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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study is to determine if people who are status consistent differ with respect to several attitudes from the people characterized as being status inconsistent. It had been hypothesized by several previous researchers that the status inconsistent will experience status strain which will be manifested in their attitudes.

The sample was a 1972 National Election sample poled by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center. A cluster sampling technique was used in the sampling.

The variables which were used to measure the status inconsistency were the respondent's educational ranking, his occupational prestige ranking, and his ethno-religious group ranking. Each of these variables trichotomized the "high" educational ranking for those who had more than a high school diploma; the "medium" ranking for those who had a high school diploma; and the "low" ranking for those who had less than a high school diploma. The "high" occupational prestige ranking was for those who had prestige scores of 48 and above (based upon the NORC study of occupational prestige); the "medium" group was for those who had scores of 47-33; and, the "low" group was for those who had scores of 32 and below. The ethno-religious variable was also
trichotomized, with, in general, the Protestants whose ancestors had come from Northern and Western Europe being in the "high" group; the "medium" group was composed of Protestants whose ancestors had come from Southern and Eastern Europe, or who were Catholics with ancestors from Northern and Western Europe; and, the "low" group was composed of the remainder of our sample.

In the determination of status inconsistency, only the "high" and "low" groups were used in order to eliminate the possibility that significance would not be found because of the possible confounding effects that moderate inconsistency would have. We wanted to be very certain that if status inconsistency does exist, we would find it.

The sample was further stratified by age (45 and above; 31-45; and 18-30) and by region of the country (South and Non-South) to ensure that these variables did not cloud the effects of the forms of status inconsistency. Furthermore, when two variables were cross-classified to determine if the individual was status inconsistent, the effects of the third independent variable and the controlled variables were already removed. This enabled us to be certain that any attitudinal differences were due entirely to the effects of status inconsistency.

The dependent variables were four in number. A factor analysis scheme was used which located four factors composed of three questions each. The four factors were:
Factor 1: Intolerance; Factor 2: The Preservation of the Status Quo; Factor 3: Intolerance 2; Factor 4: Prejudice. Only whites were included in our sample.

Essentially, we discovered that status inconsistency has an effect only for Factor 2 (The preservation of the status quo), and then only for differences between achieved and ascribed variables, and only when the ascribed variable is the low rating of the status inconsistent person. We found that status inconsistent of the above type tend to be more often in favor of social change than the status consistent.

We conclude that the additive effects of the independent variables sufficiently account for the attitudinal differences between the status inconsistent and the status consistent.
CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of my dissertation is to examine attitudinal differences which accrue to the various combinations of social rankings by which a person may be classified in order to see if those who are status consistent differ with respect to attitudes (on a non-economic nature) from those who are status inconsistent.

Perhaps this work will shed some light on the effects of status inconsistency on the attitudes of individuals. As will be discussed, research in this area has been contradictory with respect to results and conclusions.

Perhaps some of the following questions will be answered: Are those who are status consistent less liberal (non-economically) than those who are status inconsistent? Do people with certain types of inconsistency hold more liberal views than people with other types of inconsistency? Are liberalism and conservatism the ends of a continuum, or are they issue-specific?

By understanding the effects of status inconsistency on the attitudes of individuals, we can better understand the
attitudinal changes taking place in our society. In a highly mobile, industrializing, Western society, the determinants of social status tend to change continuously. Achievement is said to be replacing ascription as a basis for social ranking of individuals in a society which has a need for efficiency.

What is Status Inconsistency

The first question to be asked is "What is status inconsistency?".

Laumann says that an individual's social position may be characterized by his group memberships and social attributes, such as his religious affiliation (including his denomination), ethnic origin and socioeconomic status. Thus, the social structure of a community can be defined as a persisting system of social relationships among social positions (Laumann, 1969: 183).

According to Landecker, the major rank systems of a population are only those in which: 1) virtually every member of a population can be placed (or head of the household); and, 2) to serve as a potential basis for class stratification, a major rank system must be one in which it is possible for all members of a family to hold identical statuses; and, 3) the major rank systems of a society must have conceptual and logical independence from each other, though they may highly intercorrelate (Landecker, 1960: 312).

But, we are dealing with individuals and not social classes. We are not, therefore, concerned that all members
of the family have identical statuses. We are interested in the rankings each individual holds on the various status dimensions, and the consistency of rankings for any one particular individual.

An individual's social position is made up of his social statuses in each of the hierarchies by which he is ranked or judged by his peers. Three general types of status are the economic, the political, and the prestigal (Benoit-Smullyan, 1944: 155). (These can be equated to Max Weber's use of class, party, and status.) Theoretically, each individual is ranked in these three ways. To determine an individual's social position, it is necessary to know his rankings on the three dimensions of social status.

"Status consistency is defined here as the extent to which an individual occupies ranks on relevant status dimensions that are defined as comparable in shared expectations" (Goffman, 1957: 275). Are the individual's rankings on the various dimensions similar with respect to behavior expected of him? Lenski began the empirical study of the differences in behavior associated with consistent and inconsistent status rankings (Lenski, 1954). He hypothesized that the consistents and the inconsistents will exhibit different behavior patterns.

Lenski mentions there are two types of variables considered in status inconsistency research: ascribed characteristics, or those fixed at birth, like race; and, achieved characteristics, or those acquired during the person's lifetime
through what is usually his own effort, like education. Inconsistencies between a person's achieved and ascribed rankings are usually greater in their effect upon the dependent variable than are differences between achieved or between ascribed variables (Lenski, 1967: 300). It has been empirically shown that high achieved and low ascribed inconsistency has the most pronounced effect upon dependent variables. This type of inconsistent differs most from the status consistent (Knoke, 1972: 27).

However, a study by Segal and Knoke in 1968 had found that "The hypothesis that inconsistencies between an achieved status and an ascribed status have stronger effects than inconsistencies between achieved statuses or ascribed statuses was not confirmed" (Segal and Knoke, 1968: 156). There is obviously room here for further study.

There may be inconsistencies within the class system itself, such as among the labor market, the credit or money market and the commodity market. In the labor market one may be an employee or a property owner. In the credit or money market one may be a debtor or creditor. In the commodity market one may be a buyer or seller. If a person is a creditor and seller and an employee, he is, by definition, inconsistent (Wiley, 1967: 351).

At the present time, given the accent upon achieved criteria for societal placement, some groups in our society, such as non-whites, have seen an increase in the numbers of
status inconsistencies. Their ethnic ranking has remained low, while the non-whites have been upwardly mobile on one or more of the other dimensions. Similarly, whites have seen an increase in the number of status inconsistencies, as the achieved variables are no longer as determinant of total societal placement (Geschwender, 1964: 254). The proportion of status inconsistencies in American society would seem to be increasing.

But not all persons in society exist within the status ranking system. Some people are marginal in that respect. The symptoms of marginality are insecurity, ambivalence and psychological instability. If the society provides latitude for these people to attempt to enter the mainstream, these symptoms appear. Further, there are two types of marginality: individual marginality and group marginality. Group marginality provides a perspective for the individual members, while individual marginality does not (Knoke, 1972: 28-29).

