

TOLERANCE LEVELS FOR DEFEAT
AND SOCIAL CLASS:
AN EXPLORATORY
STUDY

By

REBECCA FAITH GUY
Bachelor of Arts
Phillips University
Enid, Oklahoma

1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirement for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1970

Thesis
1970
69864
cop 2

1. The first part of the thesis is devoted to a study of the history of the subject. It begins with a survey of the literature on the subject, and then proceeds to a detailed study of the work of the leading authorities in the field.

The second part of the thesis is devoted to a study of the theory of the subject. It begins with a survey of the literature on the subject, and then proceeds to a detailed study of the work of the leading authorities in the field.

The third part of the thesis is devoted to a study of the practice of the subject. It begins with a survey of the literature on the subject, and then proceeds to a detailed study of the work of the leading authorities in the field.

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
OCT 12 1970

TOLERANCE LEVELS FOR DEFEAT
AND SOCIAL CLASS:
AN EXPLORATORY
STUDY

Thesis Approved:

Gonold E. Allen

Thesis Adviser

Gene Huff

Larry M. Perkins

D. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

762328

PREFACE

This thesis is concerned with the concept of tolerance levels for defeat and its relation to social class. This is an area for sociological research which has heretofore received little empirical attention, thus leaving the writer a great deal of freedom in devising a methodology. The methodological approach can perhaps best be described as game theory.

Social class was measured by the criteria of education and occupation. Tolerance levels for defeat were measured by a time span. Subjects were asked to perform two tasks: a maze test and a cube test. They were not subjected to a rigid time limit but were told that they should voluntarily stop themselves when they wanted to quit. Their tolerance scores became the exact amount of time spent in task performance. A statistical analysis of these scores as related to social class was then made allowing us to get at the nature of the research problem.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Carol Pollis for valuable instruction and advice, Dr. Donald Allen whose suggestions, directions and counsel were of immeasurable value, and Miss Marilyn Miller, who so graciously helped me in the preparation of the pilot study preceding this research. A very special note of thanks is due my

parents whose constant encouragement and assistance has been an endless source of strength. Thanks are particularly due to all of those individuals who so willingly agreed to participate in this research. A collective note of appreciation is offered to the many persons by whom I have been influenced as it is not possible to list each of their names.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PROBLEM	4
Review of Current Literature	5
The Hypotheses	12
Operational Definitions	12
The Research Setting	16
Sample	17
Collection of Data	17
III. ANALYSIS OF DATA COLLECTED	21
Classification by Social Class	21
Classification by Tasks	22
Classification by Tolerance Levels	22
Classification by Age	23
Classification by Cities	23
Classification by Religion	23
Classification by Verbal Responses	25
Testing the Hypotheses	25
IV. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS	38
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	50
APPENDIX - INTERVIEW AND OBSERVATION SHEET	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Criteria for Determining Social Class	15
II. Classification of Subjects by City	24
III. Tolerance Scores for the Working and Middle Class	26
IV. Correlation of Tolerance to Social Class on the Cube Test	28
V. Correlation of Tolerance to Social Class on the Maze Test	28
VI. A Comparison of Tolerance Levels by Social Class on the Cube Test	30
VII. A Comparison of Tolerance Levels by Social Class on the Maze Test	31
VIII. Comparison of Communicative Acts per Minute on the Cube Test	32
IX. Comparison of Communicative Acts per Minute on the Maze Test	33
X. Comparison of the Cubes Test as Task I and Task II within the Middle Class	34
XI. Comparison of the Maze Test as Task I and Task II within the Middle Class	35
XII. Comparison of the Cubes Test as Task I and Task II within the Working Class	35
XIII. Comparison of the Maze Test as Task I and Task II within the Working Class	36
XIV. Comparison of Subjects' Performance on Task I to Their Performance on Task II within the Middle Class	37

Table	Page
XV. Comparison of Subjects' Performance on Task I to Their Performance on Task II within the Working Class	37
XVI. Comparison of the Cubes Test by Cities and Tolerance Levels	39
XVII. Comparison of the Maze Test by Cities and Tolerance Levels	40
XVIII. Comparison of the Cubes Test by Age and Tolerance Levels	41
XIX. Comparison of the Maze Test by Age and Tolerance Levels	42
XX. Comparison of Social Class and Self-Concept on the Cube Test	45
XXI. Comparison of Social Class and Self-Concept on the Maze Test	46
XXII. Social Class and Mobility through Marriage	48

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The concept of tolerance is one which can be interpreted in many different ways. Webster defines the term as "the relative capacity to endure or adapt physiologically to an unfavorable environmental factor; a sympathy or indulgence for beliefs or practices differing from or conflicting with one's own; the act of allowing something; the allowable deviation from a standard."¹ In other words tolerance might be defined as one's capacity for endurance or the ability to withstand hardship, adversity, or stress. Each of these definitions is very general in scope. But intrinsic in each of them is the notion that tolerance denotes the existence of some imaginary boundary which separates that which is allowable, permissive, normal, or stressless from that which is not. In other words, it is quite possible that there is a general personality dimension which runs from extreme tolerance to extreme intolerance. This personality dimension is possessed by all individuals and can be consciously observed by imposing certain stresses on the individual.

¹Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield, Mass., 1963), p. 930.

Those whose tolerance level is low or who possess extreme intolerance will succumb to this stress. Those whose tolerance level is high or who possess extreme tolerance will be less affected by this stress. Of immediate concern in this research is levels of tolerance for defeat and social class. In other words, how great is an individual's tolerance when he is continuously unsuccessful at a given task. In relating tolerance to social class we are thinking in terms of classes having different subcultures. If this is true, then by extension we may suppose that members of different classes have something resembling a typical class personality that is also distinctive. We may base this on the supposition that an individual's personality expresses the values and the behavior considered appropriate to membership in the subculture. Dale Fitzgerald, in an examination of the literature on class and personality notes that although personalities may cut across social lines, one ought to expect different classes to have different proportions of such personalities.² This expectation rests on the assumption that the family tasks of the classes "differ to a considerable extent, e.g., the upper class strives to maintain its social position, while the middle class has a high concentration on its orientation of achievement and mobility, and the lower class must concern itself with problems relating to its subsistence, fear of illness, and

²Melvin M. Tumin, Social Stratification (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1967), p. 78.

economic insecurity and unemployment."³ Thus in light of this evidence, it does not seem too farfetched to suppose that levels of tolerance for defeat might have some very definite relationship to social class.

We might also predict the direction, though not the size of the tolerance differential. Members of the working class generally are employed in tasks requiring dependability and certain recognized manual skills, but the actual performance of the job is more likely to require repetition of essentially the same operation for an extended period. Neither innovative nor problem solving behavior is likely to be required. On the other hand many middle class occupations do require innovative behavior and problem solving. Middle class people are likely to have had more years of schooling which affords more experience and training in innovative behavior. It is therefore predicted that middle class members will manifest more tolerance for defeat and will work longer in the attempt to complete a novel task.

