlation demonstrated that the fit between the objective rankings of occupation with their subjective prestige ranking is nearly one to one.

Yet when individuals ranked their own jobs (or that of the male head, in the case of female respondents) in terms

²¹For instance, for those naming income first, on the class criteria question, the correlation of class identification with occupation, education, and income respectively, was .41, .44, and .31, yet the correlation of class identification with income for the whole sample was .36.

²²See, for instance, J. Porter, The Vertical Mosaic (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1970), pp. 14-15.

²³P. Pineo and J. Porter, "Occupational Prestige in Canada", Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 4, 32.

of their social standing, this consensus broke down. The correlation of National Study respondents' ranking of their own job with the Blisshen scores (1961) of the occupations was only .23.²⁴ This suggests, of course, that people can rate the prestige of other peoples' jobs according to objective criteria and with close agreement, but when they rate their own jobs other factors intervene, causing highly idiosyncratic ratings.²⁵ Thus, we have here a pattern that is consistent with the hypothesis of ego-involvement, yet which uses a ranking task wholly divorced from class identification, and all the attendant problems of egalitarian ideology, ignorance, etc.

The difficulty people have in making objective self-evaluations does not seem to have been discussed by Centers. However, Warner reproduced part of an interview with one of his informants in a community study to illustrate the difficulties of eliciting accurate self-categorizations into class. After the informant had described various aspects of the class structure of "Jonesville" he was asked by the

²⁴Unpublished result from secondary analysis of National Study performed by the writer.

²⁵As explained in Chapter II, this ranking of own job involved the respondents being explicitly asked to rate the social standing of their own jobs. If one traced how the respondent ranked the stimulus card that actually corresponded with the occupation he reported on the occupation question, the correlation between rank of own occupation and the Blisshen score of that occupation would probably be much higher.

interviewer where he placed himself. The informant replied, "Hell, leave that out. Although we associate with this group most of the time, just leave me out of it. If you're putting me in, this (upper-middle class-clique) is where we belong. But just leave me out of it, and you can make up your mind where we belong."²⁶

Despite his reluctance, this informant did place himself in a class that corresponded with the one ascribed him by the researchers on the basis of interviews with other informants, but Warner noted that this was rare. "Unlike many people, particularly the upper-middle class, he had scrupulously refrained from giving himself a higher status than he enjoyed"²⁷

In Warner's data, there was a very strong relationship between the objective socio-economic status of a person and the class status that others in the community assigned him. For instance, in the Jonesville study, Evaluated Participation, (the class assigned a person according to informants in the community) correlated .91 with objective occupational status, and .96 with the Index of Status Characteristics (an index of objective S.E.S. based, in this case, on

²⁶W. L. Warner, M. Meeker, and K. Ellis, Social Class in America (New York: Harper & Row, 1960), pp. 50-51.

²⁷Ibid.

occupation, house type, and dwelling area).²⁸ Of course, class identification never approaches correlations with objective S.E.S. of this strength.

Ego-Involvement and the Intensity Dimension

It seems to follow, as a logical consequence of the ego-involvement hypothesis, that people who care least about social class would evaluate their class status most accurately, and vice versa. But, on the other hand, it could plausibly be argued that very "class conscious" people would choose their class more in accordance with objective S.E.S. criteria, for they would understand more clearly than others the theory of class structure. That is, the problems of egalitarian ideology and ignorance of class should be minimized among people strongly identified with a social class.

It was possible to evaluate these two conflicting predictions using the "intensity dimension" of class identification. This question was described in Chapter II. The correlations of class identification with occupation, education, and income are shown in Table IV-4 for respondents grouped according to whether they reported a strong, fairly strong, or not at all strong feeling of belonging to a social class.

These data indicate a pronounced pattern of increasing accuracy in class identification with decreasing inten-

²⁸Ibid., pp. 168, 174. Of course, these results from the National Study and the Warner Study are ecological correlations, but this does not alter the argument.

sity of identification. Thus, the prediction based on the ego-involvement hypothesis appears to be correct. For instance, the correlation of class identification with occupation is .33 for those having a very strong feeling of belonging to the social class they chose, .41 for those having a fairly strong feeling of identification, and .43 for those feeling not at all strongly identified with the class they chose.²⁹

TABLE IV-4.--Zero-order correlations of class identification with occupation, education, and income, for respondents in the Four City Study, grouped according to their strength of identification with a social class

	Occupation	Education	Income
Very strong feeling	.33 (138)	.29 (144)	.29 (134)
Fairly strong feeling	.41 (344)	.35 (346)	.34 (342)
Not at all strong feeling	.43 (453)	.39 (451)	.37 (450)

Another type of class consciousness question was asked in the Four City Study. This was, "How conscious are

²⁹As will be shown later, the correlations of class identification with S.E.S. indicators are higher among Protestants than among Catholics. However, this alone does not account for the pattern seen here. The trends in Tables IV-4 and IV-5 are unchanged when variation in the independent variables is equalized.

people today of belonging to a social class compared to people 20 or 30 years ago?" The list of possible responses ranged from "Much more conscious of belonging to a social class than people 20 or 30 years ago" to "Much less conscious than people 20 or 30 years ago". Unlike the intensity dimension question, this question probes the respondent's perception of how others feel about class. Also, it deals with simple awareness of social class rather than strength of membership in a class.³⁰ That the questions measure somewhat different dimensions is demonstrated by the fact that the correlation between responses to the two questions is only .23. Nevertheless, on the premise that those perceiving increasing class consciousness are themselves more class conscious, the same reasoning as used above may apply.

The same pattern was found for this question as for the intensity question. Table IV-5 shows the correlations of class identification with occupation, education, and income for those perceiving more consciousness of class than 20 or 30 years ago, no difference in class consciousness, and less consciousness than before. The correlations are, for all

³⁰Class consciousness is, of course, a term that can take a variety of meanings. Morris and Murphy developed a typology of class consciousness, and within their system class intensity refers to "stratum affiliation" while consciousness of belonging refers to "stratum awareness". See, R. T. Morris and R. J. Murphy, "A Paradigm for the Study of Class Consciousness", Social Stratification in the United States, ed. J. Roach, L. Gross, O. R. Gursslin (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), pp. 345-359.

three measures of S.E.S. lower among those perceiving greater class consciousness than among those perceiving less consciousness. The greatest differences are seen in the relationship between class identification and income. This correlation is only .16 among respondents perceiving greater class consciousness today, but rises to .50 among those perceiving less consciousness.

TABLE IV-5.--Zero-order correlations of class identification with occupation, education, and income, for respondents in the Four City Study, grouped according to their perception of changes in class consciousness over the past 20 or 30 years

	Occupation	Education	Income
More conscious of class	.29 (357)	.21 (359)	.16 (347)
No difference	.44 (164)	.44 (165)	.43 (158)
Less conscious of class	.53 (433)	.48 (438)	.50 (440)

Summary

In this chapter an attempt was made to test the hypothesis that the incongruencies between objective and subjective class are due to ego-involvement. Two tests using data from the Four City Study were designed. These were based on the premise that there is less ego-involvement involved in evaluating the status of others, so these evaluations should be more accurate than self-evaluations. The first

test showed that people were slightly more accurate in evaluating the class status of their best friend, father, and father-in-law than in evaluating their own class. However, they were less accurate in evaluating the class status of their wives, and so it was concluded that this test gave only partial support to the hypothesis.

The second test involved the class rankings made by Four City respondents of people in different occupational groups. These class rankings showed close congruence with objective S.E.S., and this was interpreted as quite strong support for the hypothesis.

Data from the National Study revealed that there is also a large amount of idiosyncrasy when people rate the social standing of their own occupation. This seemed to suggest that ego-involvement in self-evaluation may be a general phenomenon, not limited solely to class self-identification. The ego-involvement hypothesis also appears to be supported by the fact that Warner's Evaluated Participation correlates much more strongly with objective S.E.S. than class identification does.

Finally, a prediction based on the ego-involvement hypothesis was investigated. It was suggested that those who felt most strongly about their class status would be least objective in evaluating their class. Findings from the Four City Study indicated that this was true.

CHAPTER V

MINORITY STATUS AND CLASS IDENTIFICATION IN THE UNITED STATES

In the following two chapters consideration is given to the possibility that minority status displaces economic status as a determinant of self-evaluated class status. In this chapter data from the United States are used to test this hypothesis. It is found that minority status can be an important criterion for class identification among religious and racial minorities in the United States. With occupation held constant, Jews tend to assign themselves higher class status than white Protestants, while white Catholics place themselves in slightly lower classes than white Protestants. Black Protestants, on the average, assign themselves considerably less class status than white Protestants of the same objective socio-economic level.

However, it does not uniformly hold that minority status, for these groups, displaces the socio-economic correlates of class identification. While this seemed true in the case of black Protestants and white Catholics, the relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. was higher among Jews than among white Protestants.

Minority Status and Social Stratification

It has long been recognized by students of social stratification that class status may be influenced by religion, race, and ethnicity, along with objective economic position, as indicated by such characteristics as occupational status, education, and income. This is noted in most of the well-known stratification texts.¹ For Barber, "the problem of the relation between membership in ethnic, racial, or religious groups, on the one hand, and position in the system of social stratification, on the other, is an important one for the theory of social stratification."²

There are, of course, two ways in which minority group status can affect class status. First, there is the simple coincidence of minority status with socio-economic status. It has been demonstrated many times that blacks in the United States hold substantially lower economic status than whites.³ Similarly, although the differences are not so great, it is well-known that the various ethnic groups in American society

¹See, for instance, B. Barber, Social Stratification (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1957), pp. 59-76; E. B. Bergel, Social Stratification (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), pp. 255-256; M. M. Gordon, Social Class in American Sociology (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1965), pp. 252-254; T. E. Lasswell, Class and Stratum (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965), pp. 331-354.

²Barber, p. 59.

³G. E. Simpson and J. M. Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 260-283.

have tended to fall into a socio-economic ranking.⁴ This has been linked to such factors as period of immigration, and the manpower needs of the country at the time of entry.⁵ The ethnic ranking is closely associated with a ranking of religious groups. Thus, Protestants typically hold somewhat higher economic status than Catholics. This is probably due not only to the ethnic composition of the two religious groups, but also to certain intrinsic characteristics of Protestantism and Catholicism.⁶ Of course, minority status does not automatically mean low economic status. This is demonstrated by the high average economic level of Jewish people in America, achieved despite the handicap of a certain amount of anti-semitism.

The more complex factor in the relationship between minority status and class status is the evaluation of religious, racial, or ethnic status itself. Members of racial, ethnic, or religious minorities may be accorded low overall

⁴E. L. Anderson, We Americans (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937); A. B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1961), pp 83-120; W. L. Warner and L. Srole, The Social System of American Ethnic Groups (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965).

⁵Warner placed considerable importance on these two factors. See, Warner and Srole, The Social System of American Ethnic Groups.

⁶Weber's well-known thesis of the Protestant work ethic argued that Protestants tended to acquire values conducive to economic success. See, M. Weber, The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958).

status, even though they may hold high economic status. Rank according to minority status can have important consequences, influencing such things as patterns of interaction, memberships in associations, residential patterns, consumption, the distribution of power, and so on.⁷ Because of the frequent inconsistency between economic status and minority status, many situations develop which can cause severe strains. For instance, Frazier found that the "black bourgeoisie" were subject to stress because whites would not accord them the status and deference commensurate with their economic status.⁸ Warner showed that a correction in his Index of Status Characteristics was necessary to compensate for variations in ethnic status. This was because his informants' evaluations of people of different ethnicities included the status of their ethnic group as well as their economic standing in the community.⁹

These were the theoretical reasons for supposing that minority status would be a determinant, independent of S.E.S., of class identification among white Jews, Catholics, and black Protestants (the data could not be analyzed by ethnicity). Yet this could not be assumed. The high prob-

⁷J. Dollard, Caste and Class in a Southern Town (New York: Harper and Row, 1937).

⁸E. F. Frazier, Black Bourgeoisie (New York: The Free Press, 1965).

⁹W. L. Warner, M. Meeker, and K. Eells, Social Class in America (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), pp. 186-199.

ability of incongruencies between self-evaluations and the evaluations people make of others was seen in the previous chapter. Also, the literature on self-concept among religious, racial, and ethnic groups is contradictory.

On the one hand, one encounters findings that suggest negative self-images among racial, ethnic, and religious minorities. This has been found particularly among blacks, but also among Jews and other ethnic and racial minorities.¹⁰ Yet, on the other hand, Frazier notes the inflated self-esteem among the "black bourgeoisie".¹¹ Also, the rise of black nationalism during the 1960's has signalized a movement away from self-hatred. A different interpretation of minority group self-concept is noted by Jackson and Curtis. They speculate that "members of a given group would accord their group somewhat higher status than it

¹⁰K. B. Clark and M. P. Clark, "Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children", Readings in Social Psychology, ed. E. Maccoby et al. (3rd ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958); J. K. Morland, "A Comparison of Race Awareness in Northern and Southern Children", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 36, 22-31; D. L. Noel, "Group Identification among Negroes: An Empirical Analysis", Journal of Social Issues, 20, 71-84; J. Adelson, "A Study of Minority Group Authoritarianism", The Jews, ed. M. Sklare (New York: The Free Press, 1958), pp. 475-492; M. Anisfield et al., "The Structure and Dynamics of the Ethnic Attitudes of Jewish Adolescents", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56, 31-36; G. Engel et al., "An Investigation of Anti-Semitic Feelings in Two Groups of College Students: Jewish and Non-Jewish", Journal of Social Psychology, 48, 75-82.

¹¹Frazier.

would be accorded by members of other groups."¹²

If, as expected, minority status is a criterion for self-evaluated class status among religious and racial groups, does this criterion supplement or displace the objective socio-economic criteria? The former case was a possibility. The predictive power of objective S.E.S. could be constant among the minorities, yet the mean self-evaluated status could vary among the groups due to the role of perceived racial or religious status. But it seemed more probable that minority status would tend to actually displace objective S.E.S. as a criterion for class identification.

On a purely technical level, self-evaluation of class status according to minority status might reduce the variation in class identifications, automatically lowering the strength of association between class identification and other variables. But besides this, there was the probability of subcultural variations on the perceived criteria for class status. Warner ranked the minorities in the United States according to their "deviation from the dominant American culture".¹³ Those most integrated into the

¹²E. F. Jackson and R. F. Curtis, "Conceptualization and Measurement in the Study of Social Stratification", Methodology in Social Research, ed. H. M. Blalock and A. B. Blalock (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1968), p. 125.

¹³Warner, The Social System of American Ethnic Groups, pp. 285-296.

core culture were English-speaking white Protestants while Negroes were the least integrated. Catholics and Jews were placed between these two extremes. Gordon notes the "unique sub-cultural heritage" caused by different religious values, immigration, or the experience of enforced segregation.¹⁴ Thus, the feeling that the criteria for class identification are universalistically applied objective socio-economic characteristics may be a value most common to the core white Protestant culture, but shared only partially by other groups.

The Data

In order to investigate these questions a sample of American respondents was needed that would be sufficiently large for comparisons among minorities yet would be on the national level, representative of the whole American society.¹⁵ Also, a sample that would allow the examination of

¹⁴M.M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 38.

¹⁵It was felt that one problem with previous research in this field is the use of local samples. This aspect of Warner's work has been criticized frequently. It seems reasonable to assume that minority status is part of the national stratification structure. See, H. W. Pfautz and O. D. Duncan, "A Critical Evaluation of Warner's Work in Community Stratification", American Sociological Review, 15, 1205-1215.

trends over time was desired.¹⁶ The solution was to collect several national samples, from different years, and merge them so that they could be analyzed as one sample.

The studies used to create this "combined sample" were: The Centers Study in 1945 (fieldwork by the Office of Public Opinion Research at Princeton University), a National Opinion Research Center (N.O.R.C.) study in 1949, the Michigan University Survey Research Center (S.R.C.) Election Studies in 1956, 1960, 1964, and 1968, a N.O.R.C. study in 1964, and an American Institute of Public Opinion (A.I.P.O.) study conducted in 1969.¹⁷ Each of the studies used a national sample. The Centers Study included only white males, but the other studies sampled all adults in the United States.¹⁸ As might be expected, for the years before 1956 it was difficult to obtain reliable data that contained the

¹⁶Parsons notes the importance of trends over time in ethnic stratification. T. Parsons, "A Revised Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification", Essays in Sociological Theory (New York: The Free Press, 1964), p. 424.

¹⁷The Centers Study was the main source of data for Centers' book, The Psychology of Social Classes, the S.R.C. studies were all primarily concerned with presidential election campaigns, the N.O.R.C. 1964 study was designed to furnish occupational prestige scores for a detailed list of occupational titles, and the N.O.R.C. 1949 and Gallup 1969 studies surveyed opinions on a number of national and international matters.

