



University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

4-1-1972

Status Crystallization, Social Attitudes, and Powerlessness Within a Student Population

James T. Maguire

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Maguire, James T., "Status Crystallization, Social Attitudes, and Powerlessness Within a Student Population" (1972). *Student Work*. 2281.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2281>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION, SOCIAL ATTITUDES, AND
POWERLESSNESS WITHIN A STUDENT POPULATION

A Thesis
Presented to the
Department of Sociology
and the
Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies
University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
James T. Maquire
April, 1972

UMI Number: EP73824

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73824

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to those whose generous assistance is responsible for whatever success may be accorded to this thesis. Whatever faults found herein are solely the responsibility of myself.

To Professor George W. Barger, I acknowledge an unpayable debt both for the knowledge he has transferred to me, and for the sacrifices of personal time and energy in connection with his service as the chairman of my thesis committee. A special word of appreciation to Professor Sybil Better who withstood my neurotic ravings while her student and retained the courage to serve as a reader and advisor. My thanks also to the third member of my committee, Professor Eugene Freund of the Department of Education, for accepting the task of reader and advisor. To Mrs. Sophie Katz, for the months of encouragement which she so unselfishly culminated by taking on the task of typing much of the manuscript which follows, I am especially grateful.

A word of thanks to Professor Theodore Caplow, and the Faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of the University of Virginia, who by supporting my doctoral study indirectly supported the completion of this thesis.

Finally, to my wife, Gail, and to my daughter Kerry Ann, a special kind of gratitude for weathering the storms and easing the task.

J.T.M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. Social Stratification and the Concept of Status Crystallization	1
II. Statement of the Problem	11
III. Research Design	18
IV. Findings and Discussion	29
V. Summary and Conclusion	37
References	41
Appendix A - The Personal Data Questionnaire	47
Appendix B - The Kerlinger Social Attitudes Scale	51
Appendix C - The Neal and Seeman Powerlessness Scale	53

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
I. Sex Distribution in the Sample and Population by College	21
II. Crystallization Categories.	24
III. Crystallization Dichotomy	25
IV. Summary of Responses on Kerlinger's "The Social Attitudes Scale"	26
V. Summary of Responses on the Neal and Seeman Powerlessness Scale	27
VI. Summary of Findings for the Relationship Between Status Crystallization (Dichotomized) and Social Attitudes	32
VII. Summary of Findings for the Relationship Between Status Crystallization (Triple Categories) and Social Attitudes.	32
VIII. Summary of Findings for the Relationship Between Status Crystallization (Triple Categories) and Powerlessness	32
IX. Summary of Findings for the Relationship Between Social Attitudes and Powerlessness among the High Status Crystallization Respondents	33
X. Summary of Findings for the Relationship Between Social Attitudes and Powerlessness among the Moderate Status Crystallization Respondents	33
XI. Summary of Findings for the Relationship Between Social Attitudes and Powerlessness among the Low Status Crystallization Respondents	33
XII. Summary of Findings for the Relationship Between Social Attitudes and Powerlessness among the Low Status Crystallization Respondents, Ages 18-26	34

TABLE

Page

XIII.	Summary of Findings for the Relationship Between Social Attitudes and Powerlessness among the Low Status Crystallization Respondents, Ages 27 and above	34
-------	--	----

CHAPTER I
SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND THE CONCEPT OF
STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION

The threefold purpose of this chapter is: (1) to briefly discuss the history of scholarly thought on the subject of social inequality, (2) to make a distinction between social differentiation and social stratification, and (3) within the context of the two former objectives to introduce the subject of status crystallization.

Social inequality, as an integral part of man's social existence, was a phenomenon of long-standing concern to scholars before the first sociological questions were asked. Aristotle (Politics. 1252a, 1254b.), among other ancients, viewed social inequality as, essentially, the aligning of society's membership based on inherent social inferiority and superiority. The belief in a natural place for every man and every man in his natural place, buttressed sometime later by appeals to divine authority, survived, more or less intact, until the French Revolution of 1789. With such writers and thinkers as Ferguson (1819), Millar (1793), and Rousseau (1949), this belief in inequality as given in nature was challenged and finally dispelled in the face of the inquiry into the causation of social inequality.

With the development of the discipline of sociology, there came numerous investigations and explanations of

both the causes of social inequality and the effects of differentiated and stratified social structures on society as a whole or on societal substructures. By and large, the model for analysis of social stratification in these various contexts took a uni-dimensional form, an analogue of the "social ladder." The uni-dimensional model orders society uni-linearly as the steps on a ladder. To assign an individual or family to a position on the "ladder," researchers have utilized a composite status score arrived at either statistically or intuitively from various status indicators. Groups possessing similar scores are, in this general manner, defined as social classes. The collapsing of data to arrive at a composite score necessitates the loss of information, in consequence limiting the types of explanations which may be derived from this model. In terms of utility this uni-dimensional model has a record of considerable productivity: witness the work of Warner (1960), and others. Without demeaning the importance of the uni-dimensional model, it has been demonstrated to be limited (Benoit-Smullyan, 1944; Sorokin, 1947; Adams, 1953; Lenski, 1954) in describing the effects of social stratification on and within complex groups. The discussion presented in this chapter is oriented around the superior utility of a multi-dimensional

model as an analytical tool for the study of the effects of some of the properties of social stratification on social attitudes. The primary focus is on a merging of Lenski's (1966, 1970) technological evolutionary theory of social stratification and Dahrendorf's normative theory of the origin of social inequality. The specific aspects will be detailed below.

A system of stratification exists for a particular society as a mode of adaptation which is a part of a network of adaptations to environmental conditions.¹ Such a network of adaptations is generally referred to as a society's form of social organization.² Human societies are those various adaptations which "exist to the degree that a territorially bounded population of . . . (humans) maintains ties of association and interdependence and enjoys autonomy." (Lenski, 1970:9)³

Reducing these various societies to their lowest common

¹The environmental conditions referred to here extend beyond physical factors, such as climate, topography, natural resources, and the like, to include intra-societal conditions such as technology, particularly those basic technologies concerned with subsistence production.

²The degree of complexity of social organization is linked to the ability of technologies to provide surpluses necessary for the support of societal members not directly engaged in the production of society's subsistence, such as priests and politicians.

³I have substituted the word "humans" for the phrase "animals of a single species."

denominator, it may be shown that social organization as adaptation functions to enhance the species' probabilities for survival and reproduction. (Lenski, 1970:44) According to Lenski (1970:38) social organization "refers to any structured system of relationships among people." The origin of social organization, and therefore of society, is at best, obscure and essentially irrelevant. With the aid of historical data, it appears that social organization proceeds from two general principles underlying human behavior: (1) that collective effort enhances survival (i.e. need satisfaction) and, (2) however tentative such adaptive forms may be, a consensus must exist with respect to means and ends if society is to be viable. The implications of these principles have born endless data and debate. While a recounting of the latter would, no doubt in the manner of good gossip, tantalize the reader, in terms of the yet to be revealed issue at hand, such a discussion would prove barren. Granting these principles to be unresolved empirical questions, it seems prudent to define them as assumptions and to set the context in the hopes that their utility will become apparent.

