SOCIAL MOBILITY AND SOCIAL ISOLATION: A TEST OF SOROKIN'S DISSOCIATIVE HYPOTHESIS *

ROBERT A. ELLIS
University of Oregon

W. CLAYTON LANE
San Jose State College

Panel-design research on lower-class youth entering a high-status university is used to test three competing hypotheses of the personal and social consequences of upward mobility. The evidence clearly shows that, although these upwardly mobile youth have been screened for their "middle-class" characteristics and for their academic and social promise in high school, they nevertheless encounter a disproportionate share of isolating experiences and personal strain, both as viewed through the eyes of institutional observers and as realized in personal experience. The compensatory hypothesis—*that this situation stems from early childhood deprivation and the attendant inability to form effective primary group relations—is not supported by their high school records and recommendations. The* ameliorative hypothesis—*that the value assimilation necessary for upward movement brings acceptance by the new group—is not substantiated by the college experiences of the subjects. Rather, the evidence bears out Sorokin's* dissociative hypothesis *that upward mobility is itself a disruptive social experience which leaves the individual for an appreciable period without roots or effective social support.*

THE stratification system generally operates in our society to bind persons to the class circumstances to which they are born. Nevertheless, in any given generation a number of individuals do free themselves of the restraints of their class of origin and change their position in the social structure. Just what consequences these shifts in status have for the individual, especially where major mobility is involved, has been a matter of recurring concern but little consensus.

One line of thought portrays the upwardly mobile as isolated, lonely individuals who, because of their ascent, find themselves unable to form satisfactory personal relationships in their new environment. This point of view—what we term the *dissociative hypothesis*—was introduced by Sorokin over a quarter of a century ago. Although in discussing the effects of mobility Sorokin mentions such benefits to society as increased creativity and adaptability, he points out that they come at a psychological cost to the individual. Part of this cost is an experience of rootlessness, for upward mobility is a disruptive social experience that, to use Sorokin's terms, "diminishes intimacy and increases psychosocial isolation and loneliness." The mobile man in contemporary society he thus depicts as one who is unattached to anything or anybody.[1]

* Expanded version of a paper read at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, April, 1964. The research has been supported by Public Health Grant MH-04968 from the National Institute of Mental Health and by grants from the Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology, the Social Science Research Council, and Stanford University Faculty Research Funds. Data analysis was supported in part by a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

In a project of this duration, it is impossible to acknowledge the services of all the persons who have contributed time, energy, and ideas. Special appreciation, however, is due to the following individuals: Richard H. Anderson, Milton Bloombaum, John Koval, Virginia Olesen, Robert Von der Lippe, and William Zwerman.

[1] Pitirim A. Sorokin, *Social Mobility,* New York: Harper & Bros., 1927, pp. 522–525.

More recent statements of this view are found in: Robert H. Bohlke, "Social Mobility, Stratification Inconsistency and Middle Class Delinquency," *Social Problems,* 8 (Spring, 1961), pp. 351–363; Peter M. Blau, "Occupational Bias and Mobility," *American Sociological Review,* 22 (August, 1957), pp. 392–399; Richard Hoggart, *The Uses of Literacy: Changing Patterns in English Mass Culture,* Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1961, pp. 246–249; Jerome K. Myers and Bertram H. Roberts, *Family and Class Dynamics in Mental Illness,* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959, pp. 147–149, 152–153; Jurgen Ruesch, "Social Technique, Social Status, and Social Change in Illness" in Clyde Kluckhohn

An alternative view, the *compensatory hypothesis,* has been advanced by psychoanalytically oriented social scientists. They treat social isolation as more the cause than the effect of upward mobility. Status strivings, from this standpoint, are evoked to compensate for social deprivation arising from childhood and early adolescent experiences.[2] While those who rise in the social structure may, as adults, encounter inordinate difficulties in establishing close ties with others, this isolation is construed as only "a continuation of [the same] superficial, impermanent primary group relations" that originally motivated them to alter their class circumstances.[3]

Still another approach is to be found in the *ameliorative hypothesis* set forth in reference group theory. An upward shift of one's class position is acknowledged to have a potentially disruptive effect, but one that is not inevitable. The disruptive tendencies can be substantially ameliorated, if not alleviated entirely, by prior social experiences. Conceiving anticipatory socialization to be the usual mechanism for achieving upward mobility, proponents of this hypothesis contend that lower-class persons who have had opportunity to absorb the values, norms, and judgmental standards of the middle class to which they aspire should easily gain acceptance by that segment of society.[4]

In essence, then, these represent three competing interpretations of the personal consequences of upward mobility. The dissociative hypothesis stipulates that a prolonged period of estrangement is the normal, direct consequence of upward mobility. Conversely, social isolation is treated in the compensatory hypothesis as a concomitant of mobility, but not a direct consequence, and in the ameliorative hypothesis as a potential consequence of mobility, but not a normal one. The validity of these hypotheses remains, however, to be demonstrated.

Methodologically, a test of Sorokin's hypothesis against its two theoretical alternatives requires capturing upwardly mobile individuals at a time of major status transition. This would permit determining whether a significant step in upward mobility is, in fact, accompanied by a period of social dislocation. If social isolation is a result, independent evidence needs to be gathered as to whether this isolation can be attributed either to (1) earlier inability to form effective social relationships or (2) the absence of effective anticipatory socialization.

RESEARCH PROBLEM

This paper endeavors to provide such a test by examining a situation of extreme mobility. We draw upon findings from a panel research undertaken at Stanford University over a complete undergraduate sequence to ascertain the intellectual and social adjustment students make to college life. As the discussion makes clear, the elaborate institutionalization of behavior at Stanford, plus

and Henry A. Murray (eds.), *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture,* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949, pp. 117–130 (esp. p. 125); Robert P. Stuckert, "Occupational Mobility and Family Relations," *Social Forces,* 41 (March, 1963), pp. 301–307; W. Lloyd Warner and James C. Abegglen, *Big Business Leaders in America,* New York: Harper & Bros., 1955, pp. 70–105; and Harold L. Wilensky and Hugh Edwards, "The Skidder: Ideological Adjustments of Downward Mobile Workers," *American Sociological Review,* 24 (April, 1959), pp. 215–231 (esp. pp. 216 and 230).

[2] Russell R. Dynes, Alfred C. Clarke, and Simon Dinitz, "Levels of Occupational Aspiration: Some Aspects of Family Experience as a Variable," *American Sociological Review,* 21 (April, 1956), pp. 212–215; Evelyn Ellis, "Social Psychological Correlates of Upward Social Mobility Among Unmarried Career Women," *American Sociological Review,* 17 (October, 1952), pp. 558–563; Karen Horney, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time,* New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1937, pp. 80–82, 162–187.

[3] Ellis, *op. cit.,* p. 563.

[4] Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Rev. Ed.), Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957, pp. 254–255, 265–266, 384–385; Ralph H. Turner, *The Social Context of Ambition: A Study of High-School Seniors in Los Angeles,* San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964, pp. 207–208, 219–222. For findings consistent with the ameliorative hypothesis see Julius Roth and Robert F. Peck, "Social Class and Social Mobility Factors Related to Marital Adjustment," *American Sociological Review,* 16 (August, 1951), pp. 478–487 (esp. pp. 485–486).

