Social Mobility and Membership in Voluntary Associations
Author(s): Darrel J. Vorwaller
Source: *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 75, No. 4, Part 1 (Jan., 1970), pp. 481-495
Published by: The University of Chicago Press
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2776079
Accessed: 19-12-2019 10:09 UTC

Social Mobility and Membership in Voluntary Associations[1]

Darrel J. Vorwaller
University of Chicago

Two alternative hypotheses regarding the consequences of vertical social mobility for membership in voluntary associations are investigated. The socialization hypothesis predicts an adaptive outcome, while the dissociation hypothesis holds that maladaptive responses to mobility obtain. Mean numbers of memberships in voluntary associations are tabulated for respondents cross-classified according to social status of origin and of destination, which reflects social mobility status. The observed means are plotted against hypothetical means obtained from a statistical model of additive effects, and differences are inspected for convergence with or significant departures from the means predicted by the model. The data do not support the dissociation hypothesis, which leads to the conclusion that vertical social mobility exerts little or no effect on affiliations with voluntary associations. The status effects of social origins and destinations account for variations in number of memberships at significant levels, which supports the notion that socialization processes operate during the course of social mobility to mediate responses at expected levels.

This study of the effect of social status origins and destinations on membership in voluntary associations joins a score of research efforts concerned with the consequences of vertical social mobility. These studies, in most cases, have focused on the disruptive or pathological effects of social mobility, a conception referred to here as the "dissociation hypothesis." Vertical movement through social space is seen as a precipitant of social isolation, separating individuals from nonmobile peers who remain in their status of origin, as well as from peers in their status of destination. The social distance resulting from vertical mobility effectively reduces the integrative effects of shared norms, values, beliefs, and presses for conformity. Social mobility in this view is a disruptive experience, generating anxiety, alienation, insecurity, and other forms of maladaptive behavior. This orientation to social mobility has given rise to studies seeking to establish links between mobility and various personality or social pathologies, such as mental illness, suicide, prejudice, and alienation. (See Sorokin 1959, pp. 508–28. Others who have discussed dissociation effects include Blau 1956, 1957; Bettelheim and Janowitz 1964; Janowitz 1956; Ruesch 1953; Stuckert 1963; Wilensky and Edwards 1959; Miller 1960; Srole et al. 1962; Greenblum and Pearlin 1953;

[1] I wish to express appreciation to Edward O. Laumann, Eugene Litwak, and Henry J. Meyer for the data made available for this research. I am grateful to David Street and Edward O. Laumann for their helpful comments and suggestions for the revisions of earlier drafts.

Silverstein and Seeman 1959; Hodge and Treiman 1966; Ellis and Lane 1967. Hollingshead, Ellis, and Kirby 1954 were concerned with social mobility and mental illness. See Lystad 1957; Ellis 1957; Srole et al. 1962. Breed 1963 studied suicide. Greenblum and Pearlin 1953 sought mobility correlates in prejudice. See Silverstein and Seeman 1959; Bettelheim and Janowitz 1964; Hodge and Treiman 1966. Correlates of the alienation concept are represented in Stuckert 1963; Litwak 1960*a*, 1960*b*; LeMasters 1954; Curtis 1958, pp. 88–90; Yellin 1955.)

More recently, the consequences of social mobility have been conceptualized as the outcome of successive events associated with the move between social class status of origin and status of destination, what we will call the socialization hypothesis (Blau 1956 called this concept the acculturation hypothesis). This point of view draws on theories about reference group, anticipatory socialization, and continuous adult socialization. (Merton and Kitt 1953 applied the concept of anticipatory socialization to social mobility. See Wilensky 1966; Blau 1956; Ellis and Lane 1967; Srole et al. 1962; Hodge and Treiman 1966. Adult socialization is discussed by Bloom 1964, pp. 193–96; Newcomb 1943, pp. 58–59; Yarrow and Yarrow 1964; Henry 1965, pp. 30–47.) In the socialization hypothesis, the current behavior of the mobile individual is seen as the outcome of both antecedent and current psychosocial forces impinging on it. The behavior and attitudes represented among peers in the status of destination may constitute a model for effecting behavioral modifications. The degree to which a mobile individual changes his attitudes may vary from one case to another. The adaptation process may be accelerated by an individual's own motivation and the availability in his current status of highly visible cues and reinforcements. For another, the process may be impeded by conflicting loyalties to artifacts of his origin status, insufficient individual motivation, or low visibility in his current status of behavioral cues and reinforcements. From the vantage of the individual, several adaptive patterns of response to vertical mobility may exist. Patterns of adaptation may be influenced by the rapidity of the mobility, the expenditure of psychic and social energy entailed, the availability of social and economic resources, the strength of behavioral cues and reinforcements to which the mobile individual is exposed, or the richness of the social environment.

