

Journal of the Arkansas Academy of Science

Volume 6

Article 23

1953

Social Standing of One Hundred Occupations

Norman F. Washburne

Southern State Community College

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/jaas>

 Part of the [Work, Economy and Organizations Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Washburne, Norman F. (1953) "Social Standing of One Hundred Occupations," *Journal of the Arkansas Academy of Science*: Vol. 6 , Article 23.

Available at: <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/jaas/vol6/iss1/23>

This article is available for use under the Creative Commons license: Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-ND 4.0). Users are able to read, download, copy, print, distribute, search, link to the full texts of these articles, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without asking prior permission from the publisher or the author.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of the Arkansas Academy of Science by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, ccmiddle@uark.edu.

THE SOCIAL STANDING OF ONE HUNDRED OCCUPATIONS

EVALUATED BY SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE STUDENTS

NORMAN F. WASHBURNE

Southern State College

An individual's occupation is one of the most important factors determining his social and economic status. However, sociological literature is not quite clear as to just what status a given occupation accords an individual.

Warner, Meeker, and Eells¹ in evaluating the occupations of people who are to be accorded a socio-economic status score use an 8-point scale which gives professional men and managers of large businesses, the rating 1; semi-professional men and managers of large businesses, and high status white-collar workers, the rating 2; managers of medium-sized businesses and medium-status white-collar workers, the rating 3; managers of small businesses, low status white-collar workers, and skilled workers, the rating 4; managers of small businesses and apprentices, the rating 5; semi-skilled workers, the rating 6; and unskilled workers, the rating 7. However, when the problem of investigating the socio-economic status of Southern State College students was approached, it was found that such a scale was not applicable either to the students or to their parents. For instance, it is quite obvious that, at least in Arkansas, a doctor, (a professional man) has considerably higher status than a high-school teacher, another professional man. Furthermore, it was also found that because of the social and economic structure of southwestern Arkansas it is often impossible to classify an individual in any one of Warner's categories. For instance, where would one classify a man who makes part of his living buying and selling land, who has a couple of farms with tenants on them, who has an insurance office, and who sells used cars on the side? This is an exact description of the occupation of the father of one of our students. There is no category listed by the United States Census or *The Dictionary of Occupational Titles* or by Warner's scheme which adequately describes him.

Therefore, as a step in the development of a socio-economic scale to be applied to our students, we investigated the social standing of occupations representative of those of the student's parents. The method described by North and Hatt was used².

Briefly, the method is this: A truly random sample of 118 Southern State College students was asked to rate each of 100 occupations, which were chosen as representative of those of their parents. The questionnaire was given to small groups and it consisted, in part, of four pages listing occupational titles. The pages were collated in varying order, so as to minimize bias. The respondents were asked to evaluate each of the occupations as "excellent, good, average, somewhat below average, or poor", in accordance with a five-point rating scale. The instructions read: "For each job mentioned please pick out the statement which best gives your own personal opinion of the general standing that such a job has. 1. Excellent standing; 2. Good standing; 3. Average standing; 4. Somewhat below average standing; 5. Poor standing; or X, "I don't know where to place that one." The respondents were warned not to evaluate a job according to someone who held it. The ranking of the occupations was made possible by the use of the procedure that North and Hatt devised: When the "don't know" answers were excluded, the scoring theoretically allowed a maximum of 100 points for any job receiving only excellent ratings and a minimum of 20 points for any job that was unanimously rated as poor.

Table 1 illustrates what the various scores mean. It is a list of 100 occupations, ranked according to the score received.