Central to our definition of the first principles, cited above, is the individual act of perceiving the necessity for, and hence, the relative worth of, collective

effort over individual effort. This primary act of evaluation of alternatives is important, especially in explaining the subjugation of individual autonomy to even the most basic forms of group control. With reference again to the first principle, it is assumed there is a societal subjugation to the group by its members under various conditions where group means more easily or efficiently provide for the attainment of group and/or individual ends. It should be emphasized that this felt need need not be conscious with the individual, nor is the intent here to picture a rational society. Rather, the individual is subtly imbued with this feeling through the process of socialization. From this point on, the assumption outlined above is embodied in the term social action and accounts for that portion of our definition of social organization that deals with "relationships among people."

In order for the group to provide for its members, it must achieve a coordination of efforts among its parts. With reference to the second principle above, the assumption made is that coordination implies consensus or a shared definition of the situation as to the functioning of the various parts of the group with respect to goal accomplishment. Attendant to consensus are group expectations which, even in

the simplest of societies, result in what may be loosely termed structure.

Based upon these two assumptions, social organization may be redefined as that patterned whole which is made up of accepted expectations for behavior (i.e. norms), and which has its origin in the value of social action. Since societies receive most of their replacement members through reproduction, it is necessary for societies to employ mechanisms for the integration of these non-volunteers. For those members entering into a social organization by birth, the value of social action and behavioral expectations must be learned. This is the coercive nature of social organization. Conforming behavior to societies' norms cannot be guaranteed by a system of voluntary individual controls. Norms are buttressed by attendant sanctions, that is, rewards for conforming and punishments for non-conforming behavior. These sanctions apply wherever expectations of behavior govern the performance of society's members in their various positions. The result is a continuity of organization and of societal task which transcends the life-span of society's members. Societies generally do not pursue a solitary goal via solitary means utilizing efforts of all its members at the same time. This leads to a third assumption, that societies pursue multiple goals via multiple means assigning portions of the total endeavor of the total membership who

carry out their tasks at various rates, places, and times. Social positions, then, are those analytically distinct entities delineated by norms of performance of social tasks (e.g. occupations) which sum to the division of labor of the social organization.⁴ Those differentiated parts, positions, are essentially equal in that they function to the same ends. A manager, butcher, checker, and produce-man for the supermarket are all "equally indispensable for the attainment of the goal in question." (Dahrendorf, 1970:14) When talent, skill, education, or other conditions are made requisite for the incumbents of these positions the relative value of these conditions is established bringing to the position additional norms of an evaluative nature. These norms operate in two ways to reflect the relative importance of their attendant positions. First, the greater the market

⁴To paraphrase Dahrendorf (1970:12-15), the issue of the division of labor has been at the center of debate in most discussions of the origin of social inequality. Some of the principles in this debate are Marx, Engels, Durkheim, Simmel, and Schmoller. The division of labor is the conceptual equivalent of social differentiation. According to Schmoller (1890): "The difference in social rank and property, in prestige and income, is merely a secondary consequence of social differentiation." The idea that social differentiation precedes social stratification is made more palatable by Schmoller's subsequent addition of an intervening "psychological fact," whatever that may be. Dahrendorf, adds substance to this intermediate agent by interpreting it as "an additional act of evaluation, one that is neither caused nor explained by the division of labor." (1970:14)

value of a position for a given social organization, the greater is the tendency for higher rewards for conforming behavior.⁵ Secondly, such differential valuation of position services (individual qualifications) functions to exclude portions of the membership of the social organization from participation at successive levels.⁶ In this manner the incumbents of social positions accrue prestige and power to their status in this vertical alignment of the social organization. This is what is termed social stratification, or the rank ordering of individuals in terms of the relative importance of the positions they hold. In sum, social differentiation may be termed the "functional organization" of society, and social stratification the "scalar organization." (Dahrendorf, 1970:14)

Having distinguished between social differentiation and stratification it is now possible to begin the discussion

⁵While this tendency seems to be the general pattern found in stratified society it is not an unavoidable one, the Israeli experience is a case in point. Tumin, in his criticisms of Davis and Moore makes it clear that not all of society's positions are filled by those who are objective qualifiers for high positions, it has been shown that power, prestige, and income may be inherited or otherwise transferred to individuals who had no direct responsibility for such accumulations. (Tumin, 1953; Davis, and Moore, 1945)

⁶This characteristic of social stratification to advantage groups to the exclusion of others holds special importance for the investigation at hand and is well within the spirit of Wrong's criticism of the functional theory of stratification. (1959) This article, along with Tumin's clearly illustrates the manner in which stratification may be dysfunctional for a society.

of the particular considerations surrounding the research problem we are investigating.

In our discussion to this point, the treatment of social stratification has been macroscopic. As a society is made up of many subdivisions, so is society's system of stratification.

. . . the uni-dimensional view of social stratification is inadequate to describe the complexities of group structure. . . the structure of human groups normally involves the coexistence of a number of parallel vertical hierarchies which usually are imperfectly correlated with one another.
(Lenski, 1954:405)

Systems of stratification function as distributive channels for the results of societal production, or in summary terms, those social commodities, power, prestige, and income. The multiple hierarchies, referred to above, serve the same end.⁷ In terms of the individual occupying statuses in the various hierarchies, power may be derived from occupation (i.e. legitimated authority), income, and indirectly from education and ethnicity which effect occupation, and therefore income. Power may also be forthcoming through property ownership, insofar as power may derive from contributions to common tax pools or other

⁷These sub-systems of stratifications act as distributors for one, two, or all three of the social commodities, and with emphasis or weighting on any one. Lenski isolates four sub-systems: occupation, education, income, and ethnic hierarchies. I will utilize all but the latter, substituting instead a property hierarchy for reasons discussed in chapter two.

manipulations such as determining modes of land usage.⁸

The illustration above is not exhaustive. It appears that the interaction of these four (plus one) hierarchies, as they function in the distribution of the social commodities, is most probably limited to the possible permutations and combinations of the number of hierarchies employed. A further point to be emphasized is that the individual possesses these multiple statuses simultaneously, it being impractical, except for analytical purposes, to conceive of the individual as consciously behaving in such a manner as to hold each separately at all times.⁹

An important question which is raised immediately by such a view is the question of how these several positions are interrelated. Theoretically, it becomes possible to conceive of a non-vertical dimension to individual or family status--that is, a consistency dimension. In this dimension units may be compared with respect to the degree of consistency of their positions in the several vertical hierarchies. In other words, certain units may be consistently high or low while others may combine high standing with respect to certain status variables with low standing with respect to others. (Lenski, 1954:405)

⁸Probably the most common derivative of property status for the bulk of society, and here we are referring to all material property, is property's effect on mode or style of living, which in turn is derived from other sources.

⁹Insofar as occupation, income, education, ethnicity, and property possess attributable expectations and are therefore identified with positions in the functional organization of society such separation is possible. But the issue here is concerned with the scalar organization which is quantitative rather than qualitative. For a further discussion of this separation of roles, see Goode (1960).

CHAPTER II

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In his research, Lenski (1954), demonstrates that status consistency (crystallization) is related positively to political attitudes. The concern of the present research is that of replicating, some seventeen years later, Lenski's work. The use of the term replication somewhat begs the question of equivalence. Problems such as zero funding, sample size and selection, and strict adherence to Lenski's design may be cause for describing this research as a shadow of Lenski's research, that is conforming to shape and form but obscuring precise detail. A complete discounting of these operational problems is impossible but it is felt that where changes have been made they were necessitated by external conditions. The attempt, then, is one of restricted replication coupled with a conscious effort toward clarification.