The more marginal the individual (isolated or less integrated into the web of society), the greater the insecurity of the individual (Gibbs and Martin, 1958). And, the greater the number of marginal men in a society (and the greater the inconsistencies in a society) the greater the desire for social change in that society (Lenski, 1954: 411).

Status Inconsistency Terminology

With respect to the terminology used in the study of status inconsistency, there has been some confusion. Status
congruency is said to exist when individuals stand in the same rank on a number of status hierarchies (Adams, 1953: 17). Social certitude exists for the consistent individual, as the ranks on the various dimensions reinforce each other (the expectations associated with those ranks). Social relations for such a person tend to be fluid and satisfying. For the person who has inconsistent statuses, anxiety is created and the individual is said to desire to create consistency (Geschwender, 1967: 161). Benoit-Smullyan define status equilibration as the tendency for the various types of status to reach a common level (Benoit-Smullyan, 1944: 160). Equilibration implies that an individual will exhibit greater status strivings in those reference groups where he has low status than in those where he has high status. He tries to make them reach a common level (Fenchel, et al., 1951: 476). It is the equilibration rank which is the most unchangeable rank (the focal rank) and the one with which he is said to compare his other ranks. This is often his innate ability (Kimberly, 1967: 172). And, status crystallization is a measure of how unchangeable the various rankings are for the individual. Where there is low crystallization, it is possible for the individual to change his rank on one or more of the hierarchies.

Sampson said that status crystallization, status equilibration, and status congruence are often used to mean the
same thing (Sampson, 1963: 146). Lenski, in his 1954 article, used status crystallization to mean what we would term inconsistency (Lenski, 1954).

For the last 15 or 20 years, however, terminology discrepancies have been minimized, as certain meanings for the terms become more widely accepted than others and thus used in subsequent articles.

Status Salience

The perceived inconsistency of the individual is related to the saliency of the various ranks. How individuals relate to others is a matter of status definition, or labeling. "Where an individual defines his own status as high and others define his status as low, he suffers from status inconsistency. This situation assumes that his lower status is, in some sense, visible." Where it is not visible, he may withdraw until one becomes less salient (Segal, 1969: 358).

Box and Ford mention that it is assumed in status inconsistency theory that an inconsistent person will try to relate to people who share the highest of his status rankings to maximize ego's status. And, alter will attempt to treat ego in terms of his lowest status to maximize self-interest. They ask if people really relate in this way if it means the rupturing of some relationships. They say that it is not the case that the desire for high status comes above all other desires. Situations and reactions of the audience to ego must be taken into consideration (Box and Ford, 1969: 191-193).
Rather than relating to people by means of the highest or lowest status rank which he occupies, one may relate to people on the basis of an averaging of their several rankings (Segal, Segal, and Knoke, 1970: 347).

But, it seems to be status salience and subjective evaluations which help to determine the behavioral consequences of rank inconsistency. And, it is not status incongruity, per se, which is totally adequate as a predictive model; rather, it is the expectations associated with the various rankings which help to determine the behavior associated with various types of inconsistency. We must first talk about expectations before we can talk about incongruency. If an individual has three dimensions by which he is ranked; and, if he has a (1) rank on the first two, and a (4) rank on the third, then we might define a 1-1-4 ranking for that individual as being inconsistent. But, if 1-1-4 is expected to go together, then 1-1-2 is considered to be incongruent (Brandon, 1965). But, differing ranks do not necessarily mean that a person would have differing expectations. Just because a person is of high ethnicity does not necessarily mean that the person expects high achievement (Treiman, 1966: 653).

It is the differing expectations which bring about the pressure for change (Sampson, 1963: 151). The same could be said of opinions, attitudes and beliefs. The greater the
cross pressures, the greater the pressure to change some of the conflicting attitudes, opinions, and beliefs (Berelson and Stainer, 1964: 580).

Status Crystallization

The status rankings of people, according to most theory, can be either uncrystallized, somewhat crystallized, or crystallized. Uncrystallized rankings are changing or are subject to change. Somewhat crystallized rankings might be where one is changing and one is fixed. And, crystallized rankings are where both are fixed (Laumann and Segal, 1971).

Crystallization is said to reduce status ambiguity and increase visibility (Laumann and Segal, 1971). High crystallization is where the reference and membership groups coincide. The degree of discrepancy among the variables is an indication of cross pressures (Fauman, 1968: 59).

Advancing crystallization brings with it changes in status salience. As crystallization advances (the ranks become more fixed), achieved and ascribed rankings become nearly equal in salience for the individual. With low crystallization the achieved variables are more important in the determination of the individual's status (Smith, 1969: 911). (In a 1968 study by Bauman, he notes that, for his data, inconsistency may be salient only when occupational ranking is out of line with one or more of the other statuses (Bauman, 1968: 52). Smith hypothesized that as crystallization
advances, achieved-ascribed dysjunctions become more stressful for the individual, as differences become more salient (Smith, 1969: 914). The salience of the achieved rankings exceeds that of the ascribed rankings as long as crystallization is low. The more crystallization advances, the more important become the ascribed rankings (Laumann and Segal, 1971). Furthermore, it appears that the orientations are crystallized, rather than the statuses (Mitchell, 1964: 317).

The Effects of Status Inconsistency Upon Various Categories of People

Not all people are influenced by status inconsistency to the same extent. High and low crystallization groups differ with respect to social class. Fauman observed that the upper class and the lower class differed only when high crystallization was considered. With low crystallization, there was less difference in the social classes (Fauman, 1968: 57). Lower class people, (who are low in S.E.S.), are less influenced by inconsistencies than middle class people because they place less weight on the status variables like education, occupation, etc. (Bauman, 1968: 49). Inconsistent people of different ages react differently also. Advancing age crystallizes status, and low crystallization individuals behave differently from highly crystallized individuals. Furthermore, visibility with a low rank, such as ethnicity, aids in dissatisfaction with that rank (Hyman, 1967). We might expect blacks and whites to differ somewhat with respect to the behavioral effects of inconsistency.
Theoretical Framework

Perhaps the major theoretical work in the area of status inconsistency deals with the concept of distributive justice. Geschwender applies the Homans scheme to Lenski's dimensions. He says that education and ethnicity may be classified as investments. Education is an achievement investment, and ethnicity is an ascribed investment. People expect to be rewarded in conjunction with these investments. The rewards are either occupation, which is a social reward, or income, which is a material reward. Distributive justice is said to exist when investments equal rewards. If investments are greater than rewards, anger and a desire for change in the society which has wronged him results (Geschwender, 1967: 162). If a person has low education or ethnicity and high occupation or income, the person is thought to be considered overrewarded (Geschwender, 1967: 164).

Box and Ford reply to Geschwender by asking how ascribed status can be considered an investment. They say that Geschwender has distorted Homans' conception of distributive justice (Box and Ford, 1969: 188).

An extension of distributive justice is what is called congruence rules, those which specify relations between status attributes (like investment). To balance an inconsistency, an actor may be flexible in locating or valuing certain status attributes (like investments and rewards). He may, as a teacher, say "I have low pay, but summers off." This
raises the reward to coincide with the investment. Actors may vary the importance to themselves of the various status attributes. Also, the meanings of the attributes vary from one social status to another (the rewards of one status become resources or costs in investment in another). Finally, many status attributes are not exchangeable commodities (prestige cannot be used up) (Meyer and Hammond, 1971: 94-97).