The study of social mobility in the aggregate entailed in this research necessarily conceals individual modes of adaptation. Our basic interest here is in the dynamics which operate on the whole to produce a particular behavioral outcome for socially mobile individuals. We wish to determine whether there is sufficient evidence present in a behavioral outcome as assessed against status variables to make inferences about antecedent processes which influenced it. Such evidence is obtained through an investigation of the socialization and dissociation hypotheses. Membership in voluntary associations provides a behavioral medium which facilitates the investigation of origin and destination effects and, inferentially, those antecedents effecting a behavioral outcome. Membership is particularly useful in this analysis, since membership has been investigated extensively for

the effect on it of social status per se (Axelrod 1956; Wright and Hyman 1958; Warner 1949; Erbe 1964). Research findings from such studies provide base-line knowledge about status effects, making it possible to extrapolate effects according to the dimensions of the hypotheses used in this study. Membership in voluntary associations represents a known quantity in my investigation, providing greater confidence in the identification of conformity to departures from expected behavior.

The socialization hypothesis holds that changes in behavior are incremental over an extended period of time. (For findings supporting the socialization hypothesis, see Hodge and Treiman 1966; Roth and Peck 1951; Berent 1952; Blau and Duncan 1967, pp. 361–400.) Blau (1956, p. 291) postulated that an ex post facto assessment of current behavior of mobile individuals would reflect an intermediate level of conformity when contrasted with the behavior of nonmobile, since the socially mobile individual has been subject to the psychosocial forces of both reference groups. A variation of this dynamic may occur when the mobile person is located socially and economically in his destination status but has not yet acquired all of the behavioral and attitudinal accoutrements typical of that status. He may be in an intermediate stage of the process of adjusting his behavior so that it is consistent with the normative influences of his destination status. An aggregate of mobile persons occupying a given destination status may thus represent a range of phases of adaptation. One might suspect that the intermediate level of conformity discussed by Blau may be simply a statistical artifact where the aggregate is composed of an array of persons representing several levels of conformity.

The major drawback of research assessing consequences of social mobility has been the narrow focus on the effect of vertical movement alone or, occasionally, on the combined effects of mobility and current social class status. Research has seldom considered the joint effects of both the origin and destination of social class statuses. Reasons for this may include the fact that longitudinal recall data are difficult to obtain and are replete with problems of validity and reliability. An aspect of this problem is the system used to classify mobility status. Usually, respondents are classified according to the degree of upward and downward mobility. The subgroupings derived from this classification are then compared on the dependent variable. If a mobile group departs markedly from the nonmobile group on the dependent variable, the effect is attributed to vertical mobility, without acknowledging the independent effects of the origin and destination status variables used operationally to define mobility status.

In the absence of longitudinal data, the model of additive effects provides a preferred alternative. This assumes that the effect of any one origin status is the same for all destination statuses flowing from that origin. The effect of a common destination status is the same for all origins composing it. The expected outcome of a given behavior for any combination of origin and destination statuses is a weighted average of the effects of the two status variables on that behavior. Persons low on the origin status variable but high on the destination variable would appear, on the average, to be located

somewhere between the origin and destination norms for that behavior in their performance of it. The model of additive effects provides a calculated estimate of the outcome predicted in the socialization hypothesis, against which the observed empirical behavior can be assessed.

The conditions of the socialization hypothesis are met if the socially mobile person alters the number of his affiliations with voluntary associations so that it is about the same as that of his nonmobile peers but intermediate between the norms of his statuses of origin and destination. For example, the upwardly mobile person would be expected to belong to more organizations than the downwardly mobile person. As the upwardly mobile individual responds to the psychosocial influences of his destination status, he is likely to discover that participation in voluntary associations is an accoutrement of his higher status. He initiates efforts which result in an increase in his affiliations. Commenting on this phenomenon, Whyte (1957, p. 317) writes of the mobile suburbanite: "Before long Charlie Adams may feel the urge to shoot out a few extra roots here and there and, having normal joining instincts, may think a mild involvement in some community-wide organization just the thing. When the matter is bruited to him he may be tentative—nothing strenuous, understand, awfully busy with company work; just want to help out a little. Instantaneously, or no longer than it takes one person to telephone another, the news is abroad. Charlie will never be quite the same again. He has plunged into a hotbed of participation." In addition to the strong expectation that one should participate, the upwardly mobile person acquires the means of participation. He now has the necessary occupational and social status, as well as an economic means to cover the expense of participation. His employer may be more flexible in allowing time off work to participate in community affairs; it may even be a part of his job to help convey the image of the civic-minded corporation.