³Ibid.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM

There have been innumerable studies devoted to the examination of aspiration levels of individuals. Many, if not most of these studies suggest that individuals in different social classes hold different levels of aspiration. Leonard Reissman, in his book, Class in American Society, observes, "There are several independent studies, of widely different samples, of individuals, that all come to a reasonably common conclusion about aspirations: the striving for 'success' is strongest among those in the middle and upper class and is lowest among those in the lower class."¹ The question Reissman is asking is why such a class difference exists. Reissman suggests the first and most obvious reason is that those individuals in the lower class are simply being realistic. Those in the upper and middle class have a fairly good chance of achieving high aspirations whereas those in the lower class do not. Those lower class individuals either are forced to transfer their levels of aspiration to their children or to lower their level of

¹Leonard Reissman, Class in American Society (Glencoe, Illinois, 1959), pp. 361-362.

aspiration to within an accessible distance.

Genevieve Knupfer's article, "Portrait of the Underdog," offers a similar conclusion but a different explanation.

"Lower status individuals hold low levels of aspiration 'to make life tolerable,' a fact which in some cases is a 'sign of apathy and ingrained acceptance of defeat rather than of adjustment to reality.'"²

Knupfer's use of the phrase "to make life tolerable" is interestingly put. It suggests that those individuals who are members of the lower class have a low level of tolerance for defeat. This, then, may be one of the reasons why they set their level of aspirations low. At the same time it suggests that those individuals in the middle and upper class have a higher level of tolerance for defeat. They can afford to set their goals higher without threatening their ego. Our immediate problem for investigation is to examine the concept of tolerance levels for defeat and its relationship to social class.

Review of Current Literature

The proposed problem is primarily concerned with the concept of tolerance as viewed in relation to experiencing defeat. This is an area of research which has received little attention in the past although there have been a few

²Genevieve Knupfer, "Portrait of the Underdog," Public Opinion Quarterly (Spring, 1947), pp. 103-114.

studies directly or indirectly related to the notion of tolerance. Based upon a personal analysis of this literature, this writer would suggest that many of these studies employ one of three definitions of tolerance: (1) Tolerance is defined in relation to the term prejudice. The less prejudiced one is the more tolerant he is. (2) The term tolerance is defined in relation to the term deviance. The more permissive and lenient one is toward deviant behavior, the more tolerant he is considered to be. (3) The term tolerance has been related to the political realm and the concept of nonconformity. The more broadminded an individual, the more tolerant an individual. The following are several studies which employ the concepts of tolerance as previously defined.

"Social Distance Attitudes of South Afrikan Students,"³ by Thomas F. Pettigrew is a study of prejudice in South Afrikan Students. Pettigrew administered an ethnic attitude questionnaire which contained a social distance scale, three Likert scales to measure authoritarianism, social conformity and anti-Afrikan prejudice, and a variety of personal information items. Among other things Pettigrew found that ethnic membership proved to be an important correlate of social distance. Afrikan students tended to be the most intolerant of non-whites and Jewish subjects tended to be the most

³Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Social Distance Attitudes of South Afrikan Students," Social Forces, XXXVIII (1960), pp. 246-253.

tolerant of non-whites.

James P. Martin and Frank R. Westie published a study entitled "The Tolerant Personality" in which they attempted to determine the distinguishing personal and social characteristics of persons operationally defined as tolerant.⁴ On the basis of a tolerance-prejudice scale featuring a zero-point of group preferences, subjects were classified as "tolerant" or "prejudiced." Tolerant and prejudiced subjects were compared with respect to twenty-five personal and social characteristics. Martin and Westie discovered that tolerant people appeared willing and able to perceive gradation, variation and relativity whereas the prejudiced persons seemed to have a need for absolute dichotomies. Tolerant persons preferred the logical and rational whereas prejudiced persons subscribed to statements indicating a tendency to accept mystical, bizarre, or superstitious definitions of reality. Tolerant subjects rejected authoritarian practices stressing strict obedience, harsh discipline, and physical punishment. Prejudiced persons stressed a strong preference for obedience and respect. Downward mobility was found to be associated with prejudice. Tolerant subjects showed a significantly higher mean occupational status and educational status. ($p < .001$)

"The Concept of Tolerance and Contraculture as Applied

⁴James G. Martin and Frank R. Westie, "The Tolerant Personality," American Sociological Review, XXIV (1959), pp. 521-528.

to Delinquents," by Ruth Cavan is the presentation of the hypothesis that behavior can be placed on a continuum running from an underconforming contraculture through various degrees of disapproved behavior to normal conformity and then through stages of overconforming behavior to an overconforming contraculture. The reaction of the normally conforming segment of the population varies in severity according to the threat posed to the social norms by either under- or over-conforming. In other words, tolerance is measured by the perceived size of the threat to social norms. When deviancy is perceived to threaten social norms to the extent that social organization is threatened, tolerance reaches a peak.⁵

Bruce P. Dohrenwend and Edwin Chin-Shong have done research dealing with still another kind of deviancy. Their research deals with community leaders' attitudes of psychological disorders. They found that when both lower and upper-status groups define a pattern of behavior as seriously deviant, lower status groups are less tolerant.⁶

In 1963, Wieslow Wisniewski published a study in which he considered the relationship between tolerance and equalitarianism. Tolerance was defined as "reluctance to apply

⁵Ruth Cavan, "The Concepts of Tolerance and Contraculture as Applied to Delinquency," Sociological Quarterly, II (1961), pp. 243-258.

⁶Bruce P. Dohrenwend and Edwin Chin-Shong, "Social Status and Attitudes Toward Psychological Disorder: The Problem of Tolerance of Deviance," American Sociological Review, XXXII (1967), pp. 417-433.

limitations and sanctions on people whose views we regard as harmful." Equality was defined as "the right of each individual to proclaim views he regards as proper." Wisniewski found tolerance and equalitarianism to be negatively correlated. However, he did confirm his second hypothesis that the application and the maintenance of the principle of economic equality might lead to intolerance through the necessity of applying pressure to those who oppose such equality. Intolerance seemed to be the result of frustration of needs.⁷

Samuel F. Stouffer, in his book Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties, contends that the empirical data in his study strongly support the conclusion that tolerance is highest among college graduates in metropolitan cities. It is lowest among grade school people on the farms. In each type of community in every region it increases with education. More specifically, Stouffer found that when class position is defined by occupational and educational level, the percentage of persons falling in the two "most tolerant" categories of political opinion are as follows:⁸

high white-collar, college graduates	83%
low white-collar, some college education	64
high manual, high school graduates	48
low manual, high school graduates	40
low manual, grade school education	13

⁷Wieslaw Wisniewski, "Tolerance and Egalitarianism," Polish Sociological Bulletin, I (1963), pp. 21-32.

⁸Samuel Stouffer, Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties (New York, 1953).