The ameliorative hypothesis, as Merton formulates it, has relevance only for the individual's relation to his class of destination. With respect to one's class of origin, Merton clearly views upward mobility as a disruptive experience, the individual becoming progressively alienated from the old group in attitude, in value, and in interaction, even as this response is being reciprocated by the old group. See Merton, *op. cit.,* pp. 269–271, 294–295.

the wide discrepancy between the past and present status circumstances of the upwardly mobile, make it an excellent natural experimental setting for testing the effects of social mobility.

Of primary interest in this inquiry are the highly selected students who come to Stanford from lower-class backgrounds. Clearly in the minority at this university, constituting only three percent of the total undergraduate student body, they are upon matriculation confronted with the task of assuming full-time residence in what, from their perspective, may seem an alien and stressful social environment. Stanford is, in terms of its personnel, policies, and values, a predominantly upper-middle-class institution. Moreover, it is a highly competitive setting. This partially results from the characteristically upper-middle-class emphasis put on striving for achievement. In part, it is the direct consequence of admissions procedures that recruit youths who have been eminently successful in high school, having in the majority of cases been outstanding leaders in both scholastic and nonscholastic endeavors.

Yet this is not a world for which such lower-class youth as these are unprepared. The joint circumstances of self- and institutional selection have operated to bring to Stanford students from lower social backgrounds who have already adopted a middle-class reference group and many of its attendant norms and values.[5] It is nevertheless problematical (1) whether their anticipatory socialization into middle-class practices and beliefs enables them to be readily assimilated into the Stanford undergraduate society; and (2) if not, whether the social estrangement that results is attributable to a chronic inability on their part to establish effective primary group ties.

METHOD

The subjects for this report consist of 126 male undergraduates who entered Stanford as first-year freshmen in the fall of 1958. Of these, 99 were selected by means of a standard probability sample. Designated the Regular Sample, it furnishes a reliable and accurate estimate of the characteristics of the Stanford undergraduate population. The remaining 27 students represent an oversample taken of all lower- and lower-middle-class freshmen not originally contained in the Regular Sample so as to compensate for the underrepresentation of persons from these social levels in the student body. The oversample is used to augment the Regular Sample whenever the factor of social class is analyzed.

Social-class background was determined by the Index of Class Position (ICP), a two-factor intercommunity measure of stratification developed and validated specifically for research on college populations.[6] ICP is based on the two components of father's occupation and the student's subjective identification of the class position of the family. This index yields a six-class scale ranging as follows:

Social Class	Nominal Designation
I	Upper
II	Upper-Middle
III	Middle-Middle
IV	Lower-Middle
V	Upper-Lower
VI	Lower-Lower

For a student to be categorized in the lower stratum by ICP, his father would have to be employed in a blue-collar occupation, and the student would have to perceive the family as being in the working or lower class.

Since background factors other than social class might be presumed to alienate individuals from their peers, appropriate controls were imposed. Race, ethnicity, and age were controlled by sample exclusion, so that nonwhites, foreign-born, and persons over 20 and under 17 were eliminated from the sample frame, a step that resulted in only a negligible reduction of the parent universe. Non-Protestants among the Stanford student body were too few to permit systematic partialling of the effects of Catholic, Jewish and Protestant backgrounds. Nevertheless, all class differences obtained for the Regular Sample were recomputed for only the Prot-

[5] See Robert A. Ellis and W. Clayton Lane, "Social Mobility and Career Orientation," *Sociology and Social Research,* 50 (April, 1966), pp. 280–296.

[6] Robert A. Ellis, W. Clayton Lane and Virginia Olesen, "The Index of Class Position: An Improved Intercommunity Measure of Stratification," *American Sociological Review,* 28 (April, 1963), pp. 271–277.

estants in the sample so as to insure that the effect of religion did not spuriously contribute to the results. All class differences reported below have been found to stand up independently of the effect of religion. Finally, the incidence of broken homes among Stanford students was found to be evenly distributed among the social classes, and thus required no special treatment.

Data on social background, as well as all other information gained through students' self-reports, were obtained from hour-long interviews held early in the freshman year and, so long as the students remained in college, at the end of the freshman, sophomore, and senior years—which for some involved a time span of up to seven years. Two additional sources of data were provided by administrative records and by judgments made of the students by other persons with the opportunity to observe and evaluate them in a social context. Included among the latter were high school teachers, dormitory counselors, and college administrators.

These outside judgments furnish an especially vital datum. Their use permits us to avoid exclusive reliance on individual self-reports, which may very well mask the more sensitive social and personal side-effects of upward mobility. Moreover, since these evaluations span the time from high school to the senior year at Stanford, they help make it possible to pinpoint the pre-mobility characteristics of the students and then to discern over an extended period the social impact that results from their movement in the social structure.

Finally, we should emphasize the strategic nature of the Stanford setting which allows us to concentrate on persons taking a major step in upward mobility. This circumstance lends special weight to whatever negative findings may be uncovered regarding the compensatory hypothesis; for, as Lipset and Bendix and Evelyn Ellis note, it is extreme mobility that may be expected to attract "personality configurations which are a result of childhood deprivation." [7]

[7] Evelyn Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 563; Seymour Martin Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, *Social Mobility in Industrial Society,* Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1960, pp. 252–253.

PRE-COLLEGE POTENTIAL FOR SOCIAL SUCCESS

Our first concern is with the social potential exhibited by lower-class students prior to the time they come to Stanford. Is there early indication that they lack the skills necessary for making an effective social and personal adjustment to college life?

By their record of extracurricular accomplishments in high school, it is readily evident that social maladjustment is the exception, characterizing no more than 5 to 10 percent of all class V and VI students. It is much more the rule for the upwardly mobile to be the prototype of the much-fabled "All-American Boy." They have been able to combine a record of scholastic excellence with a prominent leadership role in the nonscholastic activities of high school life and even in the community at large. Not infrequently, these youngsters have achieved scholastic distinction as class valedictorian or National Merit Scholarship holder, while at the same time accumulating a series of nonscholastic honors, such as leadership in extracurricular organizations, class or student body officership, and major athletic awards. Many, in addition, have held offices that would bring them to the attention of the community at large, as, for example, in the City Youth Council or Junior Red Cross. In addition, almost half of the lower class were recipients of such "general honors" as American Legion Award for Outstanding Citizen of the Year or Senior Voted Most Likely to Succeed. Of equal significance is the fact that their record of leadership in nonscholastic endeavors falls only slightly below that of Stanford undergraduates in general: 64 percent of class V and VI students, as compared to 76 percent of the Regular Sample, have had the kind of awards and offices that would stamp them as outstanding leaders in the student culture.[8] (See Table 1.) Conse-

[8] Information on students' accomplishments in high school was obtained in the interviews held early in the fall of the freshman year when the students' high school experiences still were fresh in their minds. This information was subsequently checked for completeness and accuracy against the students' high school records on file in the Stanford Admissions Office.

The activities, accomplishments, and awards in each of the four role spheres of scholarship, athletics, student government, and school-sponsored

quently, their high school accomplishments not only mark these class V and VI students as atypical of other persons coming from their background, but also indicate that they have essentially the same potential for social success as students coming to Stanford from higher status levels.