The downwardly mobile person may also respond in a manner fitting the socialization hypothesis. If he is sensitive to social pressures, he may spend more time associating informally in neighborhood and friendship groups rather than in membership associations. He is not likely to be exposed to the profusion of voluntary associations making appeals to the attention and energy of the middle-class individual. Opportunities for him to affiliate are thus decreased. As he acclimates to the prevailing activity patterns, he may concentrate his social affiliations in church and labor-based organizations, which typically are patronized by lower-class individuals for social outlets. His limited financial resources may impose further restrictions on his activities in voluntary associations. The resulting outcome is a reduced number of memberships in voluntary associations. His response is adaptive because it is compatible with the behavior of his nonmobile peers.

The dissociation hypothesis asserts that the incongruity and conflicting demands of inconsistent origin and destination statuses generate intrapersonal insecurity and frustration. The tension felt by the socially mobile person affects his performance in other sectors of his life, producing departures from behavior usually expected of occupants of his destination

status. For example, the socially mobile person who is insecure in his new status may respond by belonging to more organizations than most of his nonmobile peers. His overconformity may be seen as a way of dealing with his feelings of frustration or as an effort to obtain the acceptance of his peers. In a contrasting mode of adaptation, the socially mobile person who is alienated from the social influences of both his origin and destination statuses may underconform, that is, belong to fewer voluntary associations than his nonmobile peers. A finding of over- or underconformity would confirm the dissociation hypothesis with respect to membership in voluntary associations, providing that statistical interaction is significant.

The investigation of social mobility and participation in voluntary associations has not produced findings which clearly support either the dissociation or the socialization hypothesis. Curtis (1958, pp. 150–51) found no differences between mobile and nonmobile respondents in his study, although there was evidence that downward mobility was associated with a decrease in the number of memberships in associations. Sykes (1954, pp. 86–94) found that upward mobility may increase the number of memberships in associations, while a decrement in memberships may result from downward mobility, which is consistent with the socialization hypothesis. Findings regarding mobility and membership in trade unions are instructive. As the socialization position would predict, downwardly mobile persons more frequently belonged to trade unions, which are occupation-oriented organizations and thus strongly associated with social class status. The number of upwardly mobile persons in trade unions was negligible (Lipset and Gordon 1953). Downwardly mobile persons stood a stronger chance of affiliating with a trade union because their survival in the occupational world demanded it. Upwardly mobile individuals were not exposed to the same opportunity in the managerial and professional occupations, where unionism had not made inroads at the time of this research. Affiliation with unions is thus positively associated with the probability of exposure to the pressure to join. The mixed findings to date in the mobility and affiliation research may be due in part to the neglect of the direct effects of origin and destination statuses, which are critical in the study of the consequences of social mobility.

DATA AND METHOD

The mechanics of this analysis provide for the computation of the mean number of memberships in voluntary associations which could result hypothetically from the independent effects of status of origin and status of destination. These hypothetical means are then subtracted from those obtained from the empirical data to facilitate an examination for inconsistencies or departures. A high degree of congruity between the hypothetical and observed means supports the socialization hypothesis. A significant departure supports the dissociation hypothesis.

Data regarding voluntary association membership, from two survey samples, were analyzed for the purpose of testing the socialization and dis-

sociation hypotheses. The use of the two sources of data was undertaken in order to determine whether the finding obtained in one population would be replicated in the other. The first study provided data obtained from white males in the contiguous communities of Cambridge and Belmont, Massachusetts.[2] This sample was obtained by the use of area probability sampling procedures. The second study provided data from white mothers of elementary school youngsters in Detroit, Michigan.[3] The youngsters in this latter study were sampled from the population of ten- to twelve-year-old pupils in eighteen Detroit public schools, selected systematically to satisfy the interests of the primary researcher. Because school units in this sample were not sampled probabilistically, the basic assumptions required for inferential analysis were violated. However, the findings of several statistical tests satisfied me that demographic characteristics of the sample did not depart markedly from those of the general population of Detroit (Vorwaller 1967, pp. 293–301). The results of the analysis were not modified significantly when school area effects were held constant, which provided additional confidence that sampling procedures had not produced sample characteristics different from those of the population.