The "owner of a large manufacturing plant" and "doctor" tied for first place with a score of 95 points. 78.6 per cent of the students rated "owner of a manufacturing plant," excellent; 16.2 per cent of the students rated it as good; 3.39 per cent rated it as average; none rated it as below average; none rated it as poor; and the 1.71 per cent answered "don't know." The resulting

TABLE 1. Social Standing Scores of 100 occupations as evaluated by Southern State College Students

Occupation	Excellent per cent	Good per cent	Average per cent	Somewhat below average per cent	Poor per cent	Don't know per cent	Score
Owner of large manufacturing plant	78.63	16.24	3.39	0	0	1.71	95
Doctor	63.05	14.41	1.69	0	0	1.69	95
Owner large plot oil land	57.63	34.75	2.54	.85	0	4.24	91
Dentist	59.32	36.44	1.69	1.69	.85	0	90
Chemist	50.00	37.29	9.32	0	.85	2.54	88
Lawyer	51.69	41.18	5.88	.85	.85	0	88
Petroleum engineer	43.22	45.76	4.24	.85	.85	5.08	87
Owner large retail store	36.75	55.17	7.76	0	0	.85	86
Mayor large city	42.74	44.07	6.84	1.71	1.71	2.56	86
Civil engineer	32.48	58.12	5.13	0	.85	3.42	85
Minister	51.28	29.91	11.97	2.56	2.56	1.71	85
Owner large hotel	40.17	47.86	10.26	.85	0	.85	85
Owner large wholesale business	37.61	53.85	5.13	3.42	0	0	85
College professor	36.44	50.85	11.02	0	.85	.85	85
Certified Public Accountant	32.48	49.57	11.97	.85	0	5.13	84
College administrator	23.08	52.14	16.24	2.56	0	5.98	84
Superintendent of schools	21.93	47.89	14.91	2.63	.88	1.75	80
Owner large plot timber land	20.66	56.20	20.66	.82	0	.82	80
Owner large farm worked by tenants	17.80	58.47	20.34	1.67	0	1.67	79
Owner medium sized plot oil land	19.49	55.08	22.03	1.69	0	1.69	79
Manager local office large corporation	11.86	63.56	21.19	0	0	3.39	78
Manager of manufacturing concern	8.47	67.80	16.10	2.54	0	5.08	76
Veterinarian	15.13	52.94	28.81	1.69	.85	.85	76
Owner small manufacturing plant	11.86	49.15	33.90	2.54	0	2.54	74
County judge	13.45	47.90	29.41	5.04	.84	3.36	74
Manager of supermarket	6.67	53.33	35.83	.83	0	3.33	74
Airline pilot	16.95	44.07	33.05	1.70	2.54	1.70	74
School principal	14.41	50.00	27.97	4.24	3.39	0	74
Real estate broker	6.75	46.61	29.66	1.69	.85	11.86	73
Postmaster	15.38	44.44	32.48	5.13	1.69	.85	73
Accountant	12.71	35.59	47.46	1.69	0	2.54	72
Owner large farm who works land himself	8.40	48.74	34.45	7.56	0	.84	72
Roadmaster on railroad	5.08	24.58	23.73	2.54	0	44.07	72
Mayor of small town	6.78	45.76	39.83	5.93	0	1.70	71
Foreman in factory	3.39	49.15	41.53	3.39	0	2.54	71
Owner small plot oil land	2.71	34.75	41.53	5.93	2.54	2.54	71
Manager of department store	2.54	53.59	39.83	2.54	.85	.85	71
Livestock farmer	8.55	39.32	47.86	3.42	.85	0	70

--Continued

THE SOCIAL STANDING OF OCCUPATIONS

83

TABLE 1 --(continued)