Conclusions of a similar nature can be drawn from the recommendations that the high schools furnish the Stanford Admissions Office on each prospective student. Included in the recommendation form is a check list of academic and personal qualifications that is filled out by the high school principal or counselor assigned this responsibility. Tabulation of these items (See Table 2) shows that class V and VI students are viewed by high school administrators as slightly more motivated and able than other Stanford freshmen to do academic work—a finding that is not too surprising since almost all lower-class freshmen come to Stanford on scholarships.

TABLE 1. HIGH SCHOOL ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF LOWER-CLASS AND OTHER STANFORD FRESHMEN (%)

Percent Who Achieved High Success In:	Classes V and VI (N=22)	Regular Sample (N=99)
Area of Success		
Scholastic	86	63
Nonscholastic *	64	76
Voluntary associations	18	30
Student government	32	51
Athletics	32	36
General honors	45	25
Pattern of Success		
Both scholastic and nonscholastic areas	50	54
Scholastic area alone	36	10
Nonscholastic area alone	14	22
Neither area	0	14

* Success has been achieved in athletic activities and/or voluntary associations and/or student government.

voluntary associations were classified by use of a High School Achievement Scale specifically developed for this purpose. The Scale makes it possible to classify students' accomplishments in each role sphere according to whether they yield *very high, high, medium, low,* or *no* social recognition in the high school setting. For the present paper, students with a record of high or very high achievement in a role sphere are treated as "successful" in that area.

A manual describing the use of the High School Achievement Scale is in preparation.

TABLE 2. HIGH SCHOOL RECOMMENDATIONS OF LOWER-CLASS AND OTHER STANFORD FRESHMEN (%)

Items Checked	Classes V and VI (N=22)	Regular Sample (N=99)
1. Great desire to achieve academic success at college	59	52
2. Possibility of achieving academic distinction in college	59	40
3. Very unlikely to have personal or social problems leading to emotional instability that would interfere with academic and personal success at Stanford	68	50
4. A good leader [in high school student body]	55	52
5. Generally neat and clean in appearance	95	93
6. Responsible and trustworthy in social and academic affairs	95	94
7. Accepts suggestions and corrections gracefully	91	89
8. Respectful and cooperative toward teachers and school officials	95	92
9. Gets along well with students and is respected by them	91	87

It is also clear from the high school reports that these lower-class youth are thought to possess the social potential to fit into the Stanford undergraduate culture. Slightly more than half are regarded as having been good leaders in the high school student body, a result comparable to that obtained for the Regular Sample. Furthermore, they are even more likely than other Stanford freshmen to be judged free from those "personal or social problems . . . that would interfere with academic and personal success at Stanford," and not a single lower-class student is reported as being "more likely than the typical student" to be experiencing such problems. Moreover, in spite of their families' socioeconomic status—which almost inevitably was the subject for comment in the high school's report—the students from classes V and VI are described as possessing those personal and social characteristics which stamp an individual as "middle class." Almost without exception they are described as: (1) generally neat and clean in appearance, (2)

responsible and trustworthy in social and academic affairs, (3) likely to accept suggestions and corrections gracefully, (4) respectful and cooperative toward teachers and school officials, and (5) able to get along well with students and be respected by them.

Thus, from both their high school records and the judgments of high school personnel, it is clear that before they enter Stanford these upwardly mobile youth are not the socially inept, constrained individuals that the compensatory hypothesis of upward mobility would imply. Nor do they give evidence of having missed the significant anticipatory socialization into middle-class practices and beliefs that the ameliorative hypothesis suggests would pave the way for their making an easy and effective adjustment to the new social world they are entering.

Let us now turn our attention to the social reaction made to these students at the time they enter Stanford and over the course of the undergraduate years. Does the reaction by the other Stanford students indicate that the upwardly mobile encounter special difficulty in gaining social acceptance in this new milieu?

SOCIAL REACTION TO THE UPWARDLY MOBILE

Initial Reaction. The task of selecting undergraduate judges is simplified by Stanford's practice of having 24 undergraduate counselors assigned as residents to the freshman dormitory, one to approximately every 30 freshmen. After the initial list of applicants is screened by the administration, these counselors, known at Stanford as "freshman sponsors," are elected to their post each year by the preceding group. Their role in the dormitory consists partially of acting as institutionally approved socializing agents. They are expected to interpret the undergraduate culture for the new students and to serve as a prototype of the model Stanford undergraduate. Their job also requires acting as agents of social control in maintaining house discipline and reporting signs of trouble to the administration.

Apart from convenience, two basic advantages accrue from using sponsors as judges. First, they typify the core upper-middle-class undergraduate society faced by students coming from lower social strata. (See Table 3.) Second, they are by virtue of the functions of their role put in a position to know the incoming students intimately—a premise well borne out by the data. High agreement is found between sponsors and students on their expectations of how the student will fare in college (e.g., getting very good grades, joining a fraternity, being an important person in school affairs, being a good athlete, etc.). The percentage of agreement ranges from 61 to 94, with the median level of agreement being 70 percent. Moreover, it is found that the sponsors' judgments accurately predict the actual performance of the students in those areas where data are available. For example, a 0.58 correlation (Pearson r) is obtained between the sponsors' grade estimates and the students' first-year grade-point averages, while 71 percent of the students they expect to make fraternities during spring rushing actually do so (a figure that increases to 80 percent if the academically disqualified are omitted from consideration).

The sponsors' evaluations of the students in their charge were obtained through individual interviews held two months after the start of the school year. The number of students judged by each sponsor ranged from 3 to 11, the median being 5.

One measure of the extent to which lower-class students are integrated into the undergraduate culture was provided by gauging the sponsors' own personal reaction to the students in their charge. Sponsors were asked whether they, themselves, had found any of these students "difficult to know or to understand as a person" and, if so, why? From their replies, two different categories of "difficult" students can be identified:

1. Those who are socially withdrawn (e.g., "he keeps to himself.")
2. Those whose attitudes are in some way interpreted as peculiar (e.g., "he has a don't-give-a-damn attitude.")

The distribution of the sponsors' answers for the several social classes is presented in Table 4. As the findings show, the phenomenon of social withdrawal is concentrated disproportionately in the lower class where one-third of the students are perceived as socially isolated, withdrawn individuals. In contrast,

TABLE 3. SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF STANFORD FRESHMEN AND SPONSORS (%)

Social Characteristic	Regular Sample (N=99)	Sponsors (N=24)
Resident of California	61	54
Social Class of Family (ICP) [a]		
Class I (upper class)	12	21
Class II (upper-middle class)	49	50
Occupation of Father		
High-level executive or major proprietor	22	38
Major professional	27	33
Educational Background of One or Both Parents		
College graduate	68	75
Undergraduate attendance at a prestige university or college [b]	38	42
Stanford alumnus	21	21
Religious Affiliation of Student		
High-status Protestant [c]	44	42
Graduate of Private Secondary School	14	04
Recipient of Freshman Scholarship	38	42

[a] Social Class was measured by the Index of Class Position. See Robert A. Ellis, W. Clayton Lane, and Virginia Olesen, "The Index of Class Position: An Improved Intercommunity Measure of Stratification," *American Sociological Review,* 28 (April, 1963), pp. 271–277.