Social class status of the respondents and respondents' fathers were obtained by collapsing occupational status categories as shown in the table below. Occupational status is considered to be an extremely condensed measure of social class status (see Chinoy 1955, p. 181; Kahl 1961, p. 53; Duncan and Hodge 1963). Occupational prestige ratings have shown re-

Social Class Status	Occupational Status
Higher white collar....	Professional, technical, and kindred workers, managers, officials, and proprietors
Lower white collar....	Sales workers, clerical, and kindred workers
Higher manual.....	Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers
Lower manual.....	Operatives and kindred workers, service workers, laborers
Not classified.....	Not in experienced civilian labor force, not reported, information not available

[2] Data were made available for this study by Edward O. Laumann, University of Michigan. The sample was drawn from the contiguous Massachusetts communities of Cambridge and Belmont (subsequently to be referred to as Cambridge data). Both communities are heavily urbanized areas, well integrated socially and economically into the Boston metropolitan area. Although the extreme categories of the occupational scale were overrepresented in the sample to provide numbers of adequate magnitude for the analysis of occupational social distance, an analysis disclosed that the occupational distribution obtained in the sample coincided very closely with that reflected in the 1960 Census. See Vorwaller (1967, pp. 302–310).

[3] Data from this study were made available by Professors Eugene Litwak and Henry J. Meyer, University of Michigan. The research investigated relationships between bureaucracies and primary groups. It was supported in part as Project no. 5-0355, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

markable stability over time and space, as seen in Hodge, Siegel, and Rossi (1964). Female respondents were classified according to the occupational status of the main breadwinner in the family to locate them in a social stratification hierarchy. Intergenerational vertical mobility was determined by contrasting status of origin (father's status when the respondent was about sixteen years old) and status of destination (status of the respondent or the main breadwinner at the time of the interview). Discrepancies between the two statuses indicated vertical mobility.

The multiple classification analysis used in this study is a modification of regression analysis, similarly providing means, sums of squares, η coefficients, and an adjusted multiple correlation coefficient. The analysis requires one dependent variable, regarded as quantitative (that is, measured on an interval scale), and two or more independent variables, each regarded as qualitative or classificatory. The dummy variable procedure was used in the treatment of the independent variables. Each category of each independent variable in this procedure is assigned to value of one or zero according to whether a case in the sample corresponds to a given category of the variable (Suits 1957). The multiple classification technique assumes that members of a particular category of an independent variable possess an attribute which exerts a distinct influence on the dependent variable.

Additive effects are represented statistically as $\bar{Y}_{ij} = \bar{Y} + a_i + b_j + e_{ij}$, where $\bar{Y}_{ij}$ is the mean score for the cell category; $\bar{Y}$ is the grand mean for the total sample; a_i is the effect of belonging to the ith origin class and is expressed as a deviation from the grand mean; b_j is the effect of belonging to the jth destination status, also expressed as a deviation from the grand mean; and e_{ij} is the difference between the observed and the calculated mean, computed on the basis of the additive effects of row and column categories. The model of additive effects assumes that row and column net effects are constant for all cross-classifications subject to the effects of the row and column categories. The net effects of row and column categories provide a basis for calculating the hypothetical means of each of the cross classifications of the row and column variables ($\hat{Y}_{ij}$) which would obtain if all variation in a given dependent variable were due to the additive effects of social class statuses of origin and destination. The difference between the observed and hypothetical means ($\bar{Y}_{ij} - \hat{Y}_{ij}$) provides a baseline for assessing the goodness of fit of the observed data to a model of additive effects. For a technical discussion of the multiple classification analysis, the interested reader is advised to consult the authors of this technique (Blau and Duncan 1967, pp. 115–62, 371–400; Duncan 1966; Hill 1959; Brownlee 1960; Morgan et al. 1962, pp. 508–11).

The mobility status of the respondents in the sample is represented in the cross-classification of social class statuses of origin and destination (tables 1, 2). The diagonal categories represent the nonmobile; the upwardly mobile are located in those cells to the left of the diagonal, and the downwardly mobile are in the cells to the right of the diagonal.

MOBILITY AND PARTICIPATION

The mean number of memberships in voluntary associations for the two samples for all categories of vertical mobility is presented in the second panel of table 1 (Cambridge males) and table 2 (Detroit mothers).[4] In both samples social class statuses of origin and destination appeared to be relatively unimportant in accounting for variance in the number of associations to which a person may belong. Only 8.4 percent (adjusted R coefficient = .29) of the variance was due to the joint effects of social class statuses of origin and destination in the Cambridge data. The two statuses were more important in accounting for variance among the Detroit mothers, however, where they were jointly responsible for 16 percent of the variance (adjusted R coefficient = .40). Despite the relative weakness of social class statuses of origin and destination in accounting for variance, there is still justification for testing our alternate hypotheses, since within the statuses of origin and destination, the patterning of memberships in voluntary associations was statistically significant at probability levels exceeding .01.