J. L. Simmon, in a study entitled "Tolerance of Divergent Attitudes," explored the extent to which attitude disparity, liberalism, and alienation from society are related to tolerance. The alienated person was defined as one who has been estranged from, made unfriendly toward his society and the culture it carries. This definition was developed by Gwynn Nettler and Nettler's scale for measuring this type of alienation was used. Tolerance toward those more conservative and those more liberal than the respondent was measured by two questions. The author found that conservatism receives greater acceptance than liberalism. Tolerance decreases with an increasing attitude divergence from the target. Tolerance increases with liberalism. The relationship between intolerance and attitude divergence is greater among conservatives and smaller among liberals. Alienated extremists are more tolerant and alienated moderates are less tolerant than their non-alienated counterparts.⁹

S. M. Lipset, in his book, Political Man,¹⁰ contends that "although higher occupational status within each educational level seems to make for greater tolerance, the increase in tolerance associated with higher educational levels is greater than that related to higher occupational

⁹J. L. Simmon, "Tolerance of Divergent Attitudes," Social Forces, XLIII (1965), pp. 347-364.

¹⁰S. M. Lipset, Political Man (New York, 1960), Chapter 4.

levels.

In his book, The Psychology of Social Class, Richard Centers deals with the concept of frustration which is closely related to tolerance as defined in this research. Centers found that the working class as a group tends to be distinctly more frustrated than the middle class. More people who affiliate with the working class are dissatisfied with their jobs, their pay, their opportunities to get ahead, and their chances to enjoy life.¹¹

A study bearing indirect relationship to our research was conducted by Murray A. Strauss. In his study, "Communication, Creativity, and Problem-Solving Ability of Middle and Working Class Families in Three Societies, Strauss employs the technique of task performance. Strauss is directly concerned with the effects of communication on ability to solve a problem. The problem was presented in the form of a game which each subject had to play with the other members of his family. In all three societies, the working-class families had substantially less communication with each other than was the case with the middle-class families.¹²

Although the present study is a somewhat unique application of the concept of tolerance, it was with these

¹¹John F. Guber and William F. Kenkel, Social Stratification in the United States (New York, 1954), p. 250.

¹²Murray A. Strauss, "Communication, Creativity, and Problem-Solving Ability of Middle and Working Class Families in Three Societies," Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family (Boston, 1959), pp. 15-27.

studies in mind that the proposed sociological model was formulated.

The Hypotheses

The present study deals with a dimension of tolerance which heretofore has received little empirical attention. Nevertheless, the various dimensions of tolerance bear a certain kinship with one another. Thus, the assumptions underlying this study are based on findings published in related studies. Using these studies as a basis for beginning, the following hypotheses have been formulated for testing:

(H₁:) There is a positive correlation between middle class groups and working class groups and levels of tolerance for defeat.

(H₂:) Middle class subjects will have a greater level of tolerance for defeat than working class subjects.

(H₃:) Middle class subjects will emit a significantly greater quantity of communicative acts than will working class subjects during task performance.

(H₄:) Within social class there is no significance associated with ordering of tasks.

(H₅:) Within social class there is no significance associated with addition of tasks.

Operational Definitions

Working and Middle Class: As the concept of social

class is of paramount importance in this study, it would seem that more than a simple definition of the two classes involved is in order. We first need to establish some justification for the criteria used in defining these classes. Leonard Reissman, in his article, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," remarks,

...there is some confusion in the definition and empirical determination of class, which has been taken to mean status, economic position, power, ideology, associations, and various combinations of these. The lack of adequate theory has often made it necessary to use a limited operational definition of class which does not take into account the multiplicity of aspects just noted.¹³

For this reason, he comments, objective factors such as occupation, education, or income are used to approximate class position. In this study social class shall be operationally defined in terms of two objective factors: occupation and education. The logic of this decision is supported by the following studies:

Albert J. Reiss, in his book, Occupation and Social Status, observes,

The three most commonly used measures of socio-economic status employed in status scales are income, education, and occupation. Each of these measures is thought of as having a rank-or-scale order such that a population can be stratified from high to low. ... Both individual income and educational attainment are known to be correlated with occupational ranks, and both can be seen as aspects of occupational

¹³Leonard Reissman, "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class," American Sociological Review, XX (1955), pp. 233-242.

status, since education is a basis for entry into many occupations.¹⁴

Leonard Reissman, in his book, Social Class in American Society, states,

If occupation and income are mobility roads, then the metaphor for education must be that of a modern freeway for education has become the most frequently used means for social advancement in the class system. In many senses, education is a prerequisite to mobility via both occupation and income. Educational requirements are almost without exception the prerequisites for entry into the higher income categories.¹⁵

The United States Department of Labor has further testified to this strong relationship between education and occupation in Manpower: Challenge of the 1960's.¹⁶ They stipulate the higher occupations are composed of the better educated. In fact by their figures, three-fourths of the professional and technical workers have had some college education.

The working class will be occupationally defined as those individuals engaged in unskilled, semi-skilled, blue-collar, or service occupations. The middle class will be occupationally defined as those individuals engaged in ownership of small businesses, white collar positions, semi-professionals, or professionals. The working class will be

¹⁴Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Occupations and Social Status (Glencoe, Illinois, 1961), pp. 83-84.

¹⁵Reissman, American Sociological Review, XX, p. 232.

¹⁶Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, Sociology (New York, 1968), p. 362.

educationally defined as those individuals with a high school education or less. The middle class will be educationally defined as those individuals with more than a high school education. It should be emphasized that an individual must fit into a class both on the basis of occupation and education in order to be so classified. In other words, an individual must either have both a working class occupation and education or a middle class occupation and education. Charted, our description appears as follows:

TABLE I
CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING SOCIAL CLASS

Variable	Working Class	Middle Class
Education	High School or Less	Above a High School Education
Occupation	Unskilled, Semi- skilled, Blue- collar, or service	White collar, Professional, Businessman

Only two classes were selected for this particular study: working and middle class. Although these can be considered gross categories, it was hoped that the subjects selected from each of these classes could be more specifically iden-

tified as upper middle and upper working. This was based upon the presupposition that the more distinct the class differences, the more varied the results.

Tolerance for Defeat: The concept of tolerance for defeat will be defined in terms of the time spent by each subject in performing two different and separate tasks. The two tasks administered were chosen on the basis of their difficulty, the probability of success on either task in a relatively short period of time being rather remote. However, it should be kept in mind that neither task is impossible and both can be mastered. Summarily, low tolerance will be defined as a subject's inability to cope with a given task for more than seven and one-half minutes. High tolerance will be defined as a subject's ability to cope with a given task for more than seven and one-half minutes.

Communicative Acts: By communicative acts we mean any series of syllables that transmits a unit of intelligible information by virtue of the explicit relations among the words in the unit.

Acts of Interference: By acts of interference we mean any verbal emittance which interrupts the flow of intelligible information.

The Research Setting

The research under consideration utilizes two settings: Stillwater, Oklahoma and Kingfisher, Oklahoma. Stillwater is a city of about 30,000 located in the north central sec-

tion of Oklahoma and is the site of Oklahoma State University providing services for students and personnel of the city. Aside from the university, the city is also a service center for farming which is for many of its citizens the primary source of their income.