Assumptions of Status Inconsistency

As mentioned, the literature on status inconsistency is voluminous. Yet, status inconsistency studies have proceeded without consensus about certain ideas, and many assumptions made by status inconsistency theorists are not universally accepted.

The assumed underlying dynamic—namely disruption of social relations as a function of status inconsistency—has never been empirically demonstrated (Laumann and Segal, 1971: 37-38). Also, status inconsistency assumes the lowest status is known to the audience, but this may not be true. Individuals may segment or compartmentalize their lives; they may conceal things from their audience (Box and Ford, 1969: 193-194). Further, status inconsistency assumes there are no external constraints on the inconsistent audience to stop them from embarrassing him, whereas there may be unwritten laws against discrimination, for example (Box and Ford, 1969: 195).
Doreian and Stockman point out that sociologists arbitrarily divide up the ranks on a dimension such as income, and this is not necessarily the way social reality really is or the way people think of their own reality (1969: 51). There is assumed to be a correspondence between "objective" status rankings and the subject's own perception of reality. But, various groups in the population might differ with regard to how various occupations might rank. The people involved might not experience status inconsistency. Income, for example, varies with region. High salary in one region may be low in another. Therefore, status inconsistency would vary with region. And, income must be treated in relation to the rest of an individual's status rankings, for this reason. Furthermore, there are some rankings (not as easily measured) which are important, such as sexual attractiveness. Some rankings, which sociologists say are important, may not be for the people involved (Box and Ford, 1969: 195).

Mitchell criticizes the assumptions made in the Jackson and Lenski article by saying:

They assume that each rank on a single dimension has its own distinctive constellation of orientations associated with it, and that once the rank is known, then the assumed reactions of others to the person with this rank is also known (Mitchell, 1964: 316-317).

The status inconsistency model also assumes each dimension has a fixed number of ranks and each dimension has the same number of ranks as every other dimension (Doreian and Stockman, 1969: 51).
Indeed the seemingly unwarranted assumptions of status inconsistency theory provide formidable obstacles to analysis.

Summary

In sum, the literature on status inconsistency appears to be contradictory in many places. But, taking the majority of writings as being indicative of majority opinion on status inconsistency and its efforts, the following may be said:

1) Each individual may be ranked along several dimensions or indicators of social status.

2) The expectations associated with the various rankings held by each person help to determine his inconsistency.

3) When an individual is status inconsistent, he may try to alleviate that inconsistency to reduce his internal cross pressures.

4) Individuals who might contact "ego" might tend to think of him in terms of his lowest status, while he might think of himself in terms of his highest status rank.

5) The more crystallized the individual's ranks, the more salient become achieved-ascribed discrepancies.

6) Advancing age increases crystallization.

7) Status inconsistencies become meaningful only in relation to other people.

At this point, we turn to a discussion of the dimensions by which an individual's social status is computed, and thus his status inconsistency. We will review the research which has been done to see which dimensions were used in the study of status inconsistency.

The third and final section of this chapter will deal with the dependent variables which have been used in the study of status inconsistency.
Independent Variables

In the determination of status inconsistency, several different independent variables have been used. These variables may be classified as achieved variables and ascribed variables. The achieved variables have usually been one or more of the following: education, occupation, and income. The ascribed variables have been race, religion, ethnicity, racial-ethnic origin, and ethno-religious group membership.

(For a summary of the discussion in this section, the reader is referred to Table 1, page 16 of this manuscript.)

The Achieved Variables

The achieved variables (or dimensions of social status) are categories into which the individual is not born. He has attained a certain level on these dimensions by his own effort or lack of it.

The first of these dimensions to be discussed is education. As can be noted from Table 1, the vast majority of the studies listed used education as one of the independent variables. Most of the studies which used education as an independent variable did other than dichotomize it or trichotomize it; they coded it as the number of school years completed. Of the studies listed, and only the major studies are listed, four dichotomized education, five trichotomized it, and eleven did other than that.

Some examples of dichotomous arrangements of the education variable are listed below. Segal and Knoke divided
Table 1. Independent Variables Used in the Study of Status Inconsistency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Achieved Variables</th>
<th>Ascribed Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenaski, 1954</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenkel, 1956</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenski, 1956</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goffman, 1957</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, 1962</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandmeyer, 1965</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson and Burke, 1965</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt, 1965</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly and Chambliss, 1966</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treiman, 1966</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyman, 1967</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenski, 1967</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush, 1967</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauman, 1968</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segal and Knoke, 1968</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauman, 1968</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, 1969</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segal, 1969</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broom and Jones, 1970</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laumann and Segal, 1971</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segal and Knoke, 1971</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsen and Tully, 1972</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson and Curtis, 1972</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1"o" indicates that the authors of the respective studies did other than dichotomize or trichotomize the respective variables.

2"t" indicates that the authors trichotomized the indicated variable.

3"d" indicates that the authors of the study dichotomized the appropriate variable. (If the chart has no "o," "d," or "t" in the cell by an author and any variable, that indicates that the authors did not use that variable.)
the population into those who had eleven or more years of formal education and those who had less than 11 years formal education (1968: 156). Smith used 13+ years of school and grade school and less for his sample (1969: 914). Segal's "high" category was for those who had 12 or more years of schooling and his "low" category was for those who had 11 or fewer years of school (1969: 357). Segal and Knoke, three years after their original study, changed their procedure. This time they used above the median in education as the "high" category and below the median as the "low" category.

Trichotomous divisions of education were used by Jackson and by Jackson and Curtis. Jackson divided the population into those who were college graduates or who had attended college (the high group), those who were high school graduates or who had 9-11 years of schooling with or without other schooling (the medium group), and those who had eight or less years of schooling (the low group) (1962: 471). Jackson and Curtis later trichotomized into more than high school graduate, high school graduate, and less than high school graduate (1972: 702-703).

Several studies did other than trichotomize or dichotomize the educational dimension. Kenkel coded education as the number of formal years completed (1956: 365). This was the most frequent way of coding education of the methods which did not trichotomize or dichotomize it. Schmitt used a continuous method called numerical estimation for his coding of
education (1965). Treiman used four ranks for the education hierarchy: those who had at least some college; high school graduates; those with some high school; and, those with eight grades or less. Treiman also included the educational level of the spouse in his analysis (1966: 665). Seven ranks for the education hierarchy were used by Bauman (1968: 47). Olsen and Tully, finally, used eight ranks for education (1972: 565).

Occupation had a variety of coding and computing methods also. Only one study failed to include occupation in the determination of status inconsistency (that was the 1971 study by Laumann and Segal). It is said that occupation plays the biggest role with respect to perceptions of the American stratification system. That is, people are more thoroughly judged with respect to the occupations they hold than any other dimension of social status (Segal, Segal and Knoke, 1970: 354).