The data in panel 2 of tables 1 and 2 indicate that substantial differences in mean memberships in voluntary associations obtain for the various status subgroups. Examination of the row totals shows that as status of destination increases, membership in associations also increases. This pattern also obtains in the column totals, where the number of voluntary associations to which one belongs increases directly as status of origin increases. This pattern replicates the finding obtained in studies of affiliation with voluntary associations and social class status. The monotonic pattern of increasing memberships and social class status also obtains for the nonmobile categories, seen in the entries along the main diagonal. Looking at the mobile subgroupings to the left and right of the diagonal in both tables, it appears evident that origin and destination statuses indeed exert additive effects on memberships as postulated in the socialization hypothesis. For each change upward or downward in destination status, there tends to be a change in the same direction in the mean number of memberships for a given mobility subgrouping. The same holds true for changes in origin status. The patterning obtained is not strictly monotonic, due primarily to the small numbers of cases in some of the cross-classifications of the mobile. In order to confirm the impression obtained by inspection of an additive-effects pattern, and also to test the dissociation hypothesis, the additive model is fitted to the data. The hypothetical means obtained from

[4] The reader may be interested in the difference in mean number of memberships in voluntary associations between the two samples, since the difference departs from that expected from other findings. Whereas Bell, Hill, and Wright (1961, pp. 43ff.) found that men are more likely to be members of voluntary associations than are women, the data analyzed here indicate the opposite. The average Detroit mother belonged to slightly more associations (grand mean = 1.62) than the average Cambridge male (grand mean = 1.14 associations). The difference is probably due to variations in the data collection instruments. The Detroit mothers were given a check list of organizations to facilitate recall, while the Cambridge males were asked to list their affiliations from memory. The check list apparently was more efficient both in defining what was to be considered a voluntary association and in calling to mind actual memberships.

TABLE 1

MEAN NUMBER OF MEMBERSHIPS IN VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS ACCORDING TO SOCIAL CLASS STATUSES OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION (CAMBRIDGE MALE SAMPLE)

SOCIAL CLASS STATUS OF ORIGIN	SOCIAL CLASS STATUS OF DESTINATION					
	Total	White Collar		Manual		Not Classified
		Higher	Lower	Higher	Lower	
1. Number						
Higher white collar...	110	90	7	9	3	1
Lower white collar....	50	20	13	8	9	...
Higher manual.....	88	20	14	24	30	...
Lower manual.....	155	26	27	27	75	...
Not classified.....	14	4	1	2	7	...
Total.....	417	160	62	70	124	1
2. Observed Mean Memberships						
Higher white collar...	1.60	1.84	0.43*	0.78*	0.00*	0.00*
Lower white collar....	1.12	1.60	1.23*	0.38*	0.55*	...
Higher manual.....	0.88	1.35	0.86*	0.67	0.73	...
Lower manual.....	0.96	1.54	1.00	1.07	0.71	...
Not classified.....	1.29	2.00*	0.00*	1.00*	1.14*	...
Total.....	1.14	1.71	0.94	0.81	0.71	0.00
3. Calculated Mean Memberships						
Higher white collar....	...	1.76	1.04*	0.92*	0.80*	0.00*
Lower white collar....	...	1.62	0.90*	0.78*	0.66*	...
Higher manual.....	...	1.55	0.83*	0.71	0.59	...
Lower manual.....	...	1.70	0.98	0.86	0.74	...
Not classified.....	...	1.94*	1.22*	1.10*	0.98*	...
4. Observed Minus Calculated Means						
Higher white collar...	...	0.08	—0.61*	—0.14*	—0.80*	0.00*
Lower white collar....	...	−0.02	0.33*	—0.40*	—0.11*	...
Higher manual.....	...	−0.20	0.03*	−0.04	0.14	...
Lower manual.....	...	−0.16	0.02	0.21	−0.03	...
Not classified.....	...	0.06*	−1.22*	−0.10*	0.16*	...

NOTE.—Increment for destination: $F = 5.27$, $P < .01$. Increment for interaction: $F = .78$ (N.S.). Gross effects of origin: $F = 3.76$, $P < .01$. Gross effects of destination: $F = 9.81$, $P < .01$. Adjusted R coefficient = .29.

* Number of cases less than twenty.

TABLE 2

MEAN NUMBER OF MEMBERSHIPS IN VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS ACCORDING TO SOCIAL CLASS STATUSES OF ORIGIN AND DESTINATION (DETROIT FEMALE SAMPLE)