Kingfisher, considerably smaller than Stillwater, is about 4000 in population and is also located in the north central section of Oklahoma. Kingfisher is primarily a farming community, the main crop being wheat. The town is centrally located among well-developed communities with Oklahoma City to the south, Enid to the north, Guthrie to the east and Watonga to the west, all of these cities being within a forty mile radius of Kingfisher in the designated direction thus providing many employment opportunities. Kingfisher and Stillwater are geographically close, the distance between the two cities being about sixty-seven miles.

Sample

A total sample of forty experimental adult female respondents was selected in equal numbers from Stillwater and Kingfisher. Within each city ten were selected from the middle class and ten from the working class. The female adults in the sample were white, married, and between the ages of twenty-five and fifty-five.

Collection of Data

After obtaining an individual's consent to participate

in this study, each was asked several questions related to personal background information. First of all, the researcher inquired concerning the husband's occupational and educational achievements in order to get an assessment of the subject's class. Social class was assigned on the basis of the husband's occupation and education rather than the wife's on the premise that regardless of the wife's class origin, she had elected in marriage the class most congenial to herself. Each subject was also asked to give her occupation and educational level and her father's occupation and educational level. This information was acquired as it was thought that it might be useful in helping to analyze the subjects' task performance. In addition each subject was asked to give her church preference and the frequency with which she attended. The researcher also assessed each subject's age based upon personal evaluation.

The methodological approach used in this research might be termed game theory. Martin Shubik defines game theory in the following manner:

Game theory is a method for the study of decision making in situations of conflict. It deals with human processes in which the individual decision-unit is not in complete control of other decision units entering into the environment. It is addressed to problems involving conflict, cooperation, or both, at many levels. The decision unit may be an individual, a group, a formal or an informal organization, or a society.¹⁷

¹⁷Martin Shubik, ed., Game Theory and Related Approaches to Social Behavior (New York, 1964), p. 8.

The methodological approach employed two distinct and separate tasks. The first task consisted of finding a unique order for four colored cubes. The six sides of each cube are either white, blue, red, or green. All colors are found on each cube and no two cubes are identical in color arrangement. The object of this task is to arrange the cubes in a series in such a way that there is a red, green, blue, and white cube (not necessarily in that order) exposed on each side as the four cubes are rotated together.

The second task used in the experiment makes use of a round flat surface and a steel marble. The surface has a starting and a finishing point. The purpose of this game is to manipulate the marble from the starting point to the finishing point. However, the task has been complicated by the addition of twenty-five small holes into which the marble fits perfectly and one very large hole in the center of the maze. If the marble drops into one of these holes, the subject must start over. Although the tasks have been described as first and second tasks, they were administered in random order.

With the administration of each task, the researcher first explained the rules of the task. Each subject was then told that she could have as much time as she desired or as little time as she desired. Each subject was told that her task performance would not be stopped but that in order to stop she would have to stop herself. In actuality, though, for each task, each subject was allowed a maximum

of fifteen minutes. Exact time was recorded for each individual with the use of a concealed stopwatch. If a subject continued with a task for fifteen minutes, the researcher would then intercede. By recording exact time spent in task performance, the researcher was able to get an indication of tolerance for defeat, as previously defined, at some level. In order to eliminate the possibility of bias, the researcher's remarks to each subject were standardized as much as possible, so that identical instructions were repeated to all subjects until understanding appeared to be adequate. Differences in responses to subjects occurred when subjects asked direct questions dealing with the task at hand.

Unknown to the subjects, during task performance all verbalization was recorded by means of a hidden tape recorder. The verbalization was transcribed and subjected to a content analysis to determine the relation of verbal responses to the subject's tolerance and task performance behavior.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA COLLECTED

The first part of this chapter is devoted to summarizing and classifying the data in such a way that the results obtained from interviews and observations could be employed to test the hypotheses mentioned earlier.

The data was not only organized by social class and tolerance levels but also by age and cities. Verbal responses were categorized as communicative acts or acts of interference. A frequency count of all responses was taken and then recorded. The data was then arranged and evaluated to permit statistical analysis.

The latter part of this chapter includes the testing of the hypotheses. Each hypothesis is stated, tested, and discussed in terms of the indices of data prepared from interviewing and observation of task performances.

Classification by Social Class

Items number one and four on the interview sheet were used as a basis for determining social class. As has been previously stated, social class was determined by the husband's occupational and educational level. Using this criteria for defining social class, subjects were categorized

as working or middle class. The number of subjects in each class was purposely kept equal with twenty subjects designated as working class and twenty subjects designated as middle class.

Classification by Tasks

As mentioned previously, each subject was asked to perform two tasks. One involved a set of colored cubes. The other involved a maze game. Although these tasks were not always administered in the same order, the researcher kept a record of the order in which the tasks were performed. Thus it was possible to categorize tasks by the order in which they were administered (Task I or Task II) or by name (cubes or maze).

Classification by Tolerance Levels

Each subject's task performances were timed by use of a stop watch in order to gain a precise reading of the time spent in task performance. On the basis of the operational definitions assigned to high and low tolerance for defeat, subjects were categorized accordingly. With the tasks involving the colored cubes, eighteen (90%) of the middle class subjects displayed high tolerance. Two subjects or 10% showed low tolerance. Within the working class on this same task, 100% displayed low tolerance. On the task involving the maze game, fifteen or 75% of the middle class showed high tolerance. Five subjects in this class or 25% dis-

played low tolerance. Within the working class, again 100% exhibited low tolerance.

Classification by Age

Subjects were not specifically asked to give their age but an assessment of each subject's age was made by the researcher. As indicated on the interview and observation sheet, age was assessed into one of six categories. However due to the small number of subjects falling into each of these six categories, in the final analysis, subjects were divided into two gross categories: 25-39 and 40-54. In the middle class the distribution was as follows: 25-39 (55%); 40-54 (45%). In the working class the breakdown was just the reverse: 25-39 (45%); 40-54 (55%).

Classification by Cities

Since subjects were not drawn from just one city, subjects were also grouped on the basis of the city from which they came in an effort to eliminate any bias which might be incurred from such a procedure. The percentage of subjects and the distribution by social class taken from the two cities was knowingly kept equal. Table II gives a breakdown of the social class by cities.

Classification by Religion

Items seven and eight on the interview sheet were included as an effort to obtain some indication of the regularity of

the subjects' church attendance. Subjects were asked to give their church affiliation and the frequency with which they attended. Due to the diversity of denominations represented, this factor was not considered. Regarding frequency of attendance, regular church attendance was defined as attending church at least twice a month. Irregular church attendance was defined as attending less than twice a month. Summarily, within the middle class seventeen subjects or 85% were classified as regular attenders. Only 15% were considered to be irregular. Within the working class, 60% were designated as regular church attenders and 40% as irregular. Due to the uneven distribution within the two categories, this factor was not empirically tested.

TABLE II
CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECTS BY CITY

City	Social Class		Total
	Working	Middle	
Kingfisher	10	10	20
Stillwater	10	10	20
Total	20	20	40

Classification by Verbal Responses

As previously stated, complete verbal responses of all subjects during task performances were tape-recorded unknowingly on the part of each subject. After transcribing all verbalization, all responses were categorized as communicative acts or acts of interference. Altogether there was a total of 1625 verbal responses. Of this total, 423 or 24% of the responses were emitted by the working class. Verbal responses emitted by the middle class numbered 1202 or 76%. Of those acts emitted by the middle class, 939 or 78% were communicative and 263 or 22% were acts of interference. Within the working class, 309 or 73% were evaluated as communicative and 114 or 27% were evaluated as acts of interference.