[b] An institution was coded as a prestige college or university if it was included either in the *Chicago Tribune's* 1957 survey of the 40 best schools or in the Knapp and Greenbaum list of 50 undergraduate colleges and universities that have been most productive of future Ph.D's. See Robert H. Knapp and Joseph J. Greenbaum, *The Young American Scholar: His Collegiate Origins,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953; Chester Manly, "Greatest Schools in Nation: A Survey by the *Chicago Tribune,*" *Chicago Tribune,* April 21–June 9, 1957.

[c] Protestant denominations classified as high status are Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Congregational.

only 11 percent of the Regular Sample are reacted to in this fashion.

A second measure of social estrangement was obtained by having the sponsors make percentile estimates of the popularity the students in their charge would eventually enjoy by the time they are seniors. The results, summarized in Table 5, present the mean and standard deviation of the percentile estimates for each social class and the percentage by class that is judged unpopular (defined by the percentile estimates' falling at or below the fortieth percentile).[9]

The data offer some confirmation for the social dominance earlier premised for the upper-middle class, for it is to these individuals that the greatest popularity accrues in the eyes of the sponsor. The data furnish additional proof, too, of the social disadvantage at which lower-class freshmen initially find themselves in the Stanford environment. Their average popularity rating falls at the 40th percentile. This is 19 percentile points below the average rating sponsors give class II students and, indeed, is at the level we have taken as the cutting point for designating unpopularity. Only one other group at Stanford is perceived to be as unpopular as the lower class on campus. These are the Jews in the sample, who, on the average, receive a popularity rating that falls at the 36th percentile.

When the results on unpopularity and withdrawal are combined, as has been done in Table 6, we are in the best position to appraise the initial social impact of upward mobility. Despite the earlier data indicating that the lower class had in high school made a dramatic shift to a middle-class reference group and, at that time, given evidence of fully the same potential for social success as students from the Regular Sample, once the

[9] For a description of the linear rating procedure, see Robert A. Ellis and Thomas C. Keedy, Jr., "Three Dimensions of Status: A Study of Academic Prestige," *The Pacific Sociological Review,* 3 (Spring, 1960), pp. 23–28.

TABLE 4. SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES IN STUDENTS REPORTED "DIFFICULT TO KNOW" BY SPONSORS EARLY IN FRESHMAN YEAR (%)

Difficult to Know Category	(N)	Social Class I (12)	II (49)	III (27)	IV (16)	V and VI (22)	Regular Sample (99)
Social isolates		8	10	4	25	32[a]	11
Unusual attitudes		17	10	11	0	0	10

[a] One-tailed exact probability test of difference between classes V and VI and Regular Sample yields a P of 0.02.

TABLE 5. SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES IN SPONSORS' PERCENTILE ESTIMATES OF STUDENTS' FUTURE POPULARITY AT STANFORD

Percentile Estimates	(N)	Social Class I (12)	II (49)	III (27)	IV (16)	V and VI (22)	Regular Sample (99)
Mean		54	59	55	51	40[a]	55
Standard deviation		16.4	16.5	18.9	21.9	16.2	18.0
Percent in unpopular category[b]		25	14	15	38	55[c]	20

[a] One-tailed t test (35 d.f.) between classes V and VI and Regular Sample=3.85; $P<0.001$.
[b] The fortieth percentile and below are treated as negative estimates.
[c] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=9.22; $P<0.01$, when classes V and VI are compared with the Regular Sample.

lower class enter Stanford they are quickly reacted to as marginal individuals on campus. Fully two-thirds of the lower class are perceived as failing to become integrated into the undergraduate society.

Subsequent Reaction. That this experience of estrangement is not a transitory phenomenon is shown by the data in Table 7, where we present the social reaction to the students at the end of freshman year and during the later undergraduate years. For these data, it was necessary to turn to administrative records. Throughout the time a student is an undergraduate, Stanford compiles a series of confidential reports that carefully chronicle his academic and social progress. At the end of freshman year, these reports are prepared by the sponsors and by the faculty residents assigned to the freshman dormitory. In subsequent years, they are prepared by resident assistants (usually graduate students) assigned to the dormitory or the fraternity in which the student lives. While the reports vary in quality and completeness, they do furnish a rich body of information on the student's behavior through the undergraduate years and the reactions it evokes. Of particular importance are the detailed comments provided on the student's ability for getting along with others, his personal traits, and the extent and kind of involvement he manifests in social life and extracurricular activities.

Use of these confidential reports as a data source yields essentially the same definition of social isolation as relied upon in the preceding section. The fact that a student may be depicted as quiet and shy is not, by itself, sufficient to classify him as socially isolated. He is categorized as socially isolated only when there are explicit statements that he has withdrawn from his peers.[10]

[10] The following three examples illustrate the kind of statements relied on for categorizing students as socially isolated.

> John had trouble adjusting to college life. It took him nearly the entire year to become accustomed to being away from home. He tended to live quite unaware of activity around him. In fact, he did not converse with anyone at length. It is only in the past few weeks he has begun to come out of his shell.

> He is not well integrated into house activities. Only recently has he begun to be seen often with his roommate. He is the only fellow in the dorm who did not come to our cottage [the faculty resident's] for our evening get-togethers. [The sponsor notes: "He seems to let the group go its own way as long as he can go his."]

> I cannot say I know him well, although he has been one of my charges (certainly, one of my brighter ones) all year long. He is extremely independent, quiet in a forceful rather than a meek way, his relations with his neighbors are

TABLE 6. SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES AMONG STUDENTS REPORTED BY SPONSORS AS SOCIAL ISOLATES AND/OR UNPOPULAR EARLY IN FRESHMAN YEAR (%)

	(N)	Social Class I (12)	II (49)	III (27)	IV (16)	V and VI (22)	Regular Sample (99)
Social isolates and/or unpopular		33	16	15	44	64[a]	23

[a] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=12.00; $P<0.001$ when classes V and VI are compared with Regular Sample.

TABLE 7. SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES IN NEGATIVE SOCIAL REACTION MADE TO STUDENTS LATER IN THEIR UNDERGRADUATE CAREER (%)

	Social Class					
	I	II	III	IV	V and VI	Regular Sample
End of Freshman Year						
Social isolates	00	21	09	25	38	17
Unpopular	11	12	05	00	12	08
Social isolates and/or unpopular	11	27	14	25	50[a]	23
(N)	(9)	(33)	(22)	(12)	(16)	(71)
Later Undergraduate Years						
Social isolates	12	18	25	38	64	24
Unpopular	12	06	07	00	29	06
Social isolates and/or unpopular	25	24	25	38	79[b]	29
(N)	(8)	(34)	(16)	(13)	(14)	(66)

[a] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=3.65; $P<0.05$ when classes V and VI are compared with Regular Sample.
[b] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=10.18; $P<0.001$ when classes V and VI are compared with Regular Sample.

The shift to a new data source does, however, result in a more restricted definition of unpopularity. From the confidential reports it was relatively easy to discern when a student was being depicted as socially rejected by his peers. However, it was not possible on the basis of these reports to identify the more passive form of "unpopularity" where the student, though not socially rejected, is perceived as not being popular among his classmates. Thus, we were unable to incorporate into our analysis many of the more passive cases of unpopularity which occur in conjunction with social isolation. Exclusion of these cases undoubtedly contributes to the lower frequency of unpopularity found in Table 7 as compared to Table 5. It does not, however, appear to affect the combined category of "social isolates and/or unpopular," which is the main datum for assessing the impact of upward mobility.

