



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group

Social Mobility and Participation: The Dissociative and Socialization Hypotheses

Author(s): Alfred M. Mirande

Source: *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (Winter, 1973), pp. 19-31

Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4105732>

Accessed: 19-12-2019 14:35 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Taylor & Francis, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Sociological Quarterly*

Social Mobility and Participation: The Dissociative and Socialization Hypotheses*

ALFRED M. MIRANDE, *University of North Dakota*

Information on participation with kin, with friends, and in voluntary associations was used to test two competing hypotheses of the effects of social mobility on social relations. The dissociative hypothesis maintains that mobility leads to social isolation, while the socialization hypothesis predicts an adaptive outcome to mobility. The relationship is more complex than either position would suggest. Social mobility is associated with isolation from kin and friends, but only for the upwardly mobile. The findings obtained with voluntary associations support the socialization hypothesis in that the level of membership of the socially mobile is intermediate between the two stable groups. Social mobility has maladaptive consequences for more intimate and personal social relations, but it is integrative as far as participation in voluntary associations is concerned.

IN RECENT YEARS there has been considerable controversy over the consequences of social mobility for interpersonal relations. Two hypotheses at test in this study suggest very different effects. One hypothesis, found repeatedly in the sociological literature,¹ assumes that social mobility leads to a generalized estrangement from self and society. This view is known as the social isolation, or dissociative, hypothesis. In his classic study on suicide, Durkheim (1951:252-253) suggested that social mobility has disruptive consequences for the individual and his ties to society. Sorokin (1927:522-523) was more explicit in his assertion that "in a mobile society, where its members are shifting from group to group, from place to place, the chances for intimacy are much less . . . as a result . . . the socio-psychological loneliness of individuals is likely to become greater."

The second hypothesis, variously labeled as the ameliorative hypothesis (Ellis and Lane, 1967) or the socialization hypothesis (Vorwaller, 1970), postulates an adaptive response to social mobility. This view has been discussed by several authors including Blau (1956), Ellis and Lane (1967), and, more recently, Vorwaller (1970). According to the socialization hypothesis, the socially mobile person is a product of the combined effects of his class of origin and his class of destination. It assumes that socially mobile persons are socialized within two social strata and that their level of social participation is influenced by both antecedent and current psychosocial forces (Vorwaller, 1970:482).

*The data employed in this paper were obtained through research supported by the National Science Foundation under grants G24969 and GS 779. I am indebted to Harry J. Crockett, Jr., and Lewis Levine for giving me access to these data. I would like to thank Nicholas Babchuk, John N. Edwards, David L. Klemmack, James Larson, and Richard Ludtke for their helpful suggestions.

¹ This view is also expounded in popular literature. For an excellent example of this theme in popular literature see the novel *Kitty Foyle* by Christopher Morley (1939).

The socialization hypothesis rejects the view that socially mobile persons are isolated from social relations and suggests instead that their level of social participation is intermediate to their class of origin and destination. Vorwaller (1970), however, has cautioned against the common practice of attributing effects to social mobility without testing for interaction in the data or assessing the main effects of class of origin and destination. He suggests that a practical alternative to longitudinal data is to test the socialization hypothesis by comparing the observed frequencies with a hypothetical model of additive effects. If the data conform to a hypothetical model of additive effects the socialization hypothesis is supported in that the effects of mobility are not independent of the main effects.

Numerous studies bear on the controversy over the effects of social mobility on interpersonal relations. There is evidence to suggest, for example, that socially mobile persons have higher rates of mental illness (Turner and Wagenfeld, 1967; Hollingshead et al., 1954), are prone to psychosomatic ailments (Ellis, 1952) and neurosis (Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958:368-369), are more likely to be prejudiced (Greenblum and Pearlin, 1953; Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1964),² and have a higher incidence of suicide (Breed, 1963). Although these research findings indirectly document the disruptive effects of social mobility, they provide only inferential support for the position that social mobility leads to isolation from interpersonal relations.