Testing the Hypotheses

After the administration of eighty tests to forty subjects, the scores were recorded. Each subject received two scores: one for his performance on the cube test and one for his performance on the maze test. These scores represent the time in minutes spent by each subject on the two tasks performed. This time factor functioned operationally as a subject's tolerance for defeat at some level. These scores were used to test the five hypotheses listed earlier. Table III gives the tolerance scores for both the working and middle classes on the two tasks.

TABLE III

TOLERANCE SCORES FOR THE WORKING AND MIDDLE CLASSES

Subject	Social Class	Tolerance Levels	
		Cubes	Maze
1	working	3.45	2.42
2	working	3.98	2.60
3	working	1.75	1.68
4	middle	9.70	8.80
5	working	3.07	1.10
6	middle	10.10	15.00
7	middle	15.00	11.58
8	working	2.38	1.58
9	working	4.98	3.17
10	working	4.38	1.67
11	middle	11.97	15.00
12	working	2.60	5.00
13	middle	14.05	15.00
14	working	2.58	2.67
15	middle	8.38	9.92
16	working	3.08	1.00
17	middle	15.00	12.33
18	working	4.82	5.85
19	working	4.62	1.12
20	middle	15.00	11.80
21	working	1.42	.33
22	working	2.27	3.62
23	working	5.42	1.00
24	middle	8.17	5.17
25	working	5.17	.33
26	middle	9.17	5.00
27	working	4.72	5.00
28	working	2.50	2.25
29	middle	6.93	5.58
30	middle	9.25	15.00
31	working	4.05	1.67
32	middle	15.00	15.00
33	middle	8.93	3.00
34	middle	11.42	15.00
35	middle	15.00	15.00
36	working	3.93	5.87
37	middle	15.00	5.57
38	middle	15.00	15.00
39	middle	12.10	11.53
40	middle	9.93	8.97

Hypothesis number one states that there is a positive correlation between middle class and working class groups and levels of tolerance for defeat. In order to test this hypothesis a point biserial correlation was run. Point biserial correlation provides a measure of relationship between continuous variable and a two-categorized, or dichotomous, variable. Point biserial correlation is a product moment correlation and is a particular case of the formula $r = \frac{\sum(X-\bar{X})(Y-\bar{Y})}{(N-1)S_x S_y}$.¹ This correlation was obtained for both the maze test and the cubes test. Tables IV and V give the results obtained. On the cubes test a correlation of .90 was found. On the maze test, the correlation was .81. In order to test the significance of r_{pbi} from zero, the situation may be treated as one requiring a comparison of the two means \bar{X}_p and \bar{X}_q . The appropriate value of t may be written:²

$$t = r_{pbi} \frac{N-2}{1-r_{pbi}^2}$$

The number of degrees of freedom is two. This is a two-tailed test. Using this formula our correlation of .90 was found to be significant at the .01 level of significance. Likewise our correlation of .81 was significant at the .01 level. Therefore we accept our first hypothesis and conclude that there is a positive correlation between middle

¹George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (New York, 1959), pp. 239-240.

²Ibid., p. 242.

class and working class groups and levels of tolerance for defeat.

TABLE IV

CORRELATION OF TOLERANCE TO SOCIAL CLASS ON THE CUBE TEST

Social Class	Tolerance Levels		Total
	High	Low	
Middle Class	19	1	20
Working Class	0	20	20
Total	19	21	40

$r_{pbi} = .90; p < .01$

TABLE V

CORRELATION OF TOLERANCE TO SOCIAL CLASS ON THE MAZE TEST

Social Class	Tolerance Levels		Total
	High	Low	
Middle Class	15	5	20
Working Class	0	20	20
Total	15	25	40

$r_{pbi} = .81; p < .01$

Hypothesis number two states that middle class subjects will have a higher level of tolerance for defeat than working class subjects. This hypothesis was tested, dealing with each task separately, by use of a Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance test. The H statistic was computed for each task. For the cubes test, H was found to equal 22.78. For the maze test, H was found to equal 18.78. The results shown in Tables VI and VII support the second hypothesis at the .001 level of significance. Therefore, we conclude that the middle class subjects have a higher level of tolerance for defeat than the working class subjects.

Hypothesis number three states that middle class subjects will emit a greater quantity of communicative acts than will working class subjects. To test this hypothesis, two Kolmogorov-Smirnov Tests were run. One compared the middle class subjects' and the working class subjects' number of communicative acts per minute on the cubes test. The other compared the middle class subjects' and the working class subjects' number of communicative acts per minute on the maze test. Tables VIII and IX give the results of these tests. On the cubes test, D was equal to 5. On the maze test, D was equal to 7. For significance at the .05 level, a D of 11 or more was needed. Thus we reject our third hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference in the quantity of verbal acts emitted by working class and middle class subjects.

TABLE VI
 A COMPARISON OF TOLERANCE LEVELS BY
 SOCIAL CLASS ON THE CUBE TEST

Working Class		Middle Class	
Tolerance	Rank	Tolerance	Rank
3.45	10	9.70	27
3.98	12	10.10	29
1.75	2	15.00	37
3.07	8	11.97	31
2.38	4	14.05	33
4.98	18	8.38	23
4.38	14	15.00	37
2.60	7	15.00	37
2.58	6	8.17	22
3.08	9	9.17	25
4.82	17	6.93	21
4.62	15	9.25	26
1.42	1	15.00	37
2.27	3	8.93	24
5.42	20	11.42	30
5.17	19	15.00	37
4.72	16	15.00	37
2.50	5	15.00	37
4.05	13	12.10	32
3.93	11	9.93	28
Total	$R_1 = 210$		$R_2 = 610$

$H = 22.7839; df = 1; p < .001$

TABLE VII
 A COMPARISON OF TOLERANCE LEVELS BY
 SOCIAL CLASS ON THE MAZE TEST

Working Class		Middle Class	
Tolerance	Rank	Tolerance	Rank
2.42	12	8.80	26
2.60	13	15.00	36.5
1.68	10	11.58	30
1.10	5	15.00	36.5
1.58	7	15.00	36.5
3.17	16	9.92	28
1.67	8.5	12.33	32
5.00	19	11.80	31
2.67	14	5.17	21
1.00	3.5	5.00	19
5.85	24	5.58	23
1.12	6	15.00	36.5
.33	1.5	15.00	36.5
3.62	17	3.00	15
1.00	3.5	15.00	36.5
.33	1.5	15.00	36.5
5.00	19	5.57	22
2.25	11	15.00	36.5
1.67	8.5	11.53	29
5.87	25	8.97	27
Total	$R_1 = 225$		$R_2 = 595$