Occupation	Excellent per cent	Good per cent	Average per cent	Somewhat below average per cent	Poor per cent	Don't know per cent	Score
Railroad engineer	4.24	43.22	40.68	7.63	.85	2.39	69
Electrician	7.63	35.59	50.84	5.08	.85	0	69
Cotton buyer	5.93	38.78	40.18	2.54	4.24	7.63	69
Insurance broker	5.08	32.30	44.07	1.69	.85	16.10	69
Bookkeeper	6.78	35.59	53.39	4.24	0	0	69
Foreman of housing construction	1.71	37.61	50.43	5.13	0	5.13	68
Wholesale oil equipment salesman	.85	39.32	48.72	2.54	.85	7.69	68
Owner medium plot timber land	3.39	37.29	50.00	7.63	0	1.69	67
Manager of wholesale business	.85	38.29	52.24	4.24	0	5.08	67
High school teacher	9.32	26.27	54.24	8.47	1.69	0	67
Owner medium farm worked by tenants	4.24	24.58	63.56	5.08	.85	1.69	66
Owner small wholesale business	1.69	31.36	59.32	7.63	0	.85	65
Auto salesman	.85	28.81	60.17	7.63	2.54	0	65
County tax assessor	5.93	22.88	55.93	4.24	4.24	6.78	65
Undertaker	6.78	29.66	39.83	9.32	6.78	7.63	64
Sheriff	6.78	21.19	57.63	8.47	2.54	3.39	64
Wholesale farming equipment salesman	.85	23.73	67.80	5.00	.85	1.69	64
Foreman in machine shop	1.71	23.08	62.39	9.40	0	3.42	64
Primary school teacher	7.69	19.66	56.41	11.97	4.27	0	63
Chief of police small town	3.39	28.81	50.00	9.32	5.08	3.39	63
Secretary	2.56	19.66	70.09	5.13	1.71	.85	63
Manager of farm	2.54	21.34	62.71	11.02	1.69	1.60	62
Machinist	2.54	18.64	61.02	11.86	.85	5.08	62
Owner small retail store	.85	22.22	65.81	10.26	.85	0	62
Rig builder	4.24	19.49	39.83	11.86	4.24	20.34	62
Millwright	.83	8.33	22.50	8.33	0	60.00	61
Carpenter	2.54	14.41	65.25	15.25	.85	1.69	61
Stenographer	2.59	13.79	68.97	12.93	.86	.86	61
Furniture salesman	0	14.41	72.88	10.17	.85	1.69	61
Foreman highway construction	.85	18.80	59.80	17.09	1.71	2.56	60
Owner small grocery	2.54	10.17	70.34	16.10	0	.85	60
Owner small farm land worked by tenants	.85	17.95	63.25	14.53	3.42	0	60
Wholesale grocery salesman	1.70	9.32	72.03	11.03	2.54	3.39	59
Plumber	1.69	14.41	61.02	20.34	1.69	.85	59
Post office clerk	1.71	10.26	60.68	23.93	.85	2.56	58
Postman	2.54	10.7	64.41	21.19	.85	.85	58
Barber	.86	12.07	65.52	14.66	4.31	2.59	58
Policeman	.86	12.93	62.79	18.10	2.59	1.72	58
Owner small auto repair shop	.85	8.55	64.94	21.37	2.56	1.71	57
Salesman in clothing store	0	10.17	65.25	19.49	3.39	2.54	57
Pipe fitter	2.54	16.10	44.92	16.95	8.47	11.02	57
Salesman in shoe store	0	9.24	62.18	26.89	.85	.85	56
Painter	1.69	8.47	53.39	29.66	5.00	1.69	54

--Continued

TABLE 1 --(continued)

Occupation	Excellent per cent	Good per cent	Average per cent	Somewhat below average per cent	Poor per cent	Don't know per cent	Score
Owner small plot timber land	.85	5.98	62.39	19.66	7.69	3.42	54
Factory worker	1.69	5.08	52.54	30.51	6.78	3.39	53
Shoe saleslady	0	2.54	52.54	33.90	5.78	4.24	52
Owner liquor store	1.69	15.25	38.98	16.10	25.42	2.54	50
Seamstress	1.69	3.39	43.22	36.44	8.47	6.78	50
Sewing machine operator	1.68	5.88	35.29	41.18	10.08	5.88	49
Truck driver	.84	.84	43.70	42.04	10.92	1.68	48
Roughneck	.84	5.04	40.34	33.61	14.29	5.88	48
Owner small farm who works land himself	1.69	2.54	38.98	42.37	11.68	2.54	48
Construction worker for highway	.85	4.24	38.14	38.98	14.41	3.39	47
Row crop farmer	1.69	4.24	29.66	29.66	20.34	14.41	45
Lumberjack	.85	1.71	32.48	43.59	15.38	5.98	45
Worker in cotton gin	0	1.72	21.55	54.31	19.83	2.59	41
Door-to-door saleslady	0	1.68	1.76	57.98	20.17	2.52	40
Tenant farmer on shares	0	1.71	21.37	37.60	35.90	3.42	38
Waitress	0	1.71	15.38	54.70	26.50	1.71	38
Hod carrier	0	0	7.63	11.86	10.17	70.34	38
Saw filer	.85	1.69	16.10	41.53	31.36	8.47	38
Day laborer on farm	0	.85	4.20	42.20	47.05	5.88	31