¹⁸Comparing results from the 1945 study with published results from Centers' 1946 study convinced us that this did not cause serious problems. R. Centers, "Class Consciousness of the American Woman", International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research, 3, 399-408.

necessary variables (and suitable codes) for the analysis. Although Centers carried out national class identification studies in 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1950, the data sets for all these studies are lost.¹⁹

Recoding these studies so that they could be analyzed as one large sample required considerable compromises in the detail of the categories for the variables used in the analysis. There were three different forms of class identification question used in the eight studies, and in the combined sample these had to be recoded into simply "middle class" (or higher) and "working class" (or lower).²⁰ Occupation was coded into seven broad categories.²¹ In all the studies farmers were removed as they are difficult to categorize accurately in such a simple code, comprising a very socio-ec-

¹⁹This was confirmed by Professor Centers.

²⁰The 1945, 1949, and 1969 studies used the question: "If you were asked to use one of these four names for your social class, which would you say you belonged in; the middle class, lower class, working class, or upper class?" The S.R.C. studies used the question: "There's quite a lot of talk these days about different social classes. Most people say they belong to the middle class or to the working class. Do you ever think of yourself as being in one of these classes?" Which class? Would you say that you are about an average (class selected) person or that you are in the upper part of (class selected)?" The N.O.R.C. 1964 study used the question: "If you had to pick one, which of the following five social classes would you say you were in -- upper class, upper-middle class, middle class, working class, or lower class?"

²¹The occupation code was; Professional (technical), business, white collar (clerical, sales), skilled labour, semi-skilled labour, personal service, unskilled.

onomically heterogeneous group.²² It was necessary to give up information in the coding of both education and income, in order to reach sets of categories common to each study, and neither of these codes is as detailed as might be hoped.²³ Due to the different levels of detail in coding occupation, education, and income, it is misleading to compare the relative power of these predictors of class identification, but the abbreviated coding does not invalidate comparing variations in the strength of relationship of each variable with class identification among different sub-groups in the sample.²⁴ The case total for the combined sample is 9764, with 5757 respondents reporting their religion as Protestant, 2009 as Catholic and 278 as Jewish. There was a

²²Centers separated out farmers in his analysis, arguing that they constituted a special case. Centers, The Psychology of Social Classes, p. 52.

²³The education code was; Elementary school, high school, one to three years of college, college graduate or more. The income code was; Under \$1,000, \$1,000-\$1,999, \$2,000-\$2,999, \$3,000-\$3,999, \$4,000-\$4,999, \$5,000-\$9,999, \$10,000 or more. In the sample, 50 percent had only high school education, and 41 percent earned between \$5,000 and \$9,999. Greater detail in these two categories, had it been possible, would have raised the correlations of income and education with class identification.

²⁴That is, if the correlation of, say, income and class identification is higher for one group than another, that is meaningful even if the overall correlation for the whole sample is lower than it would be given more detailed coding.

total of 8861 whites and 826 blacks in the sample.²⁵

Results

The proportion of white Jews, Protestants, Catholics, and black Protestants identifying with the middle class is shown in Table V-1.²⁶ The groups are arranged in order of their mean occupational status. The lower the score in Table V-1 the higher the mean occupational status. (The rank order does not change when education or income is substituted). The results reveal the expected pattern of decreasing self-evaluated class status with decreasing mean occupational status. The differences in the percentage identifying with the middle class are significant ($p < .01$) between each group. Also, the mean occupational status of each group differs significantly ($p < .001$) from the others.

As one would expect, the differences in occupational status between the groups are not of uniform magnitude. The two largest groups, white Protestants and white Catholics, are clustered quite closely together, and this is reflected in the small difference in the proportion classifying themselves in the middle class.

²⁵Religion was not asked in the 1949 study, and there were no blacks in the 1945 study, and so these two samples were excluded in most of the calculations.

²⁶There was one black Jew, and less than 50 black Catholics in the sample.

TABLE V-1.--Percentage identifying with the Middle Class, and mean occupational status, for white Jews, Protestants, and Catholics, and black Protestants

	White Jewish	White Prot.	White R.C.	Black Prot.
Class	74 (265)	47 (4483)	43 (1707)	23 (641)
Occupation	2.65 (253)	3.49 (4148)	3.67 (1591)	4.95 (577)

The differences between the four groups in the proportion choosing the middle class are not due only to the varying levels of mean occupational status. Table V-2 shows the proportion identifying with the middle class, by occupation, among white Jews, Protestants, Catholics, and black Protestants. If the differences in mean self-evaluated class status seen previously were due solely to differences in occupational status among the four groups in the analysis, then we would expect that within each occupational category there would be no significant differences in class identification among the groups (neglecting inequalities among the groups within categories). Yet this is clearly not the case. Table V-2 reveals substantial variations in the percentage identifying with the middle class among white Jews, Protestants, Catholics, and black Protestants at each occupational level. However, the theory of minority self-hatred does not, alone, account for the findings. For instance,

there is no evidence that self-hatred causes downgrading of class status among Jews. On the contrary, Jewish people were the group most frequently, at each occupational level, identifying with the middle class. This is not what one would expect on the basis of Warner's rankings.

TABLE V-2.--Percentage of respondents identifying with the middle class, by occupational status, religion, and race

Occupational Status	Jewish white	Prot. white	Catholic white	Prot. black
Professional	94 (47)	80 (608)	75 (179)	58 (48)
Business	77 (73)	67 (718)	61 (256)	19 (21)
Other white collar	74 (50)	54 (628)	48 (248)	21 (42)
Skilled labour	74 (19)	33 (895)	34 (378)	29 (51)
Semiskilled, service	37 (30)	26 (996)	26 (412)	18 (304)
Unskilled	a (1)	11 (180)	30 (79)	13 (97)
All occupations	74 (220)	46 (4025)	43 (1552)	22 (563)

^aTwo small to percentage.

In contrast, blacks do appear to downgrade their class status because of their low racial status. Comparing Jewish and black professional workers, 94 percent of the Jewish professionals in the sample identified with the middle

class, yet this proportion was only 58 percent among blacks of the same occupational status. This pattern holds between all the occupational categories shown in Table V-2. For example, while 37 percent of the Jewish respondents in semi-skilled or service occupations categorized themselves in the middle class, this proportion fell to 18 percent among blacks of the same occupational status.

The "core society" of white Protestants falls between the two extremes in class identification seen among Jews and blacks.²⁷ As might be expected, white Catholics adhere more closely than Jews or blacks to the pattern among white Protestants. However, there are some intriguing variations in the distributions for white Protestants and Catholics. Among Catholics, there is an effect like a regression towards the mean in class identification. Thus, while 80 percent of white Protestant professionals classified themselves as middle class, the corresponding proportion among Catholics was only 75 percent. Similarly, higher proportions of white Protestants in the business and "other white collar" occupations identified with the middle class than Catholics of equivalent occupational status. In the first two blue-collar categories, the pattern among white Protestants and Catholics showed little variation, but among unskilled labourers, the bottom category, 11 percent of the

²⁷Gordon, Assimilation in American Life, p. 72.

white Protestants, compared to 30 percent of white Catholics, categorized themselves in the middle class.

The pattern among white Catholics is clearly due to something more complex than the simple evaluation of religious status, or the incidence of low status ethnicities in the Catholic religion. One may speculate that doctrinal differences between Protestants and Catholics are responsible. It has been suggested, for instance, that there is less shame in poverty and greater distrust of wealth in Catholicism than in Protestantism.²⁸

The patterns seen in Table V-2 are essentially unchanged when education or income is substituted. For instance, among respondents with family incomes over \$10,000, 92 percent of Jews and 53 percent of the blacks identified with the middle class, yet the corresponding proportions among white Protestants and Catholics were 72 and 66 percent respectively. Similarly, among respondents having college education or more, 92 percent of the Jews and 68 percent of the blacks identified with the middle class, compared to 89 percent of the white Protestants and 86 percent of the white Catholics.

Some readers may feel that these findings are merely due to a tendency for white Protestants and Jews to hold higher status, within each socio-economic category, than

²⁸H. Miner, St. Denis (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 96.

Catholics or blacks. While this clustering within categories does occur, there is little evidence that this factor explains away the finding described here.²⁹ In the Canadian data, described in the following chapter, it was found that the pattern was essentially the same with both single and two digit Blisshen scores. Also, this argument cannot account for the finding that lower blue-collar Catholics (in both Canada and the U.S.) identify more frequently with the middle class than Protestants in the same occupational categories.

Objections of this type could be made about any analysis where an attempt is made to hold socio-economic status constant. The greater the detail in the categories, the less serious this problem should become. But it is impossible to completely overcome. The use of very detailed categories in a cross-tabulation causes the cell sizes to become too small for reliable interpretations.

An interesting regularity in the data in Table V-2 is that minority status as a determinant of class identification seems to reinforce the ranking established already by the simple economic characteristics of the groups. When the occupational distributions of the groups were adjusted so as to conform to that for white Protestants, the proportion

²⁹For instance, black professionals are somewhat over-represented in the lower status professions, such as clergymen and school teachers.

identifying with the middle class became .65, .47, .45, and .27 percent for white Jews, Protestants, Catholics, and black Protestants respectively.³⁰

This may be a structural effect due to the strength of the minority sub-cultures, particularly in the Jewish and black cases. That is, the fact that the majority of Jews have middle class status according to objective economic measures may cause the Jewish community as a whole to hold a middle class self-image. So, even Jews holding low economic status will tend to perceive themselves as middle class, because of their group's status.³¹ Conversely, the generally low economic status of blacks in the United States may be the reason that even high S.E.S. blacks tend to identify with the working class.

Among blacks, improvements in economic status along with the rise of black nationalism may be changing this self-image. The data clearly indicate a rise in perceived class status among blacks. For instance, in the group of studies from 1949 to 1960, 21 percent of black professionals or businessmen identified with the middle class. In the group of studies from 1964 to 1969 this proportion rose

³⁰The means and standard deviations on occupation were set equal for the four groups.

³¹Hodge and Treiman have shown that the status of one's associates is an important determinant of self-identified class. R. W. Hodge and D. J. Treiman, "Class Identification in the United States", American Journal of Sociology, 73, 535-547.

to 50 percent.

We turn now to the question of whether minority status supplements or displaces economic status as a determinant of self-evaluated class status. The Pearsonian correlations of occupation, education, and income with class identification, for white Jews, Protestants, Catholics, and black Protestants, are shown in Table V-3. The coefficients are corrected for restriction of range in the independent variables.³² This correction was necessary because of the possibility that the correlations would vary as a result of differences in the standard deviations of occupation, education, and income among the sub-groups in the analysis.³³

Some caution is required in interpreting the data in Table V-3, as the results change somewhat according to which S.E.S. measure is used. Generally the results using occupation as the independent variable are probably the most reliable, both because this is the theoretically superior measure of economic status, and because the occupation code in the

³²J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (3rd ed.; New York: McGraw Hill Book Co. Inc., 1956), p. 320.

³³

The standard deviations were; Occupation, Jews 1.388, white Protestants 1.678, Catholics 1.654, black Protestants 1.748; Education, Jews 1.023, white Protestants .902, Catholics .813, black Protestants .840; Income, Jews 1.188, white Protestants 1.649, Catholics 1.454, black Protestants 1.923. The change caused by the correction was trivial except in the case of Jews. All correlations in the remainder of this chapter carry this correction.

combined sample was more detailed than those for education or income.³⁴

TABLE V-3.--Zero-order correlations of occupation, education, and income with class identification (corrected for restricted range in the independent variables) for white Jews, Protestants, Catholics, and black Protestants

Relationship	White			Black
	Jews	Prots.	Cath.	Prots.
Class and occupation	.43 (244)	.42 (4025)	.33 (1552)	.23 (563)
Class and education	.23 (264)	.41 (4471)	.37 (1704)	.27 (639)
Class and income	.39 (226)	.24 (4392)	.26 (1670)	.17 (627)

However, with each of the three indicators, the correlation of class identification with objective S.E.S. is lowest among the blacks in the sample. Thus, comparing the coefficients for white and black Protestants, we find that the correlations of occupation, education, and income with class identification are higher among whites by, respectively, 19, 14, and 7 points.³⁵ However, the pattern is not simply that the correlations are lower among the minority groups

³⁴Barber, pp. 184-185.

³⁵The difference between white and black Protestants in the correlation of class identification with income is not statistically significant ($p < .05$).

than in the white Protestant core society. The relationship between occupation and class identification is almost identical among Jews and white Protestants. Education is less strongly associated with class identification among Jews than among white Protestants ($r = .23$ and $.41$ respectively), but the relationship between income and class identification is 15 points higher among Jews than among white Protestants.

There is a tendency also for the correlations to be somewhat higher among both Jews and white Protestants than among Catholics. This is most clearly seen in the correlation of class identification with occupation, where $r = .43$, $.42$, and $.33$ among Jews, white Protestants, and Catholics respectively. These results suggest a kind of interaction effect.³⁶ It seems that the higher the mean economic status of a group, the stronger the association between self-evaluated class and occupational status. But this does not appear to be due to a simple status maximization process whereby people use the status they rank highest on when deciding what social class they belong in.³⁷ For one thing, the correction for restriction of range should at least partially compensate for differences in mean economic status.

³⁶H. M. Blalock, Causal Inferences in Non-Experimental Research (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1961), p. 91.

³⁷D. R. Segal, M. W. Segal, and D. Knoke, "Status Inconsistency and Self-Evaluation", Sociometry, 33, 347-357.

Also, such a theory does not adequately explain the findings for Jews and Catholics.

A more satisfactory line of reasoning, it seems, is to return to the sub-cultural theory noted previously.³⁸ It seems likely that the belief that self-evaluated social class should be based on universalistically applied, objective socio-economic criteria is largely a middle class value. Gordon notes that middle class values are strongest among white Protestants and Jews.³⁹ Working class values seem more dominant among blacks and Catholics. Of course, there is economic class differentiation in each group, but it does seem likely that the values held by the majority in each group tend to pervade among the minority. For instance, Gordon writes, "Even the Jewish industrial workers themselves did not display the cultural values usually associated with a proletariat."⁴⁰ And Lenski notes the converse among Catholics: "For example, many of the attitudes and actions of middle-class Catholics in our society represent working-class responses to life because of the historic position of the Catholic group as a whole in American society."⁴¹

³⁸Gordon, Assimilation in American Life, p. 38.

³⁹Ibid., p. 72, 186.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 186.

⁴¹G. Lenski, The Religious Factor (Garden City: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1963), p. 130.

The homogeneity of values among minorities is probably conditioned by common experiences. For instance, economic discrimination may destroy confidence in the legitimacy of middle class achievement values among blacks, and to a lesser extent, among Catholics.⁴²

The findings in Table V-3 do not appear to be due to any tendency for minority group membership to reduce class consciousness. One measure of class consciousness is the refusal rate on the class identification question. In the combined sample, this refusal rate showed little variation among the different sub-groups. The refusal rate was 3 percent among Protestants and Catholics, 4 percent among blacks, and 5 percent among Jews. Probably a more accurate test of class consciousness is the class question used in the S.R.C. studies. Here people were asked if they felt they belonged to either the middle or the working class (rather than being obliged to categorize themselves). The proportion answering "yes" were, 63 percent of the white Protestants, 65 percent of the white Catholics, 72 percent of the black Protestants, and 74 percent of the Jews.⁴³ Thus, there appears to be no simple relationship between the basic sense

⁴²This would be consistent with the fact that occupation is a stronger correlate of class identification ($r = .24$) among blacks in the East, Midwest, or West than among southern blacks ($r = .11$).

⁴³Calculated from the 1956, 1960, 1964, and 1969 S.R.C. studies, including farmers.

of belonging to a class, and objective economic class consciousness (as measured by the congruence between self-rated class and objective economic status).⁴⁴

There are almost certainly other factors that govern the congruence between self-evaluated class status and objective economic status. Political factors are probably important. Nationalistic feeling likely reduces objective economic class consciousness, while labour unrest and left-wing political activity probably raise it. However, the hypothesis suggested above best seems to account for the particular pattern of findings encountered here.

Up to this point, the role of external variables has not been considered in the analysis. However, it seemed possible that some of the findings might simply be due to the demographic characteristics of the religious and racial groups. This possibility was given the most detailed consideration in the case of the difference between white Protestants and Catholics in the correlation of self-evaluated class with occupational status. The introduction of control variables was only practical when comparing these two large groups.

The proportions of foreign-born and urban are high among Catholics and both characteristics could be expected to contribute to the weaker association between class identi-

⁴⁴These results also show that "false class consciousness" can be felt as strongly as "true" class consciousness.

fication and occupational status. Of course, Jews are highly urbanized too, but the small numbers in this group precluded more detailed tabulations. Warner notes that new immigrants tend to be outside of community class systems.⁴⁵ It was hypothesized that first-generation immigrants would have lower objective economic class consciousness than native-born Americans. Also, the tendency for Catholic immigrants to be of lower status, less assimilable ethnicities than Protestant immigrants suggested that the association between class identification and objective occupational status would be stronger among Protestant than among Catholic immigrants. Thus, it was conceivable that the difference between Protestants and Catholics in the strength of occupation as a criterion for class identification was due solely to the incidence of a large proportion of foreign-born Catholics having very low objective economic class consciousness.

The correlation of class identification with occupation, by religion and immigration status, is shown in Table V-4.⁴⁶ As before, the coefficients were corrected for restricted range in the independent variable. Among Catholics, there is no difference between the native-born and the foreign-born in the strength of relationship between class

⁴⁵Warner, and Srole, The Social System of American Ethnic Groups, p. 68.