A few studies dichotomized occupation. Lenski put the occupations into the upper and lower classes (Lenski, 1967). Segal and Knoke coded occupation as being "high" and "low." The "high" group was for those who were professionals, technical workers, managerial people, those who were self-employed and for those who were clerically employed. The "low" group was for those who were foremen, craftsmen, operatives and laborers (1968: 156). Smith used a dichotomy of white collar and blue collar (1969: 914). Segal did the same
in that year (1969: 357). And, Segal and Knoke did the same two years later (1971: 948).

Trichotomous divisions of the occupational hierarchy were used by Jackson. He used only the male heads of households employed in urban occupations and the wives of such persons. The "high" group in his study was for those who were professional employees and for those employed in business occupations. The "medium" group was for those who were clerical workers and for those classified as skilled labor. Finally, the "low" group was for the semiskilled, the unskilled and for service employees. Any doubtful occupations were fit in by use of the NORC study of occupational prestige (1962: 471). Jackson and Burke only used the head of the household in their trichotomous coding of occupation (1965: 557). Jackson and Curtis used respondent's occupation, respondent's father's occupation, and first occupation of the respondent in the use of the occupation dimension. The "high" group consisted of professionals, managers, and officials. The "low" group was for laborers, farmers, most operatives and some craftsmen. The remaining occupations were put in the "middle" category (1972: 702-703).

Several divisions of the occupational hierarchy were used which were neither dichotomous nor trichotomous. Schmitt used, in his study of married women, the husband's occupation. As with education, he used a continuous variable technique called numerical estimation (1965: 192). In 1967, Hyman used
eight categories for occupation, initially, and was ultimately left with six. In the end he combined self-employed professional or semi-professional and not self-employed professional and semi-professional into one category (1967: 384). Bauman used seven ranks in his use of the occupational dimension (1968: 47). Hodge and Reiman coded occupation according to deciles (1968: 724). Four categories were used by Broom and Jones (1970: 991). Olsen and Tully gave scores of from "0" to "8" for the occupational dimension (1972: 565).

In order to rank occupation by prestige in the community, several methods were used. Brandmeyer used Warner's Index of Status Characteristics to rank occupations (1965: 245). Bauman used a revised Warner scheme in his analysis (1968: 47). Duncan's 1961 Socio-economic Index was used by Hodge and Treiman to score occupation (1968: 724). The same was used by Laumann (1969: 186), Laumann and Segal (1971: 44), Olsen and Tully (1972: 565), and Jackson and Curtis (1972: 702-703). Schmitt used the Duncan index and the inclusive NORC Occupational Prestige Scale (1965: 192). Jackson also used the NORC study to fit doubtful occupations into his scheme (1962: 471). Kelly and Chambliss used a 1963 replication of the NORC study of occupational prestige (1966: 377). Finally, Kenkel used the North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale (1956: 356).
Income provided problems for researchers. Jackson omitted income data because, according to Jackson, total family income could not be used in the determination of individual inconsistency (an individual problem) when total family income is a combined measure (1962: 471). The same argument was used by Geschwender (1970: 863). Treiman defended the use of total family income by saying that the family consumes as a unit. Also, he says, females can be retained in the same in this way (1970: 162). Brandmeyer failed to include income for a different reason. He said that inconsistencies between income and occupation have little bearing upon political behavior. They are very highly correlated, he said (1965: 245).

Nevertheless, most of the studies did use income as one measure of status. Dichotomous divisions of income were used by Segal and Knoke. They divided the population into those with an income of $6000 and above and those with an income of $5999 and below (1968: 156). Smith used $5000 and above and $4999 and below as his dividing line (1969: 941). The same division was used by Segal (1969: 357). Segal and Knoke simply divided the population into those above and below the median (1971: 948).

Jackson and Curtis used a trichotomous division of the population. The three categories were 0-$5500, $5501-$9500, and $9501+ (1972: 702-703).

Treiman used four categories: $10,000+, $9999-$7500, $7499-$5000, and less than $5000 (1966: 665). Bauman had
seven ranks for the income variable (1968: 47). Finally, Olsen and Tully had eight ranks for income as they had for occupation and education (1972: 565).

Income is often equated with wealth. Hyman had different measures for wealth. He used such things as ownership of a house, auto, telephone, electric toaster and electric mixer (1967: 384).

Finally, Kenkel used two achieved variables which are not included in the table on page 16 of this text. He used the rental value of the dwelling and the dwelling area prestige (in addition to education and occupation) in the determination of the individual's social status. The rental value was established by the monthly rent, or, for owners, 1/120 of the sale value of the dwelling. The dwelling area prestige was based upon a scale of from 1 to 14 (1956: 365).

And, some studies, such as that of Olsen and Tully, combined some of the achieved variables into an overall achieved index. They took the 0-8 scores on education, occupation and income (with a total possible score of 24) and gave each person a number which represented (according to his total) his achieved rating (1972: 565).

Now, we turn to a discussion of the ascribed independent variables commonly used in the research of the effects of status inconsistency. As with the previous discussion, examples will be provided of the operationalization and categorization of each of these variables. (For a summary of
this discussion, the reader is again referred to Table 1 on Page 16 of this text.)

The Ascribed Variables

The ascribed variables (or dimensions of social status) are those into which the individual is born. In the study of status inconsistency, the major ascribed variables which have been used are race, religion, ethnicity, racial-ethnic origin, and ethno-religious group. It can be seen from the chart on Page 16 of this text that ascribed variables have often been shown to have the greatest effect with respect to the dependent variables, as will be discussed later in this chapter.

The first of the ascribed variables to be discussed is "race." Of the studies listed on the table, as can be seen by examination, only five studies used race as a variable. All five of these studies dichotomized it. Segal and Knoke dichotomized into "white" and "black." All whites were put into the "high" category and all blacks were put into the "low" category (1968: 156). The same was done by Smith (1969: 914). In a later study Segal and Knoke dichotomized into white and non-white, with the former being the "high" group and the latter being the "low" group (1971: 948). The same method was used by Olsen and Tully (1972: 565).

Broom and Jones did not use race in their study because race is said to be a less pervasive determinant of social rank in Australia than it is in America (1970: 991).
Many studies used "race" as part of the ethnicity factor or as part of a combined index such as racial-ethnic origin. Other studies controlled for race (ran separate analyses for whites and for blacks). Some studies only used one racial group such as the whites. Later in this section some of the combined measures of the ascribed variables will be discussed. Race is often a part of these combined measures, as are religion and ethnicity.

Ethnicity was used as an independent ascribed variable by seven of the listed studies. Segal and Knoke dichotomized ethnicity into English or Scandinavian ancestry of the father (the "high" group) or "other" (the "low" group (1968: 156). A later article by Segal and Knoke divided the population into those with English speaking paternity and those with non-English speaking paternity (1971: 948). Olsen and Tully also dichotomized the population with respect to the ethnic factor, which they labelled ethnicity. If the respondents thought of themselves as being members of minority groups, they were put in the low status category (1972: 565).