Studies which have been more directly concerned with the effects of mobility on social relations do not consistently support either the dissociative or the socialization hypothesis. Ellis (1952) found that a large proportion of mobile unmarried women had experienced rejection in the family of orientation and were isolated from primary ties. More recently, Ellis and Lane (1967) presented findings which support the social isolation hypothesis. In their study, upwardly-mobile students enrolled in a high status university were generally isolated socially.

Undoubtedly the greater controversy stimulated by the social isolation hypothesis has been with respect to the effects of mobility on extended kinship ties. The isolated nuclear family position expounded by Parsons (1943) and others (Williams, 1960) has been challenged by several researchers who have found that social mobility does not lead to isolation from extended kin. Litwak (1960), for example, did not find that social mobility decreases extended family contact. He maintains that relatives promote mobility by providing help patterns and social support, and mobility helps to intensify extended family bonds as relatives identify with the achievements of the upwardly mobile. Adams (1968:170-171) also reports that the upwardly mobile are not categorically isolated from kin ties. The upwardly mobile are isolated relative to their class of origin (stable blue collar) but not relative to their class of destination (stable white collar). Other studies, however, support Parson's position. Schneider and Homans (1955) suggest that socially mobile persons maintain shallow ties with relatives, although they do not present empirical support for this contention.

² Some studies do not support this contention. Hodge and Treiman (1966), for example, found support for the additive model which suggests that the attitudes of socially mobile persons toward Negroes are intermediate between the attitudes of their class of origin and those of their class of destination.

Stuckert (1963) reports that the upwardly mobile are less likely than the stable to visit with kin, identify with the extended family, use the extended family as a reference group, and show concern for maintaining family unity. Another study has examined the effect of intragenerational mobility on kin ties. Bruce (1970) found that mobility was associated with a lower frequency of visiting with siblings.

Although the bulk of research aimed at testing the dissociative hypothesis has focused on kinship ties, there are several studies of the effects of mobility on other social relations. Overall, studies of mobility and membership in voluntary associations do not support the view that social mobility decreases membership in associations. Curtis (1959) found that the participation of socially mobile persons in selected types of voluntary associations did not differ significantly from the participation of stable persons. Sykes (1954:86-94), on the other hand, reports that while downward mobility decreases membership in voluntary associations, upward mobility increases membership. Findings from a more recent and sophisticated study suggest that social mobility does not have an independent effect on affiliation with voluntary associations (Vorwaller, 1970). The differences in membership in associations between the upwardly mobile and stable categories were explained by an additive model of effects. These findings are consistent with Janowitz's (1956) contention that social mobility brings about isolation from primary relations but not from secondary groups.

The effects of mobility on other relations, such as contact with friends and neighbors, are not clear. Bruce (1970) found that while persons who were intragenerationally mobile had friendships which were shorter in duration, they did not visit friends and neighbors less frequently than stable persons. One could infer from this finding that intragenerational mobility temporarily disrupts social relations but that socially mobile persons form new interpersonal ties. The study by Ellis and Lane (1967) suggests that socially mobile college students are both isolated and alienated from interpersonal relations.

From this review of literature it is clear that the controversy over the effects of social mobility is far from settled. The findings do not consistently support either the dissociative or the socialization hypothesis. Some of the confusion has been created by the use of different measures of mobility and different samples. Moreover, previous studies have typically not considered whether the effects of social mobility vary according to the direction of mobility and the type of social relation. The two alternate hypotheses on the effects of social mobility will be tested in this study by comparing the participation of socially mobile and stable persons in three types of social relations—extended kin, friends, and voluntary associations. With each type of social relation the observed frequencies will be compared with a hypothetical model of additive effects.