⁴⁶To simplify the calculations, blacks were included in these calculations. There were not sufficient blacks or Jews to allow separate calculations for these two groups.

identification and occupation. There is a slight tendency for the correlations to be higher among native-born Protestants than among Protestant immigrants.⁴⁷

TABLE V-4.--Zero-order correlations of occupation with class identification (corrected for restricted range) for Protestants and Catholics by country of birth and community size

Categories	Protestant	Catholic
<u>Country of birth:</u>		
United States	.43 (4169)	.35 (1310)
Foreign	.39 (126)	.35 (143)
<u>Community size:</u>		
Over 500,000	.46 (389)	.38 (420)
10,000-499,999	.43 (1194)	.28 (558)
Under 9,999	.44 (1618)	.32 (348)

As anticipated, the congruence between class identification and occupational status is greater among Protestant immigrants than among Catholic immigrants. The differences

⁴⁷It may be that Protestant immigrants assimilate the core society values about class identification more quickly than Catholic immigrants. Although many of the differences between Protestants and Catholics reported in this section are small, and do not meet the significance test, the patterns are almost always the same using income or education.

are not large, but the same pattern was observed using education and income. It can be seen that immigration status plays no important part in determining the basic difference in objective economic class consciousness between Protestants and Catholics observed in Table V-3. The correlation between class identification and occupation is substantially higher among native-born Protestants ($r = .43$) than among native-born Catholics ($r = .35$).

It seemed important also, to take community type into account. Much of the hypothesizing in this chapter was based on Warner's community study research. It has rightly been pointed out that Warner's findings do not necessarily apply on the national level.⁴⁸ Catholics in the United States tend to live in the larger cities, while Protestants have a higher proportion living in rural areas. The higher correlation between class identification and occupation among Protestants than among Catholics could simply be due to a general tendency for higher objective economic class consciousness in small communities.

However, the data indicate that this is not the case. The lower panel in Table V-4 shows the correlation of class identification with occupation, by religion and community size.⁴⁹ There is little variation in the results. In each

⁴⁸Pfautz and Duncan, American Sociological Review, 15.

⁴⁹Jews are highly urbanized also, of course. The fact that community size does not alter the Protestant-

interval of community sizes, the congruence between self-evaluated class and occupation is higher among Protestants than among Catholics. The correlations among Catholics are actually largest in the large cities (over 500,000), where they are relatively most numerous.⁵⁰

Other control variables were used in the analysis also, including father's country of birth, region, and gender. Although these form part of the "standard package" of conventional control variables, they were of less theoretical interest in this study, and so detailed discussion of these results is omitted. None of these variables "explained away" the basic Protestant-Catholic difference.⁵¹

Summary

Data from the United States were used to evaluate the possibility that minority status displaces economic status as a determinant of subjective class identification. There is evidence that minority status acts as a criterion for class identification. Holding occupational status constant, Jews

Catholic difference suggests that the findings for Jews are not merely epiphenomena of urban living.

⁵⁰Of course, this is not quite the same test as examining patterns among people living in individual cities of different sizes.

⁵¹Some readers may have preferred to see all of the control variables simultaneously held constant in this analysis. The decision against this type of approach was taken primarily because of limitations in the data. The set of data in the combined sample that is complete for all these control variables is very small, and certain combinations of

place themselves in higher classes than white Protestants or Catholics, while black Protestants tend to assign themselves the lowest class status.

However, it does not appear that minority status simply displaces objective economic status as a criterion for class identification. While the congruence between objective S.E.S. and subjective class identification was lower among black Protestants than among white Protestants or Catholics, this relationship was strongest among the Jewish minority group. In interpreting these findings, it was hypothesized that the use of universalistically applied, objective socio-economic criteria for class self-identification is largely a middle class value, held by Jews and white Protestants, but only to a lesser degree by Catholics and blacks.

control categories would contain cell sizes so small that no confidence could be held in the results.

CHAPTER VI

MINORITY STATUS AND CLASS IDENTIFICATION IN CANADA

A replication of the results for Protestants and Catholics, found in the previous chapter, was attempted using data from Canadian studies. It was felt that it would be useful to find out if the difference between American Protestants and Catholics in the congruence between objective and subjective class holds in Canada. An international comparison of this type is valuable as it allows one measure of the generality of the original finding. As the structure of religious stratification is similar in Canada and the United States it was reasonable to anticipate similar results in the two societies.¹

This proved to be the case. The results reported in this chapter reveal that, in Canada as in the United States, the relationships between class identification and measures

¹In both societies, Protestants hold higher socio-economic status than Catholics. According to the survey data used in these two chapters, the gap is greater in Canada. In the U.S. data (combined sample), the mean occupational status of Catholics was .042 deviations below the grand mean, and the mean occupational status of Protestants (black and white) was .011 deviations above the grand mean. In the National Study (Canada), the deviations from the grand mean, for French Catholics, English Catholics, and English Protestants were, -.283, -.104, and +.162 respectively.

of objective S.E.S. tend to be higher among Protestants than among Catholics. Also, some support is found for the hypothesis, suggested previously, that these results are due to deviations by Catholics from the core North American values. There is evidence that Catholics hold more particularistic norms for self-evaluation than Protestants do. Consistent with this is a finding that certain other self-ranking variables are quite strongly correlated with class identification among Catholics.

With the small Canadian samples available, it was only possible to examine the two large religious groups; Protestants and Catholics. There are too few blacks or Jews in Canada to allow an analysis of these groups. Because of the importance of language differences in Canada, French and English-speaking Catholics were analyzed separately.²

Results of the Replication

In the U.S. data it was found that an effect resembling a regression towards the mean existed among Catholics. A similar pattern was observed among the Canadian respondents

²Ethnicity was measured, in the National Study, by the question, "As a child, what was the main language spoken in your home?" In the Four City Study, the question was, "What is your mother tongue (the language you first learned to speak)?" In the calculations, all language groups other than French were included with the English, and all religions other than Catholic were included with the Protestant. As usual, the practice of excluding farmers from correlations was followed. There was only a handful of French-speaking Protestants in the two samples, and they were excluded from all calculations.

in the National Study. The proportions in the National sample identifying with the upper/upper-middle, middle, and working/lower classes, by occupational status and religion, are shown in Table VI-1.³

TABLE VI-1.--Percentage identifying with the upper/upper-middle, middle, and working/lower classes, for Protestants and Catholics in the National Study

Occupational group	Protestant				Catholic			
	U/UM	Mid.	W/L	N	U/UM	Mid.	W/L	N
Professional ^a	51	44	5	55	45	41	14	22
Small Proprietary ^b	30	52	17	69	19	59	22	32
Clerical, Sales	23	53	23	47	6	60	34	35
Skilled	7	59	33	69	5	48	46	56
Semi-skilled	1	46	53	72	10	46	44	84
Unskilled	5	38	57	37	14	36	50	44
Farm	15	54	31	65	4	65	30	46
Total	19	50	31	414	12	50	38	319

^aCategory includes Professionals, Semi-professionals, Proprietors, Managers and Officials, large.

^bCategory includes Proprietors, Managers and Officials, small.

³The cell sizes became too small for precise interpretations when English and French Catholics were analyzed separately in this cross-tabulation.

It can be seen that in the occupational categories ranging from professional to skilled labour, Protestants tend to classify themselves in higher classes than Catholics. For instance, 51 percent of the Protestant respondents in professional occupations placed themselves in the upper or upper-middle class compared to only 45 percent of the Catholic professionals. Among semi-skilled and unskilled workers, this pattern is reversed. According to theoretical expectations, we would expect people in these lower blue-collar occupations to identify with the working class. The results in Table VI-1 indicate that Protestants conform more closely than Catholics to this expectation. Among Protestant semi-skilled workers, 53 percent identified with the working class, yet only 44 percent of Catholics of corresponding occupational status chose this class. Similarly, among unskilled workers, 57 percent of the Protestants but only 50 percent of the Catholics classified themselves as working class.

The separate cross-tabulations of class identification with male head's occupation among English and French-speaking Catholics show essentially the same pattern for the two groups, although the tendency for self-depreciation among high occupational status respondents is somewhat more typical of the English-speaking Catholics, while self-enhancement of class position by low occupational status people is somewhat more characteristic of the French-speaking Catholics.

The results shown in Table VI-1 demonstrate that in

Canada, as in the United States, minority status has only a weak relationship with class identification when comparing Protestants and Catholics. In order for religious affiliation to be a strong correlate of class identification, it would be necessary for Protestants at every occupational level to assign themselves higher class status than the corresponding Catholics. The data in Chapter III are actually sufficient, in this case, to show us that Protestant or Catholic religious affiliation does not greatly affect self-evaluated class status. However, for a small minority such as Jews in the U.S. data, correlations using the whole sample would not indicate the importance of Jewish religious affiliation as a determinant of class identification.

Although farmers cannot properly be fitted into this occupational status scale, the figures for this group are included in the bottom row of Table VI-1 as an item of parenthetical interest. The majority of Canadian farmers, both Protestant and Catholic, hold a middle class self-image according to these data. This contrasts quite intriguingly with the corresponding percentages from the U.S. data, where 65 percent of the white Protestant and 60 percent of the white Catholic farm owners and managers identified with the working class.

The pattern seen among the non-farm occupations clearly suggests that the relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. is stronger among Protestant

than among Catholic Canadians. This is confirmed using correlational analysis.

Table VI-2 shows the correlations of 14 different measures of S.E.S. with class identification, for English Protestant, English Catholic, and French Catholic respondents in the National Study. The coefficients reported here are uncorrected for restricted range in the independent variable. The differences in the standard deviations seemed too trivial to require this correction.⁴ As many different S.E.S. measures as possible were used here because the subdivision of the sample into the three ethno-religious groups results in small N's in many of the calculations. Thus, although differences between English Protestant, English Catholic, and French Catholic respondents in the correlations of class identification with individual S.E.S. measures should be interpreted with caution, and are unlikely to be statistically significant, it is possible to observe patterns that hold for almost all the different S.E.S. measures.

⁴For example, in the correlation of occupation of male with class identification, the corrected coefficients were, for English Protestants, English Catholics, and French Catholics respectively, .46, .27, and .26. The corrected coefficients in the correlation of income with class identification were, .40, .38, and .35 respectively, while the corrected correlations of education with class identification were, respectively, .39, .34, and .30 (National Study).

TABLE VI-2.--Zero-order correlations of class identification with measures of socio-economic status, by religion and ethnicity, for respondents in the National Study

	English Protestant	English Catholic	French Catholic
Occupation of male	.47 (349)	.24 (116)	.25 (157)
Occupation of female	.36 (280)	.25 (90)	.30 (93)
Occupation of male's father	.24 (230)	.06 (73)	.07 (91)
Occupation of female's father	.20 (234)	.40 (76)	.16 (92)
Occupation of best friend of respondent	.42 (191)	.43 (65)	.31 (77)
Occupation of relative res- pondent feels closest to	.33 (157)	.04 (54)	.21 (64)
Income of family	.41 (357)	.37 (121)	.31 (159)
Education of male	.39 (364)	.33 (124)	.28 (163)
Education of female	.36 (348)	.29 (118)	.23 (154)
Education of male's father	.39 (316)	.29 (107)	.23 (151)
Education of female's father	.28 (310)	.21 (106)	.30 (150)
Education of best friend of respondent	.38 (292)	.35 (94)	.30 (122)
Education of relative res- pondent feels closest to	.31 (311)	.13 (105)	.23 (134)
Index of occupation, income, and education	.49 (341)	.41 (113)	.32 (153)

Looking at the results shown in Table VI-2, in every case but one, the relationship between class identification and S.E.S. indicators is stronger among Protestants than among French-speaking Catholics. In the lone exception to this pattern, the correlation of female's father's education with class identification is .30 among French Catholics and .28 among English Protestants.

The pattern is almost as consistent comparing English Catholics and Protestants. For all but two of the correlations there is a stronger association between class identification and S.E.S. indicators among Protestants than among English Catholics. The exceptions are the correlation of female's father's occupation with class identification, where the coefficient is considerably higher for English Catholics than for Protestants, and the correlation of best friend's occupation with class identification, where the coefficients are almost identical.

Thus, there appears to be considerable similarity in the level of objective economic class consciousness among Catholics of the two main language groups in Canada. In 8 of the 14 relationships examined the correlations for English Catholics were higher than the corresponding figures among French Catholics, and in the 6 other cases they were lower. In fact, when English and French-speaking Catholics were combined in the calculations, the coefficients for Protestants and Catholics differed significantly at the .05 level

in 3 instances. These were the correlation of class identification with male head's occupation, male's father's occupation, and the index of occupation, income, and education. It seems important that the results were so similar for Catholics belonging to the two main language groups in Canada. It was not possible to hold ethnicity constant in the American data, and the fact that it is not an issue in the Canadian results provides reassurance that this omission in the analysis of the U.S. data was not serious.⁵

A subsidiary pattern in Table VI-2 is that socio-economic status attributes pertaining to wives seem to carry relatively more salience for Catholics (both English and French) than for Protestants. In the correlation of class identification with male head's occupation the coefficient for Protestants is 23 points higher than the corresponding figure for Catholics, yet in the correlation of class identification with female's occupation the difference is only 8 points. Similarly, compared to male's father's occupation, female's father's occupation seems relatively more important for Catholics than for Protestants in accounting for class identification. Somewhat the same pattern holds in the cor-

⁵Of course, this does not completely settle the ethnic issue, as the non-French Catholics in Canada and the United States still have a different ethnic composition than the Protestants. But French-Canadians are often treated as a special case (because of their unique history) and the results shown here are one instance where they follow a general pattern, common to other Catholics.

relation of class identification with the education of the male's and the female's fathers, although not for the male and female's own education.⁶

The findings from the National Study are corroborated by the Four City data. Table VI-3 shows the correlations of a series of S.E.S. measures with class identification for Protestants and English and French Catholics. The same general pattern observed in Table VI-2 holds here also, although the relative strengths of individual S.E.S. predictors of class identification among Protestants, English Catholics, and French Catholics tend to vary somewhat. This is not surprising considering the differences between the two studies.⁷ Comparing Protestants and French Catholics, the pattern of closer congruence between the objective and subjective measures of class among Protestants is reversed in only two instances; respondent's wife's occupation correlates .37 with class identification among French Catholics but only .26 among Protestants, and respondents's wife's income is a substantial-

⁶This is corroborated by other data in the Four City Study. Respondents were asked how important wife's occupation is in determining what social class a man belongs to. The proportions answering that this is very or somewhat important were, 15, 18, and 23 among English Protestants, English Catholics, and French Catholics respectively. Similar results were found when asking about the importance of wife's income.

⁷The data from the National Study shown here include both male and female respondents. It will be recalled from Chapter II that female status is a less important correlate of class identification when the sample is limited to male respondents.

ly stronger predictor of class identification among French Catholics ($r = .29$) than among Protestants ($r = .14$). Thus, the tendency seen in the National Study for a relatively greater importance of the wife's status, as a criterion for class identification among French Catholics, holds in the Four City data also.⁸

In the Four City Study, as in the National Study, the relationship between S.E.S. and class identification among English-speaking Catholics is higher than among French Catholics but lower than among Protestants. However, in the Four City data, the figures for English Catholics appear to be somewhat closer to those found among Protestants than was the case in the National Study. In 11 of the 14 correlations of class identification with measures of S.E.S., the relationships are stronger among English than among French Catholics. In both studies, the best friend's occupation seems to be a particularly important criterion for class identification among English-speaking Catholics. For instance, among English Catholics in the Four City sample, class identification correlated .47 with best friend's occupation but only .43 with respondent's occupation.

As in the analysis of the U.S. data, consideration was given to the possibility that the findings could be accounted

⁸One factor here may be the fact that working wives are less common among French Catholic families than among English people of either religion. In the Four City sample, the proportion of working wives among English Protestants, English Catholics, and French Catholics, was 44, 42, and 33 percent

TABLE VI-3.--Zero-order correlations of class identification with measures of socio-economic status, by religion and ethnicity, for respondents in the Four City Study

	English Protestant	English Catholic	French Catholic
Occupation of respondent	.46 (487)	.43 (214)	.36 (235)
Occupation of respondent's wife	.26 (268)	.22 (114)	.37 (90)
Occupation of respondent's father	.28 (453)	.19 (187)	.10 (214)
Occupation of wife's father	.21 (362)	.11 (141)	.11 (173)
Occupation of respondent's best friend	.31 (315)	.47 (127)	.22 (158)
Income of respondent	.48 (479)	.30 (211)	.24 (237)
Income of respondent's wife	.14 (235)	.20 (99)	.29 (86)
Education of respondent	.42 (486)	.36 (215)	.32 (244)
Education of respondents's wife	.25 (428)	.28 (182)	.19 (213)
Education of respondents's father	.27 (368)	.26 (161)	.21 (193)
Education of wife's father	.36 (318)	.36 (137)	.13 (161)
Education of best friend	.33 (382)	.27 (175)	.26 (197)
Consumer Index	.31 (487)	.28 (211)	.18 (238)
Index of occupation, income, and education	.53 (457)	.42 (207)	.37 (224)

for by other demographic variables. It was found that there is little variation in the strength of relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. between categories of such variables as gender, age, community size of origin, or present community size. In the National Study data the congruence between objective and subjective class was higher among Protestants in the established sects than among those in the smaller Protestant sects, but this finding was not upheld in the Four City data.