Lenski used a method of coding the ethnic factor which was not dichotomous. He asked the respondents to rank several ethnic groups and then gave scores to the various ranks (1954: 407). Brandmeyer used the same method, except he did not include in the ethnic groups to be ranked the ethnic group of the respondent (1965: 245-246).
Mitchell wrote an article critical of the Lenski method. He said that ethnicity accounted for most of the variance in the dependent variable. Therefore, he said, Lenski should have controlled for ethnicity (1964: 321-322). Schmitt originally used numerical estimation in the coding of ethnicity, but later found, contrary to Mitchell, that very little could be predicted on the basis of ethnicity. He did not, therefore, include ethnicity in his determination of inconsistency (1965: 191). Broom and Jones also did not use ethnicity. The reason they did not use ethnicity was the same reason they did not use race—ethnicity is a less pervasive determinant of social rank in Australia than it is in America (1970: 991).

Three studies made use of racial-ethnic group membership as an ascribed independent variable. In 1962 Jackson trichotomized racial-ethnic origin. Rank 1 was for the individuals of old English or American stock. Rank 2 was for those who had ancestors from Northern and Western Europe. Rank 3 was for those who had ancestors from Southern and Eastern Europe, who were Jewish, American Indian or Negroid. If there was any question about the nationality, it was settled by reference to Bogardus' Social Distance Scale. If an individual had mixed parentage, he was given the lower of the two ranks (1962: 471). Jackson and Curtis also trichotomized the racial-ethnic variable. The "high" group was for those who had ancestry which happened to be from Canada,
England, or America and happened to be "white." The "low" group was made up of people whose ancestry happened to be from Southern or Eastern Europe, who were Jewish, Indians, Mexican-Americans or Negroes. The remainder were put in the "middle" category (1972: 702-703).

All of the studies which used religion as an independent variable dichotomized it. As with race, ethnic identification and racial-ethnic identification, there is agreement with respect to which groups are to be put in the "high" category etc., in the treatment of religion. Segal and Knoke put all of the Protestants in the "high" group and Catholics, Moslems and Jews in the "low" group (1968: 156). The same ranking was used by Segal, although he had no Moslems in his sample (1969: 357). Smith used the same system, although he had no Moslems or Jews in his sample (1969: 914). Segal and Knoke later used Protestant and non-Protestant as the dichotomy (1971: 948). Olsen and Tully put Catholics, Jews and orthodox Christians in the "low" category and the rest of the Christians in the "high" category (1972: 565).

Laumann and Segal were the only ones to use an ethno-religious variable. They ranked fifteen ethno-religious groups with respect to several dependent variables such as socio-economic status, the number of friends, tolerance for communists, etc. The fifteen groups were (in descending order of status) the German Methodists, German Presbyterians, Anglo-American Baptists, Protestants (whose origin has not been
ascertained), Italian Catholics, Anglo-American Catholics, Irish Catholics, German Catholics, French Catholics, Slavic Catholics, Polish Catholics, and Jews (Laumann and Segal, 1971). It should be noted here that, in general, the Northern and Western Europeans (within religious group) were given higher rank than the Southern and Eastern Europeans. This is the same as was done for racial-ethnic origin (see Page 25 of this text). Also, Catholics and Jews were given lower rank than Protestants, as was done for the religious variable (see above paragraph). In short, there is general agreement with respect to the above-mentioned ascribed variables as to which groups are thought of as being of "high", "medium" and "low" status.

Olsen and Tully devised an ethnicity index which was composed of race, religion, ethnic identification and nativity. We have already treated their discussion of race (see page 24), religion (see Page 26), and ethnic identification (see Page 24). Nativity was also dichotomized. The "low" group was for those who were foreign born or had both of their parents foreign born. The others were put in the "high" category. Then, Olsen and Tully combined the four ascribed variables into an index. A trichotomy was developed with the "low" group being that group which had two or more "low" rankings on the four ascribed variables. The "medium" group was for those who had one "low" rating of the four ascribed variables. The "high" group was for those who had no "low" ratings on any of the ascribed dimensions (1972: 565).
Knoke, summarizing much of what had been done in ethnicity research, said that ethnicity usually includes three factors: race, religion and country of birth (nativity) (1972: 30). The ascribed dimension is often combined into one variable, ethnicity. In effect, this is what Olsen and Tully did (see the above paragraph).

Finally, Schmitt ranked several dimensions of social status. The rankings were determined by the respondents. The greatest weight with respect to the determination of the individual's social status was given to education; occupation was second; income was third; and, the ethnic category was last (1965: 192). In our society it would appear that the achieved variables are more important in the determination of social status than the ascribed variables.

Some might consider age an ascribed variable because it is not subject to change as a result of our own effort, unfortunately. Therefore, age will also be considered in this section. Although age has not been used as an independent variable, it has significantly entered status inconsistency research. Many of the studies have controlled for age. That is, many researchers have analyzed the results of their studies separately for different age groupings. Lenski divided the population into two groups--those 40 years of age and above and those 39 years of age and below. He computed separate results for both of the age groupings. He reasoned that the younger age group is more likely to be more
educated due to the accent upon education in modern society (1954: 407). Jackson (1962: 471) and Hyman (1967: 392) also controlled for age, but they used age 45 as the dividing point. Goffman controlled for age also, but he did so because he said that younger people may be more in favor of a change in the existing societal power arrangements (his dependent variable) (1957: 277). And, Laumann and Segal found that age tended to be an intervening variable, but they also found main effects attributable to age (1971: 39).

At this point we turn to a discussion of the dependent variables used in the study of the effects of status inconsistency.

The Dependent Variables

In general, very few of the dependent variables used in the study of status inconsistency have been shown to be significantly related to status inconsistency. That is, in few cases has it been shown that the status inconsistents possess different attitudes or behave differently from the status consistents. And, when one researcher has found "significant status inconsistency effects" with respect to a certain dependent variable, another researcher has found no status inconsistency effects with respect to that same dependent variable. Therefore, many of the findings of status inconsistency research, at the present time, appear to be contradictory at worst, ambiguous at best. Much clarifying research is sorely needed in this area.
As will be discussed in the following chapter, the results of the various studies have been related to the type of method used by the researcher. As will also be discussed at length in the following chapter, a method of measuring status inconsistency used by Lenski in 1967 was more likely to yield significant findings than was another method (dummy variable multiple regression) used after 1967. Therefore, the majority of the significant findings are to be seen in research taking place prior to the Lenski article of 1967.

And, as will be seen in this section, certain types of status inconsistency were found to be more significantly related to the dependent variable than were other types of status inconsistency. In effect, there is no clear relationship between status inconsistency and any dependent variable. Where there is some significance, it appears to be related to certain types of status inconsistency.

Arbitrarily, we might divide the dependent variables which have been used into the non-political variables and the political variables. The non-political variables will be considered first.

The Non-Political Variables

Several of the non-political variables have been operationalized in different ways. However, for the sake of convenience in reading and interpretation, they have been categorized. The discrepancies in operationalization will be detailed in the present section.
The non-political responses to be considered are social isolation, participation in voluntary organizations, social participation, the maintenance of satisfactory social relationships, psychosomatic stress, dissatisfaction with the lower rank which a person holds, intolerance, and prejudice.