Score based on 118 responses when all "Don't Know" answers were excluded.

score was 95. At the opposite end of the scale stands "day laborer on a farm." None of the students rated it as excellent; less than one per cent rated it as good; 4 per cent rated it as average; 42 per cent rated it as somewhat below average; 47 per cent rated it as poor; and 5.88 per cent said they didn't know. The resultant score was 31.

Both the median and the mean scores for the occupations fell at 65 occupied jointly by "owner of a small wholesale business," "auto salesman" and "county tax assessor."

It should be noted that the validity of the scores for "road master on a railroad," "millwright" and "hod carrier" is doubtful, as over 40 per cent of the students stated that they did not know where to place those occupations.

Table 2 shows the scores indicating the evaluation of various groups of students. Again, the occupations are listed by the score accorded them by all students. The scores given by those students who come from towns of 10,000 or more population, towns of 2,500 to 10,000 population, and towns of less than 2,500 population are compared. Also, the evaluations by upperclassmen (juniors and seniors) are compared with those of lower classmen (freshman and sophomores).

Here some interesting relationships become apparent. In the first place, proximity to one's mayor seems to lower one's esteem for him: "Mayor of a large city" was rated highest by those students from small towns and "mayor of a small town" was rated highest by those people from the larger cities.

Some other relationships exist. Juniors and seniors fairly consistently tended to rate all occupations higher than did freshmen and sophomores. Furthermore the upperclassmen tended to rate significantly higher those occupations which required a great deal of specialized training. Thus, while "doctor" and "owner of large manufacturing plant" tied for first place for the total group, juniors and seniors rated "doctor" higher than "owner of manufacturing plant." The upperclassmen also rated "dentist," "chemist," and "lawyer" significantly (more than 5 points) higher than did the freshmen and sophomores.

THE SOCIAL STANDING OF OCCUPATIONS

TABLE 2. Social Standing Scores of 100 Occupations as evaluated by Southern State College students Grouped According to Population of Home Town and Class Standings.