Inspection of Table 7 reveals that as a group the upwardly mobile do not succeed in overcoming the social barriers initially encountered. At the end of freshman year, still one-half of class V and VI students are depicted as social isolates or as unpopular in the eyes of their classmates. Moreover, in later undergraduate years, when they have moved out of the freshman dormitory to which they were assigned on a random basis and taken up residence in new quarters and with friends more of their own choosing, an even greater proportion of them encounter social difficulties. Seventy-nine percent are reported during this later period to be socially isolated or rejected by their peers.

The exact extent of their estrangement in their new surroundings is best seen by examining Table 8, which summarizes the findings obtained over the undergraduate years. As the results show, the vast majority (77 percent) of class V and VI students have at some point in their undergraduate career encountered difficulty in establishing effective peer-group relations. For a few, the social disruption that occurs is of relatively short duration, lasting less than a year. For 60 percent of the upwardly mobile, however, the period of social dislocation lasts at least a year or longer; and for 40 percent, it continues unabated throughout the time they are at Stanford. Thus, for many, although not for all, the price of social mobility is social isolation.[11]

polite but minimal, and he keeps his own counsel.

[11] That this isolation is the consequence of mobility, not its precursor, is clearly revealed by the sharp and abrupt contrast between the lower-class students' pre-college potential for social success and their actual college experiences. This conclusion is further underscored by findings obtained on twelve lower-class boys who had been specifically singled out in their high-school recommendations as "good leaders." Consistent with these recommendations, the majority had either been major officers in the student body or had held important positions in student government. Those who had not done so had distinguished themselves by major accomplishments in extracurricular activities or in athletics. By all indications, none should have experienced

TABLE 8. SUMMARY OF NEGATIVE REACTIONS TO LOWER-CLASS STUDENTS THROUGHOUT THE UNDERGRADUATE YEARS (%)

Reacted to as Social Isolates and/or Unpopular	Classes V and VI	Regular Sample
At Least Once While at Stanford		
Percent	77[a]	35
(N)	(22)	(99)
For One Year or More		
Percent	60[b]	19
(N)	(20)	(91)
For the Entire Period at Stanford		
Percent	40[c]	10
(N)	(20)	(91)

[a] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=11.25; $P<0.001$.
[b] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=12.44; $P<0.001$.
[c] One-tailed test of exact probability yields a P of 0.003.

Perceived Success in College. A fuller comprehension of the social disadvantage at which the upwardly mobile find themselves in their new surroundings is gained by examining Table 9, which presents the sponsors' expectations early in the freshman year of the success students in the sample would later attain in four areas of undergraduate achievement: scholastic, extracurricular, athletic, and social (i.e., fraternity membership). It can be seen that some measure of successful accomplishment is expected of most freshmen, regardless of their class of origin. Moreover, students from classes V and VI are viewed as not handicapped in the scholastic and athletic spheres of undergraduate life where success depends more upon technical proficiency than upon social skills. It is only when successful accomplishment requires some degree of social facility that social class considerations loom as important. One such instance is fraternity membership,[12] which is seen to decline consistently with class position—and abruptly so for class V and VI students. The latter are deemed half as likely as other undergraduates to make a fraternity, a prediction which, if true, would importantly shape their social experiences on campus. Similarly, only a negligible minority of lower-class students are expected to attain a position of prominence in school affairs, this being viewed as mainly the domain of classes II and III.

The extent to which the lower class is perceived as uninvolved in extracurricular activities is obscured by our dichotomizing such participation at the extreme end of the continuum. Many students who are not "very important persons in school affairs" may nevertheless take an active part in extracurricular activities. For this reason, data are also included on the sponsors' percentile estimates of the future success students would achieve in the area of extracurricular activities. The findings, as presented in Table 10, indicate how completely the lower class are seen to be removed from this arena of undergraduate behavior. Their average percentile rating of 29 falls 13 points below the rating given any other class and 19 points below that given the Regular Sample. Equally significant is the fact that 82 percent of class V and VI students, as compared to 43 percent of the Regular Sample, receive ratings at or below the fortieth percentile, the cutting point relied upon for categorizing a student as judged to be inactive in extracurricular endeavors. A similarly high percentage of low participation is also reported for class I students, but for entirely different reasons. Rather than indicating a lack of social acceptance, it reflects the presumed preoccupation of the upper class with the social life available to them in fraternities and in nearby San Francisco society. A final point regarding Table 10 is that students from the lower-middle class (class IV) are judged to be as deeply involved in extracurricular activities as are students from classes II and III. While the lower-middle class may not be viewed as attaining prominence in this area, they are not regarded as socially excluded from it—a fact that underscores the

inordinate difficulty in adjusting socially to college life. Yet, once they enter Stanford there is a sharp reversal in their social fortunes. Eight out of the twelve are reported at some juncture in their undergraduate career as socially isolated or rejected by their peers; and for six, this period of estrangement lasts for a year or more.

[12] Unlike many schools, where fraternity rushing is held at the start of the freshman year, at Stanford rushing takes place in mid-spring of the freshman year. Thus, sponsors' expectations about fraternity membership are as much predictions about future social behavior as are their expectations about athletic success, prominence in extracurricular activities, and scholastic performance.

TABLE 9. SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES IN SPONSORS' EXPECTATIONS OF ACHIEVEMENT IN FOUR SELECTED SPHERES OF THE STUDENT ROLE (%)

Achievement Expectations (N)	Social Class I (12)	II (49)	III (27)	IV (16)	V and VI (22)	Regular Sample (99)
Join a fraternity	75	67	63	56	36[a]	64
Get very good grades	25	55	52	69	50	53
Be a good athlete	33	24	41	19	32	28
Be an important person in school affairs	8	24	19	6	5	18
Success in one or more role spheres	92	88	93	88	82	88
Success in both scholastic and nonscholastic roles[b]	8	39	37	38	14[c]	33

[a] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=4.46; $P<.05$, when classes V and VI are compared with the Regular Sample.
[b] Nonscholastic success is defined as a person who is expected to join a fraternity, be a good athlete, and/or be a very important person in school affairs.
[c] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=2.46; $P\approx.05$.

special plight of the lower class in this setting.

The findings on perceived success in college, thus, temper what might otherwise be an overly bleak picture of the upwardly mobile. While the data continue to emphasize the failure of the lower class to find ready social acceptance among their peers, they reveal that the opportunity for success is not closed to them in college. Rather, their success is perceived to lie in those spheres where achievement is largely a matter of technical proficiency.

BEHAVIORAL EVIDENCE OF SOCIAL ISOLATION

The evidence so far has been based on observations by others officially in a position to be in close contact with the students and familiar with their progress in college. Their judgments, reflecting as they do the prevailing norms of the Stanford culture, give us considerable insight into the social dislocation that accompanies upward mobility. Nevertheless, it is germane to inquire whether or not the portrait that is gained of the lower class has its counterpart in the actual social and academic experiences of the students. Is there independent behavioral evidence that students from the lower class do not gain social acceptance from their peers? Do their actual accomplishments in college take on the segmental pattern predicted by the freshman sponsors?