Social Isolation

The first of these to be discussed is social isolation or withdrawal. Lenski, in 1956, found that social isolates were more numerous in the low crystallization (which we term the inconsistent) category (1956: 461). Geschwender hypothesized that the inconsistencies would be unable to achieve satisfactory social relationships and would therefore withdraw into social isolation. This would be more true for certain groups than it would be for other groups. He said that all under-rewarded inconsistencies would have a tendency to withdraw into social isolation if all coping responses fail. The same could be said of investment inconsistencies who had high ethnicity and low education. Also, there would be a probable tendency toward social isolation for all reward inconsistencies. Social isolation would be doubtful, he hypothesized, even if coping responses fail, for all over-rewarded inconsistencies and for investment inconsistencies who had high educational levels and low ethnic ratings (1967: 170). (The reader is referred to Table 2, on the following page, for a summary of the findings in this section.)
Table 2. The Dependent Variables Used by Previous Researchers in the Study of Status Inconsistency and the Significance of Their Findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Isolation</th>
<th>Participation in Voluntary Organizations</th>
<th>Social Participation in Meaningful Organizations</th>
<th>The Maintenance of Satisfactory Social Relationships</th>
<th>Psychosomatic Stress</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction with the Lower Rank</th>
<th>Intolerance</th>
<th>Prejudice</th>
<th>Economic Ideology</th>
<th>Right-Wing Extremism</th>
<th>Social Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lenski, 1954</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenkel, 1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenski, 1956</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goffman, 1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, 1962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandmeyer, 1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson and Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt, 1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly and Chambliss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treiman, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyman, 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenski, 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush, 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauman, 1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segal and Knoke, 1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauman, 1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segal, 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broom and Jones 1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laumann and Segal, 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segal and Knoke 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsen and Tully 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson and Curtis 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 "S" means the findings were significant for the appropriate dependent variable, "D" means the findings were not significant but were in the expected direction, "M" means the findings were mixed, with some types of inconsistencies more significant than other types, and "N" means the findings were not significant.
Participation in Voluntary Organizations

Lenski found that status inconsistents will tend to be less frequent participants in voluntary organizations (1956: 463). Geschwender hypothesized that status inconsistents would be unable to achieve satisfactory social relationships due to multiple reference groups and would therefore tend to withdraw from social contact, of which associational membership is one type (1967: 170). Lenski further found that status inconsistents, who are members of voluntary organizations, will tend to be less active members than status consistent (1956: 170). And, he found that they are less likely to report sociable motivations for joining such organizations (Ibid: 463).

Jackson and Curtis tested the Lenski idea that status inconsistents tend to have fewer associational memberships and found no significant difference for the consistent and the inconsistents (1972: 708).

Further research is needed on this question. This is a case of differing methodologies (see Table 3, Chapter II).

Social Participation

Related to social isolation and participation in voluntary organizations is the idea of social participation. Geschwender had hypothesized that status inconsistents will tend to be less frequent social participants than would the status consistent due to multiple reference groups and divided loyalties (1967: 170). This idea was tested by
Laumann and Segal who found no significant relationship between ethno-religious group and education with respect to social participation. The status consistents are not more likely to be social participants than are the status inconsistents (1971: 55).

The Maintenance of Satisfactory Social Relationships

In a study prior to the 1954 Lenski study, Adams found that as status congruency increased, personal social relationships tended to get better (1953: 18-21). The same was found by Exline and Ziller (1959: 159). In 1956 Lenski found that status consistents tended to have more trouble establishing rewarding patterns of social interaction. He found that they don't have as many enduring friendship ties as the status consistents (1956: 463).

Contrary to his hypothesis and to the Lenski findings, although supporting the Adams work and that of Exline and Ziller, Bauman found that middle-class persons who have inconsistent status are more likely to experience satisfactory social interaction and community satisfaction than are the individuals with the consistent statuses. This was not found to be the case with the lower class, however. The group with high occupation and low education or income is the most satisfied with its interaction and community. It is possible, he said, to explain his results by saying that those who are the most status inconsistent have the most status diversity and thereby the most flexibility. Flexibility, he reasons,
enables a person to maintain satisfactory social relationships by making him more adaptable in a highly mobile society (1968: 45-49).

Dissatisfaction with the Lower Rank

Hyman's dependent variable was the presence or absence of a dissatisfaction with the lower of the two ranks a person happens to hold. He compares occupation and wealth. He found that a difference for the two age groups exists (45+ and 44-). "Only among those who are relatively young does this type of inconsistency produce dissatisfaction with the lower rank." After a while, he theorized, the inconsistent becomes resigned to his fate. He also found that the longer the length of residence the greater the dissatisfaction with the lower of the two ranks (not stratified by age). He reasons that there would be more visibility to the inconsistency. Hyman also discovered that when an inconsistent has high wealth and low occupation, there is no dissatisfaction for either group. Status inconsistency effects are only confined to the reverse type of inconsistency (1967: 120-129).

Psychosomatic Stress

Stresses associated with inconsistencies produce dissatisfaction with the lower of two ranks a person happens to hold. Dissatisfaction with the lower rank may be thought of as a subtype of "psychosomatic stress," the next dependent variable to be considered.
Adams found that as status congruency increases for the individual, his personal emotional state gets better for him also (1953: 18-21). Jackson found mixed effects for status inconsistency with respect to psychosomatic stress. He found that when ethnicity is high and occupation or education is low, there is a high symptom level, while the reverse type of inconsistency does not produce a high symptom level. He explains that where there is high ascribed status and low achieved status, the individual would tend to think of himself as a personal failure, which would result in stress. For achieved inconsistencies, Jackson discovered that high occupation and low education produced a high symptom level, while the reverse type of inconsistency had no effect for men. The exact reverse was true for women (1962: 469-478).

Jackson and Burke later found that high ascribed and low achieved rankings affect the symptom level not very much more than other sharply inconsistent patterns. A high racial ranking and a low achieved ranking will, however, produce a higher symptom level than will the reverse type of inconsistency. Moderate inconsistency appeared to have little or no effect upon the symptom level (1965: 556-564).

Geschwender then hypothesized about the possible effects of status inconsistency with respect to psychosomatic stress. He said that the responses to inconsistency varied with the type of inconsistency. He said that anger would be a
probable reaction for under-rewarded inconsistencies. This is the group which has high ethnicity and low occupation or income, or, high education and low occupation or income. If coping responses for this group fail, and withdrawal becomes impossible, symptoms of psychosomatic stress are likely. Guilt was thought to be the probable reaction for over-rewarded inconsistencies. This is the group with high occupation or income and low education. Symptoms for this group are doubtful even if coping responses fail. They would tend to think of themselves as successes. The reactions of investment inconsistencies were said to be mixed. For those who had high educational levels and low ethnic ratings, symptoms were thought to be unlikely. These people would tend to define themselves as successes. They had made it despite "ethnic strikes" against them. The reverse type of inconsistency (high ethnicity and low education) would be more likely to experience psychosomatic stress as they would tend to think of themselves as failure, he said (1967: 170).

Smith found that the reactions to inconsistency depended upon the type of inconsistency and the age of the respondent. He had hypothesized that, for achieved-ascribed inconsistencies, as crystallization (age) advances, stress becomes greater because there is less chance of a change in the achieved status. He found this to be the case. He found that achieved-achieved inconsistencies are more stressful for
the low crystallization group, although income-education inconsistencies are also stressful for the high crystallization group. Ascribed-ascribed inconsistencies are stressful for all groups, although they are even more stressful for the high crystallization group (1969: 913-919).