Method

The data were collected in a community with a population of about 5,000. The community is both stable and old, as evidenced by the fact that its legal boundaries have remained constant since 1754. The ancestors of all respondents

in the study were residents of the United States for at least 100 years. There is mobility to and from the town, but the pattern of mobility is regional rather than national. Only 12 of the 275 persons interviewed were born outside of the region which includes the Carolinas, Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, and Maryland. Although the community is small and stable, it is far from isolated: it is located within 15 miles of the state university, near several major cities, and it is easily accessible by highway. The town is also a county seat, has some textile mills, and is near major tobacco markets. Since roads in the area are good, the community provides labor for other nearby communities.³

A random sample of 275 was selected from the 1,121 dwelling units normally occupied by white residents. The member of each household to be interviewed was selected according to a procedure developed by Kish (1949). Extensive occupational information obtained in the interview was used to classify occupations as manual or nonmanual. For married women, the occupation of their husbands was assumed to be the most adequate measure of their social status.⁴ Intergenerational social mobility was established by comparing the occupation of the respondent with the occupation of his father according to the manual-nonmanual classification. Nonmanual respondents whose fathers had a manual occupation were termed upwardly mobile; those in manual occupations whose fathers were nonmanual were classed as downwardly mobile. Respondents who were in the same occupational category as their fathers were categorized as stable. A woman's mobility was measured by comparing the occupation of her husband with the occupation of her father. Persons from farm backgrounds were treated separately since it is not possible to classify the occupation of their fathers as either manual or nonmanual. None of the respondents included in the study listed farming as their major present occupation. Even though farming is carried on in surrounding areas, the town itself is not agricultural.

The interview schedule contained questions about social participation with relatives, with friends, and in voluntary associations. The items on kinship participation ascertained the number of relatives seen regularly and the amount of time usually spent with relatives during a week. Information was also obtained on the number of close friends and membership in voluntary associations.

Findings

Mobility and Kin. The findings provide some support for the dissociative hypothesis, but the relationship between social mobility and kin participation is more complicated than anticipated by either of the two competing hypotheses. It is apparent from panels 1 and 2 of Table 1 that only the upwardly mobile are relatively isolated from extended relatives; the downwardly mobile remain active in kin relations. Relative to their class of destination and their class of origin, the upwardly mobile are isolated on both measures of kin participa-

³ Most respondents are stable residents of the community. The median length of residence is 25 years. Thirty-four of the 275 respondents have lived in the community for 5 years or less and only 10 of these have lived in it less than a year. For a detailed description of the community and the sample see Levine and Crockett (1966).

⁴ Single females were excluded because of the difficulty in ascertaining their occupational status.

tion. Only 14.3 percent of the nonmanual-upwardly mobile typically spend three hours or more with relatives per week, compared to 43.2 percent of the nonmanual stable and 54.5 percent of the manual stable (panel 1). The same pattern is found in panel 2. Thirty-three percent of the upwardly mobile, 50 percent of the nonmanual stable, and 54.8 percent of the manual stable see four or more relatives regularly.

The figures in panels 1 and 2 of Table 1 show that contrary to the dissociative hypothesis, the downwardly mobile have a higher level of extended

TABLE 1. Social Mobility and Participation with Kin, Friends, and in Voluntary Associations

1. Percentage Spending Three or More Hours With Relatives			
Father's Occupation	Respondent's Occupation		
	Manual	Nonmanual	Total
Manual	54.5 (99)	14.3 (21)	34.4
Nonmanual	69.2 (13)	43.2 (37)	56.2
Farm	56.0 (45)	31.0 (26)	43.5
Total	59.9 (157)	29.5 (84)	44.7 (241)
Chi square = 17.99 $P < .01$			
2. Percentage Seeing Four or More Relatives			
Father's Occupation	Respondent's Occupation		
	Manual	Nonmanual	Total
Manual	51.8 (104)	33.3 (21)	44.0
Nonmanual	78.6 (14)	50.0 (38)	64.3
Farm	37.8 (45)	50.0 (26)	43.9
Total	57.1 (163)	44.4 (85)	50.7 (248)
Chi square = 10.46 $P < .10$			
3. Percentage With Four or More Friends			
Father's Occupation	Respondent's Occupation		
	Manual	Nonmanual	Total
Manual	39.0 (105)	26.3 (19)	32.7
Nonmanual	35.7 (14)	68.4 (38)	52.1
Farm	44.0 (45)	54.0 (26)	49.0
Total	39.6 (164)	49.6 (83)	44.6 (247)
Chi square = 13.76 $P < .05$			
4. Percentage Belonging to Voluntary Associations			
Father's Occupation	Respondent's Occupation		
	Manual	Nonmanual	Total
Manual	28.6 (105)	47.6 (21)	38.1
Nonmanual	35.7 (14)	81.6 (38)	58.7
Farm	31.1 (45)	69.0 (26)	50.1
Total	31.8 (164)	66.1 (85)	49.0 (249)
Chi square = 33.68 $P < .001$			