Social Acceptance. One indicator of peer acceptance on campus is living-group affiliation. In spring of the freshman year, the student is faced with the choice of joining a fraternity, joining an eating club, or remaining independent.[13] An eating club, an insti-

[13] The choice of living group made at the end of freshman year is not irrevocable. Eleven percent of the Regular Sample, but none of the lower class, switch their affiliation at some later date. In the

TABLE 10. SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES IN SPONSORS' PERCENTILE ESTIMATES OF STUDENTS' FUTURE SUCCESS IN EXTRACURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Percentile Estimates (N)	Social Class I (12)	II (49)	III (27)	IV (16)	V and VI (22)	Regular Sample (99)
Mean	42	51	49	47	29[a]	48
Standard deviation	17.7	22.2	20.2	21.5	18.7	21.4
Percent judged inactive[b]	75	39	37	38	82[c]	43

[a] One-tailed t test (36 d.f.) between classes V and VI and the Regular Sample=4.19; $P<0.001$.
[b] The fortieth percentile and below are treated as negative estimates.
[c] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=9.13; $P<0.001$, when classes V and VI are compared with the Regular Sample.

tution distinctive to Stanford (at least in its function), gives the student an intermediate option between the highly organized group life characterizing fraternity living and the socially autonomous existence of being an independent. Like the fraternity, the eating club is a socially exclusive organization electing its own members. Members of each eating club eat together in their own dining hall but, unlike fraternity members, do not live together in a separately established house. Instead, members of all eating clubs are quartered in a common dormitory. The eating club thus provides companionship and a sense of belonging to a chosen group without the total strictures of organized fraternity life. In this way, eating-club life also contrasts sharply with the dormitory existence facing independents who are more prone to look upon their living quarters as a "boarding house" than as a place for social companionship.

As may be seen from Table 11, a student's affiliation with a living group provides a rough index of his popularity among his peers. Regardless of whether student popularity is measured by sponsors' estimates early in the freshman year or by admissions office ratings of students' "personal potential" for Stanford, fraternities are found to recruit the most popular students on campus, and eating clubs, those intermediate in popularity. In turn, those who remain independents receive the lowest ratings of popularity.[14]

Social class differences in living-group affiliation, summarized in Table 12, offer striking evidence of the extent to which the upwardly mobile are out of the mainstream of undergraduate society. Three-fourths of students in all social classes except V and VI manage to join either a fraternity or an eating club, with one-half affiliating with a fraternity. In contrast, only 45 percent of the lower class join a fraternity or an eating club, and only 20 percent a fraternity. Even their acceptance into a fraternity or an eating club does not necessarily signify that the upwardly mobile have made a successful adjustment to the social demands of undergraduate life. Some have, but the majority fail to become integrated into the living group. Instead, they later appear in administrative records as "loners"—persons who do not mix with the other members of the house or club. Yet those who remain independent are not exempted from the necessity of having to cope with living in an upper-middle-class environment, for class II students still constitute the model group in the dormitories reserved for independents.[15]

TABLE 11. DIFFERENCES BY LIVING GROUP IN STUDENT POPULARITY

(N) [a]	Fraternity (49)	Eating Club (18)	Independents (26)
Popularity Rating by Sponsors			
Mean percentile	65	47	44
Standard deviation	14.8	14.3	18.3
Rating of "Personal Potential" by Admissions Office			
Percent rated high	73	56	38

[a] Analysis is restricted to the 93 males in the Regular Sample attending Stanford long enough to participate in rush activities.

A second indicator of social acceptance on campus is popularity with the opposite sex. Dating is such an elaborately institutionalized facet of campus life that, as Willard Waller long ago noted, it serves as a sensitive barometer of an undergraduate's in-

majority of cases, this entails a move away from the status of being an independent. For purposes of analysis, a student's living group affiliation is classified according to the highest status he attains on a scale running from fraternity to eating club to independent.

[14] Further evidence that living group affiliation serves as a rough index of a student's popularity among his peers is found in the association between fraternity membership and "sociability" reported by Levine and Sussman and by Goldsen, *et al.* See Gene Norman Levine and Leila A. Sussman, "Social Class and Sociability in Fraternity Pledging," *American Journal of Sociology,* 65 (January, 1960), pp. 391–399; and Rose K. Goldsen, Morris Rosenberg, Robin Williams, Jr., and Edward A. Suchman, *What College Students Think,* Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1960, esp. pp. 60–80.

[15] Examination of interview data on persons cited as close friends also reveals that the lower class do not seek each other out at any point in their undergraduate years, a fact that would appear to reflect their disinclination to associate with class equals at this juncture in their mobility experience as well as their being part of a numerically small minority on campus.

TABLE 12. SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES IN FRATERNITY-EATING CLUB AFFILIATION (%)

Affiliation	(N) [a]	Social Class I (11)	II (46)	III (26)	IV (15)	V and VI (20)	Regular Sample (93)
Fraternity		55	57	54	47	20[b]	53
Fraternity or eating club		73	74	73	74	45[c]	72

[a] Analysis is limited to students still attending Stanford long enough to participate in rush activities.
[b] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=5.81; $P<0.01$ when classes V and VI are compared with the Regular Sample.
[c] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=4.31; $P<0.05$ when classes V and VI are compared with the Regular Sample.

formal standing in the college peer group.[16] Moreover, the gradient of dating desirability is so clearly recognized and adjusted to on the college campus that it can be an especially traumatic event for the student to perceive himself—and have others perceive him—as one who is unable to get a date. Yet the same barriers that set the lower class apart from other college males also appear to restrict their relationships with college coeds. Information to this effect was obtained by asking students in each of the four interviews how often each month they have coffee and study dates and how often each month they have other kinds of dates. No effort was made to restrict answers to dates with Stanford coeds, though in the majority of cases the dates were with girls attending Stanford. The results are presented in Table 13. They reveal that 64 percent of the boys in classes V and VI, but only 29 percent of the Regular Sample, have gone through at least one period in college of not having dated. While for some this experience of not dating is relatively short-lived, for 45 percent of class V and VI students it lasts a year or longer. Equally important is its distinctive pattern of persistence among class V and VI students. In all four interviews, a substantial minority of the upwardly mobile report being in a situation of not dating.[17] That this situation is clearly in evidence during freshman year, before students have a chance to affiliate with fraternities or eating clubs, rules out considering the low frequency of dating to be a side effect of living group affiliation.

[16] Willard Waller, "The Rating and Dating Complex," *American Sociological Review*, 2 (October, 1937), pp. 727–734.

[17] Undoubtedly, financial factors contribute to the social plight of the lower class, but a simple economic interpretation is not feasible. Seventy-one percent of class V and VI students report owning or having access to a car while they are at college—a figure that is somewhat, but not materially, less than that obtained for the Regular Sample, 86 percent of whom own or have access to a car. Students from the lower class, on the other hand, are handicapped by having considerably less money per month than class I and II students to spend for recreational purposes. (The median amount of spending money available to class V and VI students is $18; for students in classes I and II, $51 and $40.) Nevertheless, they are no more handicapped than students from classes III and IV, who have a similarly restricted budget for recreational purposes but do not encounter the same barriers to fraternity membership and dating behavior. Thus the sharp and abrupt decline in social participation observed for the lower class would appear to be more a function of social than financial factors.