Laumann and Segal found that only for achieved-ascribed inconsistencies in the high crystallization category does stress result (1971: 52).

Finally, Jackson and Curtis found no significant relationship between status inconsistency and psychosomatic stress (1972: 702). It appears as if there is doubt as to the effects of status inconsistency with respect to psychosomatic stress. If there is one group which would have a high symptom level, it would be the group characterized by high ascribed status and low achieved status.

The next two dependent variables, intolerance and prejudice, could be considered divisions of one variable, but will be considered separately here, as they were by the researchers who studied both variables.

**Prejudice**

It was found that more persons, in 1964, were aware of what the government was doing in the area of school desegregation and the promoting of racial equality in jobs and housing than in any other area about which they were questioned. Furthermore, they were likely to hold opinions with respect to these matters (Campbell et al., 1964: 101).
Treiman had hypothesized that status inconsistency would lead to feelings of strain which would, in turn, lead toward prejudice toward Negroes. He found that the husband's education is more important in determining the prejudice level of both the husband and the wife than is the wife's education. He also found that if the wife is more educated than the husband, they are probably both more prejudiced. In general, men have substantially more influence over their wife's attitudes than women do over their husband's (1966: 661-663).

Kelly and Chambliss also found that educational level was significantly related to attitudes such as prejudicial attitudes, though they found no significant relationship of status inconsistency to prejudicial attitudes (1966: 382).

Geschwender outlined his conception of how inconsistent subtypes can be expected to behave and the attitudes they can be expected to hold. He said that under-rewarded inconsistents, who have high ethnicity and low occupation (if mobility is impossible for this group), are likely to hold prejudicial attitudes and to discriminate against minorities. For under-rewarded inconsistents, who have high education and low occupation or income, if there is no mobility then there is possible prejudice against the majority or minority groups. This prejudice is unlikely to aid the individual in coping with his problem. The same could be said of over-rewarded inconsistents, who have low ethnicity and high occupation or
income; investment inconsistents, who have high education and low ethnicity; over-rewarded inconsistents, who have low education and high occupation or income; and investment inconsistents, who have high ethnicity and low education. The latter group, he said, is likely to develop prejudice and to discriminate (1967: 170).

Fauman said that the proportion of respondents favoring integration is greater in the high inconsistency category than it is in the low inconsistency category, although the differences are not significant statistically. They did find that mean social class more clearly differentiates attitudes toward integration than does status crystallization (inconsistency). They also found that the group with low income and low ethnicity was the group most likely to want to desegregate (1968: 55-59).

It has been shown by Robinson that socio-economic status in general has but slight connection with feelings about Negroes and race relations. The disproportionate number of Negroes in the lower socio-economic orders has tended to reduce the average level of racism there. However, lower class whites have been more racist than more privileged whites (1968: 48).

In 1970, Geschwender used the Treiman data to reanalyze the relationship between status consistency and integration. He concludes:
... thus, status consistent persons possess higher mean prointegration ranks than would be predicted by their status ranks; status inconsistent persons whose income level is higher than their educational level have a lesser tendency in the same direction; and, status inconsistents whose income level is lower than the educational level deviate in the direction of lower prointegration ranks than would be predicted from their status ranks.

He therefore says that there is a relationship between status consistency and beliefs about integration (1970: 865).

But, Olsen and Tully found no general relationship between status consistency (or inconsistency). They found small differences between the individuals with ascribed-achieved inconsistencies and those with achieved-achieved inconsistencies with respect to prejudice level. They did find that the former type of inconsistency is more significantly related to prejudice than is the latter, though the differences are slight (1972: 559-563).

Finally, no significant relationship was found by Jackson and Curtis with respect to prejudice for any form of status inconsistency (1972: 707).

In sum, with respect to prejudice, the results appear to be slight and contradictory. It does appear that achieved-ascribed inconsistencies are the most significantly related to the level of prejudice.

Intolerance

A dependent variable often used in the study of status inconsistency is the tolerance for dissidents (such as communists and atheists). In 1964 Campbell et al. found that
only 16% of their sample did not have an opinion about the firing of a suspected communist (1964: 101).

The researchers who have dealt with intolerance as a dependent variable have found no significant relationship between intolerance and inconsistency (Kelly and Cambliss, 1966), (Laumann and Segal, 1971), (Olsen and Tully, 1972), and (Jackson and Curtis, 1972). However, tolerance for political protest action was found to be more closely related to achieved-ascribed inconsistencies than to other forms of inconsistency (Olsen and Tully, 1972). The independent effects of education appear to have a decisive influence on an individual's tolerance level for those of opposing opinions. There is a positive correlation between educational level and the tolerance for opposing opinions (Laumann and Segal, 1971).

Again, a summary for the foregoing discussion can be found in Table 2, as can a summary of the discussion to follow about political dependent variables.

The Political Variables

In this section three general variables will be considered. These are economic ideology, right-wing extremism, and social change. This author realizes that, broadly speaking, all opinions are political opinions. However, the division made in this paper is only for the simplifying of the presentation.
Economic Ideology

The majority of studies which have dealt with economic ideology as a dependent variable in status inconsistency research have not found any significant relationships between status inconsistency and economic ideology.

For the sake of this discussion, economic liberalism and conservatism will be defined. An extended discussion of liberalism and conservatism can be found later in this chapter.

Economic liberals are more often in favor of social welfare and the associated government programs than are the economic conservatives (Lipset and Raab, 1970). We might define economic liberalism as support for the welfare state idea, or economic statism. Economic conservatism would be support for the idea of individual freedom and initiative with respect to economic matters. Economic conservatives would be opposed to economic statism and in favor of a laissez-faire government policy with respect to economic matters. It has been shown that the higher the social class of the individual, the more likely it is that the individual tends to be an economic conservative (for he has the most to lose by a redistribution of wealth) (Kelly and Chambliss, 1966: 380).

Robinson found that people who favored liberalized programs in one domestic field, such as assistance to dependent children, have tended to approve of liberalization of other
domestic programs as well. Conversely, those who have opposed expansion of social security coverage, for example, have tended to oppose aid to dependent children, unemployment benefits and federal involvement in public health and medical care. He also found that the higher the income, the more economically conservative. Economic self-interest seems to be a powerful determinant of economic ideology (1968: 48-49).

In 1954 Lenski asked his sample their views on government sponsored health insurance, price controls, and a general extension of government powers. He found that the low crystallization (high inconsistency) group tended to be more leftist with respect to government economic policy (1954: 410). Two years later Kenkel asked two groups seven questions (paraphrased): 1) Are you in favor of the Taft-Hartley Law?; 2) Are you in favor of foreign trade?; 3) Are you in favor of government care for the needy?; 4) Are you in favor of strikes during wartime?; 5) Are you in favor of government price controls?; 6) Are you in favor of government ownership of aircraft factories?; 7) Are you in favor of strict labor laws? He said that previous studies had shown there was a relationship between social status, per se, and the responses. He found, contrary to Lenski, that there was no difference in the responses between the consistent and the inconsistent. He further examined each of the two groups to see if the respondents in the two groups who differed most from the group means also differed in their
responses to the questions. Still no significant difference was detected (1956: 367). Lenski comments on the Kenkel study that questions 2) and 7) were ambiguous and the other five did go in the expected direction, although the differences were small, with the exception of the one on price controls. (Lenski had also noticed a difference with respect to this question. He said that it may tap a different constellation of values.) Lenski said that it was possible to make 20 comparisons with his deviants (those who differed most from the group mean). He said that 70% of the time the deviants were more liberal than their consistent counterparts. He said that if we eliminate "price controls," over 80% are consistent with the original hypothesis (1956: 369).