In the previous chapter it was suggested that the relatively weak association between class identification and objective socio-economic status among blacks and among white Catholics may be because these two groups hold working class values. It was speculated that the belief that class self-evaluation should be made according to universalistically applied objective socio-economic criteria may be characteristic of the core middle class American value system.

If this hypothesis accounts for findings in the United States it probably holds in Canada also. It has been shown that French-Canada has only a small professional middle class and that the majority of the population hold working class status.⁹

respectively.

⁹J. Porter, The Vertical Mosaic (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1970).

Further examination of this hypothesis is possible with the Canadian data. It seems probable that objective criteria for class identification tend to be used under universalistic norms of evaluation, and subjective criteria tend to be used under particularistic norms.¹⁰ Parsons describes the "dilemma of transcendence versus immanence."

In confronting any situation, the actor faces the dilemma whether to treat the objects in the situation in accordance with a general norm covering all objects in that class or whether to treat them in accordance with their standing in some particular relationship to him or his collectivity.¹¹

The universalistic solution to this dilemma is to follow "norms or value standards which are maximally generated and which have a basis of validity transcending any specific system of relationship in which ego is involved"¹² Conversely, when primacy is given to value standards "which allot priority to standards integral to the particular relationship in which the actor is involved with the object" the Parsonian dilemma is resolved particularistically.¹³

¹⁰That is, objective in the sense of consensual societal agreement. This is because objective units, say, income measured in dollars, can be applied equally to all people. Using a subjective measure, say, income evaluated as "high" or "low", makes this very difficult, though it may be a meaningful measure on the personal level.

¹¹Talcott Parsons et al., Toward a General Theory of Action (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 81.

¹²Ibid., pp. 81, 82.

¹³Ibid., p. 82. See the rest of this page for a rigorous definition of the particularism-universalism pattern variable in its cultural, personality, and social system aspects.

It seems probable that in a group where universalistic norms are dominant people will evaluate their class status according to objective criteria that transcend the particular relationship the person (as ego, in Parson's terms) has with himself (as alter). Where particularistic norms are dominant, it seems most probable that people will tend to use subjective class criteria that are directly related to the intimate knowledge and relationship a person has with himself.¹⁴

According to this, we would expect that subjective measures of status would tend to be more strongly related to class self-identification among Catholics than among Protestants. This can be tested with the self-ranking questions used in the two Canadian studies. It will be recalled from Chapter III that respondents in the National Study were asked to rank the social standing of their ethnicity and religion, as well as their father's occupation, male head's occupation, and male head's industry. The correlations of these ratings with class identification, for English Protestants, English Catholics, and French Catholics are shown in Table VI-4. The two subjective ratings from the Four City data are also included here.

¹⁴The particularism hypothesis can be considered as a special case of the ego-involvement hypothesis, or at least as a hypothesis about variations in the amount of ego-involvement among different groups. Thus, under particularistic norms for self-evaluation, ego-involvement is the prescribed, socially rewarded mode of behaviour.

TABLE VI-4.--Zero-order correlations of class identification with self-ranking variables, by religion and ethnicity, for respondents in the National and Four City studies

Self-ranking on:	English Protestant	English Catholic	French Catholic
<u>National Study</u>			
Ethnicity	.07 (193)	.08 (61)	.06 (89)
Religion	.08 (192)	.13 (60)	-.05 (90)
Father's occupation	.17 ^a (389)	.26 ^a (131)	.10 (169)
Male head's occupation	.32 (397)	.40 ^a (134)	.21 ^a (172)
Male head's industry	.21 ^a (191)	.45 ^a (59)	.31 ^a (87)
<u>Four City Study</u>			
Income	.62 ^a (490)	.50 ^a (211)	.39 ^a (239)
Culture	.31 ^a (484)	.24 ^a (213)	.22 ^a (242)

^a $p < .05$ (one-tailed).

It can be seen that self-evaluated ethnic status is only a minor correlate of class identification, and this relationship shows little variation among the three ethno-religious groups, as $r = .07$ among English Protestants, $.08$ among English Catholics, and $.06$ among French Catholics. Self-evaluated religious status is not a strong correlate of class identification either, although there is somewhat more

variation among the three ethno-religious groups.¹⁵

The relationships are considerably stronger using the three socio-economic self-ratings from the National Study. These seem particularly important among English Catholics. The rating of father's occupation correlates .26 among English Catholics, but only .17 among English Protestants and .10 among French Catholics. Similarly, subjective rating of the male head's occupation predicts class identification more accurately among English Catholics ($r = .40$) than among English Protestants ($r = .32$) or among French Catholics ($r = .21$)

However, the most intriguing finding in Table VI-4 is the importance of the perceived prestige of the male head's industry as a criterion for class identification among Catholics in the National sample. The correlation of subjective industry rank with class identification reaches a value of .45 among English Catholics and .31 among French Catholics, compared to only .21 among English Protestants. As only half the National sample was asked this question, the sample sizes are small in the calculations, and consequently the coefficients can only be considered rough indicators of the importance of industry as a class criterion. It is difficult to interpret the meaning of this kind of

¹⁵The negative sign in the result for French Catholics is inconsequential, as the correlation is not statistically significant (at the .05 level).

rating. For instance, it is not precisely known what qualities of a man's industry cause him to attribute high social standing to it.¹⁶ It does seem clear, though, that contrary to the pattern among Protestants, for Catholics, where a man works is more important, so far as class identification is concerned, than what he works at.

The final set of figures in Table VI-4 show that self-rating on income, asked in the Four City Study, followed the usual pattern of higher relationships with class identification among Protestants than among Catholics. Self-rating on culture was also a more powerful predictor of class identification among English Protestants than among English or French Catholics. These two questions were in quite a different form than the five self-evaluative questions used in the National Study, and this may have something to do with the different results produced by the two studies.

It is probably asking too much to expect the correlation of class identification with every kind of self-ranking question to be higher among Catholics than among Protestants. The important thing seems to be that this is the case for some of these subjective self-rankings. One can make at least a reasonable case that Catholics apply subjective eval-

¹⁶For a discussion on the correlates of industry rankings, see, P. Pineo and J. Porter, "A Ranking of Industries", in "The Canadian Status System" (forthcoming). One might expect that something as simple as amiable surroundings might be a determinant of the ranking of male head's industry among French Catholics.

uations of their status when evaluating their class position, while Protestants tend more toward objective evaluations. Further data would be needed in order to come to a more definite conclusion about this.

However, it is not certain that one would have to search for non-socio-economic measures of self-perceived status in order to find further correlates of class identification among Catholics. The responses to the question asked in the Four City Study, "What things decide what social class a man belongs to?" showed little variation between the three ethno-religious groups used in the analysis. On the first criterion named by respondents, only 26 percent of the English Protestants, 25 percent of the English Catholics, and 26 percent of the French Catholics named criteria other than occupation, income, wealth, or occupation. In other words, a clear majority of about three-quarters of those in each group appear to perceive social class in socio-economic terms.

Measures of Particularism-Universalism

There is little Canadian research directly focusing on religious and ethnic differences in the strength of universalism-particularism. However, it has been frequently shown that kinship orientation is stronger among French-Canadians than among English-speaking Canadians.¹⁷ Blau shows that family relations are one of the few instances in modern

¹⁷See, for example, E.C. Hughes, French Canada in Transition (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967);

society where particularism is culturally prescribed, and in fact indispensable.¹⁸ Thus, indirectly, this body of literature on the family in Canada seems to indicate the probability that particularistic values are strong among French-Canadians. Norman Taylor reaches the conclusion that French entrepreneurs hold more particularistic values than English businessmen on the basis of how they run their firms. He found, for instance, that personal contacts with employees carry more weight among French than among English businessmen.¹⁹

The French-Canadian familialism is frequently attributed to the Catholic Church, and references to the importance of kinship relations among Catholics of other ethnic back-

H. Miner, *Ibid.*; P. Garigue, "French Canadian Kinship and Urban Life", *French-Canadian Society*, ed. M. Rioux and Y. Martin (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1968); M. Rioux, "Kinship Recognition and Urbanization in French Canada", *French-Canadian Society*, ed. M. Rioux and Y. Martin (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968); R. Piddington, "A Study of French Canadian Kinship", *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, II, 22. This family orientation may, of course, be dying out as Quebec rapidly modernizes. Norman Taylor uses the concept of particularism to explain his finding of conservatism in business management among French-Canadian industrial entrepreneurs.

¹⁸P. M. Blau, "Operationalizing a Conceptual Scheme: The Universalism-Particularism Pattern Variable", *American Sociological Review*, 27, 164.

¹⁹N. Taylor, "The French-Canadian Industrial Entrepreneur and His Social Environment", *French-Canadian Society*, ed. M. Rioux and Y. Martin (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968), pp. 271-295.

grounds can be found.²⁰ In particular, this seems typical of Italian Catholics.²¹ Similar findings have been reported in family research in the United States. Lenski found several indications of this Catholic family orientation in his analysis of the Detroit Area Study. He noted: "Not only are ties with the extended family weaker among white Protestants than among Catholics, this is also apparently true of ties with the immediate family."²²

Some direct measures of particularism were attempted in the Four City Study. Two of these "particularism questions" were based on a hypothetical situation where the respondent was asked to imagine he was in a car driven by a close friend and they had an accident while speeding. The first question asked whether the friend had a right to expect the respondent to perjure himself in court by testifying that his friend was driving within the speed limit. The second asked the respondent how he thought he would actually testify,

²⁰F. Elkin, The Family in Canada (Canadian Conference on the Family, April, 1964, 55 Parkdale Avenue, Ottawa 3), p. 66.

²¹J. Boissevain, The Italians of Montreal (Ottawa: The Queen's Printer, 1970), p. 10. There is less research on Catholics of other ethnicities, although the next largest Catholic group in Canada after the French were British (including Irish). See, J. Porter, Canadian Social Structure (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1967), p. 85.

²²G. Lenski, The Religious Factor (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1963), p. 218.

regardless of any obligations he felt.²³ The particularistic response to these two questions was, of course, to take the side of the friend over the obligations of a citizen to society and the law.

The other two particularism questions dealt with the strength of the respondent's loyalty to his family and relatives. One asked whether the respondent agreed or disagreed that, "When looking for a job, a person ought to find a position in a place located near his parents, even if that means losing a good opportunity elsewhere." The final question asked the respondent for agreement or disagreement on the statement; "If you have the chance to hire an assistant in your work, it is always better to hire a relative than a stranger."

The distribution of responses to these four questions, for English Protestants, English Catholics, and French Catholics, is shown in Table VI-5. A large majority of respondents, in each of the three groups, chose the universalistic response to each question. Among Protestants, over 80 percent selected the most universalistic response on each question, while among Catholics no fewer than 64 percent of either language group chose the most universalistic response in each case. This clear pattern suggests that the legitimacy of universalistic norms is widely acknowledged in Canada. However, it may be that the questions were biased towards

²³See Appendix B for the exact wording of these two questions.

TABLE VI-5.--Percentage distribution of responses to four universalism-particularism questions, by religion and ethnicity, for respondents in the Four City Study.

Question	English Prot.	English Catholic	French Catholic
<u>Right of friend to expect respondent to perjure himself on his behalf</u>			
A definite right	1	2	3
Some right	12	11	10
No right	84	84	83
No answer	3	3	4
N ^a	562	237	277
<u>What would respondent actually say in court?</u>			
Testify that friend was not speeding	10	12	12
Testify that he was speeding	86	81	82
No answer	5	6	6
<u>A person ought to find a job near his parents, even if that means losing a good opportunity elsewhere</u>			
Agree, or agree somewhat	4	4	9
Don't know	2	4	12
Somewhat disagree	8	12	11
Disagree	83	78	64
No answer	3	2	4

TABLE VI-5--Continued

Question	English Prot	English Catholic	French Catholic
<u>It is always better to hire a relative rather than a stranger</u>			
Agree, or agree somewhat	3	7	8
Don't know	4	5	12
Disagree somewhat	10	12	14
Disagree	81	73	64
No answer	2	3	3

^aColumn totals in the other three questions are the same.

encouraging the universalistic response. This certainly seems likely in the car accident question, where the particularistic response required the respondent to admit that he would be willing to lie in court.²⁴

²⁴The high level of universalism reflected in these responses contrasts with the relatively weak relationships found between class identification and objective S.E.S., even among Protestants. These correlations suggest that universalistic values are not held very strongly even among Protestants. One possible answer is that the universalism-particularism questions measure the cultural aspect of the pattern variable (what should be), while the correlations of class and S.E.S. reflect the social system aspect (what is). It was originally intended to sub-divide the religious groups according to their score on the universalism-particularism scale, and examine whether the relationship between class and S.E.S. was similar among the particularistic Protestants and Catholics. However, the one-sided distribution of responses to these questions made this type of analysis impractical.

There does seem to be some indication from Table VI-5 that Catholics hold more particularistic values than Protestants. Although on the first two questions the responses among the three groups were almost identical, on the third and fourth questions, both English and French Catholics were somewhat more inclined than English Protestants to select the particularistic responses. While 83 percent of the Protestants disagreed that a person ought to give up a good opportunity in order to work near his parents, the corresponding proportions taking this view among English and French Catholics were 78 percent and 64 percent respectively. Similarly, the proportions disagreeing that it is always better to hire a relative than a stranger as an assistant were 81 percent of Protestants, 73 percent of English Catholics, and 64 percent of French Catholics. Both differences in proportions between Protestants and French Catholics are significant at the .05 level.

It seems wise, though, to interpret these results with caution as there is a problem with internal consistency among the four questions, and this casts doubt on their reliability as a scale of universalism-particularism. Although the first two questions deal with loyalty to a friend, and the third and fourth with kinship orientation, it would be expected that if each question measures a tendency to value particularistic norms there would be substantial inter-correlation between them. Yet these inter-correlations, shown in Table

VI-6, reveal that this was not the case. It can be seen that there is scarcely any relationship between the friendship and kinship questions.²⁵ For instance, the "rights of friend" question correlates only .03 with the "take a job near parents" question, and .05 with the "hire a relative over a stranger" question, neither coefficient being significant at the .05 level.

TABLE VI-6.--Inter-correlations of four measures of universalism-particularism, for respondents in the Four City Study.

Variables ^a	Variables ^a			
	W	X	Y	Z
W44 (1034)	.03 (1048)	.05 (1052)
X		...	-.04 (1028)	.03 (1031)
Y		35 (1058)
Z				...

^aW: Rights of friend in traffic accident.

X: Testify for or against friend.

Y: A person ought to find a job near his parents.

Z: Better to hire a relative rather than a stranger.

²⁵This raises the question of the validity of gener-

Thus, two distinct pairs of values appear to be captured in this series of questions. First, there is friendship orientation; the correlation between the duty the respondent recognizes to his friend in the accident and whether he thinks he would testify in his favour is .44. The second pair of questions, measuring kinship orientation, are also quite strongly related ($r = .35$).

The lack of internal consistency among the two pairs of questions makes it impossible to know which, if any, of the questions are valid measures of the universalism-particularism pattern variable. This seems to be a very difficult variable to measure by survey techniques. Probably it is necessary to use a much more sophisticated battery of questions than the four tried here.²⁶

Summary

Data from two Canadian studies were used to replicate the results found for Protestants and Catholics in the U.S. data. Similar patterns seem to exist in the two societies.

alizing from particularism in family relations to norms as a whole. If the two types of measures used here do not agree, can we use material like the family literature to infer a particularistic value system among Catholics? Clearly, further measures would be useful.

²⁶The two questions pertaining to the traffic accident situations were designed by Stouffer. See S. A. Stouffer, "An Empirical Study of Technical Problems in Analysis of Role Obligation", Toward a General Theory of Action, ed., T. Parsons and E. A. Shils (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 479. Stouffer used three other role conflict situations which were not used in the Four City Study because of lack of space and because their applicability to French-Canadians seemed doubtful.

As in the United States, an effect like a regression towards the mean was discovered among Canadian Catholics. As well, in the Canadian data the strength of relationship between class identification and measures of S.E.S. was lower among French and English Catholics than among Protestants. These results held in both the National Study and in the Four City Study.

Some attempts were made to devise tests of the hypothesis, suggested in the previous chapter, that the use of universalistically applied objective S.E.S. class criteria is most consistent with the core middle class North American value system. In support of this hypothesis, evidence was found which suggested that some subjective measures of status are stronger predictors of class identification among Catholics than among Protestants. Also, indicators, both indirect and direct, showing greater particularism among Catholics than among Protestants were found. However, problems of internal consistency were encountered with the particularism-universalism questions.

CHAPTER VII

THE DEPRESSION HYPOTHESIS

In the previous chapters, the anomaly of the surprisingly weak relationship between objective (S.E.S.) and subjective (class identification) measures of social class has been considered from two perspectives. In Chapter IV the difficulty of performing objective, disinterested, self-evaluations was examined, and it was hypothesized that this "ego-involvement" in class identification was responsible for part of the incongruence between the objective and the subjective measures of class status. Then, in the following two chapters it was shown that there are significant variations in the strength of relationship between objective socio-economic status and subjective class identification.