SOCIAL CLASS STATUS OF ORIGIN	SOCIAL CLASS STATUS OF DESTINATION					
	Total	White Collar		Manual		Not Classified
		Higher	Lower	Higher	Lower	
1. Number						
Higher white collar...	118	38	14	27	39	...
Lower white collar...	49	17	5	11	16	...
Higher manual.....	200	39	31	56	72	2
Lower manual.....	315	47	24	76	166	2
Farm.....	125	15	10	23	75	2
Not classified.....	37	4	...	9	22	2
Total.....	844	160	84	202	390	8
2. Observed Mean Memberships						
Higher white collar...	2.50	3.16	2.71*	2.56	1.74	...
Lower white collar...	2.22	3.12*	3.20*	2.18*	1.00*	...
Higher manual.....	1.98	2.79	2.16	2.09	1.44	0.00*
Lower manual.....	1.31	1.87	1.96	1.34	1.07	0.00*
Farm.....	0.99	2.00*	1.00*	1.22	0.73	0.50*
Not classified.....	0.81	3.50*	...	0.77*	0.41	0.00*
Total.....	1.62	2.59	2.12	1.72	1.10	0.13*
3. Calculated Mean Memberships						
Higher white collar...	...	3.13	2.69*	2.38	1.88	...
Lower white collar...	...	2.84*	2.40*	2.09*	1.59*	...
Higher manual.....	...	2.73	2.29	1.98	1.48	0.24*
Lower manual.....	...	2.20	1.76	1.45	0.95	0.14*
Farm.....	...	1.95*	1.51*	1.20	0.70	−0.11*
Not classified.....	...	1.84*	...	1.09*	0.59*	0.22*
4. Observed Minus Calculated Means						
Higher white collar...	...	0.03	0.02*	0.18	−0.14	...
Lower white collar...	...	0.28*	0.80*	0.09*	−0.59*	...
Higher manual.....	...	0.04	−0.13	0.11	−0.04	−0.24*
Lower manual.....	...	−0.33	0.20	−0.11	0.12	−0.14*
Farm.....	...	0.05*	−0.51*	0.02	0.03	0.61*
Not classified.....	...	1.66*	...	−0.31*	−0.18*	−0.22*

NOTE.—Increment for destination: $F = 10.20$, $P < .01$. Increment for interaction: $F = 2.76$, $P < .01$. Gross effect of origin: $F = 17.00$, $P < .01$. Gross effect of destination: $F = 27.00$, $P < .01$. Adjusted R coefficient = .40.

* Number of cases less than twenty.

the sum of the grand mean and the net effects of origin and of destination statuses are arrayed in panel 3. The fourth panel presents the differences between the empirical and the hypothetical means.

If the dissociation hypothesis were to obtain, we would expect the additive model in panel 3 either to overstate significantly or to understate significantly the mean memberships for the mobility categories, depending on the particular dynamics producing interaction effects. If the overstatement or understatement of means occurs as predicted in the dissociation hypothesis, we would expect to find a patterning of difference scores in panel 4a in the cells off the diagonal to the left or right, representing a marked departure of the observed data from the additive model. It is evident from an examination of the difference scores in panel 4 that the departures of the observed data from the additive model are generally small. Note in the Cambridge data a clustering of negative differences in the left-hand column, representing a slight understatement of mean memberships for the upwardly mobile. In this case, however, it is fruitless to conjecture regarding the meaning of this understatement, since statistical interaction is not significant.

The case of the Detroit mothers is somewhat different, since interaction effects are significant at a confidence level exceeding .01. The clustering of negative differences obtained for the extreme downwardly mobile cases, located in the upper right-hand column, is suggestive of the understatement pattern predicted by the dissociation hypothesis. In this case, the differences are hardly large enough to be convincing, even though the direction of the difference is interesting. In both the Cambridge and the Detroit data, the larger differences are conspicuously located in cells with very small case bases, where the possibility of random fluctuation is greatest. Except for the two clusterings of negative differences, it appears that the positive and negative differences are not systematic, providing further evidence against the dissociation hypothesis. Even though the interaction effect in the Detroit data is significant, there is no compelling evidence that it is due to conditions specified in the dissociation hypothesis. There is no clear patterning indicative of a dissociation effect on the basis either of magnitude of difference or of direction of departure.

The departure of the observed from the calculated means is summarized in table 3 according to gross mobility categories. A reduction of data into these categories provides a basis for determining the most general nature of the discrepancy between the observed and calculated means. The weighted average departure for each of the mobility categories represented in the difference score in the third column and summarized in the ratio of the observed to the calculated means in the fourth column indicates whether the respondents in the mobility categories belonged to more or fewer associations than hypothetically expected from the additive model. With this highly condensed data, the pattern of mean number of memberships is reproduced by the additive model with a high degree of integrity. This permits the conclusion that although there are differences in the number of associations to which the socially mobile belong, they accrue essentially

from effects of origin and destination statuses, and not from social mobility per se. Although, in the aggregate, the upwardly and downwardly mobile in both samples belonged to slightly fewer associations than hypothetically calculated according to the additive model, the observed mean memberships of the mobile were actually greater than the means obtained for the nonmobile. For each line in table 3 t-tests were computed to test the statistical significance of the departure of the observed means from those expected hypothetically from the multiple classification analysis. With only