TABLE 13. PERCENT OF LOWER-CLASS AND OTHER STANFORD STUDENTS WHO REPORT THEY DO NOT DATE AT COLLEGE

Time of Report	Classes V and VI	Regular Sample
Beginning of Freshman Year		
Percent	41[a]	17
(N)	(22)	(99)
End of Freshman Year		
Percent	30[b]	17
(N)	(20)	(90)
End of Sophomore Year		
Percent	29[c]	14
(N)	(17)	(81)
End of Senior Year		
Percent	33[d]	10
(N)	(15)	(71)
At Least Once While at Stanford		
Percent	64[e]	29
(N)	(22)	(99)
For One Year or More		
Percent	45[f]	26
(N)	(20)	(93)

[a] One-tailed $\chi^2_c=4.69$; $P<0.05$.
[b] One-tailed exact probability test yields $P=0.15$.
[c] One-tailed exact probability test yields $P=0.11$.
[d] One-tailed exact probability test yields $P=0.03$.
[e] One-tailed $\chi^2_c=7.83$; $P<0.01$.
[f] One-tailed $\chi^2_c\approx 2.08$; $P<0.05$.

Success Achieved in College. A more balanced picture of the impact of upward mobility is gained by examining the students' record of accomplishment in college. In each interview from the end of freshman year to the time they left college (in some cases, seven years later) a continuing inventory was taken of students' activities, achievements, and awards in all areas of undergraduate endeavor. This information was subsequently checked against class yearbooks and a variety of administrative records. Besides insuring completeness and accuracy, this check made it possible to include in the final inventory those achievements realized after the terminal spring interviews (e.g., honors and awards conferred at graduation and awards received for spring sports). Using a procedure closely patterned after the High School Achievement Scale referred to above,[18] we classified students as to whether they had been highly or very highly successful in four main spheres of undergraduate life: scholastic, athletic, extracurricular, and social (i.e., achievements centering around the living group). Students classified as successful were ones who had clearly gained general recognition on campus for being top scholars or athletes, being very important persons in school affairs, or being elected leaders of their living group.

The findings reveal what may be best described as a qualified success story for the upwardly mobile. (See Tables 14 and 15.) They are as likely as students from more favored backgrounds to compile a record of outstanding accomplishment over the undergraduate years. Their achievements, however, take on the segmental pattern predicted originally by the freshman sponsors, being concentrated disproportionately in scholastic and athletic endeavors rather than in the realm of social and extracurricular pursuits. The latter is, instead, the domain of class I and II students who together hold 69 percent of the major positions of social and extracurricular leadership on campus.

[18] See footnote 8.

RESPONSE TO ESTRANGEMENT

Evidence of Alienation. As Table 15 makes clear, the successful attainments of the upwardly mobile have been realized at a social cost. Nine of the 11 who are successful have undergone the estranging experience of moving abruptly from a situation of peer acceptance to one where they are socially isolated or rejected for an extended period. That they are not impervious to this reversal of their social fortunes is shown by the feeling of self-alienation that emerges. As is true of the upwardly mobile in general, two-thirds of those in classes V and VI who have been outstandingly successful report experiencing difficulty at college in "feeling you are a

TABLE 14. SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES IN COLLEGE ACCOMPLISHMENTS (%)

	Social Class					
	I	II	III	IV	V and VI	Regular Sample
(N)	(12)	(49)	(27)	(16)	(22)	(99)
1. Area of Success						
Scholastic	0	18	15	12	32[a]	16
Athletic	8	4	7	19	9	5
Social	33	22	30	25	5[b]	25
Extracurricular	33	39	15	6	18	28
2. Pattern of Success						
Scholastic or athletic	8	22	22	31	41[c]	21
Social or extracurricular	50	43	33	31	18[d]	39
Success in any area	58	57	52	38	50	53

[a] One-tailed test of exact probability yields P=.09 when classes V and VI are compared with the Regular Sample.

[b] One-tailed test of exact probability yields P=.02 when classes V and VI are compared with the Regular Sample.

[c] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=2.76; P<0.05 when classes V and VI are compared with the Regular Sample.

[d] One-tailed χ^2_c (1 d.f.)=2.16; P<0.05) when classes V and VI are compared with the Regular Sample.

TABLE 15. ATTAINMENTS, SOCIAL EXPERIENCES, AND ROLE STRESSES OF UPWARDLY MOBILE WHO ACHIEVE SUCCESS IN COLLEGE

Student	Inventory of Attainment [a]	Social Experiences [b]		Evidence of Alienation [c]
		First Year	Later Years	
A	*Scholastic:* 1. Phi Beta Kappa, 2. graduation with great distinction, 3. departmental honors.	—	—	Continuous pattern
B	*Scholastic:* 1. graduation with distinction.	—	— to +	None
C	*Scholastic and Extracurricular:* 1. graduation with distinction, 2. election to student legislature.	—	+	Intermittent pattern
D	*Scholastic:* 1. departmental honors.	—	— to +	Intermittent pattern
E	*Athletic:* 1. three varsity letters in major sport.	+	—	None
F	*Athletic:* 1. three varsity letters in minor sport.	—	—	None
G	*Scholastic and Extracurricular:* 1. Phi Beta Kappa, 2. Tau Beta Kappa, 3. graduation with distinction, 4. scholastic award from national professional society, 5. vice president and treasurer of undergraduate professional society, 6. secretary of campus voluntary association.	0	0	None
H	*Scholastic:* 1. Phi Beta Kappa, 2. graduation with great distinction.	— to +	—	Initial response
I	*Extracurricular:* 1. editor of major campus publication.	—	No data	Continuous pattern
J	*Social and Extracurricular:* 1. rush chairman and social chairman of eating club, 2. one of five elected to major legislative post.	+	+	Continuous pattern for first two years
K	*Scholastic:* 1. graduation with distinction.	—	—	Initial response

[a] Graduation with distinction at Stanford is an honor comparable to graduating *magna cum laude* at other universities; graduation with great distinction is comparable, in turn, to graduating *summa cum laude.*

[b] Data on social reaction to students are coded for freshman year and later undergraduate years as follows: —=student perceived as socially isolated and/or unpopular, 0=student perceived as having average acceptance among peers, +=student perceived as popular among peers.

[c] Alienation is defined by the student's reporting in one or more interviews that he has experienced difficulty at Stanford in "feeling you are a nobody." The patterns of answers are coded as follows: (1) none, (2) initial response [in first interview only], (3) intermittent response [in four interviews], (4) continuous pattern for first two years [but not in senior-year interview], and (5) continuous pattern [reported in all four interviews].

nobody"—a response given only by a minority of the Regular Sample.[19]

Interrupted Pattern of Academic Achievement. Not surprisingly, the social shock of their mobility experience appears to have had a temporarily adverse effect on their performance in the classroom. As may be seen from Table 16 (see page 253) their grades in freshman year suffer, but in a

[19] Sixty-four percent of class V and VI students, compared to 38 percent of students in the Regular Sample, report experiencing difficulty at college in feeling they are a nobody [χ^2_c (1 df)=3.71; $P<0.05$]. The incidence of self-alienation by the four interview phases is as follows:

	Early in 1st Year	End of 1st Year	End of 2nd Year	End of 4th Year
Lower Class	55%	35%	47%	33%
Regular Sample	24%	20%	22%	13%

[20] The skewed distribution of grades has dictated using the median rather than the mean as the measure of central tendency.