family participation than their class of destination (manual stable) and their class of origin (nonmanual stable). While slightly over 69 percent of the downwardly-mobile respondents spend at least three hours per week with relatives, only 54.5 percent of the manual stable and 43.2 percent of the nonmanual stable spend this much time with relatives (panel 1). Downwardly-mobile persons also see more relatives regularly than persons in their class of destination and in their class of origin. Roughly 79 percent of those classified as downwardly mobile see four or more relatives regularly, compared to 54.8 percent of the manual stable and 50 percent of the nonmanual stable (panel 2).

The pattern of extended family participation is difficult to interpret for persons from farm backgrounds because the findings in panels 1 and 2 are inconsistent. While nonmanual respondents with farm origins spend less time with relatives than manual respondents with farm origins (panel 1), they see more relatives regularly (panel 2).

These findings suggest that upward and downward mobility have a different effect upon extended family participation.⁵ Apparently, upward mobility creates a gap between the upwardly-mobile individual and extended relatives as he enters a more desirable status and seeks to establish relationships with status peers and, to some extent, disassociate himself from previous social ties. Downward mobility apparently does not disrupt extended family ties. Perhaps the current class position of the downwardly-mobile persons does not serve as a positive reference point and he continues to identify with the class position of his family of orientation. In an achievement-oriented society like ours, downward mobility may even intensify extended relations because a negative value is placed on downward movement and relatives may seek to help the downwardly-mobile person regain his previous status. This interpretation of the findings is consistent with data from a number of studies which report that downwardly-mobile persons continue to identify with the middle class and retain middle-class values and life styles (Wilensky and Edwards, 1959; French, 1960).

Although the findings indicate that the kin participation of socially mobile persons differs from the participation of stable persons, caution must be exercised before attributing an independent effect to social mobility. The difference in kin participation may be misleading, resulting primarily from unequal marginal totals. Duncan (1966:90-97) maintains that no recourse to mobility as an explanation is necessary if the main dimensions of father's and respondent's occupation explain the variation in the dependent variable. Computation of the interaction between the respondent's class origin and his current class standing suggests that social mobility does have an independent effect on extended family participation.⁶ The interaction effect in panel 1 of Table 2 is 14 percent. Interaction in panel 2 (Table 2) is substantially lower (-7 percent).

⁵ The relationship between social mobility and kin participate remained when the effects of age, length of residence in the community, and sex were controlled. The differences were for the most part in the predicted direction. When the data were dichotomized on each of these controls, upwardly mobile persons were relatively isolated from kin ties.

⁶ Interaction is defined as the difference between differences. The interaction effect = (a-b) - (c-d).

The data in Table 2 enable us to examine in more detail the extent to which the observed frequencies depart from the additive model.⁷ The difference score in the third column provides a measure of the goodness of fit of the observed frequencies to a hypothetical model of additive effects. Panels 1 and 2 of Table 2 show that the observed frequencies depart from the expected frequencies and that the difference is generally in the predicted direction. The level of extended family participation for the upwardly mobile is lower than one would expect from the additive model, while the participation of the stable and downwardly mobile categories is roughly equal to or greater than expected. The data in panels 1 and 2 of Table 2 support the findings obtained in Table 1 with respect to the differential effects of upward and downward mobility. Upward mobility appears to decrease extended family participation; downward mobility increases participation. These findings suggest that although much of the variation in extended family participation can be explained by the main effects of class of origin and of destination, social mobility also accounts for some of the variation.⁸ In short, the findings do not conform to a simple additive model.