Occupation	Home town: 10,000 or more	Home town: 2,500 to 10,000	Home town: less than 2,500	Juniors and Seniors	Freshmen and Sophomores	All students
Owner of large manufacturing plant	92	96	96	96	96	95
Doctor	97	96	98	98	94	95
Owner large plot oil land	89	92	91	93	91	91
Dentist	92	88	91	95	89	90
Chemist	91	83	90	92	87	88
Lawyer	88	84	86	94	87	88
Petroleum engineer	90	85	88	91	87	87
Owner large retail store	88	84	86	86	86	86
Mayor large city	89	91	94	92	84	86
Civil engineer	86	83	86	89	84	85
Minister	88	83	86	91	84	85
Owner large hotel	87	84	86	85	86	85
Owner large wholesale business	84	86	85	88	85	85
College professor	87	81	86	88	84	85
Certified Public Accountant	81	81	87	91	82	84
College administrator	82	85	80	88	83	84
Superintendent of schools	84	76	80	85	79	80
Owner large plot of timber land	78	76	83	75	81	80
Owner large farm, land worked by tenants	78	81	78	81	78	79
Owner medium size plot oil land	78	77	80	73	80	79
Manager local office large corporation	81	77	77	76	79	78
Manager manufacturing concern	75	78	78	82	75	76
Veterinarian	88	71	77	77	76	76
Owner small manufacturing plant	76	76	73	79	74	74
County judge	82	72	73	80	73	74
Manager of supermarket	75	74	73	76	73	74
Airline pilot	78	74	73	80	73	74
School principal	78	71	73	80	72	74
Real estate broker	78	78	72	74	73	73
Postmaster	72	75	72	82	72	73
Accountant	73	70	72	77	71	72
Owner large farm who works land himself	71	69	74	74	71	72
Roadmaster on railroad	71	65	76	78	70	72
Mayor small town	78	69	69	73	70	71
Foreman in factory	74	68	72	72	71	71
Owner small plot oil land	70	73	68	69	71	71
Manager department store	75	69	71	71	71	71
Livestock farmer	68	72	70	78	69	70
Railroad engineer	70	68	69	74	68	69
Electrician	72	70	68	71	69	69
Cotton buyer	72	62	71	74	68	69
Insurance broker	73	65	71	78	67	69
Bookkeeper	68	69	70	70	69	69
Foreman of housing construction	68	70	68	69	67	68
Wholesale oil equipment salesman	68	69	66	74	68	68
Owner medium plot timber land	69	66	67	65	68	67
High school teacher	68	67	67	71	66	67
Manager of wholesale business	70	67	67	70	67	67
Owner medium farm worked by tenants	70	66	63	67	65	66
Owner small wholesale business	65	66	65	69	65	65
Auto salesman	63	64	64	67	65	65
Undertaker	65	65	64	70	63	64
Sheriff	67	62	65	69	63	64

--Continued

TABLE 2 --(Continued)

Occupation	Home town: 10,000 or more	Home town: 2,500 to 10,000	Home town: less than 2,500	Juniors and Seniors	Freshmen and Sophomores	All students
Wholesale farming equipment salesman	64	65	63	65	64	64
Foreman in machine shop	68	62	63	64	63	64
Primary school teacher	68	62	63	66	62	63
Chief of police in small town	69	51	64	64	63	63
Secretary	63	61	65	67	63	63
Manager of farm	62	60	64	66	61	62
Machinist	65	62	60	65	62	62
Owner small retail store	64	62	62	64	62	62
Rig builder	65	59	63	72	60	62
Millwright	65	57	60	60	61	61
Carpenter	61	60	60	60	61	61
Stenographer	62	60	61	65	60	61
Furniture salesman	59	62	60	61	60	61
Foreman of highway construction gang	59	57	63	58	60	60
Owner small grocery	61	59	59	61	60	60
Owner small farm land worked by tenants	61	67	57	65	59	60
Wholesale grocery salesman	61	59	59	64	58	59
Plumber	63	54	61	62	58	59
Post Office clerk	58	66	58	60	57	58
Postman	61	59	59	65	57	58
Barber	62	60	59	59	58	58
Policeman	60	54	59	62	57	58
Owner small auto repair shop	62	55	55	59	56	57
Salesman in clothing store	56	58	56	59	56	57
Pipe fitter	64	57	54	56	56	57
Salesman in shoe store	59	58	56	60	55	56
Painter	54	52	56	54	54	54
Owner small plot timber land	54	57	52	58	50	54
Factory worker	57	52	51	51	53	53
Shoe saleslady	52	49	48	53	40	52
Owner liquor store	40	52	40	57	47	50
Seamstress	52	51	48	48	50	50
Sewing machine operator	52	49	48	52	48	49
Truck driver	54	49	45	51	47	48
Roughneck	54	45	47	57	45	48
Owner small farm who works land himself	49	46	47	54	46	48
Construction worker highway	51	46	46	53	46	47
Row crop farmer	48	45	44	44	46	45
Lumberjack	48	42	46	51	44	45
Worker in cotton gin	43	40	40	44	41	41
Door-to-door saleslady	43	43	37	42	40	40
Tenant farmer on shares	36	38	38	34	38	38
Waitress	44	38	36	41	39	38
Hod carrier	40	38	37	38	39	38
Saw filer	37	35	41	38	38	38
Day laborer on farm	30	31	32	33	31	31

The urban students tended to rate industrial occupations higher than did the small town students. In fact, "factory worker," "pipe fitter," "truck driver," "millwright," and "foreman in a machine shop" were all rated more than 5 points higher by the largest city groups than were they rated by the medium-sized or small-sized town group. Small town groups rated the railroad occupations higher than did either the large or medium-sized town groups. Teachers and school principals were rated higher by the large-town groups.