The most parsimonious approach to describing the particular problem at hand appears to be a concept by concept, step by step, comparison between Lenski's 1954 article reporting his research and the current attempt. Specific technical approaches to the methodology of this research will be explained in a similar manner in Chapter III. The basic hypothesis tested in Lenski's study is as follows:

. . . individuals characterized by a low degree of status crystallization differ significantly in their political attitudes and behavior from individuals characterized by a high degree of status crystallization, when status differences in the vertical dimensions are controlled. (Lenski, 1954:405-406)

This basic hypothesis could not be adopted completely.

During the formulation of the research design it was decided to drop that portion of Lenski's basic hypothesis which deals with political behavior. It was assumed, since the sample was to be drawn from a student population at a metropolitan, midwestern, state-supported university, that voting behavior¹⁰ would not be relevant because of the age of respondents. The importance of age to the decision to omit voting behavior is based upon the high probability that respondents would be selected who had not reached voting age. Age cohorts decrease in size as individuals progress from freshman to senior classes. Since the formulation of the study the voting age has been lowered and ratified by the state legislatures. However, no elections have taken place and at this time, participation in elections by the newly enfranchised group remains an unmeasurable variable. Some consideration was

¹⁰"Data relating to three elections were used: (1) the 1948 presidential election; (2) the 1950 Michigan gubernatorial election; and (3) the 1952 presidential election. For the first two elections comparisons were made on the basis of the respondents' reports of their behavior. For the 1952 election, it was necessary to make the comparison the basis of the respondents' indications of their party preferences, since the interviews were conducted eight to ten months before the election." (Lenski, 1954:408)

given to the asking of questions revealing the voting behavior of parents but, for obvious reasons, this was rejected. One further point, in terms of their relative importance in both Lenski's research and in the theoretical realm, political attitudes outweigh and are less transient in the American population than are political party preferences as indicated by voting behavior.

To complete the discussion of Lenski's basic hypothesis and also to complete the comparison, the tentative hypothesis¹¹ basic to this research is as follows:

. . . individuals characterized by a low degree of status crystallization differ significantly in their . . . political attitudes . . . from individuals characterized by a high degree of status crystallization, when status differences in the vertical dimensions are controlled. (Lenski, 1954:405-406)

Lenski uses two basic variables in his study, social status and status crystallization: social status is defined operationally as follows:

Social status. For operational purposes, the statuses of respondents were defined in terms of their relative positions in four vertical hierarchies: the income hierarchy; the occupation hierarchy;

¹¹The use of a tentative basic hypothesis here is necessary to preserve the sequence of the development of the final basic hypothesis and to avoid confusing the issues under discussion.

the education hierarchy; and the ethnic hierarchy. These four were chosen both because of their great importance and also because of the relative ease with which necessary information relating to them could be obtained. (Lenski, 1954:406)

With respect to this operationally defined variable of social status, it was necessary to replace Lenski's ethnic hierarchy with a property hierarchy. This substitution was again necessitated by the characteristics of the population from which the sample was to be drawn. Racial minorities, of singular importance to an ethnic hierarchy, exist in insufficient numbers in the research population to allow a statistical test. This lack in the population is born up by the infrequent occurrence of racial minority members in the sample. The selection of a property hierarchy is based on Lenski's (1970:309-393) discussion of the link between the property hierarchy and the occupational hierarchy. Property is a valuable dimension since it has the potential to reveal wealth not derived from income or occupational sources.

The second basic variable, status crystallization, is operationally defined as a consistency rating derived from scores based on the individual's positions in the four hierarchies. A complete discussion of the scoring technique appears in Chapter III. These scores are based upon data provided on the head of the household of which the respondent is a member. In the case of the respondent being the head of the household, the scores are derived from the respondent's statuses.

Turning to Lenski's dependent variables, political attitudes, and political (voting) behavior, some criticisms are in order. The matter of voting behavior, which Lenski equates with political party preferences, while not reported in this study, has a bearing on the operational definition of political attitudes here. Lenski develops his definition of political attitudes around the term "liberal tendencies." (Lenski, 1954:410) These liberal tendencies are defined by the respondents' expressed views on three controversial issues: ". . . (a) a government-sponsored health insurance program, (b) price-controls, and (c) a general extension of governmental powers." (Lenski, 1954:410) The argument here is with the nature of these three issues. All three issues are political in nature and might very well be related to the respondents loyalty to political party platforms rather than to general liberal tendencies per se. It is quite conceivable to envision respondents, polled for political party preferences, responding to such issues in the demonstrated direction out of a felt need to be consistent with respect to party affiliation. For our purposes here, it seemed possible to employ a definition of liberal tendencies based on a scale of social attitudes¹² which increase the scope of

¹²This scale is discussed fully in chapter three and appears as it was administered in Appendix B.

the research to include issues not so closely related to political party preferences such as religion, education, business and economics, etc. Therefore, we may now restate the tentative basic hypothesis in its final form:

. . . individuals characterized by a low degree of status crystallization differ significantly in their . . . (social attitudes) . . . from individuals characterized by a high degree of status crystallization, when status differences in the vertical dimensions are controlled. (Lenski, 1954:405-406)

In his discussion at the end of the article, Lenski makes the following assertion:

Extrapolating from these findings, one might predict that the more frequently acute status inconsistencies occur within a population the greater would be the proportion of that population willing to support programs of social change. . . . Conceivably a society with a relatively large proportion of persons whose status is poorly crystallized is a society which is in an unstable condition. In brief, under such conditions the social system itself generates its own pressures for change. (Lenski, 1954:411-412)

In other words, the rate of activity within the scalar organization of the social system in part determines the rate of social change found within the social system. Insofar as inconsistent status may be asserted as contributing to the rate of activity, within the scalar organization, inconsistent or low crystallized status may be viewed as a contributor to social change. This is interpreted by this writer as further evidence for the shift from political attitudes to social attitudes as a dependent variable. Social change involves considerably more than disagreement with

existing conditions of polity.

Lenski's assertion above is of particular importance for this study since it is the basis for an additional dimension not investigated by the 1954 study. Low crystallized individuals who exhibit liberal tendencies may be further dichotomized, in light of the above assertion, as those who view change as necessary but feel powerless to improve their position, and those who are more optimistic. The willingness to advocate change in the social order is not sufficient to predict change as a result of the actions of this group of low crystallized liberals. A recognition of available resources for effecting change is also a necessary requisite for action. This necessitates the additional variable of powerlessness which by definition is "low expectancies for control of events." (Neal and Seeman, 1964:216-226) In sum, the research reported here centers around the final basic hypothesis, cited above, and is concerned with testing of the hypotheses listed below:

Hypothesis I. Individuals characterized by a low degree of status crystallization will differ significantly in their expression of social attitudes (liberalism and conservatism) when status differences in vertical dimension of the four hierarchies are controlled.

Hypothesis II. Individuals characterized as advocates of social change (liberals) will differ significantly in their expectancies for the control of events (degree of powerlessness) from conservatives when the degree of status crystallization is controlled.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research reported in this chapter was carried out during the period from June 15, 1971, to July 15, 1971. Survey techniques were employed.¹³ The instrument consisted of a questionnaire and two attitudes scales (see Appendices A, B, and C). The average time for the completion of the instrument by the respondents was 32 minutes. No attempt was made to control for time lags between administrations of the instrument. Since the instrument was administered to respondents who were enrolled in courses at the University during scheduled course time, the scheduling of the administration of the instrument was left entirely at the option of the instructor. The observed lack of a strong informal communications system within the First Summer Session was thought to minimize the effects of leakage of information. Through conversations with, and observations of the respondents, it appeared that their overall response to the instrument was positive, and in some instances, enthusiastic.