$H = 18.7871$; $df = 1$; $p < .001$

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF COMMUNICATIVE ACTS PER MINUTE ON THE CUBE TEST

Communicative Acts per Minute			Difference $F_1 - F_2$
Working Class F_1	Middle Class F_2		
	0	.20	1/20
	0	.36	2/20
.65	1/20		2/20
.68	2/20		2/20
	2/20	.86	3/20
.88	3/20		3/20
.88	4/20		3/20
	4/20	1.07	4/20
1.09	5/20		4/20
1.16	6/20		4/20
1.20	7/20		4/20
	7/20	1.21	5/20
1.25	8/20		5/20
1.26	9/20		5/20
1.29	10/20		5/20
	10/20	1.32	6/20
1.32	11/20		6/20
	11/20	1.33	7/20
	11/20	1.60	8/20
	11/20	1.67	9/20
1.69	12/20		9/20
	12/20	1.73	10/20
	12/20	1.84	11/20
	12/20	1.92	12/20
	12/20	1.93	13/20
2.29	13/20		13/20
	13/20	2.31	14/20
	13/20	2.47	15/20
2.68	14/20		15/20
2.71	15/20		15/20
2.71	16/20		15/20
	16/20	2.73	16/20
	16/20	3.13	17/20
	16/20	3.14	18/20
	16/20	3.26	19/20
	16/20	3.78	20/20
4.22	17/20		20/20
4.23	18/20		20/20
4.57	19/20		20/20
5.42	20/20		20/20

D = 5; $p > .05$

TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF COMMUNICATIVE ACTS PER MINUTE ON THE MAZE TEST

Communicative Acts per minute				Difference F ₁ - F ₂
Working Class F ₁		Middle Class F ₂		
	0	.20	1/20	1/20
	0	.40	2/20	1/20
.76	1/20		2/20	1/20
.87	2/20		2/20	0
	2/20	.95	3/20	1/20
	2/20	1.11	4/20	2/20
	2/20	1.25	5/20	3/20
	2/20	1.30	6/20	4/20
	2/20	1.31	7/20	5/20
	2/20	1.40	8/20	6/20
1.60	3/20		8/20	5/20
	3/20	1.61	9/20	6/20
	3/20	1.67	10/20	7/20
1.79	4/20		10/20	6/20
1.82	5/20		10/20	5/20
	5/20	1.87	11/20	6/20
	5/20	2.00	12/20	7/20
2.39	6/20		12/20	6/20
2.53	7/20		12/20	5/20
	7/20	2.53	13/20	6/20
2.57	8/20		13/20	5/20
	8/20	2.85	14/20	6/20
3.11	9/20		14/20	5/20
	9/20	3.29	15/20	6/20
	9/20	3.33	16/20	7/20
3.46	10/20		16/20	6/20
3.75	11/20		16/20	5/20
3.80	12/20		16/20	4/20
4.00	13/20		16/20	3/20
4.00	14/20		16/20	2/20
	14/20	4.13	17/20	3/20
4.45	15/20		17/20	2/20
	15/20	4.84	18/20	3/20
	15/20	5.40	19/20	4/20
6.00	16/20		19/20	3/20
6.00	17/20		19/20	2/20
	17/20	6.62	20/20	3/20
9.47	18/20		20/20	2/20
9.52	19/20		20/20	1/20
10.81	20/20		20/20	0

D = 7; p > .05

Hypothesis number four states that within social class there is no significance associated with ordering of tasks. In order to test this hypothesis, four Mann-Whitney U Tests were run. Within the middle class a Mann-Whitney was run comparing the cubes test as Task I to the cubes test as Task II. A Mann Whitney was also run comparing the maze test as Task I to the maze test as Task II. Within the working class the same tests were run. Tables X, XI, XII, and XIII give the results of these tests. The four Z scores obtained were not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is tenable since within social class no significant difference was found associated with ordering of tasks.

TABLE X

COMPARISON OF THE CUBES TEST AS TASK I AND TASK II
WITHIN THE MIDDLE CLASS

Cubes as Task I		Cubes as Task II	
Tolerance	Rank	Tolerance	Rank
9.17	16	8.17	19
6.93	20	9.25	15
15.00	4	15.00	4
9.70	14	8.93	17
11.97	10	11.42	11
15.00	4	15.00	4
10.10	12	15.00	4
9.93	17	15.00	4
15.00	4	8.38	18
12.10	9	14.05	8

$Z = .5409$; $p = .5892$

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF THE MAZE TEST AS TASK I AND TASK II
WITHIN THE MIDDLE CLASS

Maze as Task I		Maze as Task II	
Tolerance	Rank	Tolerance	Rank
5.17	19	5.00	18
15.00	4.5	5.58	16
15.00	4.5	11.80	10
3.00	20	8.80	15
15.00	4.5	15.00	4.5
15.00	4.5	11.58	11
5.57	17	15.00	4.5
12.33	9	8.97	14
9.92	13	15.00	4.5
15.00	4.5	11.53	12

$$Z = .4545; p = .6528$$

TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF THE CUBES TEST AS TASK I AND TASK II
WITHIN THE WORKING CLASS

Cubes as Task I		Cubes as Task II	
Tolerance	Rank	Tolerance	Rank
2.50	16	5.17	2
4.05	8	3.93	10
3.08	12	2.27	18
4.82	4	5.42	1
1.42	20	3.45	11
3.98	9	1.75	19
2.38	17	3.07	13
4.38	7	4.98	3
2.60	14	4.62	6
2.58	15	4.72	5

$$Z = 1.2878; p = .2203$$

TABLE XIII
COMPARISON OF THE MAZE TEST AS TASK I AND TASK II
WITHIN THE WORKING CLASS

Maze as Task I		Maze as Task II	
Tolerance	Rank	Tolerance	Rank
.33	19.5	2.25	10
5.87	1	1.67	12.5
3.62	5	1.00	17.5
1.00	17.5	5.85	2
2.42	9	.33	19.5
1.68	11	2.60	8
1.10	15	1.58	14
3.17	6	1.67	12.5
1.12	16	5.00	3.5
5.00	3.5	2.67	7

$$Z = .4545; p = .6528$$

Hypothesis number five states that there is no significance associated with addition of tasks. To test this hypothesis a Wilcoxon Matched Pairs Signed Ranks Test was run comparing each subjects' performance on their first task to their performance on their second task. The T statistic was obtained for both the middle and working class. For the middle class a T of 89 was obtained. For the working class a T of 97 was obtained. For significance at the .05 level a T of 52 or less is needed. Thus we do not reject the null hypothesis of no difference and conclude that within social class there is no significance associated with addition of tasks. These results are shown in Tables

XIV and XV.