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF OBSERVED AND CALCULATED MEAN NUMBER OF MEMBERSHIPS ACCORDING TO MOBILITY STATUS

Mobility Status	Observed Means (a)	Calculated Mean (b)	Difference ($a-b$)	Ratio (a/b)	No. of Cases
		Detroit Females			
Upward	1.99	2.06	−0.07	0.97	234
Nonmobile	1.63	1.51	0.12	1.08	265
Downward	1.78	1.84	−0.06	0.97	179
		Cambridge Males			
Upward	1.25	1.26	−0.01	0.99	134
Nonmobile	1.24	1.20	0.04	1.03	202
Downward	0.60	0.82	−0.22	0.73	66

NOTE.—Not Classified and Farm categories are excluded from these calculations.

one exception, the t-ratios are less than unity. The observed mean does not in any case depart significantly from the calculated mean at the .10 level for a two-tailed test (Treiman 1966, p. 659).[5] With the exception of the downwardly mobile category in the Cambridge sample, the ratios of the observed to the calculated means are extremely close to unity, indicating the efficiency with which the additive model reproduces the empirical data. Again, this finding supports the conclusion that social mobility per se does not precipitate significant departures in levels of membership in voluntary associations. Among both the mobile and nonmobile populations status effects appear to be the moving force which affects affiliation in voluntary associations.

[5] The means expected from the multiple classification analysis were treated as universe parameters, and the statistic $t = (\bar{X} - u)/(s/\sqrt{N})$ was computed. This was an extremely conservative assumption, since in fact the means expected from the net effects calculated from the multiple classification analysis are estimates of the universe parameters and have standard errors > 0.

SUMMARY

Two alternate views regarding the effects of vertical social mobility on affiliation with voluntary associations were examined. One was represented in the socialization hypothesis; the other, in the dissociation hypothesis. I concluded that vertical social mobility had no marked effect on the number of affiliations with voluntary associations. Although substantial differences in the number of memberships were noted according to the categories of social class statuses of origin and destination, these differences were reproduced with a high level of integrity by an additive model which took into account the independent effects of origin and destination statuses. Differences were thus accounted for by the forces associated with origin and destination statuses to which mobile individuals had been exposed. Future research regarding the consequences of social mobility must take into account the independent effects of the variables used to define mobility status. Many of the apparent mobility effects found in past studies of mobility may be due to independent origin and destination effects, rather than to pathological complications of mobility experience.

REFERENCES

Axelrod, Morris. 1956. "Urban Structure and Social Participation." *American Sociological Review* 21 (February):13–18.

Bell, Wendell, Richard Hill, and Charles Wright. 1961. *Public Leadership.* San Francisco: Chandler.

Berent, Jerzy. 1952. "Fertility and Social Mobility." *Population Studies* 5 (March): 244–60.

Bettelheim, Bruno, and Morris Janowitz. 1964. *Social Change and Prejudice.* Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Blau, Peter M. 1956. "Social Mobility and Interpersonal Relations." *American Sociological Review* 21 (June):290–95.

———. 1957. "Occupational Bias and Mobility." *American Sociological Review* 22 (August):392–99.

Blau, Peter M., and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure.* New York: Wiley.

Bloom, Benjamin S. 1964. *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics.* New York: Wiley.

Breed, Warren. 1963. "Occupational Mobility and Suicide among White Males." *American Sociological Review* 28 (April):179–88.

Brownlee, K. A. 1960. *Statistical Theory and Methodology in Science and Engineering.* New York: Wiley.

Chinoy, Ely. 1955. "Social Mobility Trends in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 20 (April):180–86.

Curtis, Richard F. 1958. "Consequences of Occupational Mobility in a Metropolitan Community." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.

Duncan, Otis Dudley. 1966. "Methodology Issues in the Analysis of Social Mobility." In *Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development,* edited by Neil Smelser and Seymour M. Lipset. Chicago: Aldine.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, and Robert W. Hodge. 1963. "Education and Occupational Mobility: A Regression Analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 68 (May):629–44.

Ellis, Evelyn. 1957. "Social Psychological Correlates of Upward Social Mobility among Unmarried Women." *American Sociological Review* 17 (October):558–63.

Ellis, Robert A., and W. Clayton Lane. 1967. "Social Mobility and Social Isolation: A Test of Sorokin's Dissociation Hypothesis." *American Sociological Review* 32 (April): 237–53.

Erbe, William. 1964. "Social Involvement and Political Activity: A Replication and Elaboration." *American Sociological Review* 20 (April):198–215.