Mobility and Friends. The data in Table 1, panel 3 are consistent with the dissociative hypothesis in that upwardly-mobile persons appear to be relatively isolated from friends. The upwardly mobile are isolated in comparison to class of origin and their class of destination. About 26 percent of the upwardly mobile, 39 percent of the manual stable, and 68.4 percent of the nonmanual stable report four or more close friends. The downwardly mobile, on the other hand, are not isolated relative to their class of destination but they are isolated relative to their class of origin. Thirty-six percent of the downwardly mobile, 39 percent of the manual stable, and 68.4 percent of the nonmanual stable have four or more close friends.⁹

The differences in participation among persons with farm origins are once again difficult to interpret. The dissociative hypothesis is not supported among respondents from farm backgrounds if one assumes that those who occupy nonmanual positions are upwardly mobile and those who occupy manual posi-

⁷ Additive effects were derived from the formula $Y_{ij} = Y + a_i + b_j$, where Y_{ij} is the expected frequency for the cell category; Y is the grand mean for the total sample; a_i is the effect of belonging to the i th origin class and is expressed as the marginal frequency for origin status minus the grand mean; b_j is the effect of belonging to the j th destination status and is expressed as the marginal frequency for destination status minus the grand mean. For example, the expected frequency for the nonmanual stable in Table 2, panel 1 = $48.2 + (32.8-48.2) + (50.0-48.2) = 34.6$. This technique was employed by Vorwaller (1970:487-492) to derive calculated, or expected, mean cell categories. The technique was modified to permit the use of proportions.

Persons with farm origins were excluded from the analysis of additive effects because there is little rationale for classifying farm occupations as either manual or nonmanual. Furthermore, the findings obtained in Table 1 indicate that the social participation of farm residents does not follow a consistent pattern. It was felt that inclusion of persons with farm backgrounds would have distorted the expected frequencies in the additive model.

⁸ It is interesting to note that the main effects in Table 1, panel 1 have opposite effects on participation with relatives. With respect to class origin, the nonmanual participate more than the manual, but the pattern is reversed with class of destination.

⁹ The relationship between mobility and participation with friends remained when age, length of residence, and sex were introduced as controls. The differences were, for the most part, in the predicted direction.

tions are stable. Farm-nonmanual respondents have more close friends than farm-manual respondents (Table 1, panel 3).

The relationship between mobility and friendship participation appears to be more than a residual effect of class of origin and destination. In fact, the interaction effect (45 percent) in panel 3 of Table 2 is greater than either of the main effects. Further examination of Table 2 (panel 3) confirms the expectation that the relationship between social mobility and friendship participation does not conform to the additive model. The observed frequencies for the upward and downward mobile are lower than expected in the hypothetical additive model, and the observed frequencies of the stable categories are greater than expected.

TABLE 2. Comparison of Observed and Expected Frequencies: Social Mobility and Participation with Kin, Friends, and in Voluntary Associations