For upper-middle- as well as lower-class students at Stanford freshman grading practices pose a situation of anomic stress in the sense that there is a sharp disparity between socially reinforced academic aspirations and socially structured avenues for realizing these aspirations. The administration's practice of grading on the curve necessitates that only a minority of the 80 percent of students planning to attain a B average or better at Stanford, and attaching major importance to this attainment, can actually realize that goal in freshman year—despite their record of outstanding success in high

subtle fashion.[20] Compared to other undergraduates, they do not perform poorly on the average. Nevertheless, it is only in the freshman year that they fail to maintain the relatively superior academic record realized both in high school and in the later undergraduate years. Thus their interrupted pattern of academic achievement appears to serve as apt testimony both to the disruptive consequences of upward mobility and to the resilience of those who succeed in achieving upward mobility.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings detailed above offer convincing confirmation for Sorokin's dissociative hypothesis of upward mobility against its two competing alternatives. The high potential for social success manifested by the lower class before coming to college, plus the evidence we have of their having already made a behaviorally significant shift to a middle-class reference group, rule out the possibility of attributing their social difficulties in their new upper-middle-class surroundings either to a chronic inability on their part to form socially effective relationships with their peers or to the absence of anticipatory socialization. The extended period of estrangement the lower class has undergone, their interrupted pattern of scholastic performance, as well as their own response of self-alienation, clearly attest to the disruptive effects of social mobility. Whether such disruptive effects also accompany mobility achieved through different institutional channels or through educational settings having different institutional arrangements poses significant questions for future empirical research, but ones that lie outside the realm of the present inquiry.[21]

school. Moreover, these aspirations are reinforced, and perhaps made inflexible for many, by the fact that 75 percent of entering male freshmen clearly expect to go on to graduate school, for which a B-level record of performance is usually required.

[21] This does not imply that the present findings have no application beyond the Stanford setting. Though considerable caution needs to be exercised in generalizing beyond these parameters, it is our expectation that similar social difficulties will be encountered by lower-class youth at other prestige colleges and universities in which students must assume residence in a predominantly upper-middle-class environment if they are to avail themselves of the intellectual, economic, and social advantages such schools have to offer.

Some support for this inference is found in Harvard's experiences with its "risk-gamble fund" scholarship program. For the past decade Harvard has actively sought out a small number of disadvantaged youth that could each year be admitted to Harvard College with substantial scholarship support. During the very early stages of the program Harvard discovered the need to break with its traditional *laissez-faire* policy of permitting each undergraduate to determine his own educational and personal affairs. Although this policy was effective with students coming to Harvard through normal channels, it was found that for those entering under the "risk-gamble fund," "the price paid for failure . . . was too high, and the early failures too frequent." Corrective measures, therefore, had to be taken so that these bright but disadvantaged youth would not find "Harvard incomprehensible academically and another planet personally."

One series of measures involved the admissions procedures. In addition to the tangible evidence of scholastic potential required of all admitted to the program, two nonscholastic criteria have been introduced. One requires evidence of some extracurricular skill that would give the candidate a chance at Harvard "to find diversion and to maintain self-esteem." The other is an assessment (among other qualities) of the candidate's "toughness and resilience" for this undergraduate experience.

Even with these precautions, corrective measures have had to be enacted *after* matriculation. One is a deliberate but discreet effort to maximize the social contacts these "risk-gamble" undergraduates have with adults variously connected with the university (study counselors, psychiatric workers, personnel service people, Financial Aid Office staff, directors of activities, coaches, etc.). The purpose is quite explicitly to "find for every student [in the program] some adult in this community who can get close to the student and inspire his confidence, trust, and friendship." A second corrective step, taken during the critical first year in college, entails the careful selection of roommates for this group, and the provision of living quarters in the freshman dormitory such that they are "physically as well as spiritually" close to the quarters of their graduate-student proctors. The proctors, much like the Stanford sponsors, are thus in a position to note which students are "participating and chatting and dating least." The Harvard authorities have found such elaborate arrangements to be a practical necessity if they are to break down the communication barriers that *almost inevitably* separate the boys in the "risk-gamble" program from the undergraduate world they enter. This experience, in turn, bears testimony that the disruptive consequences of mobility which we have demonstrated are not unique to Stanford.

The information is drawn from memoranda kindly made available by Henry P. Briggs, Jr., Director of Freshman Scholarships at Harvard College.

TABLE 16. PATTERN OF SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT BY LOWER-CLASS AND OTHER STANFORD UNDERGRADUATES

	Median GPA				
	High School	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	Fourth Year
Varied N [a]					
Classes V and VI	3.89	2.34	2.81	3.12	3.13
Regular Sample	3.64	2.37	2.66	2.62	2.93
diff.	+.25	−.03	+.15	+.50	+.20
Constant N [b]					
Classes V and VI	3.88	2.56	2.81	3.12	3.13
Regular Sample	3.64	2.47	2.67	2.62	2.93
diff.	+.24	+.09	+.14	+.50	+.20

[a] N varies by interview phase. For classes V and VI, N=22, 22, 18, 16, and 15; for Regular Sample, N=98, 98, 90, 77, and 77.

[b] Analysis is limited to students who complete the undergraduate sequence at Stanford. N for classes V and VI=15; for Regular Sample, N=77.

OCCUPATIONAL DETERMINANTS OF GEOGRAPHIC MOBILITY AMONG PROFESSIONAL WORKERS *

JACK LADINSKY

University of Wisconsin

Geographic mobility statistics for professional, technical and kindred workers from the 1960 Census one-in-a-thousand sample are broken down by detailed occupations and examined for common structural conditions of work and career that explain variations in mobility rates. Analysis leads to the following conclusions: (1) professions that require heavy investments in capital equipment and close cultivation of clienteles have low migration rates; (2) salaried professions with short organizational hierarchies, low ratios of managers to managed, and decentralized work units have high migration rates; (3) salaried professions with unstandardized work conditions, no state licensing, and strong occupational communication networks have high long-distance migration rates; (4) salaried workers in highly professional occupations move in national and regional rather than local labor markets. Partial correlation analysis reveals that median age, median family income, and rate of expansion of professional occupations are not significant sources of variations in migration rates. Selected professional migration rates are compared to those for selected managerial and sales occupations; the former are found to be consistently higher, suggesting that the image of the organization man as "transient" is exaggerated. The relationship between managerial succession and career mobility is discussed. Evidence is briefly presented which suggests that the conclusions reached here might be generalized to the entire labor force.

GEOGRAPHIC mobility is pervasive in American life, and has been widely studied by labor economists and demographer-sociologists. Two major research foci appear in the literature. There is, on the one hand, the emphasis upon wage structure and the supply of jobs as crucial determinants of labor mobility.[1] There is, on the other hand, the stress upon socio-economic factors underlying population shifts, especially the streams of interstate

* Revision of a paper read at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, September 1, 1965. This research was made possible by grants from the Graduate School Research Committee and the Computing Center of The University of Wisconsin. The Social Systems Research Institute provided technical assistance in computer programming and data processing. The author is indebted to Karl Taeuber and Warren Hagstrom for comments on an earlier draft.

[1] See, *e.g.*, Robert L. Bunting, "A Test of the Theory of Geographic Mobility," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 15 (October, 1961), pp. 75–82; Robert L. Raimon, "Interstate Migration and Wage Theory," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 44 (November, 1962), pp. 428–438. More generally, see Herbert S. Parnes, *Research on Labor Mobility*, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1954.