Greenblum, Joseph, and Leonard Pearlin. 1957. "Vertical Mobility and Prejudice: A Socio-Psychological Analysis." In *Class Status and Power*, edited by Rinehard Bendix and Seymour M. Lipset. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Henry, William E. 1965. "Social Mobility as Social Learning: Some Elements of Change in Motive and Social Context." In *Mobility and Mental Health*, edited by Mildred B. Kanton. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas.

Hill, T. P. 1959. "An Analysis of the Distribution of Wages and Salaries in Great Britain." *Econometrica* 27 (July):355–81.

Hodge, Robert W., P. M. Siegel, and Peter H. Rossi. 1964. "Occupational Prestige in the United States: 1925–63." *American Journal of Sociology* 70 (November):286–302.

Hodge, Robert W., and Donald J. Treiman. 1966. "Occupational Mobility and Attitude toward Negroes." *American Sociological Review* 31 (February):93–102.

Hollingshead, August B., Robert Ellis, and E. Kirby. 1954. "Social Mobility and Mental Illness." *American Sociological Review* 19 (October):577–84.

Janowitz, Morris. 1956. "Some Consequences of Social Mobility in the United States." *Transactions of the Third World Congress of Sociology*. London: International Sociological Association.

Kahl, Joseph A. 1961. *The American Class Structure*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

LeMasters, E. E. 1954. "Social Class Mobility and Family Integration." *Marriage and Family Living* 46 (August): 226–32.

Lipset, Seymour M., and Joan Gordon. 1953. "Mobility and Trade Union Membership." In *Class Status and Power*, edited by Rinehard Bendix and Seymour Lipset. Glencoe, Ill : Free Press.

Litwak, Eugene. 1960*a*. "Occupational Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion." *American Sociological Review* 25 (February):9–21.

———. 1960*b*. "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion." *American Sociological Review* 25 (June):385–94.

Lystad, Mary H. 1957. "Social Mobility among Selected Groups of Schizophrenic Patients." *American Sociological Review* 22 (June):588–92.

Merton, Robert K., and Alice S. Kitt. 1953. "Reference Group Theory and Social Mobility." In *Class Status and Power*, edited by Rinehard Bendix and Seymour Lipset. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Miller, Seymour M. 1960. "Comparative Social Mobility." *Current Sociology* 9, no. 1: 1–89.

Morgan, James N., Martin H. David, Wilbur J. Cohen, and Harvey E. Brazer. 1962. *Income and Welfare in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Newcomb, Theodore M. 1943. *Personality and Social Change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Roth, Julius, and Robert T. Peck. 1951. "Social Class and Social Mobility Factors Related to Marital Adjustment." *American Sociological Review* 16 (August):478–87.

Ruesch, Jurgen. 1953. "Social Technique, Social Status, and Social Change in Illness." In *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture*, edited by Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray. New York: Knopf.

Silverstein, Fred B., and Melvin Seeman. 1959. "Social Mobility and Prejudice." *American Journal of Sociology* 65 (November):258–64.

Sorokin, Pitirim A. 1959. *Social and Cultural Mobility*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Srole, Leo, Thomas S. Langner, Stanley T. Michael, Marvin K. Opler, and Thomas A. C. Rennie. 1962. *Mental Health in the Metropolis: The Mid Town Manhattan Study*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Stuckert, Robert P. 1963. "Occupational Mobility and Family Relationships." *Social Forces* 41 (March):301–07.

Suits, Daniel B. 1957. "Use of Dummy Variables in Regression Equations." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 52 (December):581–51.

Sykes, Gresham M. 1954. "Social Mobility and Social Participation." Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University.
Treiman, Donald J. 1966. "Status Discrepancy and Prejudice." *American Journal of Sociology* 71 (May):651–64.
Vorwaller, Darrel J. 1967. "Consequences of Social Mobility: An Analysis of the Additive Effects of Social Class Status of Origin and Destination." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.
Warner, W. Lloyd, et al. 1949. *Democracy in Jonesville.* New York: Harper.
Whyte, William H., Jr. 1957. *The Organization Man.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor.
Wilensky, Harold L. 1966. "Measures and Effects of Mobility." In *Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development,* edited by Neil Smelser and Seymour M. Lipset. Chicago: Aldine.
Wilensky, Harold L., and Hugh Edwards. 1959. "The Skidder: Ideological Adjustments of Downward Mobile Workers." *American Sociological Review* 24 (April):215–31.
Wright, Charles B., and Herbert H. Hyman. 1958. "Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Evidence from National Sample Surveys." *American Sociological Review* 23 (June):284–94.
Yarrow, Leon J., and Marian Radke Yarrow. 1964. "Personality Continuity and Change in the Family Context." In *Personality Change,* edited by Philip Worchel and Donn Byrne. New York: Wiley.
Yellin, Seymour. 1955. "Social Mobility and Familism." Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University.