In the present chapter the relationship between S.E.S. and class identification is considered from the perspective of changes over time. American data is used to test the "depression hypothesis" that "the relationship between objective S.E.S. and subjective class identification grows stronger during economic depression and weaker during economic prosperity." Some support for the hypothesis is found, as people who experienced the 1929 depression during their working lives tend to be more likely to use objective S.E.S.

criteria for class identification than those maturing after the depression. As a result, the congruence between objective and subjective social class has decreased between 1945 and 1969.

The Depression Hypothesis

The social consequences of fluctuations in the business cycle seem to have been most thoroughly studied from the point of view of political behaviour. Philip Converse presented data from the 1956 S.R.C. Election Study which supported his contention that: "In view of the economic axis of class feeling we would readily assume that status polarization should increase in time of depression, and decrease in periods of prosperity."¹ By "status polarization" he meant class divisions on political questions, or "the strength of relationship between status and relevant politico-economic variables"²

Supporting evidence for this assumption is seen in the Lynds' study of the reaction of a midwestern American town to the depression. They found that the working class in Middletown suffered sooner and more seriously than the

¹A. Campbell et al., The American Voter (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966), pp. 356-357.

²P. E. Converse, "The Shifting Role of Class in Political Attitudes and Behavior", Readings in Social Psychology, ed. E. E. Maccoby et al. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958), p. 394.

"business class". The business class remained consistently more optimistic about the economic situation, and the Lynds commented: "This differing appraisal of when 'bad times' exist, whereby Middletown businessmen, applying their own yardstick to a situation, can say, 'Till 1932 the depression was mainly something we read about in newspapers,' while at the same time every fourth factory worker had lost his job by 1930, affords an interesting commentary on the class basis of many judgements by Middletown people."³ High unemployment decreased the prospects of occupational mobility, causing greater rigidity in the class structure.

The Lynds reported increased radicalization and union activity among workers in Middletown during the depression, and the success of Franklin Roosevelt's radical policies in the elections of 1932 and 1936 indicates the general swing to the left throughout the country.⁴

It seems to be widely accepted, at least implicitly, that rising prosperity among the working class is one of the

³R. S. Lynd and H. M. Lynd, Middletown in Transition (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1937), p. 16.

⁴Ibid., pp. 7-74. There may be international variations in this pattern. Runciman reports a "grin and bear it" attitude toward conditions in the thirties in England. See, W. G. Runciman, Relative Deprivation and Social Justice (Pelican ed.; London: Cox & Wyman Ltd., 1972) pp. 75-77. It is difficult to say whether it is relative or absolute poverty that causes working class radicalism. Lipset notes the prevalence of radical politics in the under-developed countries of the world. S. M. Lipset, Political Man (New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1963) p. 45.

most effective antidotes to working class discontent and radical left-wing politics. Goldthorpe and Lockwood note that, "From the end of the nineteenth century, a Marxian, or more accurately, a para-Marxian perspective on the question of the affluent worker has been the dominant one; that is to say, it has been generally argued (or assumed) that affluence is conducive to embourgeoisement which itself leads to political conservatism, or at any rate to political apathy, within the working class."⁵

It is hypothesized that these consequences of the 1929 depression, the widening of the material gap between rich and poor, together with a radicalization of politics, caused people who experienced the depression during their adult lives to be more likely to evaluate their class status according to socio-economic criteria.⁶

The depression hypothesis is tested here by examining trends in the strength of correlation between class identification and measures of S.E.S. between the years 1945 and 1969.

⁵J. H. Goldthorpe et al. "The Affluent Worker and the Thesis of Embourgeoisement: Some Preliminary Research Findings", Comparative Perspectives on Stratification, ed. J. A. Kahl (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968) p. 117.

⁶That is, as the material gap between classes widens, people should be able to recognize the economic differentiation more clearly and thus be able to place themselves in the class system according to objective economic criteria. In prosperous times, the opposite effect is expected, as class divisions will become more difficult to distinguish. Radical left-wing political activity tends to raise consciousness of objective economic class position and interests by publicizing these to the working class constituency.

If the depression hypothesis holds, it is expected that this correlation coefficient will show a decline during this period, as memories of the depression fade away, and as those who lived during the depression die. It is assumed that fluctuations in the business cycle during the post-war years have had only minor social consequences compared to the upheaval following the 1929 crash. The data used in this analysis are not of sufficiently uniform quality to detect systematic minor fluctuations in the strength of relationship between objective S.E.S. and class identification.

Warfare is another historical condition that probably reduces economic class consciousness and the congruence between objective and subjective measures of class.⁷ Again, the quality of data used in the analysis does not permit us to gauge the effects of, say, the Korean War on the relationship between objective S.E.S. and class identification. It is difficult to evaluate the impact of the Second World War, as the first study in the time series was conducted only in 1945,

⁷In the twentieth century, war has been linked closely with prosperity, as a war economy promotes full employment together with controlled prices. Apart from these economic effects, a major conflict such as the Second World War seems to promote a sense of community that submerges class interests under the more urgent demands of the national cause. De Grazia writes, "Mounting nationalism with its affirmations of unity, brotherhood, and common defense accompanies the march toward war." S. De Grazia, The Political Community (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966) p. 157.

at the very end of the war.⁸

Trends between 1945 and 1969

In Table VII-1 the correlations of class identification with male head's occupation, respondent's education, and family income (where asked) are shown for each of the eight national U.S. studies in the combined sample. A disconcerting methodological problem was encountered in attempting this analysis, as it became apparent that the strength of correlation between class identification and measures of S.E.S. varies according to the version of class question used. In the Michigan University Survey Research Center studies, the correlation averaged several points higher than among the other studies.⁹ For this reason, the results in Table VII-1 are shown separately for the two groups of studies.

⁸The analysis is similarly hampered by the lack of class identification data from the thirties. However, the pervasiveness of the depression, together with its long duration seem to justify the study of its effects using post hoc data.

⁹In these calculations farmers were excluded as usual. The codes for occupation, education, and income were similar but not identical among the eight studies. Class identification was coded as "middle" or "working" in the S.R.C. studies, but in the studies using the Centers question the categories were, "upper, middle, working, and lower". Recoding class in these studies as middle or working causes only insubstantial variations in the correlations. The S.R.C. class code also included a further qualification of the class choice into the upper or average part of the chosen class. Using this added detail in the correlations with S.E.S. adds about two points to each correlation.

TABLE VII-1.--Zero-order correlations of class identification with occupation, education, and income, by year of study

Class with:	Occupation	Education	Income
Year	S.R.C. Centers version version	S.R.C. Centers version version	S.R.C. Centers version version
1945	.52 (845)	.47 (855)	a
1949	.37 (953)	.39 (1032)	a
1956	.44 (1420)	.44 (1502)	.35 (1461)
1960	.44 (932)	.43 (1020)	.38 (1015)
1964 (S.R.C.)	.43 (1285)	.43 (1372)	.34 (1332)
1964 (N.O.R.C.) ^b	.36 (780)	.32 (828)	.31 (813)
1968	.41 (1226)	.41 (1400)	.34 (1368)
1969	.33 (1147)	.36 (1388)	.25 (1384)

^aIncome not asked.

^bModified Centers version.

One reason for this discrepancy may be that the S.R.C. studies used a more detailed preamble to the class identification question than the Centers question, used in the other studies. The S.R.C. question began with the statement: "There's quite a lot of talk these days about different social

classes. Most people say they belong to the middle class or to the working class." This may serve to reassure respondents that the interviewer recognizes the legitimacy of class distinctions, and, in fact, cause the respondent to feel abnormal if he doesn't place himself in a class. This reassurance may encourage more candid answers from the respondents than the brief Centers wording, "If you were asked to use one of these four names for your social class, which would you say you belonged in" ¹⁰

Despite the problem of comparability between the Centers version and the S.R.C. version of the class question, there is evidence of a decline over time in the strength of relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. This trend is consistent with the prediction based on the depression hypothesis. Among the four S.R.C. studies, spanning the years 1956 to 1968, there is only a slight decline in the correlation of class identification with male head's occupation. However, among the studies using the Centers question, the coefficient dropped from a high of .52 in 1945, to .37 in 1949, .36 in 1964, and .33 in 1969. ¹¹

¹⁰ Another factor may be the content of the other questions used in the interview. The highly political content of the S.R.C. studies may have "politicized" the respondents, and made them more aware of their objective economic class position and interests. This difficulty, equivalent to "contamination of the data" in a scientific experiment, is almost unavoidable in secondary analysis of survey data.

¹¹ It will be recalled from Chapter II that the 1964 N.O.R.C. study used slightly different wording than Centers'

These figures indicate that the most rapid decline took place in the short period between 1945 and 1949. In fact, the drop of 15 points within four years in the class identification/occupation correlations is astonishing. It was possible, by working with other data published by Centers, to evaluate the authenticity of the 1945 and 1949 figures. It will be recalled that Centers conducted class studies in 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1950. By calculating Pearsonian correlations from the cross-tabulations of class identification and occupation published by Centers, we get $r = .50$ in 1946, $.47$ in 1947-48 (data available only for the two studies pooled together), and $.40$ in 1950.¹²

This seems to corroborate the validity of the 1945 result. Also, it does appear to be true that in the five years between 1945 and 1950 the strength of occupation as a predictor of class identification was falling rapidly. As a further substantiation of this, we may note that the S.R.C. study of 1952 carried the Centers version of the class question, and occupation correlated $.38$ with class identification in this sample. This is probably a slightly conservative figure, as the occupation code in the 1952 study was less detailed than in the other studies mentioned here, and farm

class question, and included the extra class label, "upper-middle".

¹²The occupation codes in these three studies were fully comparable with the other studies, and exactly the same (Centers version) class question was used.

labourers could not be excluded from the analysis.¹³

These supplementary results do suggest, however, that the correlation of .37 between class identification and occupation in the 1949 sample is a little lower than one would expect from the other results. There is no evidence that the fieldwork and data processing of the 1949 study were of lower quality than in any other of the samples used in this analysis.¹⁴ It is probably fruitless to speculate about whether the 1949 result genuinely reflects a minor variation due to immediate events of that year, or whether this result is merely a sampling fluctuation.¹⁵

Education also appears to be declining in strength as a predictor of class identification. The pattern is similar

¹³For this reason, it was impossible to include the 1952 study in the combined sample. The correlation of occupation with class identification was re-calculated in the 1945 study, using the same codes as in the 1952 study. This indicated that a "correction" of about 2 or 3 points should be added to the 1952 results to compensate for the less detailed coding.

¹⁴One clue may be that the frequency of high S.E.S. respondents in the 1949 sample is slightly lower than in the other studies. Other attempts at quality checks were inconclusive. If the 1949 sample were of particularly poor quality, one would expect that simple relationships such as the occupation/education correlation would be unusually low. This correlation was .61 in the 1945 sample, .50 in the 1949 data, .51 in the 1956 S.R.C. sample, .56 in 1960, .48 in 1964 (S.R.C.), .46 in 1964 (N.O.R.C.), .50 in 1968, and .51 in 1969. See Appendix C for further details.

¹⁵Sampling fluctuations are still quite large in samples of this size. In the 1949 sample, with N= 953 in the calculation of the occupation/class correlation, 95 percent confidence intervals around the coefficient would range from a low of .34 to a high of .42.

to that seen with occupation. Among the S.R.C. studies, the drop between 1956 and 1968 is only 3 points. In the longer span of years covered by the studies using the Centers question, a larger drop is seen. Here education correlated .47 with class identification in the 1945 study but had declined to $r = .35$ by 1969. Again, the most rapid drop is in the first few years after 1945. Although published results from Centers' other studies do not include education, the general trend is sustained in the 1952 study, where the correlation of education with class identification was .35.

Trends in the strength of association between income and class identification seem more confused. One difficulty is that income was not asked in either the 1945 nor the 1949 studies. Among the S.R.C. studies, the relationship between income and class identification appears to be subject to minor fluctuations of no clear direction. Among the studies using the Centers question, there is a hint that income is declining in strength as a predictor of class identification ($r = .31$ in 1964 and $.25$ in 1969). In the 1952 study (which, it will be recalled, gives slightly low results) income correlated $.28$ with class identification.

Although most of the results seen in Table VII-1 are consistent with expectations following from the depression hypothesis, it would be foolhardy to assume that alternate explanations for the declining relationship between class

identification and S.E.S. are precluded. For instance, the decline could be part of a long-term trend caused by basic structural changes in American society not directly related to the 1929 depression. Several writers have expressed variations of this hypothesis that the objective basis for social class differentiation has tended to decline over time.¹⁶ For Nisbet, classes in the true sense ceased to exist sometime around 1910.¹⁷

How can we decide whether the trend observed in Table VII-1 is genuinely connected with the fading out of the depression generation or merely part of a hundred year trend toward a less differentiated labour force? Lacking the data for a long-term time series analysis, the next alternative seems to be to try to isolate the generation of people who experienced the depression during their adult lives, and observe whether the relationship between class identification and measures of S.E.S. is higher among this group than among those coming after the depression.

For this analysis, the samples were divided into respondents aged 39 and under, and over 40. In the 1945

¹⁶See, for example, G. Sjoberg, "Are Social Classes in America Becoming more Rigid", American Sociological Review, 16, 775-783; R. A. Nisbet, "The Decline and Fall of Social Class", The Pacific Sociological Review, 2, 11-17; R. E. Lane, "The Politics of Consensus in an Age of Affluence", American Political Science Review, 59, 874-889; Goldthorpe et al., Comparative Perspectives on Stratification, pp. 115-137.

¹⁷Nisbet, The Pacific Sociological Review, 2, 11.

sample, most of those aged over 40 would have experienced the 1929 depression, while most of those 39 or under would have come to maturity after the worst of the depression was past. The more recent the study, the less probability there is of people in the sample who experienced the depression. For example, in the 1969 sample a person would have to be aged 60 in order to have been 20 in 1929. Thus, if experiencing the depression really did cause people to use objective S.E.S. criteria for class identification, it would be expected that in the early studies the correlations of class identification with S.E.S. would be larger among the over 40 generation than among those under 40. In the more recent studies, the expected pattern is that this difference between the generations would decrease.

The results of this test are shown in Table VII-2.¹⁸ It can be seen that the trend is in the expected direction, although the pattern is somewhat erratic.¹⁹ In the correlation of occupation with class identification, the coefficients were higher among the over 40 (depression generation) group

¹⁸To facilitate this set of calculations, the coding of variables in Table VII-2 is identical to the uniform code for the combined sample, described previously. As this is a less detailed code, many of the coefficients have a slightly lower value than they would under the more detailed coding used in Table VII-1.

¹⁹This is not to say there may not also be a long-term trend towards less differentiated class structure. However, census data suggests this change is too slow to show up in the short period from 1945-69.

in the 1945, 1949, and 1956 samples. The pattern changes abruptly in 1960, with the coefficient 8 points higher among the under 40 group than among those over 40. In the 1964 S.R.C. study the coefficient was 3 points higher among the under 40 generation, but this is contradicted by opposite results in the 1964 N.O.R.C. sample. The coefficient was 1 point lower among the over 40 generation in the 1968 sample, and in 1969 there again is a higher correlation between occupation and class identification among the respondents over 40 years of age. Clearly, with the difference between the two age groups in the strength of this correlation oscillating so widely, we can only be concerned with the broad outlines of the overall trend.

This general conformity with the predicted pattern is seen also in the correlation of education with class identification. Again, the groups with the highest proportion of respondents who experienced the 1929 depression (i.e. those over 40 in the earlier studies) exhibit the strongest relationship between education and class identification. But the pattern is disconcertingly erratic here also. In particular, the disagreement in the results for the 1964 S.R.C. and 1964 N.O.R.C. samples indicates the instability of individual coefficients.²⁰

²⁰The mean age of respondents in the N.O.R.C. 1964 study is somewhat lower than among those in the S.R.C. 1964 sample, but it seems unlikely that this alone could account for the inconsistencies. Due to the lack of early data, in-

TABLE VII-2.--Zero-order correlations of class identification with occupation and education, by age of respondent and year of study

Year	Occupation			Education		
	Under 40	Over 40	Diff.	Under 40	Over 40	Diff.
1945	.49 (332)	.54 (401)	+5	.42 (331)	.47 (398)	+5
1949	.36 (451)	.41 (501)	+5	.37 (482)	.43 (549)	+6
1956	.41 (679)	.47 (730)	+6	.41 (694)	.41 (794)	0
1960	.49 (327)	.41 (605)	-8	.49 (337)	.44 (682)	-5
1964 (S.R.C.)	.45 (531)	.42 (750)	-3	.46 (562)	.39 (815)	-7
1964 (N.O.R.C.)	.32 (339)	.35 (427)	+3	.26 (368)	.34 (446)	+8
1968	.41 (485)	.40 (739)	-1	.45 (540)	.37 (855)	-8
1969	.32 (544)	.36 (590)	+4	.39 (557)	.31 (817)	-8

How concerned should we be about these fluctuations? The aim of this analysis was to try to examine the effect of the 1929 depression on the extent to which people use objective S.E.S. criteria for class identification. By ignoring the influence of other factors, an over-simplified model has

come was not included in this analysis.

certainly been created. Moreover, the prime causal agent in this model, the 1929 depression, ceased some thirty or thirty-five years ago. From that point of view, it is remarkable that any evidence at all was found to support the depression hypothesis, and we should not be surprised if the predicted patterns occur irregularly. Probably the impact of the depression on those living through it has not declined merely by process of the natural attrition of this generation. It would be surprising if memories of life and events in the thirties had not faded by the sixties. The eradication of these experiences may have accelerated at certain times in the post-depression years. A possibility that is consistent with the rapid decline of S.E.S./class identification correlations between 1945 and 1950 is that the growth of anti-communism during these years undid some of the social consequences of the depression. If the swing to the left during the Roosevelt years increased the general level of objective economic class consciousness, the increasingly hard right-wing line during the late forties may have had the opposite effect.²¹ The results seen in Table VII-2 do seem to become most unstable in the later sixties.