¹³Lenski's study employs interview techniques, having had the staff of the "first Detroit Area Study" at his disposal. (Lenski, 1954:406) Survey techniques were best suited to the limitations in time, money, and manpower. Also of importance here is the point that by allowing respondents to remain anonymous seems to have had a bearing on the high rate of return shown. This made the process of validation of data (Lenski, 1954:409) impossible. The overall positive response on the part of the respondents to the instrument and the researcher, however, allays suspicions of falsification of data.

The sample design was constructed on a projected enrollment of 8,310 students for the First Summer Session.¹⁴ The total of 8,310 available spaces was subdivided by colleges within the University. On the basis of these subdivisions, proportions of the total available spaces were computed for each college. These proportions were then projected against a target sample of 250. It was decided to select randomly, courses from each college until the established quota for that college had been reached. To this end, an array was made for the entire First Summer Session by expected course size. Those courses whose size placed them at the extremes of the distribution were eliminated to reduce the possibility of filling or exceeding a quota with one course in the case of large courses, and to guard against self-selective factors in the case of small courses. The mean number of available spaces in those courses retained for sampling was 33. Where the quota for a college was less than 5% of the target sample of 250, no draw for that college was made. It was assumed that these quotas could be filled by the normal occurrence of that college's enrollees in the courses of the other colleges. In all, nine courses plus alternates were drawn to fill the quotas with a mean of 29 available spaces per course. In one

¹⁴Sampling students in a University with the intent that they retain anonymity restricts the choice of sampling technique used. Where Lenski (1954:406) employed the area sampling method, this study employs the probability method.

instance, in the College of Arts and Sciences, an alternate course was used due to the refusal on the part of an instructor to participate.

The actual enrollment of the courses selected totalled 216, with a mean class enrollment of 24. Of the 216 instruments administered, 209 were returned yielding a return rate of 97%. From these 209 respondents, 19 were dropped for insufficient data yielding a usable sample which represented 88% of the original draw. The total enrollment for the First Summer Session was 4,272. Computed against this actual total of 4,272 enrollees, the usable sample represents 4.5% of the study population. The study population, when broken down, for the purposes of comparison with the usable sample, yielded 1,837 females or 43%, and 2,435 males or 56%. The usable sample, when divided by the sex of the respondents, yielded 81 females or 42%, and 109 males or 57%. Table I, (page 21), compares the study population with the usable sample on the basis of sex and enrollment in the various colleges and divisions of the University. While some divergences do exist between the usable sample and the study population, they predominate where the quota to be filled was small. The larger the quota for a college within the sample, the greater was that quota's convergence with the study population. There is no reason to believe that this lack of complete fit has an effect on the study, particularly since

the numbers involved at points of divergence were small.

TABLE I
SEX DISTRIBUTION IN THE SAMPLE AND POPULATION BY COLLEGE

COLLEGE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Arts & Sciences*	20	11	11	06	19	08	16	07
Business Admin.	08	04	09	05	02	01	05	01
Continuing Studies	53	30	49	28	16	06	20	09
Education	04	02	06	04	33	14	28	12
Engineering	01	01	04	02	00	00	00	00
University Div.	03	02	05	03	02	01	04	02
Graduate	08	04	17	10	25	11	27	12

NOTE: Column 1, males in sample by college as % of males in sample.
 Column 2, males in sample by college as % of total sample.
 Column 3, males in pop. by college as % of males in pop.
 Column 4, males in pop. by college as % of total pop.
 Column 5, females in sample by college as % of females in sample.
 Column 6, females in sample by college as % of total sample.
 Column 7, females in pop. by college as % of females in pop.
 Column 8, females in pop. by college as % of total pop.

*Included in the figures reported for the College of Arts and Sciences on the study population are 62 females and 1 male enrolled in the Affiliate Nursing Program.

The data on the study population presented in Table I was the only information on the First Summer Session available to the researcher from the University administration. As a consequence of this lack of detailed information on the study population, further comparisons are impossible.

The questionnaire was designed to collect data on general information which would characterize the respondents in terms of age, sex, college, etc., and also to provide data

for scoring the respondents on each of the four hierarchies. A copy of the questionnaire appears as Appendix A. Following the procedure described by Lenski, a frequency distribution was constructed from the data for each of the four hierarchies: income, education, property, and occupation. On the basis of these frequency distributions, each respondent was scored by assigning to him the percentile rank accorded his response for each of the four stratification indicators (income, education, property, and occupation). Annual income in dollars and education in number of years completed were ranked directly from the data collected.

In the case of the property hierarchy,¹⁵ some conversions had to be made. Where the respondent reported ownership of a home, the reported market value was used in the ranking of property. Where the respondent reported the rental of a home (house, duplex, apartment), the amount of monthly rent reported was used to compute the size of a mortgage such an amount would purchase. The computation was made assuming that the monthly rent reported represented 1% of a 25-year mortgage. This assumption is buttressed by the fact that this computation is used by bank officials as a gauge for loan approval. (This information was obtained from the senior loan officer of the Omaha National Bank and was current for the time period of the study.)

¹⁵The use of a property hierarchy is a divergence from Lenski. (See Chapter I, 9, n. 7.)

In scoring the respondents on occupation of the head of the household, it was decided to follow Lenski (1954:406) and use the North and Hatt scale of Occupational Ratings. (1947)¹⁶ Other scales were considered, but the one selected was more appropriate since it does not include data on income, education and training, and the like in arriving at the scaled occupations.

An index of the degree of status crystallization was arrived at by computing the mean of the four percentile ranks for each respondent, extracting the square root of the sum of the squared deviations from each mean, and subtracting the resultant figure from one hundred. (Lenski, 1954:407-408) "The more highly consistent or crystallized an individual's status, the more nearly his crystallization score approached one hundred . . ." (Lenski, 1954:408) This procedure yielded 60 scores with a range from 27 on the low crystallization end, to 97 on the high crystallization end.

In carrying out his procedures, Lenski (1954) divides his distribution of scores into two categories, those characterized by low and high crystallization respectively. Using squared deviations tends to emphasize large discrepancies

¹⁶In this rating, stratification is measured via the dimensions of esteem and prestige. The 1947 study was replicated producing $r .99$ (Hodge, et. al., 1964:286-302) The ratings themselves are limited to 90 occupations. It was found necessary to estimate scores for occupations reported but not listed by North and Hatt. The North and Hatt rating yields an average score of 69.8, while the mean score for the study reported here was 68.39.

in the scores on the four hierarchies and deemphasizes small status discrepancies. On the basis of this fact, it was decided to emphasize the extremes further, and in so doing, increase the demands made of the data by dividing the frequency distribution of crystallization scores found in this research into three categories. Using the 30th and 70th centiles as cutting points, the distribution of scores on crystallization found in this study was divided into low, moderate, and high crystallization categories. Table II below illustrates this division.

TABLE II
CRYSTALLIZATION CATEGORIES

Category	Percentile Range	Score Range	n.
High	71.32-99.74	78-97	57
Moderate	31.32-68.68	60-77	76
Low	0.26-28.16	27-59	57

In order to illustrate the effects of the triple division of crystallization on the data reported here, another set of categories was determined by dividing the distribution of crystallization scores at the median. The upper half comprised the high crystallization category and the lower half, the low crystallization category. Table III presents the results of this dichotomy.