1. Percentage Spending Three or More Hours With Relatives					
	Observed	Expected	Difference	Ratio	z Scores
	(a)	(b)	(a-b)	(a/b)	
NonManual Stable	43.2	34.6	8.6	1.25	1.100
NonManual Mobile	14.3	32.1	-17.8	.45	**1.747
Manual Mobile	69.2	58.1	11.1	1.19	.811
Manual Stable	54.5	55.6	-1.1	.98	.220
Interaction = 14.2%					**P<.05 *P<.10
2. Percentage Seeing Four or More Relatives					
	Observed	Expected	Difference	Ratio	z Scores
	(a)	(b)	(a-b)	(a/b)	
NonManual Stable	50.0	49.1	.9	1.02	.111
NonManual Mobile	33.3	42.6	-9.3	.78	.862
Manual Mobile	78.6	62.6	16.0	1.26	1.237
Manual Stable	54.8	56.1	-1.3	.98	.267
Interaction = -7.1%					**P<.05 *P<.10
3. Percentage with Four or More Friends					
	Observed	Expected	Difference	Ratio	z Scores
	(a)	(b)	(a-b)	(a/b)	
NonManual Stable	68.4	66.6	1.8	1.03	.235
NonManual Mobile	26.3	44.1	-17.8	.60	*1.563
Manual Mobile	35.7	50.9	-15.2	.70	1.138
Manual Stable	39.0	28.4	10.6	1.37	**2.409
Interaction = 45.4%					**P<.05 *P<.10
4. Percentage Belonging to Voluntary Associations					
	Observed	Expected	Difference	Ratio	z Scores
	(a)	(b)	(a-b)	(a/b)	
NonManual Stable	81.6	88.7	-7.1	.92	*1.383
NonManual Mobile	47.6	51.2	-3.6	.93	.330
Manual Mobile	35.7	48.6	-12.9	.73	.966
Manual Stable	28.6	11.1	17.5	2.58	**5.708
Interaction = 26.9%					**P<.05 *P<.10

Mobility and Voluntary Associations. The findings in Table 1, panel 4 support the socialization hypothesis rather than the dissociative hypothesis. In terms of affiliation with voluntary associations, the two mobility categories are intermediate between the stable categories. The highest level of affiliation is found among the nonmanual stable (81.6 percent) and the lowest level among the manual stable (28.6 percent).¹⁰ The upwardly mobile (47.6 percent) are more likely to be members of voluntary associations than the downwardly mobile (35.7 percent).

These data suggest that social mobility is not particularly inhibitory to affiliating with voluntary associations. Although the upwardly mobile are not as likely to be members of associations as nonmanual persons who are stable, they do affiliate more than either category of manually employed persons. This finding seems especially significant when one considers that, of the four mobility groups, the upwardly mobile had the lowest level of kinship and friendship participation. Apparently, upwardly-mobile persons are relatively isolated from personal relations (i.e., relatives and friends), but they maintain a fairly extensive level of membership in voluntary associations.¹¹

The social isolation hypothesis also does not appear to hold among persons from farm backgrounds. Nonmanual respondents with farm origins are more likely to belong to voluntary associations than manual respondents with farm origins.

The data obtained in this study with respect to membership in voluntary associations are consistent with Blau's acculturation pattern which maintains that socially mobile persons are not well integrated into either their class of destination or their class of origin. "... They do not have sufficient opportunity for complete acculturation to the values and style of life of the one group, nor do they continue to experience the full impact of the social constraints of the other. But both groups exert some influence over mobile individuals, since they have ... social contacts with members of both, being placed by economic circumstances amidst the one, while having been socialized among the other" (Blau, 1956:291).

The level of interaction in Table 2, panel 4 (27 percent) suggests that social mobility exercises an effect on affiliation with voluntary associations which is independent of the effect of class of origin and destination. Table 2, panel 4 also provides a comparison of the observed frequencies with the frequencies expected in the additive model. This comparison is difficult to evaluate. Although all four mobility categories deviate from the additive model, only the manual stable have an observed frequency which is greater than its expected frequency. This indicates that while the manual stable have the lowest level

¹⁰ These findings are consistent with previous research. The relationship between social class and membership in voluntary associations is well documented (Scott, 1957; Axelrod, 1956; Dotson, 1951). There is also reason to believe that socialization and early exposure to associations affect adult patterns of affiliation (Anderson, 1943; Baumlner, 1965). If associational membership is influenced both by adult social status and childhood experience with voluntary associations, stable-nonmanual respondents should have the highest level of affiliation and stable-manual respondents the lowest level.

¹¹ The relationship between social mobility and affiliation with voluntary associations follows the same basic pattern when age, length of residence, and sex are controlled.

of affiliation with voluntary associations, their membership in associations is higher than expected from the additive effects of respondent's class of origin and class of destination.