However, it probably is unwise to become too ingenious in finding excuses for what may simply be low quality data.

²¹One possible consequence of the anti-communism, particularly during the McCarthy investigations, may have been to make social class a "dirty word".

If one is required too frequently to resort to immediate historical events to explain empirical anomalies, then the whole aim of a social science based on generalizations becomes jeopardized.

Thus, while the results of this analysis do seem to indicate unusually high objective economic class consciousness among the depression generation, this must be considered only a tentative conclusion. Confidence in the results would certainly have been increased had it been possible to use only studies employing the Centers class question.²² Additional results might have stabilized the patterns, but a large number of studies becomes difficult to handle.

Relatively little seems to be known about the comparability of different studies. We do not know how much survey results are affected by outside events. This chapter is an experiment in this kind of comparative approach.

Trends among Protestants and Catholics

Protestants and Catholics in the United States appear to be converging with respect to the strength of relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. This seems to be because the depression hypothesis does not hold among Catholics. These results are seen in Table VII-3, showing the correlation of class identification with occupation and edu-

²²Unfortunately, high quality studies using the Centers class question are scarce.

cation, by religion and age. The studies in the combined sample are grouped into two sets, those in the years 1945-56 and those in the years 1960-69.

TABLE VII-3.--Zero-order correlations of class identification with occupation and education, for Protestants and Catholics between the periods 1945-56 and 1960-69, and by respondents's age

Year	Protestant			Catholic		
	Total	39 or under	Over 40	Total	39 or under	Over 40
Relationship of class identification and occupation						
1945-1956 ^a	.50 (1412)	.45 (624)	.52 (706)	.30 (494)	.31 (246)	.23 (230)
1960-1969 ^b	.40 (3602)	.41 (1447)	.40 (2135)	.32 (1293)	.31 (578)	.33 (709)
Relationship of class identification and education						
1945-1956	.45 (1486)	.44 (637)	.47 (755)	.27 (509)	.22 (248)	.29 (241)
1960-1969	.40 (4060)	.42 (1528)	.40 (2510)	.32 (1439)	.37 (623)	.30 (808)

^aThe 1945 and 1956 studies combined. The 1949 study is excluded because religion was not asked.

^bThe 1960, 1964 (two studies), 1968, and 1969 studies.

Although combining the studies in this analysis does not give an accurate estimate of the real trends among the two groups in the relationship between class identification

and S.E.S., (because of the two versions of class question) it does accurately portray the relative trends of each group with respect to the other.²³ Thus, while among the Protestants in the sample the correlation of class identification with occupation is shown as declining 10 points, among Catholics this coefficient rose by 2 points between 1945-56 and 1960-69. The pattern is much the same using education as the predictor of class identification.²⁴

Among Protestants, a depression effect is evident, as the correlation of occupation with class identification is highest among those over 40 in the 1945-56 sample; the group having the greatest proportion of depression generation respondents. Among those of the same age in the 1960-69 sample, this coefficient was 12 points lower. However, among Catholics, this pattern does not hold, as occupation correlates .33 among those over 40 in the 1960-69 sample, but only .23 among those of the same age group in the 1945-56 sample. Using education to predict class identification produces similar results; the depression hypothesis holds among Protestants but

²³The proportion of Catholics in the samples is relatively stable. Thus, if a study gives, say, unusually high correlations between class identification and S.E.S. this bias is reflected proportionately among the Protestant and Catholic groups, leaving the relative standings unchanged.

²⁴It is intriguing that it is Protestants rather than Catholics who are exhibiting the change. This is contrary to the usual pattern in Protestant-Catholic differences. The data imply that Protestants are becoming more particularistic rather than Catholics becoming more universalistic.

not among Catholics. Although the pattern of a closer association between objective S.E.S. and class identification among Protestants remained in the 1960-69 sample, if the trend towards congruence between Protestants and Catholics continues, the difference may disappear entirely in the future.

Again, the time lag between the depression years and the beginning of the time series hinders interpretation of the findings. There are two main possibilities. Either Catholics were not affected by the depression in the same way that Protestants were, or the Catholics were affected but this wore off by 1945.

The greater stability among Catholics in the strength of relationship between class identification and S.E.S. is consistent with the argument that the Catholic value system is better equipped to cope with changing economic conditions. Unemployment or falling wages may pose less threat to Catholics because of the tradition in Catholicism that poverty is not shameful.

Bakke, in his study of unemployment during the 1929 depression, notes the different attitudes taken toward unemployment by the Protestant and Catholic churches:

The Catholic church teaches us that the more we suffer on earth the greater will be our reward in heaven. Up in heaven somewhere there is a book where suffering

is recorded, and the more suffering recorded the happier will be your life in heaven . . . Another Catholic belief which is relevant to our present problem is the faith that sins can be erased by means of penance, that having thus been forgiven there is no need for further punishment after death, nor even in this life. Misfortune is not necessarily, therefore, a punishment for past sins or even mistakes.²⁵

"In contrast to these relatively comforting doctrines," Bakke writes, "the Protestant emphasis seems to be upon the relationship of rewards and punishments on earth to one's actual past behavior. Anything that happens to one now may be a punishment for something one has done sometime previous to the misfortune."²⁶

It seems probable that these doctrinal differences may cause Catholics to be less inclined than Protestants to downgrade their class status during hard times, or to upgrade it during prosperity.

There is not sufficient data to permit a time series analysis of class identification in Canada. However, a simple retrospective question was asked in the Four City Study and this yielded some interesting results. This was the question, mentioned previously, that asked people to compare class consciousness among people now with the class consciousness of people twenty or thirty years ago.

Some results from this question are shown in Table VII-4.

²⁵E. W. Bakke, Citizens Without Work (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947), pp. 21, 22.

²⁶Ibid., p. 22.

It can be seen that there is some tendency for people to perceive less class consciousness among the public now than during the 1940's and 50's. While 34 percent of the respondents thought class consciousness has increased, 45 percent thought it has decreased.

TABLE VII-4--Percentage distribution of responses in the Four City Study to the question: "How conscious are people today of belonging to a social class compared to people 20 or 30 years ago?"

Response	Total	Prot.	Eng. Cath.	French Cath.
No answer	9	9	6	10
People are much more conscious of belonging to a class than 20 or 30 years ago	19	12	20	33
Somewhat more	15	12	18	21
About the same	11	10	10	13
Somewhat less	24	30	27	12
Much less	21	26	19	11
N	1104	562	237	277

Also, the perception of declining class consciousness is most common among Protestants. Among this group, 56 per-

cent perceived some decrease, compared to 46 percent of English Catholics. These findings seem to support the evidence of time trends seen in the U.S. It may be speculated that were a Canadian time series available, the relationship between objective and subjective class would show a decline similar to the one observed in the American data.²⁷

Summary

The depression hypothesis was tested in this chapter. This hypothesis predicts that "the relationship between objective S.E.S. and subjective class identification grows stronger during periods of economic depression and weaker during economic prosperity." It was found that, as predicted by the hypothesis, the strength of relationship between measures of S.E.S. and class identification has declined over time. This decline appears to be linked with the 1929 depression as objective economic class consciousness was highest in the group having the largest proportion of respondents who experienced the depression.

Caution was recommended however, in accepting this interpretation, as contradictions were encountered in the data. Another difficulty was that the strength of the S.E.S./class identification correlations varied according to the version of the class question used.

²⁷For an account of conditions in Canada during the depression, see M. Horn (ed.), The Dirty Thirties (Canada: The Copp Clark Publishing Co., 1972).

The depression effect does not appear to hold among Catholics, with the result that Protestants and Catholics are converging in the strength of relationship between class identification and S.E.S. This may be due to a greater capacity of the Catholic value-system to withstand the consequences of economic change.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this thesis was to test empirically some hypotheses concerning the relatively weak relationship between objective and subjective measures of social class. It was argued that most of the major theories of social class have assumed that a congruence exists between the class people think they belong to and their class according to objective economic criteria.

It was shown that this expectation has not been realized in empirical work on subjective class self-identification. Richard Centers' data showed that less than one third of the variation in class identification responses could be accounted for by variations in occupational status. This finding has been confirmed in several later studies in class identification.

Several explanations for this relatively weak relationship are suggested in the literature on social class. The most frequently mentioned are; poor methodology, egalitarian ideology, ego-involvement, and simple ignorance of class. These hypotheses have not previously been tested, however, and this thesis was designed to attempt this using survey data.

Although most previous work in class identification has employed American data, most of the data used here were drawn from Canadian society. Consequently, the first priority was to replicate some of Centers' basic findings using the Canadian data. This replication also had intrinsic value, it was felt, because it provided the first description of the subjective social class structure of Canadian society.

The results of this replication were described in Chapter II. Class identification results from the Pineo, Porter National Study (Canada) of 1965 were compared with results from a N.O.R.C. Study (United States) completed in 1964. Confidence in the accuracy of this comparison was enhanced by the fact that these studies closely resemble each other in methods and content. The basic distribution of class choices in each country was found to be very similar. In both Canada and the United States, the middle class is the largest single self-identified class. Also, the strength of relationship between class identification and S.E.S. measures was found to be similar in the two countries.

Another aim in this chapter was to compare results from the two Canadian data sources; the National Study and the Four City Study. Closely matching results were found between the two samples. This was reassuring, as the quality of methodology in the Four City sample was considerably weaker than in the National Study.

The hypothesis that the weak relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. is due to ignorance or egalitarian ideology was not supported by evidence in the Four City Study. It was found that a majority of people name socio-economic criteria in response to the question: "What things determine what social class a person belongs to?" Thus, people seem to be quite knowledgeable about social class. Also, people are not reluctant to make invidious distinctions when ranking the social class status of different occupational roles. These rankings showed a clear association between class status and occupational status.

The question of the appropriate format for the class self-identification question was considered in Chapter III. Both the open and the closed version of the question were asked in the Four City Study. Comparing the distribution of responses to the two questions showed that the open-ended format results in a higher refusal rate, more frequent middle class identification, and less frequent working class identification. It was found that the correlations of class identification with various measures of objective S.E.S. were higher using the closed-response question than with the open-ended version. Taking this as a validity test, it was concluded that the closed-response identification question was the more appropriate form to use in this study. The possibility of improvements to the closed question was

considered however. Respondents in the National and Four City studies were asked how many social classes they thought there are in Canada. In both samples the modal response was three classes, and only small proportions thought there are more than five classes. Thus, it does not appear that the validity of the identification question would be appreciably enhanced by the addition of further categories. Further validation of the question came from the finding that while people do not readily name the working class in the open-ended self-identification question, those selecting this class in the closed-response question frequently report a strong feeling of belonging to their class. It was found, as well, that adding a more detailed qualification of the class choice raised the correlations between class identification and S.E.S. only slightly.

Another possible explanation for the relatively weak association between objective and subjective class was considered in this chapter. This was the chance that other types of indicators have strong relationships with class identification. Subjective self-rankings on various socio-economic status characteristics were found to have substantial independent relationships with class identification. However, none of the non-S.E.S. attributes, measured either subjectively or objectively, were powerful predictors of class identification.

The role of ego-involvement, frequently mentioned as

a factor dampening the congruence between objective and subjective class, was tested in Chapter IV. It was hypothesized that if people do indeed have difficulty in evaluating themselves dispassionately, then they should be able to judge the class status of others more accurately than their own class. Data from the Four City Study gave at least some support to this hypothesis. The respondent's class evaluation of his father and best friend was more accurate than the evaluation of his own class. The results were inconclusive in the rating of father-in-law's class, while wife's class was evaluated less accurately than respondent's own class.

The extent of the distortion caused by ego-involvement was most clearly seen when comparing the accuracy of self-evaluated class with the evaluations of the class status of occupational roles. Respondents in the Four City Study were able to differentiate distinctly between the class status of different occupational roles, and these rankings showed a high consensus. It was seen that ego-involvement is not unique to class identification. Data from the National Study showed that people can order a list of occupational titles so that the resulting aggregate ranking corresponds very closely with the average amount of income and education of incumbents of each occupation. Yet when individuals ranked their own jobs in terms of their social standing, this consensus broke down. Another result, from the Four City Study, which seemed consistent with the ego-involvement

hypothesis was the finding that the relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. is strongest among those reporting little feeling of belonging to a class. That is, it seemed that the less a person cares about his class status, the more accurately he can evaluate it.

In Chapters V and VI consideration was given to the possibility that minority status displaces objective socio-economic status as a criterion for class identification. In Chapter V this was tested using data from the United States. It was found that, holding objective S.E.S. constant, Jewish respondents placed themselves in the middle class more frequently than white Protestants. White Catholics assigned themselves working class status slightly more often than white Protestants, while black Protestants identified with the working class in greater proportions than any of the other groups.

Unexpectedly however, it was found that minority status, for these groups, does not always displace the socio-economic correlates of class identification. While this was true of black Protestants, and to a lesser degree of white Catholics, the relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. was higher among Jews than among white Protestants. It was hypothesized that the use of universalistically applied, objective socio-economic criteria for class self-identification is largely a middle class value, held by Jews and white Protestants, but only to a lesser degree by

Catholics and blacks.

Some of these results were replicated, in Chapter VI, using data from the two Canadian surveys. The U.S. results were supported. In Canada, as in the United States, the relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. was stronger among Protestants than among Catholics. An attempt to operationalize the particularism-universalism pattern variable gave some indication that Catholics hold more particularistic norms than Protestants do. It was also discovered that some other self-ranking variables (especially industry rank) are quite strongly correlated with class identification among Catholics.

Trends over time in the strength of relationship between class identification and S.E.S. were examined in Chapter VII. It was hypothesized that the relationship between objective and subjective class would tend to weaken during prosperous times and strengthen during depression. Support for this hypothesis was found, since the most accurate class identifications were made by those who experienced the 1929 depression during their working careers. There has been a decline in the relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S. between the years 1945 and 1969, with the fading away of the depression generation. Caution was recommended however, in accepting this interpretation, as contradictions were encountered in the data. Another difficulty was that the strength of the S.E.S./class identifi-

cation correlations varied according to the version of the class question used.

The depression effect does not appear to hold among Catholics, with the result that Protestants and Catholics are converging in the strength of relationship between class identification and objective S.E.S.

It was not possible, in this thesis, to deal with every conceivable source of incongruency between the objective and subjective measures of social class. One possible source, common to nearly all surveys, is error in the reporting of factual variables such as occupation, education, age, and so on. This error may stem directly from the respondent, or it may enter during clerical operations. There is not yet agreement on how serious a problem this is, but it appears to be the subject of increasing concern among sociologists.¹

If reports of factual information are subject to instability, one wonders how stable class identifications are. An interesting experiment would be to ask people the class identification question several times, at different times and under varying circumstances. Little is known about the constancy of class consciousness, or the extent

¹In one operation where respondents' reports of their fathers' occupation was checked against census records, Blau and Duncan found disagreement in 30 percent of the cases. See, P.M. Blau and O.D. Duncan, The American Occupational Structure (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967), p. 459.

to which it alters according to the frame of reference.

While it was beyond the scope of this thesis to explore these, and other aspects of class identification, it is felt that the study has dealt with some important issues. The fact that the findings were similar in Canada and the United States, yet differed markedly among various subgroups within each country seems noteworthy. The use of parallel international analyses in which each society is decomposed in the tabulations seems more rewarding than a simple comparison of total societies.

The question of discrepancies between the objective ratings of status made by sociologists and self-perceived status seems to be one of general importance. This is a largely unexplored issue. It would be useful to discover, for instance, more about the incongruence between occupational prestige scores on the individual level and on the aggregate level. If people really exclude their own occupations from the occupational status system, then this could have important implications for research using social class variables.

The longitudinal analysis of changes in class identification over time raised several questions regarding this type of comparative research. The problem of inconsistencies in results among some of the studies provides a warning against placing too much faith in any single set of data. Also, the extent to which questionnaire content influences

responses on attitudinal variables is not fully established.
This part of the thesis was an exploratory investigation
into some of these problems.

APPENDIX A

FIELDWORK IN THE FOUR CITY STUDY

We sent out 3600 questionnaires; 800 to Hamilton, 1000 to Sudbury, 800 to Ottawa, and 1000 to Hull, P.Q. Sampling was done from the City Directories (not the telephone directories) for these cities, drawing names randomly from the front (alphabetic listing of names of residents) pages. Females and students were excluded from the sample, leaving only men in the labour force (though not necessarily employed at the time of the fieldwork). The four cities were chosen because they provided a sample that, among other things, had a sufficiently large number of French respondents to allow French-English comparisons in the analysis.