TABLE III
CRYSTALLIZATION DICHOTOMY

Category	Percentile Range	Score Range	n.
High	51.58-99.74	70-97	95
Low	0.26-49.74	27-69	95

As discussed previously (see Chapter II, page 15), the dimension of political attitudes was expanded to include a wider range of issues which would reveal the more general dimension of social attitudes. To this end, the dimension of liberalism-conservatism was measured using Kerlinger's The Social Attitudes Scale. (Shaw and Wright, 1967:322-324) The scale is constructed from "26 modified Likert-type items which were selected by factor analysis. . . . the split half reliability estimates (corrected) are reported to be .78 (liberalism) and .79 (conservatism), based on a sample of 168 unidentified subjects."¹⁷ The 26 items are evenly divided: 13 liberal and 13 conservative. In the present study four pairs of statements were omitted from the research instrument to reduce the burden on the respondents and, in so doing, reduce the probability of haphazard responses. The content of the eight statements omitted was of such a nature as to have been approximated by the eighteen

¹⁷Construct validity is also reported for this scale, but the discussion is rather lengthy. For those who desire this discussion, it may be found in Shaw and Wright (1967: 322-323).

statements used.¹⁸ As may be seen (Appendix B), the responses allowed to each statement are forced in nature, there being no neutral response. The respondents' scores were computed directly from their response weights.¹⁹ The scores for the respondents were then arranged in a frequency distribution. The results of this distribution of scores is summarized, showing the cutoff point, in Table IV below:

TABLE IV
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES ON KERLINGER'S
"THE SOCIAL ATTITUDES SCALE"

Category	Score Range	n=
Liberal	1 to 30	119 (.63)
Conservative	-29 to 0	71 (.37)

The final dimension on which the respondents were scored is that of the degree of expectancy for control over events as measured by the Neal and Seeman Powerlessness Scale. (Miller, 1970:318-320; Neal and Seeman, 1964:216-226; and Neal and Rettig, 1963:599-608) This scale is a forced choice

¹⁸Statement 15 of the Kerlinger scale reads as follows: "Public enterprises like railroads should not make profits; they are entitled to fares sufficient to enable them to pay only a fair interest on the actual cash capital they have invested." (Shaw and Wright, 1967:324) In the form used the word "railroads" was substituted by the word "airlines." At the time of the study the railroads were in such a state as to make the item ambiguous.

¹⁹In the case of conservative responses, the respondents' scores are reversed, giving a resultant score relative to the degree of liberalism expressed.

instrument of seven paired statements. The statements are paired in such a manner as to force the respondent to choose between statements which reveal mastery and statements which reveal powerlessness. A copy of this scale as it was used in this research is provided as Appendix C. Respondents are scored on the basis of a 0 score for a mastery response and a score of 1 for a powerlessness response. Any score above 0 is interpreted as being indicative of a low expectancy for the control of events. In scoring the respondents in this study a cutoff point of 2 or less was set to indicate mastery, and a score of 3 or more was necessary for the respondent to be categorized as possessing a high degree of powerlessness. This scoring modification places increased demands on the data and as such, adds a degree of control in cases where a low expectancy for control over events might have been transient with the individual. The results of this method of scoring is summarized in Table V below.

TABLE V
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES ON THE
NEAL AND SEEMAN POWERLESSNESS SCALE

Degree of Powerlessness	Score Range	n=
Low	0-2	112 (.59)
High	3-7	78 (.41)

Having scored each of the 190 respondents in the sample on their respective degrees of status crystallization,

liberalism-conservatism, and powerlessness; chi-square measures of association were computed. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The goal of this research is threefold. First, to test the validity of Lenski's 1954 study of status crystallization when the liberal/conservative variable is taken out of the realm of political behavior, and placed into the broader realm of social attitudes. Second, to increase the rigor of the concept of status crystallization by emphasizing the extremes through the use of a triple classification of status crystallization in the relationship to social attitudes. Finally, to test the relationship between social attitudes and powerlessness while controlling for the three degrees of status crystallization.

The first and second of these goals are dealt with in the test of Hypothesis I.²⁰ The results of this test are summarized in Tables VI and VII. On the basis of these findings, Hypothesis I must be rejected at the .05 level of significance. Low status crystallization respondents do not differ significantly in their expression of social attitudes (liberalism and conservatism) from the high status crystallization respondents (Table VI). Table VII reports the

²⁰ Individuals characterized by a low degree of status crystallization will differ significantly in their expression of social attitudes (Liberalism and conservatism) when status differences in the vertical dimension of the four hierarchies are controlled.

findings when three levels of status crystallization are employed. From the test of the data in Table VII no support is found for Hypothesis I. While Lenski (1954) found significance in the relationship between low status crystallization and Democratic Party preference, the findings of the study reported herein suggest that the relationship does not hold when political party preference is exchanged for a measure of liberal and conservative social attitudes. Further, upon examination of the Chi-square values of Table VI and VII, it is clear that when the emphasis is placed on the extremes, as in Table VII, the strength of the relationship is reduced.

The third goal is concerned with determining whether low status crystallization liberals, asserted by Lenski (1954: 411-412) to be willing to support programs of social change, have a high expectancy for the control of events, i.e. expect to effect social change. Lenski (1954:411-412) implies that the desire for social change is sufficient cause for change directed action. As stated above (page 17), action is dependent upon a perceived expectancy for success. The decision to act is linked to the resources available, which in turn determines the likelihood of successful action. In sum, the willingness to support programs of social change is linked to the probability of realizing change, which may not be a direct result of liberalism, but rather a result of attendant conditions (resources) both immediate and historical. This goal

is attempted in the test of Hypothesis II.²¹ Tables VIII through XIII summarize the findings with respect to this hypothesis. Table VIII reports the test of the relationship between status crystallization and powerlessness. The Chi-square value does not support the hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Tables IX through XI are the partial analysis of Table VIII. Table IX represents the relationship between social attitudes and powerlessness with controls for high status crystallization. The findings are not significant and examination of the data shows that this relationship contributes only a very small amount to the overall Chi-square relationship summarized in Table VIII. Table X, which summarizes the findings of the relationship between social attitudes and powerlessness among the moderate status crystallization respondents, also contributes very little to the findings in Table VIII. However, Table XI shows a clear trend, although the data reported does not meet the criteria of the .05 level of significance, the Chi-square value is strong enough to require explanation. It is clear that the low status crystallization respondents account for the greater part of the relationship summarized in Table VIII. On the basis of the Chi-square value of 3.66 and the Correlation Coefficient of .25, low status crystallization liberals are more likely

²¹Individuals characterized as advocates of social change (liberals) will differ significantly in their expectancies for the control of events (degree of powerlessness) from conservatives when the degree of status crystallization is controlled.

TABLE VI

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION (DICHOTOMIZED) AND SOCIAL ATTITUDES.

STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION	SOCIAL ATTITUDE	
	LIBERAL	CONSERVATIVE
LOW	65 (.34)	30 (.16)
HIGH	54 (.28)	41 (.22)
$\chi^2 = 2.24$ $C = .11$		

TABLE VII

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION (TRIPLE CATEGORIES) AND SOCIAL ATTITUDES.

STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION	SOCIAL ATTITUDE	
	LIBERAL	CONSERVATIVE
LOW	33 (.17)	24 (.13)
MODERATE	51 (.27)	25 (.13)
HIGH	35 (.18)	22 (.12)
$\chi^2 = 1.231$ $C = .08$		

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION (TRIPLE CATEGORIES) AND POWERLESSNESS.

STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION	POWERLESSNESS	
	POWERLESSNESS	MASTERY
LOW	26 (.14)	31 (.16)
MODERATE	28 (.15)	48 (.25)
HIGH	24 (.13)	33 (.17)
$\chi^2 = 1.073$ $C = .075$		

TABLE IX

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND POWERLESSNESS AMONG THE HIGH STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION RESPONDENTS.

SOCIAL ATTITUDES	POWERLESSNESS	MASTERY
LIBERAL	15 (.26)	20 (.35)
CONSERVATIVE	9 (.16)	13 (.23)

$x^2 = .015$ $C = .016$

TABLE X

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND POWERLESSNESS AMONG THE MODERATE STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION RESPONDENTS.

SOCIAL ATTITUDES	POWERLESSNESS	MASTERY
LIBERAL	20 (.26)	31 (.41)
CONSERVATIVE	8 (.11)	17 (.22)

$x^2 = .128$ $C = .041$

TABLE XI

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND POWERLESSNESS AMONG THE LOW STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION RESPONDENTS.

SOCIAL ATTITUDES	POWERLESSNESS	MASTERY
LIBERAL	11 (.19)	22 (.37)
CONSERVATIVE	15 (.26)	9 (.16)

$x^2 = 3.66$ $C = .25$ $.10$ p .05

TABLE XII

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND POWERLESSNESS AMONG THE LOW STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION RESPONDENTS, AGES 18-26.

SOCIAL ATTITUDES	POWERLESSNESS	MASTERY
LIBERAL	11 (.28)	16 (.40)
CONSERVATIVE	9 (.23)	4 (.10)
$\chi^2 = 2.10$		$C = .22$

TABLE XIII

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND POWERLESSNESS AMONG THE LOW STATUS CRYSTALLIZATION RESPONDENTS, AGES 27 AND ABOVE.

SOCIAL ATTITUDES	POWERLESSNESS	MASTERY
LIBERAL	1 (.06)	5 (.29)
CONSERVATIVE	5 (.29)	6 (.35)
$\chi^2 = 1.0$		$C = .24$

to exhibit mastery while low status crystallization conservatives tend toward powerlessness. When controls for age are employed, as reported in Tables XII and XIII, little difference is found between age groups. In the case of low status crystallized respondents, partial support may be given to Hypothesis II. What is demonstrated by Table XI may be witness to the historical record of contemporary American society, a record which has been characterized by the success of liberalism since the 1954 Supreme Court decision. If the recent history of American Society may be interpreted as a series of successes

for liberalism and a corresponding series of losses from the standpoint of conservatism, then the findings reported in Table XI are not surprising. Low status crystallized liberals demonstrate a high expectancy for control over events and conservatives do not primarily because the successes of liberalism in contemporary American Society serves to ease the status discrepancies experienced by the low status crystallized liberals.

Some further consideration must be given to the findings summarized in Tables IX and X. Inspection of Table IX shows that the proportion of liberals in the powerlessness cell is nearly equal to the proportion of the conservatives in the corresponding powerlessness cell. This similarity obtains for the proportions of liberals and conservatives found in the respective mastery cells. This pattern is repeated in Table X. In the case of the high crystallized respondents, status discrepancies on the four hierarchies are absent. When the data in Table IX are compared with the data in Table XI, the indication is that low status crystallization, while unable to predict social attitudes (see Tables VI and VII), is an important condition for powerlessness among conservatives. This conclusion is retained when comparing the data for moderate crystallized respondents with low crystallized respondents. What is also indicated in Table X is that the status discrepancies of the moderate crystallized respondents are

not sufficiently severe enough to effect the results shown in the case of the low status crystallized respondents.

A summary of the discussion of the findings of the relationship between social attitudes and powerlessness when the degree of status crystallization is controlled, yields the following: (1) Among low status crystallized respondents, liberals demonstrate mastery while conservatives demonstrate powerlessness; and (2) Among high and moderate status crystallized respondents both liberals and conservatives demonstrate mastery and powerlessness at a proportionately equal rate. It is plausible to explain these results in terms of the success record of liberalism since the Supreme Court decision of 1954. Low status crystallized liberals tend toward mastery primarily because the success of liberalism eases the status discrepancies characteristic of low crystallized individuals, and affords this liberal group a high expectancy for control over events. This is not the case with low status crystallized conservatives who have witnessed a series of losses on the part of conservatism and whose status discrepancies are quite severe thereby effecting a low expectancy for control over events.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The research reported here was conducted with two purposes in mind. First, to test Lenski's (1954) hypothesis,²² exchanging his restrictive dependent variable of political attitudes with the broader variable of social attitudes. Lenski (1954) demonstrated a uniform relationship between low status crystallization and liberalism (Democratic Party preference), and high status crystallization and conservatism (Republican Party preference). However, his measurements of political attitudes and party preference (discussed in Chapter II, page 15) so closely approximate one another that the distinction is more apparent than real. By broadening the dependent variable, no significant relationship was found between status crystallization and social attitudes. This result is not without precedent. Broom and Jones (1970:999) report the following in an Australian test of the Lenski study:

Status inconsistency, conceived generally as the occupancy of statuses commanding different amounts of prestige, has no uniform relationship with the voting behavior of contemporary Australians.

The conclusion of the Australian case that status crystallization is not related to voting behavior (a conclusion running counter to Lenski) is not totally divergent from the

²²For the discussion and text of Lenski's hypothesis see pages 12 and 13, above.

conclusion of this research, i.e. that status crystallization is not related directly to social attitudes. Geschwender (1970:500) is critical of the concept of status crystallization under certain usage, stating that:

Its major weakness lies in its use as a structural characteristic predicting behavioral consequences without an explicitly stated social-psychological theory of motivation to account for these predictions.

With the Australian case, the motivation underlying the voting behavior is not accounted for by the independent variable, status crystallization. In the case of the research reported here, the dependent variable, social attitudes, represents a posture toward the social organization of American Society. The motivation for that posture was not measureable in terms of a structural characteristic, namely, status crystallization.

This brings us to the second purpose of this research. Lenski (1954:411-412, see also page 17 above) asserts that low status crystallized individuals are more willing to engage in programs of social change. He further asserts that a society with a high proportion of low status crystallized members will be unstable. A similar assertion was made prior to Lenski by Benoit-Smullyan (1944:151-161). Both offer no empirical evidence to support this proposition.

In the research reported here, the proposition offered by Benoit-Smullyan, and Lenski was approached in an admittedly roundabout manner. Even in our turbulent society, it is difficult to identify a sufficient number of revolutionaries

to provide a statistical test. Obtaining the participation in a research project of such a group is a more difficult matter.

In the absence of actively practicing revolutionaries, the issue of motivation was addressed; motivation in the sense that those who were disposed to act (liberals) perceived themselves as possessed of the resources to act (mastery). The findings are intriguing. Among the high and moderate status crystallized liberals and conservatives, mastery predominated. These respondents felt the availability of the resources necessary for effecting control over events. Among the low status crystallized respondents, liberals share the mastery of the high and moderate status crystallized respondents, but the low status crystallized conservatives do not. As suggested in Chapter IV, the need to act may be fostered by a dissonance experienced as a result of severe status discrepancies, but the response to this dissonance will be mediated by the perceived presence or absence of resources both immediate and historical.