TABLE XIV

COMPARISON OF SUBJECTS' PERFORMANCE ON TASK I TO THEIR
PERFORMANCE ON TASK II WITHIN THE MIDDLE CLASS

Task Order	Tolerance Level		Total
	Low	High	
Task I	4	16	20
Task II	2	18	20
Total	6	34	40

$T = 89; p > .05$

TABLE XV

COMPARISON OF SUBJECTS' PERFORMANCE ON TASK I TO THEIR
PERFORMANCE ON TASK II WITHIN THE WORKING CLASS

Task Order	Tolerance Level		Total
	Low	High	
Task I	20	0	20
Task II	20	0	20
Total	40	0	40

$T = 97; p > .05$

CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In the beginning of this sociological inquiry we stated an interest in studying the relationship between social class and levels of tolerance for defeat. We wanted to test empirically the concept that individuals in different social classes display different levels of tolerance for defeat. More specifically, we were primarily interested in discovering if middle class subjects display a higher level of tolerance for defeat than working class subjects.

We were assuming that within each individual there is a general personality dimension which runs from extreme tolerance to extreme intolerance. This personality dimension can be consciously observed by imposing certain stresses. Along this same vein of thought, we were supposing that members of different classes have something resembling a typical class personality that is also distinctive. We base this notion on the supposition that an individual's personality expresses the values and behavior considered appropriate to membership in the subculture.

It is interesting to note that of those forty subjects observed, a relationship between tolerance for defeat and social class was very definitely determined. Of the twenty

subjects defined as working class, not one displayed a high level of tolerance for defeat on either task.

As has been previously stated, other types of information were acquired in an effort to utilize our data to its fullest extent and to eliminate as much bias as was possible. Since all forty subjects did not come from the same city, it was decided that the data should be classified by city and tolerance levels in order to determine if a significant difference existed between the two cities. In other words, we were trying to determine if the significance we were obtaining was due to a difference in the subjects selected from the two cities. Tables XVI and XVII give the results of these tests. As the results in the Tables indicate, on both the cubes test and the maze test place of residence had no significant effect on tolerance levels for defeat.

TABLE XVI

COMPARISON OF THE CUBES TEST BY CITIES AND TOLERANCE LEVELS

City	Tolerance Levels		Total
	High	Low	
Kingfisher	10	10	20
Stillwater	9	11	20
Total	19	21	40

$$X^2 = .1; df = 1; p = .75$$

TABLE XVII

COMPARISON OF THE MAZE TEST BY CITIES AND TOLERANCE LEVELS

City	Tolerance Levels		Total
	High	Low	
Kingfisher	9	11	20
Stillwater	6	14	20
Total	15	25	40

$$\chi^2 = .96; df = 1; p = .76$$

Age was another factor which was given special consideration. Within each class, subjects were grouped into two inclusive age categories and a chi square was run for each task. As Tables XVIII and XIX show, age in our sample has no significant effect on tolerance levels for defeat. At first glance, this perhaps seems somewhat unusual. It would seem logical to reason that tolerance levels decrease with age. However, our results can be somewhat supported by Stouffer's study on Communism and Conformity.¹ In this particular study, Stouffer found that when education is controlled for, age has little effect on tolerance. In other

¹Samuel Stouffer, Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties.

words, education was the determining factor. In our study education has been controlled for in our definition of social class. Thus our results of no significance associated with age and tolerance levels would tend to be in accord with Stouffer's research.

TABLE XVIII

COMPARISON OF THE CUBES TEST BY AGE AND TOLERANCE LEVELS

Age	Tolerance Levels		Total
	High	Low	
25 - 39	10	10	20
40 - 54	9	11	20
Total	19	21	40

$$\chi^2 = .096; df = 1; p = .75$$

Hypothesis number one posited a positive correlation between social class and levels of tolerance for defeat. Hypothesis number two suggested that the middle class would exhibit higher levels of tolerance for defeat than the working class. Both of these hypotheses were supported. Likewise, as our hypotheses testing has shown, ordering of

tasks and addition of tasks had no significant effect on tolerance levels for defeat. With our third hypothesis, though, a more difficult problem was incurred. The hypothesis stated that the middle class would emit greater quantities of communicative acts than the working class. After testing this hypothesis, we found it necessary to reject it. As was previously stated, all verbal responses were categorized as communicative or acts of interference. When a frequency count was taken, the middle class did emit many more acts of communication and interference. But when our unit of measure was standardized to communicative acts per minute and acts of interference per minute, no significant difference was found.

TABLE XIX

COMPARISON OF THE MAZE TEST BY AGE AND TOLERANCE LEVELS

Age	Tolerance Levels		Total
	High	Low	
25 - 39	8	12	20
40 - 54	7	13	20
Total	15	25	40

$$x^2 = .1; df = 1; p = .75$$

When these tests showed no significance, an attempt was made to explain these results. A ratio of communicative acts to communicative acts plus acts of interference was computed for each subject. These ratios were compared by class and task. Although the working class had somewhat higher ratios than the middle class, the difference was not significant. Based upon pure speculation, it is possible that the middle class displayed somewhat lower ratios for the following reason. In the verbal responses acquired, all those acts designated as acts of interference could just as accurately have been designated as acts of tension release. In this study, acts of interference were such things as "oh," "uh oh." "damn," "ha ha." Bales, in his studies of small group interaction, designates such responses as acts of tension release. Following this line of reason, perhaps the middle class displayed higher tolerance levels partly because they were able to release a greater amount of the tension building up within themselves. This is purely speculation but perhaps it is an area which could be subject to future research.

When verbal responses were evaluated for their content, it was discovered that within both classes by far the majority of communicative acts were informative in nature as opposed to questions or opinions. However, when the content was viewed more closely, an interesting observation emerged. As has been previously pointed out, verbal responses for each task were recorded. These responses were kept separ-

ately and were analyzed separately also. Upon viewing the verbal responses of the working class for the cubes test, the researcher noticed the consistent tendency for subjects to emit negative responses. In other words, subjects would make such remarks as "I can't do this;" "I'll never get to the end;" "I can't get anywhere on this;" "I know I'm not smart enough to do this." With such responses occurring so frequently, the researcher decided to work with this phenomenon. For the task under consideration, all verbal responses for subjects in both classes were analyzed. If a subject made at least one statement similar to the examples given above he was classified as possessing a negative self-concept toward his task performance. If a subject did not respond with remarks such as those mentioned, he was categorized as not negative. The label "not negative" was used as opposed to the label "positive" as these subjects could have been positive or even neutral. Comparing these categories to social class, a chi-square test was run. The results are given in Table XX. The table shows that within social class, on the cubes test, a significant difference was found in the self-concept of working and middle class subjects. As the Table indicates, more subjects in the working class tended to develop a negative self concept (as defined in this instance) toward their task performance while far more middle class subjects maintained a non-negative self-concept.

TABLE XX

COMPARISON OF SOCIAL CLASS AND SELF-CONCEPT ON THE CUBE TEST

Social Class	Self Concept		Total
	Negative	Not Negative	
Working	12	8	20
Middle	3	17	20
Total	15	25	40

$$\chi^2 = 8.64; df = 1; p < .01$$

On the maze test, these same results were not obtained. When subjects were categorized by self-concept and social class and a chi square was run, no significant difference was found. Table XXI gives these results. Again speculating, the difference might possibly be attributed to the way the two tasks were perceived. The maze game is a task in which the ability to succeed or fail becomes readily apparent. Thus after trying this task several times, a subject perceived eventual success or failure. With the cube test, though, ability to succeed or fail was not so readily apparent. Perhaps it was for this reason that the middle class subjects were more reluctant to concede. The working class, on the other hand, seemed much more willing and ready to perceive failure.