Summary and Conclusion

Two alternate views regarding the effects of social mobility on social relations were tested. According to one view, the dissociative hypothesis, social mobility has disruptive consequences for mobile individuals who become isolated from interpersonal relations. This position was expounded by Durkheim, Sorokin, and Parsons and has been widely accepted by sociologists until very recently. The second position, the socialization hypothesis, predicts an adaptive moderating outcome to social mobility. It maintains that mobility, *per se*, does not have an effect on participation in social relations. The socially mobile are not especially isolated from interpersonal relations, their level of participation theoretically being a product of the combined effects of the social status they currently occupy and their status of origin.

The relationship between social mobility and involvement in social relations is complex; the findings do not categorically support either the dissociative or the socialization hypothesis. The nature of the relationship varies according to the direction of mobility and the type of social relationship involved.

One of the most significant findings is that upward and downward mobility have different effects on social relations. The dissociative hypothesis is generally supported with respect to kin and friends but only among the upwardly mobile. Upwardly mobile persons are relatively isolated from kin and friends, while downwardly mobile persons have the highest level of kinship participation and are not isolated from friends. This finding takes on added significance when one considers that several studies have combined upward and downward mobility into a single category, thereby obscuring possible differences in the effects of the direction of mobility (Stuckert, 1963; Bruce, 1970).

The consequences of social mobility are also dependent on the type of social relationship. The findings obtained with respect to involvement with kin and friends support the dissociative hypothesis, but those bearing on membership in voluntary associations do not. While upwardly mobile persons are somewhat isolated from personal and more intimate types of relationships (i.e., kin and friends), they do not appear to be isolated from voluntary associations. The level of affiliation with associations of both mobility categories is intermediate between the two stable categories. The effects of mobility on membership in voluntary associations are therefore consistent with the socialization hypothesis.

A final issue raised in this study is the proper way to interpret the effects of social mobility. Many studies in the past have attributed independent effects to social mobility without testing for interaction in the data. The relationship between social mobility and participation in social relations may be misleading, resulting from the main effects of class of origin and class of destination. The findings presented here do not conform to a simple model of additive effects. Social mobility exercises an effect on involvement with kin, with friends, and in voluntary associations that is independent of the effects of the class of origin

and that of destination. The most interaction was found with respect to friendship relations and the least with respect to kin relations.

In conclusion, the data from this study suggest that neither the dissociative nor the socialization hypothesis can adequately account for the complex relationship between social mobility and social relations. Whether one position or the other is supported depends on the direction of mobility and on the type of social relationship considered. Some of the confusion generated by previous studies may have stemmed from the assumption that the consequences of mobility were uniform across different types of social relationships. The two positions may be reconciled if one accepts the view that social mobility results in isolation from personal and intimate relations, as the dissociative hypothesis would suggest, but not from secondary groups, as postulated in the socialization hypothesis. In a complex industrial society the disruptive consequences of social mobility for primary types of social relations may be tempered somewhat by the availability of voluntary associations which help to integrate the socially mobile into their newly acquired status.¹²

¹² For an excellent discussion of voluntary associations as integrative forces in urban society see Babchuk and Edwards (1965).