The relationship between status discrepancies, social attitudes, and the motivation toward social change is a complex one which requires refinement. As Geschwender (1970:500-511) points out, status inconsistency varies as to type, and therefore varies as to the nature of its consequences. In the case reported here, there is a need for further research to clarify the precise nature of powerlessness as a response

of conservatives who experience severe status discrepancies. Is powerlessness a precursor to social isolation, and under what types of status discrepancies will social isolation be more likely to occur?

Status crystallization is far from being a limited concept. However, the power of the concept of status crystallization lies outside its usage as a structural characteristic.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Adams, Stuart
1953 "Status Congruency as a Variable in Small Group Performance." *Social Forces* 32(October):16-22.
- Barnes, Harry Elmer (ed.)
1948 "An Introduction to the History of Sociology." Chicago:University of Chicago Press.
- Benoit-Smullyan, Emile
1944 "Status, Status Types, and Status Interrelationships." *American Sociological Review* 9(February):151-161.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr.
1960 "Social Statistics." New York:McGraw-Hill.
- Bottomore, T. B.
1966 "Classes in Modern Society." New York:Pantheon.
- Broom, Leonard, and F. Lancaster Jones
1970 "Status Consistency and Political Preference: The Australian Case." *American Sociological Review* 35 (December):989-1001.
- Brown, Robert
1963 "Explanation in Social Science." Chicago:Aldine.
- Bruning, James L. and B. L. Kintz
1968 "Computational Handbook of Statistics." Glenview, Illinois:Scott, Foresman.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf
1970 "On the Origin of Inequality Among Men." Pp.3-30 in Edward O. Laumann, et.al, (eds.), *The Logic of Social Hierarchies*. Chicago:Markham.
- Davis, Kingsley, and Wilbert E. Moore
1945 "Some Principles of Stratification." *American Sociological Review* 10(April):242-249.
- Ferguson, Adam
1819 "An Essay on the History of Civil Society." Philadelphia:A. Finley.
- Geschwender, James A.
1967 "Continuities in Theories of Status Consistency and Cognitive Dissonance." *Social Forces* 46(December): 160-171.

- Goffman, Irwin W.
1957 "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution." American Sociological Review 22(June): 275-81.
- Goode, William J., and Paul K. Hatt
1952 "Methods in Social Research." New York:McGraw-Hill.
- Goode, William J.
1960 "A Theory of Role Strain." American Sociological Review 25(June):483-496.
- Gordon, Milton M.
1963 "Social Class in American Sociology." New York:McGraw-Hill.
- Hardyck, Curtis, and Lewis F. Petrinovich
1969 "Introduction to Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences." Philadelphia:W. B. Saunders.
- Hatt, Paul K., and C.C. North
1947 "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation." Opinion News(September):3-13.
- Heller, Celia S.
1969 "Structured Social Inequality." New York:Macmillan.
- Hodge, Robert W., et. al.
1964 "Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-63." American Journal of Sociology 70(November):286-302.
- Jackson, Elton F.
1962 "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress." American Sociological Review 27(August):469-80.
- Lasswell, Thomas E.
1965 "Class and Stratum." Boston:Houghton Mifflin.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Morris Rosenberg (eds.)
1955 "The Language of Social Research." New York:Free Press.
- Lenski, Gerhard E.
1954 "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status." American Sociological Review 19 (August):405-13.

1956 "Social Participation and Status Crystallization." American Sociological Review 21(August):458-64.

- Lenski, Gerhard E.
1966 "Power and Privilege." New York:McGraw-Hill.
1967 "Status Inconsistency and the Vote." American Sociological Review 32(April):298-301.
1970 "Human Societies: A Macrolevel Introduction to Sociology." New York:McGraw-Hill.
- Martindale, Don
1960 "The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory." Boston:Houghton Mifflin.
- Millar, John
1793 "Origin of the Distinction of Ranks." Basil:J.J. Tourneisen.
- Miller, Delbert C.
1970 "Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement." New York:David McKay.
- Neal, Arthur G., and Salomon Rettig
1963 "Dimensions of Alienation Among Manual and Non-Manual Workers." American Sociological Review 28(August): 599-608.
- Neal, Arthur G., and Melvin Seeman
1964 "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis." American Sociological Review 29 (April):216-225.
- Pierce, Albert
1970 "Fundamentals of Non-parametric Statistics." Belmont, California:Dickenson.
- Ransford, H. Edward
1968 "Isolation, Powerlessness, and Violence: A Study of Attitudes in the Watts Riot." American Journal of Sociology 73(March):581-591.
- Riley, Matilda White
1963 "Sociological Research, I: A Case Approach." New York:Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Roscoe, John T.
1969 "Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences." New York:Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques
1949 "The Origin of Inequality Among Men and Whether It Is Legitimated by Natural Law." Chicago:H. Regnery Co.

Schmoller, Gustav

- 1890 "Das Wesen der Arbeitsteilung und die soziale Klassenbildung." Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung, und Volkswirtschaft. Vol. XIV.

Simon, Julian L.

- 1969 "Basic Research Methods in Social Science." New York: Random House.

Shaw, Marvin E., and Jack M. Wright

- 1967 "Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes." New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sjoberg, Gideon, and Roger Nett

- 1968 "A Methodology for Social Research." New York: Harper and Row.

Sorokin, Pitirim A.

- 1947 "Society, Culture, and Personality." New York: Harper and Brothers.

Tumin, Melvin M.

- 1953 "Some Principles of Stratification: A Critical Analysis." 18(August):387-393.

Warner, W. Lloyd, et. al.

- 1960 "Social Class in America: The Evaluation of Status." New York: Harper and Row.

Warren, Donald I.

- 1971 "Neighborhood Status Modality and Riot Behavior: An Analysis of the Detroit Disorders of 1967." Sociological Quarterly 12(Summer):350-368.

Wrong, Dennis

- 1959 "The Functional Theory of Stratification: Some Neglected Considerations." 24(December):772-782.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

The Personal Data Questionnaire

General Information: Answer each question; if you are unsure of an item, give an informed estimate.

Sex, M ___ F ___. Date of Birth. ___/___/___ . Race (Specify) _____

Marital Status _____. Number of children _____

Student Classification: Fr ___, So ___, Ju ___, Sr ___, Sp ___,
Gr _____.

Full time _____. Part time _____. Major _____

Degree sought _____

Enrolled in the College of: Arts and Sciences _____
Business Administration _____
Continuing Studies _____
Education _____
Engineering _____
Graduate _____
University Division _____

Cumulative Grade Point Average at the end of last semester _____

Grade Point Average in your major at the end of last sem. _____

Career Information: Even though you may be undecided at present, we all have some career interests which may be expressed here.

List in order of preference three occupations you would seek after completion of your degree.

1. _____ 3. _____
2. _____

Do you feel graduate school necessary for success in these occupations? _____

If you do intend to attend a graduate school, when would you most probably do so:

- Immediately upon graduation (within 1 year) _____
After working 1 year or more _____
Uncertain at present _____

Answer the questions in this section ONLY if you reside with your parents or a principle guardian while attending UNO. If you do not, GO ON to the next section.

Do you reside with BOTH parents _____. If no, explain _____

Are they residents of Nebraska ____, Omaha ____, Other ____

Do they own ____, or rent ____ their residence? Age of structure _____.

Type of building (single family, duplex, apartment, mobile home, etc.) _____.