The fieldwork began in early July, 1971. The questionnaires, together with addressed return envelopes (postage guaranteed) were sent out by second class mail. We had a French translation of the questionnaire also. In Ottawa and Sudbury, we estimated the ethnicity of the respondent from the appearance of his name in the directory listing, sending only one version if we were confident of a person's ethnicity, or both if we were not sure. In Hull, everybody received a French version, and people having an English sounding name were also sent the English version. Only the English version

was used in Hamilton.

In each city, we hired people to telephone the respondents who had not returned the questionnaire to us after about two weeks. The telephoners were instructed to obtain the new address of people who had moved (and taken their phone number with them) and also to notify us of people who had received the inappropriate language version of the questionnaire. This method of follow-up had proved very successful in a small pretest done in Hamilton in November of 1970. However, this time the returns were very slow throughout the summer. Contrary to the usual pattern in mailed surveys of a high initial response, rapidly tailing off to a trickle after a few days, we had a small but steady flow of questionnaires throughout July and early August, with only a slow decline in volume.

In late September, with less than a third of the questionnaires accounted for, we sent out a postcard asking the respondent to return the questionnaire or to send for another copy if he had lost or never received the original. This produced another small wave of returns, but the final return was still only 1104 completed questionnaires, giving a completion rate of 31 percent (or 34 percent when people who had moved but could not be traced were excluded from the calculation). The return rates for the individual cities were; Hull 23 percent, Sudbury 28 percent, Hamilton 35 percent, and Ottawa 39 percent. The problem of people who had

moved was most acute in Hull, and this partially explains the particularly low returns there.

The low return rate was probably due to the length of the questionnaire (15 pages). Also, undertaking the field-work in the summer seems to have hampered the returns and contributed to the curious elongated pattern of returns. It does not seem likely that there was any inherent flaw in the follow-up procedure, as similar procedures in the Hamilton Pretest gave us a completion rate of well over 50 percent. On the other hand, the sense of personal rapport and other benefits we anticipated from the telephone follow-up do not seem to have overcome the problems of length and season. Having no "control group" we cannot tell whether the high cost of telephoning was worth-while, although our earlier experiences with the Hamilton Pretest suggested that it was.

APPENDIX B
FOUR CITY STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

HAMILTON, ONTARIO, CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Dear Sir:

We are conducting a survey of attitudes and experiences of men living in Canadian communities in relation to work and various aspects of community relationships. We invite you to participate in our research by completing this questionnaire and returning it to us as promptly as possible.

Although the results of the research may not benefit you directly, we expect to obtain knowledge that may, for example, help people to find jobs that make the best use of their skills or that may help understand the experiences of persons who have moved from one job level to another.

To keep down the cost of our research, we are asking only a small number of persons, selected by chance, to answer our questionnaire, so it is very important that each person chosen for our sample return the completed questionnaire to us.

When we analyse and report the results of the survey, we shall not refer to the replies of any individual as we are interested only in similarities and differences among replies from persons grouped together by, for example, age, income, and community. Consequently, your replies will be regarded as strictly confidential and you will not be identified in any reports of the research. The large number stamped on the questionnaire is only to keep our records straight and will not be used to identify your answers.

You will probably notice that our numbering scheme for the questions is unusual. This is for clerical purposes and we hope you will not find it annoying.

If you have received questionnaires in English and in French, please complete and return only the one in the language you prefer. We thank you very much for your cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

John Goyder, Ph.D. Candidate
Vincent Keddie, Ph.D. Candidate
Frank E. Jones, Professor of Sociology
Peter C. Pineo, Professor of Sociology

McMASTER PROJECT ON COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS AND JOB EXPERIENCE

MOST QUESTIONS CAN BE ANSWERED BY CIRCLING THE NUMBER BESIDE THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER

1: 6 Sex: 1. Male 2. Female

7 What is the name of the community you live in? _____

8-9 In what province (or country) were you born?

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Newfoundland | 9. Alberta | 17. Scotland |
| 2. Prince Edward Island | 10. British Columbia | 18. United States |
| 3. Nova Scotia | 11. Yukon | 19. U.S.S.R. |
| 4. New Brunswick | 12. North West Terr. | 20. Germany |
| 5. Quebec | 13. England | 21. Poland |
| 6. Ontario | 14. Italy | 22. Wales |
| 7. Manitoba | 15. Netherlands | 23. Other (Please specify) |
| 8. Saskatchewan | 16. N. Ireland | |

10-11 If you were not born in Canada, in what year did you immigrate to Canada?

- | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|----------|
| 1. Born in Canada | 7. 1951-1955 | 13. 1967 |
| 2. Before 1921 | 8. 1956-1959 | 14. 1968 |
| 3. 1921-1930 | 9. 1960-1961 | 15. 1969 |
| 4. 1931-1940 | 10. 1962-1963 | 16. 1970 |
| 5. 1941-1945 | 11. 1964-1965 | 17. 1971 |
| 6. 1946-1950 | 12. 1966 | |

12-13 In what province (or country) was your father born?

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Newfoundland | 9. Alberta | 17. Scotland |
| 2. Prince Edward Island | 10. British Columbia | 18. United States |
| 3. Nova Scotia | 11. Yukon | 19. U.S.S.R. |
| 4. New Brunswick | 12. North West Terr. | 20. Germany |
| 5. Quebec | 13. England | 21. Poland |
| 6. Ontario | 14. Italy | 22. Wales |
| 7. Manitoba | 15. Netherlands | 23. Other (Please specify) |
| 8. Saskatchewan | 16. N. Ireland | |

14 Were you ever a member of the Armed Services (do not include Reserve, COTC, TA, etc.)?

1. Yes, for less than a year
2. Yes, for 1 to 3 years
3. Yes, for more than 3 years
4. No

15-17 In what year were you born? _____

18 Are you

1. Single 2. Married 3. Separated 4. Divorced 5. Widowed?

19-24 What kind of work do you do? Please give the complete title of your job or occupation. If, for any reason, you are no longer in full-time employment, please give details about the last full-time job you held, in this question and in all the other questions concerning your employment.

Examples of complete and incomplete job titles are:

- | <u>Complete</u> | <u>Incomplete</u> |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Drill-press operator | Machine operator |
| High school English teacher | Teacher |
| Invoice clerk | Clerk |
| Medical X-ray technician | Technician |
| Electrician foreman | Foreman |
| Office machine mechanic | Mechanic |
| Farm owner | Farmer |
| Farm hand | Farmer |

The complete title of my occupation is _____

25-27 In what kind of industry do you work?

(For example: auto assembly plant, radio service, retail supermarket, farm.)

28 IF FARM OWNER: Main produce is _____ Acreage is _____

- 1:45 Are you a member of a labour union or professional association?
1. Yes, labour union
 2. Yes, professional association
 3. No
- 46 If you answered Yes to question 45 above, which of the statements below comes closest to describing your degree of involvement in the activities of your union or professional association?
1. Officer, committee man, or steward
 2. Regularly attend meetings and vote in elections
 3. Occasionally attend meetings and vote in elections
 4. Rarely attend meetings but vote in elections
 5. Neither vote nor attend meetings
 6. Not a member of a union or professional association
- 47-48 Below are listed some of the things often thought important in a job. Please circle the one you would look for first in a job.
- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| 1. Chance to help people | 7. Chances for advancement |
| 2. Interest and variety | 8. Security |
| 3. Good pay | 9. A supervisor who leaves you alone |
| 4. The chance of overtime | 10. Pleasant working conditions |
| 5. Good workmates | 11. A strong and active union |
| 6. Short working hours | 12. Important work giving a feeling of accomplishment |
- 49 So far as this first thing is concerned, how would you rate your present job?
- | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Very good | 3. Neither good nor bad | 5. Very bad |
| 2. Fairly good | 4. Fairly bad | |
- 50-51 Please circle the second important thing you would look for in a job.
- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| 1. Chance to help people | 7. Chances for advancement |
| 2. Interest and variety | 8. Security |
| 3. Good pay | 9. A supervisor who leaves you alone |
| 4. The chance of overtime | 10. Pleasant working conditions |
| 5. Good workmates | 11. A strong and active union |
| 6. Short working hours | 12. Important work giving a feeling of accomplishment |
- 52 So far as this second thing is concerned, how would you rate your present job?
- | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Very good | 3. Neither good nor bad | 5. Very bad |
| 2. Fairly good | 4. Fairly bad | |
- 53 What chance do you think you have of getting a promotion in your company or firm?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. A very good chance | 3. Not much of a chance |
| 2. A fairly good chance | 4. No chance at all |
- 54 How do you feel about the company or firm you work for?
- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. It's a very good company | 4. It's a fairly bad company |
| 2. It's a fairly good company | 5. It's a very bad company |
| 3. Undecided | |
- 55-56 How old were you when you began your first full-time job after you left school? (Include service in the Armed Forces only if you joined for a career.)
-
- 57-62 What kind of work were you doing in your first full-time job? Please give the complete job title (see question 19 for examples of complete and incomplete job titles).
- The complete title of my first full-time job was _____
- 63-65 What kind of industry was this?
-
- (For example: auto assembly plant, radio service, retail supermarket, farm.)
- 66 IF FARM OWNER: Main produce was _____ Acreage was _____
- 67 Were you:
1. Working for wages, salary or commissions for an individual, a private company, or a business
 2. A government employee (Federal, Provincial, County or Municipal Government)
 3. Self-employed and own business, professional practice or farm
 4. Working without pay in a family business or farm?

2:27- Please indicate which of the following were sources of information and advice in helping
29 you decide on the kind of job you hoped to find. (Circle as many as apply.)

- | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Father | 5. Teacher |
| 2. Mother | 6. Vocational guidance counsellor |
| 3. Brother | 7. Friend |
| 4. Sister | 8. Other (Please specify) _____ |

33-34 Please circle one or two of the following whose information and advice had the most influence in shaping your ideas about the job you wanted.

- | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Father | 5. Teacher |
| 2. Mother | 6. Vocational guidance counsellor |
| 3. Brother | 7. Friend |
| 4. Sister | 8. Other (Please specify) _____ |

38 When I was about 16, I spent my free time

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Mostly with lots of friends | 3. Mostly by myself |
| 2. Mostly with a few friends | |

40 Would you say that your friends' educational plans were

1. More ambitious than your own
2. About the same as your own
3. Less ambitious than your own

44 When you were about sixteen, were both your parents living?

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Both parents were living | 3. Only your father living |
| 2. Only your mother living | 4. Neither parents were living |

45 When you were about sixteen, with whom did you live?

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Your mother and father | 5. With your father only |
| 2. Your mother and stepfather | 6. With someone other than your parents |
| 3. Your father and stepmother | 7. Alone |
| 4. With your mother only | |

46-51 What kind of work was your father (or the head of your family) doing when you were 16?
Please give the most exact title or description that you can remember.

My father's job was _____

52-54 What kind of industry was this?

(For example: auto assembly plant, radio service, retail supermarket, farm.)

55 If he was a farm owner: Main produce was _____ Acreage was _____

56 Was your father (or the head of your family)

1. Working for wages, salary or commissions for an individual, a private company, or a business
2. A government employee (Federal, Provincial, County or Municipal Government)
3. Self-employed and own business, professional practice or farm
4. Working without pay in a family business or farm

57-58 In what country did your father receive most of his education? _____

59-60 How many years of formal education did your father complete? _____ Years

61 Where were you living when you were 16 years old?

1. In the same community as at the present time
2. In a different community. Please give its name _____

62 Was the community you lived in when you were sixteen

1. A very large city (over 500,000 persons)
2. A fairly large city, or a suburb of a fairly large city (between 100,000 and 500,000 persons)
3. A middle-sized city (between 50,000 and 100,000 persons)
4. A town or village (more than 1,000 but less than 50,000 persons)
5. A village of less than 1,000 persons or the open country (but not on a farm)
6. I lived on a farm

3:11-12 What was your income, before taxes, during the last 12 months? (If you are self-employed, state the amount after the deduction of business expenses.)

- | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Less than \$2,000 | 7. \$7,000 - 7,999 | 13. \$13,000 - 13,999 |
| 2. \$2,000 - 2,999 | 8. 8,000 - 8,999 | 14. 14,000 - 14,999 |
| 3. 3,000 - 3,999 | 9. 9,000 - 9,999 | 15. 15,000 - 16,999 |
| 4. 4,000 - 4,999 | 10. 10,000 - 10,999 | 16. 17,000 - 19,999 |
| 5. 5,000 - 5,999 | 11. 11,000 - 11,999 | 17. 20,000 and over |
| 6. 6,000 - 6,999 | 12. 12,000 - 12,999 | 18. No income, did not work for pay |

13 How many weeks did you work in the past 12 months?

- | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1. None | 4. 14 - 26 weeks | 7. 49 - 52 weeks |
| 2. 1 - 4 weeks | 5. 27 - 39 weeks | |
| 3. 5 - 13 weeks | 6. 40 - 48 weeks | |

14 In the place you are living in, are you

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. The owner | 4. Living with relatives |
| 2. Renting from your employer | 5. Other (Please specify) _____ |
| 3. Renting from someone else | |

15 Is the place you live in

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. A house | 3. A duplex or triplex |
| 2. An apartment or flat | 4. Other (Please specify) _____ |

16-31 Please check off on the list below all of the items that you own or rent (or that are included in a rental agreement).

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> One flush toilet | <input type="checkbox"/> Electric clothes dryer | <input type="checkbox"/> A second black & white T.V. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> A second flush toilet | <input type="checkbox"/> Automatic dishwasher | <input type="checkbox"/> A colour T.V. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Refrigerator | <input type="checkbox"/> One telephone | <input type="checkbox"/> One car |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Home freezer | <input type="checkbox"/> A second telephone | <input type="checkbox"/> A second car |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Automatic washer | <input type="checkbox"/> Black and white T.V. | |

32 How many social classes do you think there are in Canada? _____
(Please write the number in the blank space)

33-34 What social class do you consider yourself a member of?

(Write name of social class) _____

35 If you had to pick one, which of the following five social classes would you say you were in?

- | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Upper class | 4. Working class | 7. There is no such thing |
| 2. Upper-middle class | 5. Lower class | |
| 3. Middle class | 6. Don't know | |

36 Would you say you were in the upper half or the lower half of the class you picked in question 35 above?

- | | | |
|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| 1. Upper half | 2. Lower half | 3. Could not say |
|---------------|---------------|------------------|

37 How strong is your feeling of belonging to the class you picked in question 35 above?

- | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Very strong | 2. Fairly strong | 3. Not at all strong |
|----------------|------------------|----------------------|

38 If you had to pick one, which of the following five social classes would you say your father belongs (belonged) to?

- | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Upper class | 4. Working class | 7. There is no such thing |
| 2. Upper-middle class | 5. Lower class | |
| 3. Middle class | 6. Don't know | |

39-42 What things decide what social class a man belongs to?

3:61 Is your best friend male or female?

1. Male 2. Female

62-67 What does your best friend do for a living?

68-69 How many years of formal education has your best friend completed? _____ years.

70 What is your best friend's mother tongue (the language he or she first learned to speak)?

1. English 2. French 3. Other (Please specify) _____

71 What social class would you say your best friend belongs to?

1. Upper 2. Upper-middle 3. Middle 4. Working 5. Lower

72 Does your wife work? 1. Yes, full time 2. Yes, part time 3. No

Please give the complete title of your wife's job or occupation. If, for any reason, she is no longer in full-time employment, please give details about the last full-time job she held.

73-78 The complete title of my wife's occupation is _____

4:6-7 If married, what was your wife's income, before taxes, during the last 12 months? (If she is self-employed, state the amount after the deduction of business expenses.)

- | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Less than \$2,000 | 7. \$7,000 - 7,999 | 13. \$13,000 - 13,999 |
| 2. \$2,000 - 2,999 | 8. 8,000 - 8,999 | 14. 14,000 - 14,999 |
| 3. 3,000 - 3,999 | 9. 9,000 - 9,999 | 15. 15,000 - 16,999 |
| 4. 4,000 - 4,999 | 10. 10,000 - 10,999 | 16. 17,000 - 19,999 |
| 5. 5,000 - 5,999 | 11. 11,000 - 11,999 | 17. 20,000 and over |
| 6. 6,000 - 6,999 | 12. 12,000 - 12,999 | 18. No income, did not work for pay |
| | | 19. Not married |

8-9 How many years of formal education has your wife completed? _____ Years.

10 What social class would you say your wife belongs to?

1. Upper 2. Upper-middle 3. Middle 4. Working 5. Lower

What kind of work was your father-in-law (or the head of your wife's family) doing when your wife was 16?