Students from towns of less than 2,500 population rated people who worked land, "tenant farmers," "day laborers on farm," "owners and operators of farms," generally higher than did the students from larger towns.

Southern State College is in new oil and timber area. Nearly all of the students live within a 50-mile radius of the college and the oil and timber boom economy is their common experience. The ratings indicate a resultant bias. For instance, all groups rated jobs which had to do with petroleum higher than jobs of similar skill and income in other fields. Thus, "petroleum engineer" is ranked above "civil engineer" by all groups. Owners of oil land and timber land were ranked above owners of similar quantities of farm land, even though owners of timber and oil lands are not necessarily more wealthy than owners of good farm land. "A wholesale oil equipment salesman" is rated more highly than a "wholesale farming equipment salesman" and a "rig builder" is accorded a higher rating than is the "foreman of a highway construction gang" and a "roughneck" has a higher rating than does a "construction worker" or a "lumberjack." Thus, the evaluation of occupations by the students are in accord with the culture in which they live.

Table 3 is a comparison of Southern State College students' evaluation of 17 occupations with the evaluations of a cross section of the national population as reported by North and Hatt³. Column A is a list of the occupations given the titles that North and Hatt used; B is the scores given these occupations by the students; C is the score given on North and Hatt's survey; D is the difference between those scores. Since the occupations presented to the two groups of respondents were, on the whole, different, indeed 17 were the only ones common to both studies, and since the respondents' answers were probably influenced by the comparisons they were making, it was felt that the comparisons of the raw scores were not too revealing. Therefore, the 17 occupations were ranked, so as to compare them with each other. Columns E and F present the ranks that these 17 occupations were given as the result of the evaluation by Southern State College students and by North and Hatt's sample, respectively. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was computed and found to be .72 which is a fairly high coefficient of correlation.

TABLE 3. Comparison of Southern State College Students' Evaluation of 17 Occupations with those of a national sample as reported by North and Hatt*

Occupation	Evaluation score: students	Evaluation score: national	Difference: D=C-B	Rank: students	Rank: national	Difference: G=E-F
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Owner, mfg. plant	95	82	+13	1.5	11	-9.5
Doctor	95	93	+ 2	1.5	1	+0.5
Dentist	90	86	+ 4	3	7	-4
Lawyer	88	86	+ 2	4.5	7	-2.5
Chemist	88	86	+ 2	4.5	7	-2.5
Mayor of large city	86	90	- 4	6	2	+4
College professor	85	89	- 4	8	3	+5
Minister	85	87	- 2	8	4.5	+3.5
Civil engineer	85	84	+ 1	8	9	-1
County judge	74	87	-13	10.5	4.5	+6
Airline Pilot	74	83	- 9	10.5	10	+0.5
Accountant	72	81	- 9	12	12	0
Railroad engineer	69	77	- 8	13.5	14	-0.5
Public school teacher	65	78	-13	15	13	+2.0
Machinist	62	73	-11	16	16.5	-0.5
Farm owner and operator	59	76	-15	17	15	+2.0
Mean	78.88	83.00	6.82			

Mn-Dif = 4.0 Mn+Dif = +8.36 Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient: $p = +.72$

*Cecil C. North and Paul K. Hatt, "Jobs and Occupations: A popular Evaluation", *Opinion News*, Sept. 1, 1947, as reprinted in *Sociological Analysis* by Logan Wilson and William L. Kolb (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company) 1949, pp. 466-467.