REFERENCES

- Adams, Bert N.
1968 *Kinship in an Urban Setting*. Chicago: Markham.
- Anderson, W. A.
1943 "The family and individual social participation." *American Sociological Review* 8 (August):420-424.
- Axelrod, M.
1956 "Urban structure and social participation." *American Sociological Review* 21 (February):13-18.
- Babchuk, N. and J. N. Edwards
1965 "Voluntary associations and the integration hypothesis." *Sociological Inquiry* 35 (Spring):149-162.
- Baeumler, W. E.
1965 "Correlates of formal participation among high school students." *Sociological Inquiry* 35 (Spring):235-240.
- Bettelheim, Bruno and Morris Janowitz
1964 *Social Change and Prejudice*. New York: The Free Press.
- Blau, P. M.
1956 "Social mobility and interpersonal relations." *American Sociological Review* 21 (June):290-295.
- Breed, W.
1963 "Occupational mobility and suicide among white males." *American Sociological Review* 28 (April):179-188.
- Bruce, J. M.
1970 "Intergenerational occupational mobility and visiting with kin and friend." *Social Forces* 49 (September):117-127.
- Curtis, R. F.
1959 "Occupational mobility and membership in formal voluntary associations." *American Sociological Review* 24 (December):846-848.
- Dotson, F.
1951 "Patterns of voluntary association among urban working-class families." *American Sociological Review* 16 (October):687-693.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley
1966 "Methodological issues in the analysis of social mobility." Pp. 51-97 in Neil J. Smelser and Seymour M. Lipset (eds.), *Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Durkheim, Emile
1951 *Suicide*. J. A. Spaulding and G. Simpson (trans.). Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Ellis, E.
1952 "Social psychological correlates of upward social mobility among unmarried career women." *American Sociological Review* 17 (October):558-563.
- Ellis, R. A. and W. C. Lane
1967 "Social mobility and social isolation: a test of Sorokin's dissociative hypothesis." *American Sociological Review* 32 (April):237-253.
- French, C. L.
1960 "Correlates of success in retail selling." *American Journal of Sociology* 66 (July):128-134.
- Greenblum, Joseph and Leonard I. Pearlin
1953 "Vertical mobility and prejudice: a socio-psychological analysis." Pp. 480-491 in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour M. Lipset (eds.), *Class, Status and Power*, first ed. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.
- Hodge, R. W. and D. J. Treiman
1966 "Occupational mobility and attitudes toward Negroes." *American Sociological Review* 31 (February):93-102.
- Hollingshead, A. B., R. E. Ellis, and E. Kirby
1954 "Social mobility and mental illness." *American Sociological Review* 19 (October):577-584.

- Hollingshead, August B. and Frederick C. Redlich
1958 *Social Class and Mental Illness*. New York: Wiley.
- Janowitz, Morris
1956 "Some Consequences of Social Mobility in the United States." *Transactions of the Third World Congress of Sociology, International Sociological Association*, Vol. 3:191-201.
- Kish, L.
1949 "A procedure for objective respondent selection within the household." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 44 (September):380-387.
- Levine, L. and H. J. Crockett, Jr.
1966 "Speech variation in a Piedmont community: postvocalic r." *Sociological Inquiry* 36 (Spring):204-226.
- Litwak, E.
1960 "Occupational mobility and extended family cohesion." *American Sociological Review* 25 (February):9-21.
- Morley, Christopher
1939 *Kitty Foyle*. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Parsons, T.
1943 "The kinship system of the contemporary United States." *American Anthropologist* 45 (January):22-38.
- Schneider, D. M. and G. C. Homans
1955 "Kinship terminology and the American kinship system." *American Anthropologist* 57 (December):1194-1208.
- Scott, J. C., Jr.
1957 "Membership and participation in voluntary associations." *American Sociological Review* 22 (June):315-326.
- Sorokin, Pitrim A.
1927 *Social Mobility*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Stuckert, R. P.
1963 "Occupational mobility and family relationships." *Social Forces* 41 (March):301-307.
- Sykes, Gresham M.
1954 "Social Mobility and Social Participation." Northwestern University: Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.
- Turner, R. J. and M. O. Wagenfeld
1967 "Occupational mobility and schizophrenia: an assessment of the social causation and social selection hypotheses." *American Sociological Review* 32 (February):104-113.
- Vorwaller, D. J.
1970 "Social mobility and membership in voluntary associations." *American Journal of Sociology* 75 (January, Part 1):481-495.
- Wilensky, H. and H. Edwards
1959 "The skidder: ideological adjustment of downward mobile workers." *American Sociological Review* 24 (April):215-231.
- Williams, Robin
1960 "Kinship and the Family in the United States." Pp. 39-86 in Robin Williams, *American Society*. New York: Knopf.