11-16 My father-in-law's job was _____

17-18 How many years of formal education has your father-in-law completed? _____ years

19 What social class would you say your father-in-law belongs (belonged) to?

1. Upper 2. Upper-middle 3. Middle 4. Working 5. Lower

20 How conscious are people today of belonging to a social class compared to people 20 or 30 years ago?

1. Much more conscious of belonging to a social class than people 20 or 30 years ago
 2. Somewhat more conscious than people 20 or 30 years ago
 3. No difference between people now and 20 or 30 years ago
 4. Somewhat less conscious than people 20 or 30 years ago
 5. Much less conscious than people 20 or 30 years ago

21 Here are three views about what social class is. Would you please circle the viewpoint you most agree with.

1. Differences in power create social classes. Some people are in positions of power and authority and have the means to greatly affect the lives of those people who are subject to that power and authority. So the class you belong to is decided by the amount of power and authority you possess.
2. Differences in status, prestige, and style of life create social classes. Social classes are made up of people with similar interests, life styles, abilities, backgrounds, cultural pursuits, educational attainments, and so on.
3. Differences in wealth and money create social classes. The money you earn and the things you own are the major factors in deciding the class you belong to. It doesn't matter much what kind of education you have, or whether you work in an office or a factory, the main thing is money.

4:34 You are riding in a car driven by a close friend, and he hits a pedestrian. You know he was going at least 35 miles an hour in a 20 mile-an-hour speed zone. There are no other witnesses. His lawyer says that if you testify under oath that the speed was only 20 miles an hour, it would save him from serious consequences.

What right has your friend to expect you to protect him? (Circle only one)

1. My friend has a definite right as a friend to expect me to testify to the lower figure
2. He has some right as a friend to expect me to testify to the lower figure
3. He has no right as a friend to expect me to testify to the lower figure

35 What do you think you'd probably do in view of the obligations of a sworn witness and the obligations to your friend?

1. Testify that he was going 20 miles an hour
2. Not testify that he was going 20 miles an hour

36 When looking for a job, a person ought to find a position in a place located near his parents, even if that means losing a good opportunity elsewhere.

1. Agree
2. Agree somewhat
3. Don't know
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Disagree

37 If you have the chance to hire an assistant in your work, it is always better to hire a relative than a stranger.

1. Agree
2. Somewhat agree
3. Don't know
4. Somewhat disagree
5. Disagree

Please answer questions 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42 even if you are not eligible to vote in provincial or federal elections.

38 Which political party do you normally support in Federal elections?

1. Progressive Conservative
2. Liberal
3. New Democrats
4. Social Credit/Creditiste
5. Other (Please specify) _____

39 Which political party do you normally support in Provincial elections?

1. Progressive Conservative
2. Liberal
3. New Democrats
4. Social Credit/Creditiste
5. Parti Quebecois
6. Union Nationale
7. Other (Please specify) _____

40 Would you please indicate which political party you plan to support in the next Provincial election?

1. Progressive Conservative
2. Liberal
3. New Democrats
4. Social Credit/Creditiste
5. Parti Quebecois
6. Union Nationale
7. Other (Please specify) _____

41 Would you please indicate which political party you plan to support in the next Federal election?

1. Progressive Conservative
2. Liberal
3. New Democrats
4. Social Credit/Creditiste
5. Other (Please specify) _____

42-45 In the space below, could you state your reasons for supporting the political party (or parties) you generally vote for?

- 4:69 Which of the following views on strikes do you most agree with?
1. I don't believe that going on strike could ever benefit me, and I would not do so under any conditions.
 2. I would not be prepared to go on strike unless it was the only way to defend my rights, and the strike had the full support of the union.
 3. I would be prepared to strike if necessary to secure fair treatment at my place of work, whether or not top union officials approved of this.
 4. I would be prepared to strike at any time that it was necessary to support the interests of workers and to help the working class movement anywhere in the country.

- 70 How do you feel about the policy of a number of labour unions of affiliating with the New Democratic Party?
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Strongly approve | 4. Mildly disapprove |
| 2. Mildly approve | 5. Strongly disapprove |
| 3. Neither approve nor disapprove | |

- 71 Here are two opposing views about industry generally. Would you please indicate which you agree with most?
1. A company is like a football team--because good teamwork means success and is to everyone's advantage
 2. Teamwork in industry is impossible because employers and workers are really on opposite sides.

Of the people listed below, would you say that their political feelings are very like yours, somewhat like yours, half alike and half different, somewhat different from yours or very different from yours?

		<u>Very like mine</u>	<u>Somewhat like mine</u>	<u>Half Like Half Different</u>	<u>Somewhat Different</u>	<u>Very Different</u>
72	Your wife	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
73	Your parents	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
74	Your friends	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
75	Your workmates	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
76	Your neighbours	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

- 77-78 Which of the following descriptions best fits the area you live in?
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. A very mixed area | 5. A nice, quiet & respectable area |
| 2. A rather select area | 6. A middle class area |
| 3. An ordinary working class area | 7. An upper class area |
| 4. A pretty rough area | 8. Other (Please specify) _____ |

- 79 In some neighbourhoods the residents are all very much alike, while in others they are very different from one another. What about the area you live in?
1. People are very similar to one another
 2. There are a few differences between people
 3. There are several differences between people
 4. People are very different from one another

5:6-7 When did you move into your present neighbourhood? State year _____

- 8 If you had to leave this neighbourhood, would you be
- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Very sorry | 4. A little glad to leave |
| 2. A little sorry | 5. Very glad to leave |
| 3. Not really sorry | |

9-10 Could you briefly state your reasons for your answer to question 5:8?

APPENDIX C

VALIDITY CHECKS FOR THE COMBINED SAMPLE

It was seen in Chapter VII that the correlations between class identification and S.E.S. measures showed some instability between the eight studies used in the analysis. This was particularly evident when comparing the results within age categories. It was unclear whether these fluctuations were genuinely the result of short-term variations, or whether they were merely due to sampling fluctuations.

One test of this, it seemed, would be to examine the intercorrelations, among the studies, of some of the objective S.E.S. measures. These are simple factual variables that should remain more stable than attitudinal variables such as subjective class identification. These intercorrelations are shown in Table C-1. It can be seen that there are fairly substantial fluctuations. Many of these are greater than one would expect from sampling error alone. For instance, the correlation between occupation and education in 1960 ($r = .56$) differs significantly (at the .05 level) from the same correlation in the 1964 S.E.C. Study ($r = .48$). However, there is a pattern of general decline over time in the intercorrelations of these S.E.S. measures, and many of these differences between correlations for different years seem to be

artifacts of this trend.

The coefficients reported in Table C-1 used the common coding system for the combined U.S. sample, described in Chapter V. It appears unlikely that the patterns would change if more detailed codes were used in the calculations. For instance, the weaker intercorrelations among the S.E.S. variables in the later studies do not appear to be connected with the coding system. In the 1969 study, using the original detailed codes for this data set, the correlation of occupation with education rose by only 2 points over the coefficient using the abbreviated code. The loss of accuracy introduced by the abbreviated income code was somewhat greater, as the correlation of income with occupation rose from .34 to .39 in the 1969 data when the detailed codes were used.

Another reliability check for the samples is the simple proportions of different categories appearing in each sample. Table C-2 shows some of these distributions. It can be seen, for instance, that the proportion Catholic remained quite stable from year to year, with a gradual increase over the long run. The largest fluctuations appear to be in the proportional sizes of different age groups in the samples. The 1960 sample is the most out of line with the others. The samples are similar in the proportions white and black, and also in the proportions of respondents of each gender, with the exception of the 1949 and 1969 samples where quota sampling on gender was used apparently.

Thus, it seems that samples by different research agencies do, on the whole, give quite similar results for simple factual variables. From this, one can conclude that unstable results using attitudinal variables are not necessarily due to any inherent flaws in the samples.

TABLE C-1.--Correlations of male head's occupation with education, income, and father's occupation^a

Year	Occupation, education	Occupation, income	Occupation, father's occ.
1945	.61 (854)	b	.46 (621)
1949	.50 (969)	b	b
1956	.51 (1468)	.44 (1433)	.39 (977)
1960	.56 (957)	.45 (952)	.43 (611)
1964 (S.R.C.)	.48 (1329)	.36 (1285)	.35 (876)
1964 (N.O.R.C.)	.46 (789)	.33 (773)	.31 (557)
1968	.50 (1270)	.34 (1242)	.28 (854)
1969	.51 (1170)	.34 (1167)	b

^aSame coding as in combined deck (described in Chapter V).

^bNot asked.

TABLE C-2.--Distribution of categories of selected variables
in U.S. samples

Category	1945	1949	1956	1960	1964 SRC	1964 NORC	1968	1969
<u>Religion</u>								
Protestant	.49	a	.74	.72	.69	.73	.62	.63
Catholic	.19	a	.23	.22	.25	.23	.23	.28
Jewish	.03	a	.04	.04	.03	.04	.03	.03
Other (none)	.28	a	.03	.01	.01	.04	.01	.06
Total	1.00	000	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Age</u>								
Under 39	.45	.46	.46	.33	.40	.46	.39	.41
40 and over	.54	.53	.54	.67	.60	.55	.61	.59
Total	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Race</u>								
White	1.00 ^b	.91	.92	.91	.89	.85	.89	.90
Black	.00	.09	.08	.08	.10	.14	.09	.08
Other	.00	.00	.00	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01
Total	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<u>Gender</u>								
Male	1.00 ^b	.49	.44	.44	.44	.43	.43	.50
Female	.00	.51	.56	.56	.56	.57	.57	.50
Total	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

^aNot asked.

^bWhite males only were sampled in the 1945 study.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrams, Mark. "Social Class and British Politics", Public Opinion Quarterly, 25 (Fall, 1961), 342-350.
- Barber, Bernard. Social Stratification. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1957.
- Bott, Elizabeth. "The Concept of Class as a Reference Group", Human Relations, 7 (August, 1954), 259-284.
- Broom, Leonard, F.L. Jones, and J. Zubrzycki. "Social Stratification in Australia", in J.A. Jackson, ed., Sociological Studies I: Social Stratification. Cambridge: University Press, 1968, pp. 212-233.
- Buchanan, W., and H. Cantril. How Nations See Each Other. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953.
- Cantril, H. "Identification With Social and Economic Class", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38 (January, 1943), 74-80.
- Case, H.M. "An Independent Test of the Interest-Group Theory of Social Class", American Sociological Review, 17 (December, 1952), 751-755.
- . Marxian Implications of Centers' Interest Group Theory: A Critical Appraisal", Social Forces, XXXIII (March, 1955), 254-258.
- Centers, Richard. "Class Consciousness of the American Woman", International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research, 3 (Fall, 1949), 399-408.
- . "Nominal Variation and Class Identification: The Working and the Labouring Classes", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 45 (April, 1950), 195-215.
- . "Children of the New Deal: Social Stratification and Adolescent Attitudes", International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research, 4 (Fall, 1950), 315-335.
- . "Towards an Articulation of Two Approaches to Social Class Phenomena, Parts I and II", International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research, 4 (Winter, 1950), 499-514, 5 (Summer, 1951), 159-178.

- . "Social Class, Occupation, and Imputed Belief", American Journal of Sociology, 58 (May, 1953), 543-555.
- . "The Intensity Dimension of Class Consciousness and Some Social and Psychological Correlates", Journal of Social Psychology, 44 (August, 1956), 101-114.
- . The Psychology of Social Classes. New York: Russell and Russell, 1961.
- Cole, G.D.H. Studies in Class Structure. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.
- Cooper, H.C. "Social Class Identification and Political Party Affiliation", Psychological Reports, 5 (1959), 337-340.
- Cuber, J.F., and W.F. Kenkel. Social Stratification in the United States. New York: Appleton-Century, Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- Ellis, R.A., et.al. "The Index of Class Position: An Improved Inter-Community Measure of Stratification", American Sociological Review, 28 (April, 1963), 271-276.
- Eulau, H. "Identification with Class and Political Perspective", Journal of Politics, 18 (May, 1956), 232-253.
- Eysenck, J.J. "Social Attitudes and Social Class", British Journal of Sociology, 1 (March, 1950), 50-66.
- Fortune Magazine. "The People of the United States - A Self-Portrait", Fortune, February, 1940.
- Glass, D.V. ed. Social Mobility in Britain. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954.
- Gordon, M.M. Social Class in American Sociology. Durham: Duke University Press, 1958.
- Gross, Neil. "Social Class Identification in an Urban Community", American Sociological Review, 18 (August, 1953), 398-404.

- Haer, J. L. "A Comparative Study of the Classification Techniques of Warner and Centers", American Sociological Review, 20 (December, 1955), 689-692.
- . "Predictive Utility of Five Indices of Social Stratification", American Sociological Review, 22 (October, 1957), 541-546.
- . "An Empirical Study of Class Awareness", Social Forces, 36 (December, 1957), 117-121.
- Hamilton, R. F. "The Income Differences Between Skilled and White Collar Workers", British Journal of Sociology, 14 (December, 1963), 363-373.
- . "Income, Class and Reference Groups", American Sociological Review, 29 (August, 1964), 576-579.
- . "The Marginal Middle Class: A Reconsideration", American Sociological Review, 31 (April, 1966), 192-199.
- Hetzler, S. A. "An Investigation of the Distinctiveness of Social Classes", American Sociological Review, 18 (October, 1953), 493-497.
- Hodge, R. W., and D. J. Treiman. "Class Identification in the United States", American Journal of Sociology, 73 (March, 1968), 535-547.
- Hodges, H. M. Social Stratification: Class in America. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1964.
- Hutchinson, B. "Class, Self-Assessment in a Rio de Janeiro Population", America Latina, 6 (January-March, 1963), 53-62.
- Kahan, M., D. Butler, and D. Stokes. "On the Analytical Division of Social Class", British Journal of Sociology, 17 (June, 1966), 122-132.
- Kahl, J. A., and J. A. Davis. "A Comparison of Indexes of Socio-Economic Status", American Sociological Review, 20 (June, 1955), 317-325.
- Kahl, J. A. The American Class Structure. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Kornhauser, Arthur. "Public Opinion and Social Class", American Journal of Sociology, 55 (January, 1950), 335-343.

- Landecker, W. S. "Class Crystallization and Its Urban Pattern", Social Research, 27 (Autumn, 1960), 308-320.
- "Class Crystallization and Class Consciousness", American Sociological Review, 28 (April, 1963), 219-229.
- Lawson, E. D. "Correlation of Indexes of Families Socio-Economic Status", Social Forces, 39 (December, 1960), 149-152.
- Lenski, G. E. "American Social Classes: Statistical Strata or Social Groups?", American Journal of Sociology, 58 (September, 1952), 139-144.
- Lewis, L. S. "A Note on the Problem of Classes", Public Opinion Quarterly, 64 (Winter, 1963), 599-603.
- "Class and the Perception of Class", Social Forces 42 (March, 1964), 336-340.
- Lynd, R. S. "Tiptoeing Around Class", New Republic, 121 (July 25, 1949), 18.
- Manis, J. G. and B. N. Meltzer. "Attitudes of Textile Workers to Class Structure", American Journal of Sociology, 60 (July, 1954), 30-35.
- Murphy, R. J., and R. T. Morris. "Occupational Situs, Subjective Class Identification and Political Affiliation", American Sociological Review, 26 (June, 1961), 383-392.
- Nelson, H., and Lasswell, T. E. "Status Indices, Social Stratification and Social Class", Sociology and Social Research, 44 (July-August, 1960), 410-413.
- Overs, R. P. "The Social Class Identification of 1038 Western New York Students", Journal of Educational Research, 51 (November, 1957), 185-190.
- Pineo, P. C. and J. C. Goyder "Social Class Identification of National Sub-Groups", forthcoming in "Social Stratification in Canada". Ed. J.E. Curtis and B. Scott. Toronto: Prentice-Hall.
- Reissman, L. Class in American Society. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1963.
- Rennie, D., and R. Hilgendorf. "Stratification in a Small Town", Sociological Quarterly, 1 (April, 1960), 117-128.

- Rogoff, N. "Social Stratification in France and in the United States", American Journal of Sociology, 58 (January, 1953), 347-357.
- Runciman, R.F. "Embourgeoisement, Self-Rated Class, and Party Preference", Sociological Review, 12 (July, 1964), 137-152.
- Sargent, S. S. "Class and Class Consciousness in a California Town", Social Problems, 1 (June, 1953), 22-27.
- Schreiber, E. M., and G. T. Nygreen. "Subjective Social Class in America: 1945-68", Social Forces, 48 (March, 1970), 348-356.
- Segal, D. R., M. W. Segal, and D. Knoke. "Status Inconsistency and Self-Evaluation", Sociometry, 33 (September, 1970), 347-357.
- Spaulding, C. B. "Social Class and Social Perception", Sociology and Social Research, 41 (September-October, 1956), 18-28.
- Steiner, I. D. "Some Social Values Associated with Objectively and Subjectively Defined Social Class Membership", Social Forces, 31 (May, 1953), 327-332.
- Strunk, M., ed. "The Quarter's Polls", Public Opinion Quarterly, 13 (Winter, 1949-50), 711.
- Tucker, C. W. Jr. "Occupational Evaluation and Self-Identification". Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1966.
- . "On Working Class Identification", American Sociological Review, 31 (December, 1966), 855-856.
- . "A Comparative Analysis of Subjective Social Class", Social Forces, 46 (June, 1968), 508-514.
- Wallace, J. M., Jr., F. W. Williams, and H. Cantril. "Identification of Occupational Groups with Economic and Social Class", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 39 (October, 1944), 482-485.