However it is interesting to note those occupations for which the rankings differ broadly. The national survey ranked "owner of a manufacturing plant" eleventh, whereas that occupation tied for first in the minds of the students. The students ranked dentist, lawyer, and chemist all very high, whereas they placed seventh in the national survey. "College professor" fared comparatively badly at the hands of the students, placing eighth. "Mayor of a large city" was ranked relatively low by the college students.

It is to be noted that for this table, the data were manipulated a bit. The "public school teacher" which North and Hatt list was equated with the mean rating of "primary school teacher" and "high school teacher." "Farm owner and operator" was equated to the mean of four scores: "owner of a large farm who works land himself," score 84; "owner of a small farm who works land himself," score 48; "livestock farmer," score 70; and "row crop farmer," score 45. (Cotton hasn't been doing too well in southwestern Arkansas.)

North and Hatt report that younger groups consistently tend to score occupations lower than the average. Our students conformed to this trend except at the very top of the scale where they tended to rank most of the occupations a few points higher.

Table 4 indicates a comparison of the average scores of occupational groups as reported by North and Hatt and as worked out for the student rating. There are 18 professional and semi-professional workers in our questionnaire and their average score was 79.2; there were 30 in North and Hatt questionnaire; the average score was 80.6 and so on. Note that with a few exceptions the group scores are remarkably alike. Government officials are not comparable for the two surveys because the government jobs listed on the Southern State College survey were all local officials, whereas North and Hatt listed national officials. Other differences are in craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers; clerical, sales, and kindred workers; and farm laborers. For all of these classifications the national sample ranked the occupations higher than did the students.

The students were asked, "When you say that certain jobs have excellent standing, what do you think is the one main thing about such jobs that gives this standing?" 24 per cent gave the reason "It requires high moral standing, honesty, and responsibility;" 15 per cent replied that "the job has a good future and the field is not overcrowded;" 14 per cent answered "it requires intelligence and ability;" 13 per cent answered that "it provides security and steady work;" 11 per cent replied "it serves humanity;" 6 per cent answered "it affords maximum chance for initiative and; freedom;" 4 per cent answered "it is a good paying job;" less than 5 per cent answered that "the job carried social prestige" and that "preparation requires much education, hard work, and money."

However an analysis of the evaluation of the students indicates that they reversed the order of importance of these factors, when they rated specific occupations, for nearly all of the top-rated jobs are ones which pay well, (with the exception of college professor) and are ones which require considerable education and training. In this they conform to the national population.

The ratings were later combined to form a five point scale of occupational status, which will be used to aid in the evaluation of the socio-economic status of individual Southern State College students.

References

1. Warner, W. Lloyd; Meeker, Marchia; and Eells, Kenneth *Social Class in America: A Manual of Procedure for the Measurement of Social Status*. Science Research Associates Inc., Chicago, pages xiii-274; 1949.
2. North, Cecil C. and Hatt, Paul K. *Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation*. Opinion News, reprinted with permission by Wilson, Logan and Kolb, William L., pages 3-13; September 1, 1947. Sociological Analysis, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1949.
3. *Ibid.*

TABLE 4. Comparison of Average Ratings of Occupational Groups, Southern State College Students and National Sample*

Classification	Number of occupations: students	Average score: students	Number of occupations: national	Average score: national
Professional and semiprofessional workers	18	79.2	30	80.6
Proprietors, managers and officials, (except gov't)	18	72.8	11	74.9
Government officials**	7	70.9	8	90.9
Farmers and farm managers	8	62.8	3	61.3
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	12	62.3	7	68.0
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	16	60.8	6	68.2
Protective service workers	1	58.0	3	58.0
Operatives and kindred workers	3	49.0	8	52.8
Service workers (except domestic and protective)	2	48	7	46.7
Laborers (except farm)	3	44.3	6	45.8
Farm laborers	2	34.5	1	50

*North and Hatt, *Ibid*, p. 467.

**Government workers in questionnaire given to Southern State College students were not comparable to the North and Hatt group, the latter including high national officials, the former including only local officials.