TABLE XXI

COMPARISON OF SOCIAL CLASS AND SELF-CONCEPT ON THE MAZE TEST

Social Class	Self Concept		Total
	Negative	Not Negative	
Working	10	10	20
Middle	7	13	20
Total	17	23	40

$$\chi^2 = .922; df = 1; p = .44$$

If we may be allowed to return to hypothesis three dealing with communication, perhaps we can attempt to explain the results in part. First of all, every working class subject spent a relatively short period of time with each of the two tasks. Thus, when a subject spent only twenty seconds with a task but emitted two communicative acts, his number of communicative acts per minute computed to six. In actuality, this most probably is a false picture because had the subject continued with the task, his communicative acts per minute would probably be greatly reduced. In other words, this writer is suggesting that there is a rapid declination in verbalization with each minute of task performance. Thus, there is most probably some bias in this statistic. A better methodological approach would have

been to sample the communicative acts of each subject's first minute of task performance, standardizing our unit of measure even more and likewise gaining greater precision.

An additional glance at the personal background information obtained during the interview period offered an interesting observation. When the wife's educational achievements were compared to her husband's as a basis for determining upward or downward mobility through marriage, an interesting pattern emerged. Viewing the data within both classes, upward mobility was defined as marrying a man with more education. Downward mobility was defined as marrying a man with less education. Marrying a man with equal education was considered a neutral category. A chi square was run comparing class with mobility through marriage. Table XXII gives these results. The Table shows that there is a significant difference between middle and working class subjects and social mobility through marriage. If we may relate this to aspiration levels, it would appear that the middle class subjects aspire more highly than the working class subjects. And again the question concerning the relation between aspiration levels and tolerance levels arises. This author is inclined to think that such a relationship exist. This is perhaps an area for future research.

At the onset of this research, it was posited that the purpose of this research was to determine if there exist a relationship between levels of tolerance for defeat and social class. Class and tolerance were operationally defined

and an experiment was designed to measure this relationship.

TABLE XXII
SOCIAL CLASS AND MOBILITY THROUGH MARRIAGE

Social Class	Mobility			Total
	Up	Same	Down	
Middle	16	3	1	20
Working	3	5	12	20
Total	19	8	13	40

$$\chi^2 = 19.6; df = 2; p < .001$$

On the basis of our findings, what conclusions can we draw from this research? First of all we must keep in mind the possible limitations of our study. Our study, first of all, limits class to occupational and educational referents. Perhaps with the use of other factors, different results might be obtained. Secondly, we studied only white, female, married adults. Thus, we can not speak about males of any characteristics. Thirdly, we are limited by the size of our sample and by our sampling technique. For this study, a quota sampling technique was employed. Perhaps other sam-

pling techniques would be more advantageous. Fourthly, our study is concerned with only the middle and working classes. Thus, we can say nothing of the upper or lower class. Fifthly, there is that possibility that our tests for measuring tolerance for defeat could have been biased and yet this bias not have been detected. In other words, these could have been middle class tasks that the middle class found interesting but that the working class had little interest in performing.

It is doubtful that all of the limitations mentioned above apply to our research. But it is also apparent that from one piece of research we can not generalize onto the whole population. If we can assume a certain amount of validity our study would posit rather interesting concepts. As hypothesized, our study indicates a very definite relationship between tolerance levels for defeat and social class. The study hints at a relationship between levels of tolerance and levels of aspiration. It is the opinion of the writer that the research under review deserves some consideration. The concept of tolerance levels for defeat and social class offers insight into the behavior patterns of individuals. This information can be quite useful to the sociologists in his study of social behavior. Perhaps the most positive conclusion we can reach is that more extensive research is certainly in order. It would seem that a repetition of this study, perhaps with some modifications in the methodology, would be advantageous.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berelson, Bernard. Content Analysis in Communication Research. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1952.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Broom, Leonard and Phillip Selznick. Sociology. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.
- Cavan, Ruth. "The Concepts of Tolerance and Contraculture as Applied to Delinquency." Sociological Quarterly, II (October, 1961), 243-258.
- Cuber, John F. and William F. Kenkel. Social Stratification in the United States. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- Dohrenwend, Bruce P. and Edwin Chin Shong. "Social Status and Attitudes Toward Psychological Disorder: The Problem of Tolerance of Deviance." American Sociological Review, XXXII (June, 1967), 417-433.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- Knupfer, Genevieve. "Portrait of the Underdog." Public Opinion Quarterly (Spring, 1947), 103-114.
- Lipset, S. M. Political Man. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1960.
- Martin, James G. and Frank R. Westie. "The Tolerant Personality," American Sociological Review, XXIV (August, 1959), 521-528.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. "Social Distance Attitudes of South Afrikan Students." Social Forces, XXXVIII (March, 1960), 246-253.
- Reiss, Albert J. Jr. Occupations and Social Status. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.
- Reissman, Leonard. Class in American Society. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959.

- Reissman, Leonard. "Levels of Aspiration and Social Class." American Sociological Review, XX (June, 1955), 233-242.
- Shubik, Martin. Game Theory and Related Approaches to Social Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Simmon, J. L. "Tolerance of Divergent Attitudes." Social Forces, XLIII (March, 1965), 347-364.
- Stouffer, Samuel. Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1955.
- Strauss, Marray A. "Communication, Creativity, and Problem-Solving Ability of Middle and Working Class Families in Three Societies." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1959, 15-27.
- Tumin, Melvin M. Social Stratification. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam Company, Publishers, 1963.
- Wisniewski, Wieslaw. "Tolerance and Egalitarianism." Polish Sociological Bulletin, I (1963), 21-32.

APPENDIX

INTERVIEW AND OBSERVATION SHEET

Subject's Number _____

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Husband's occupation _____
 2. Father's occupation _____
 3. Subject's occupation _____
 4. Last year of education completed by husband _____
 5. Last year of education completed by father _____
 6. Last year of education completed by subject _____
 7. Church affiliated with _____
 8. Frequency of attendance _____
 9. Age of Respondent: 25-39 30-34 35-39 40-44 45-49
50-54
-

Colored Cubes

Task Number _____

Time _____

Maze

Task Number _____

Time _____

Number of Trials _____

Points on Path _____

VITA

Rebecca Faith Guy

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: TOLERANCE LEVELS FOR DEFEAT AND SOCIAL CLASS:
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in California, Missouri, April 22,
1946, the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Arnold Owen
Guy, Sr.

Education: Graduated from Wewoka High School, Wewoka
Oklahoma in May, 1964; attended Phillips Univer-
sity, Enid, Oklahoma, from 1964 to 1968; received
the Bachelor of Arts degree from Phillips Univer-
sity in 1968, with a major in Sociology; com-
pleted requirements for the Master of Science
degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1970
as a National Science Foundation Fellow.

Professional Experience: graduate-teaching assistant,
Department of Sociology, Oklahoma State Univer-
sity, 1968-1969.