Approximate market value _____, or monthly rent _____

Number of rooms _____. Number of baths _____

How many brothers or sisters do you have? _____ How many reside with you and your parents? _____. Are you the oldest, 2nd oldest, etc.? _____

How many of your brothers or sisters are attending a college or university? _____.

How many have attended but are not doing so now? _____

What is your father's occupation/profession? _____
(guardian's if applicable)

What is your mother's occupation/profession? _____

Where is your father/guardian employed? _____

Where is your mother/guardian employed? _____

Father's/guardian's Income:

Mother's/guardian's Income:

\$15,000 or over _____.

\$15,000 or over _____.

\$10,000 - \$14,999 _____.

\$10,000 - \$14,999 _____.

\$ 5,000 - \$ 9,999 _____.

\$ 5,000 - \$ 9,999 _____.

Under \$5,000 _____.

Under \$5,000 _____.

Father's/guardian's education _____ years.

Mother's/guardian's education _____ years.

Do you work while attending UNO? _____. Where? _____

How many hours per week? _____ Monthly income from employment. \$ _____.

Does your employer pay a part of your cost at UNO? _____

What % _____.

Do you pay such things as room and board? _____ Explain _____
_____. Amount paid per month _____

(average)

List below the sources from which you derive your expenses while at UNO; include such things as scholarships, GI Bill, grants, etc.

Parents/guardians _____%. Other (specify): _____%.

Employer _____%. _____%.

Your employment _____%. _____%.

GI Bill _____%. _____%.

How much per week do you spend on other than school/degree related items while on the UNO campus? \$ _____

How do you travel to and from UNO? (car, car pool, bus, etc.) _____

What is your weekly cost for transportation? \$ _____

If you drive, do you own/registered in your name, the car you drive? _____. What is the make and year of the car you drive? _____

Use the space below, if necessary, to clarify any of the items above.

Answer the items in this section if you reside OTHER than with your parents/guardians.

Do you live (alone, with roommate/s, wife and family, etc.) with _____

Do you own _____, rent _____, your residence? Age of structure _____

Are you a resident of Nebraska _____, Omaha _____, Other _____
 Type of residence (single family, duplex, apartment, mobile home, etc.) _____

Approximate market value _____, or monthly rent _____

Number of rooms _____. Number of baths _____

How many brothers and/or sisters do you have? _____. Are you the oldest, 2nd oldest, etc. _____. How many of your brothers and/or sisters are attending a college or university now? _____.

Are your parents living? _____ mother, _____ father.
 Are your parents employed/retired? _____

What is/was your father's occupation/profession _____

What is/was your mother's occupation/profession _____

What is/was your father's income:

\$15,000 or over _____.

\$10,000 - \$14,999 _____.

\$ 5,000 - \$ 9,999 _____.

Under \$5,000 _____.

What is/was your mother's income:

\$15,000 or over _____.

\$10,000 - \$14,999 _____.

\$ 5,000 - \$ 9,999 _____.

Under \$5,000 _____.

Father's education _____ years. Mother's education _____ years.

Are you employed while attending UNO? _____

With whom? _____

Is your wife/husband employed? _____. Where? _____

Hours worked _____.

Wife's/husband's income \$ _____ /month. Your job title _____

Wife's/husband's job title _____

Does your employer pay all or part of your cost at UNO? _____

List below the sources from which you derive your expenses while at UNO; include such things as scholarships, GI Bill, grants, etc.

Parents/guardians	_____ %	Other (specify):	_____ %
Employer	_____ %		_____ %
Your employment	_____ %		_____ %
GI Bill	_____ %		_____ %

How much per week do you spend on other than school/degree related items while on the UNO campus? \$ _____

How do you travel to and from UNO? (drive car, car pool, bus, etc.) _____.

What is your weekly cost for transportation? \$ _____. Do you own a car? _____. What is the make and year? _____

Use the space below, if necessary, to clarify any of the items above.

APPENDIX B

The Kerlinger Social Attitudes Scale

Given below are statements on various social problems about which we all have beliefs, opinions, and attitudes. We all think differently about such matters, and this is an attempt to let you express your beliefs and opinions. There are no right or wrong answers. Please respond to each of the items as follows:

+3 Agree very strongly	-3 Disagree very strongly
+2 Agree strongly	-2 Disagree strongly
+1 Agree	-1 Disagree

For example, if you agree very strongly with a statement, you would write +3 in the left margin beside the statement, but if you should happen to disagree with it, you would put -1 in front of the statement. Respond to each statement as best you can. Go rapidly but carefully. Do not spend too much time on any one statement. Do not go back once you have marked a statement.

- _____ 1. Individuals who are against churches and religions should not be allowed to teach at colleges and universities.
- _____ 2. Large fortunes should be taxed fairly heavily over and above income taxes.
- _____ 3. Both public and private universities and colleges should get generous aid from both state and federal government.
- _____ 4. Science and society would both be better off if scientists took no part in politics.
- _____ 5. Society should be quicker to throw out old ideas and traditions and to adopt new thinking and customs.
- _____ 6. To ensure adequate care of the sick, we need to change radically the present system of privately controlled medical care.
- _____ 7. If civilization is to survive, there must be a turning back to religion.
- _____ 8. A first consideration in any society is the protection of property rights.
- _____ 9. Government ownership and management of utilities leads to bureaucracy and inefficiency.

- _____10. If the United States takes part in any sort of world organization, we should be sure that we lose none of our power and influence.
- _____11. Funds for school construction should come from state and federal government loans at little or no interest.
- _____12. Inherited racial characteristics play more of a part in the achievement of individuals and groups than is generally known.
- _____13. Our present economic system should be reformed so that profits are replaced by reimbursements for useful work.
- _____14. Federal government aid for the construction of schools is long overdue and should be instituted as a permanent policy.
- _____15. Public enterprises like airlines should not make profits; they are entitled to fares sufficient to enable them to pay only a fair interest on the actual cash capital they have invested.
- _____16. Government laws and regulations should be such as first to ensure the prosperity of all depends on business.
- _____17. All individuals who are intellectually capable of benefiting from it, should get a college education, at public expense if necessary.
- _____18. The well-being of a nation depends mainly on its industry and business.
- _____19. True democracy is limited in the United States because of the special privileges enjoyed by business and industry.
- _____20. The gradual social ownership of industry needs to be encouraged if we are ever to cure some of the ills of society.

APPENDIX C

The Neal and Seeman Powerlessness Scale

Indicate with a _____, which of each of the following seven (7) pairs of statements BEST expresses your feelings on the content of the paired statements. Please give only one response per pair.

1. _____ I think we have adequate means for preventing run-away inflation.
_____ There's very little we can do to keep prices from going higher.
2. _____ Persons like myself have little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of strong pressure groups.
_____ I feel that we have adequate ways of coping with pressure groups.
3. _____ A lasting world peace can be achieved by those of us who work toward it.
_____ There's very little we can do to bring about a permanent world peace.
4. _____ There's very little persons like myself can do to improve world opinion of the United States.
_____ I think each of us can do a great deal to improve world opinion of the United States.
5. _____ This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
_____ The average person can have an influence on government decisions.
6. _____ It is only wishful thinking to believe that one can really influence what happens in society at large.
_____ People like me can change the course of world events if we make ourselves heard.
7. _____ More and more, I feel helpless in the face of what's happening in the world today.
_____ I sometimes feel personally to blame for the sad state of affairs in our government.

5276/102