Brandmeyer also found that, with respect to jobs for the unemployed, old-age insurance, and doctor's care for the needy, the inconsistencies were more liberal than the consistents. However, with respect to a guaranteed minimum income, support for college education for the needy, and support for public housing, the opposite was true. He also found that, contrary to Lenski's findings, with high occupation and low ethnicity an individual is less favorable to the extension of government services than the consistent counterparts (1965: 251, 255).

Kelly and Chambliss devised their own scale to check attitudes toward welfare. They had four statements: 1) Federal aid to education is desirable if we are going to
adequately meet present and future educational needs in the United States; 2) If unemployment is high, the government should spend money to create jobs; 3) A government administered health program is necessary to insure that everyone receives adequate medical care; 4) Economic security for every man, woman and child is a goal worth striving for, even if it means socialism. They found that inconsistent persons are not more liberal than consistent persons (1966: 378-380).

As had Kelly and Chambliss and Brandmeyer, Laumann and Segal found no significant detectable relationship between status inconsistency and economic ideology (1971: 45).

Olsen and Tully did find a significant relationship between status inconsistency and economic ideology. They found that an individual with high SES and low ethnicity is likely to differ with respect to economic ideology from the status consistent. The reverse type of inconsistency was not significant. However, they point out, less than 1.5% of the variance in attitudes is explained by status inconsistency (1972: 563).

In general, the independent effects of the main variables explain more variance in economic attitudes than does status inconsistency, per se. Few researchers have found significant effects with respect to economic ideology.

Social Change

Many researchers have dealt with social change as a dependent variable in the study of status inconsistency.
Anticipating the discussion of liberalism and conservatism to follow, we can draw a distinction between liberals, moderates and conservatives with respect to attitudes toward social change. Those who benefit most from the stratification system are most likely to accept it. They tend to rationalize the justice of the system (Berelson and Steiner, 1964: 461). Those who do not accept the existing stratification system are termed conservatives. Liberals are said to be in favor of social change, and the moderates are said to be in between (Dahl, 1967: 363).

In order to see if the consistents differ from the inconsistencies with respect to attitudes toward social change, "the vote" has often been used as an indicator of liberalism or conservatism. Olsen and Tully, among others, say that a vote for the Democratic Party would be a vote in favor of social change. They further say that those in favor of social change would also tend to be liberal on economic issues (1972: 559-563).

Most studies of status inconsistency have dealt with social change as a dependent variable. Some have found significant differences between the consistents and the inconsistencies with respect to social change. Some have found no difference between the two groups. Others have found mixed differences or directional differences.

Lenski found that the greater the inconsistency in the population, the greater the pressure for social change. He
found that the inconsistencies were more likely to support the Democratic Party than were the status consistent. Inconsistents were found to be more liberal than were the status consistent. The effects of status inconsistency varied with the type of inconsistency, he said. When there is low ethnicity and high achieved status, there is liberalism. The reverse type of inconsistency is less liberal, although still they are more liberal than the status consistent (1954: 408-411).

Goffman also found that the status consistent are less likely to favor social change than the status inconsistencies, especially when the opportunities for upward social mobility are low (1957: 279-281).

It was also hypothesized by Brandmeyer that the status consistent will tend to be more conservative than will the status inconsistencies. He found that his findings do not support those of Lenski and Goffman. He found that the status inconsistencies are not more in favor of the Democratic Party than are the status consistent. In fact, he said, the reverse is almost the case. As indicated by the vote and attitudinal preferences, the type of status inconsistency was found to be related to liberalism or conservatism. For high occupation inconsistency (high occupation and low education or ethnicity), he found more liberalism than for the consistent of high occupation. For those with low occupation he found the consistent to be more liberal than the inconsistencies (1965: 247-252).
Schmitt found support for the idea that inconsistents tend to be more liberal than the consistsents, especially if the educational rank is below that of the occupational or economic. Schmitt, however, was only dealing with women (1965: 194).

Lenski later (with a changed method of analysis to be discussed in the following chapter) also found the inconsistents to be more liberal than the consistsents, except for Britain. He said that inconsistents are 8% more liberal than would be predicted on the additive model basis in 21 of 25 tests performed (1967: 299).

On the basis of what had been done to that point, Geschwender classified the inconsistents and the consistsents with respect to the likelihood of their being in favor of social change. For under-rewarded inconsistents, two responses are possible. For those with high ethnicity and low occupation and income: if neither mobility nor prejudice proves adequate, then the individual possibly joins a racist social movement. For the inconsistent who has high education and low occupation and income: if other coping responses fail (as is likely), then the individual is prone to join extremist social movements—which provide for him perceptions of adequate power. Over-rewarded inconsistents also have two possible responses. For those who have low ethnicity and high occupation and income: if prejudice fails to reduce dissonance, then moderate change responses such as liberalism
or moderate reform social movement joining is possible. For the inconsistencies who have low education and high occupation and income: a moderate change response such as political liberalism or participation in moderate reform social movements is possible. For investment inconsistencies two responses are also possible. For those who have high ethnicity and low education: these individuals are prone to join racist social movements. For the individuals who have high education and low ethnicity: moderate change responses such as political liberalism or participation in reform social movements are likely. For reward inconsistencies he is unable to make predictions. For those with high occupation and low income Geschwender is unable to predict because the data show a tendency toward both political liberalism and extremist movements. For those with high income and low occupation he is unable to predict because the data show no tendency toward liberalism (1967: 170).

Segal and Knoke hypothesized that due to bureaucratic needs (such as efficiency of operation), achieved status is becoming more important than ascribed status. And, people are becoming upwardly and downwardly mobile at the expense of immobility. Therefore, differences between achieved and ascribed statuses will become more evident and a large proportion of the population will be predisposed to support vehicles of perceived social change. They did not, however, find general significance with respect to the relationship
between status inconsistency and the preference for social change. They did find, as had some of the researchers before them, that achieved-ascribed dysjunctions are the most significant with respect to the preference for social change. A vote for the Democratic Party was considered by Segal and Knoke to be an indication of the preference for social change (1968: 156-157).

The Democratic Vote was also used as an indicator of the preference for social change by Smith. He had hypothesized that where there is low crystallization there would be frustration for the group which is inconsistent, because change in their lower status would be possible. The low crystallization group would be more liberal than the high crystallization group because the latter group would find change to be impossible and become resigned to their fate, thus reducing frustration. The results indicate that the effects of inconsistency are mixed. He found that where there is an achieved-achieved dysjunction and crystallization is low, there is more liberalism than there is when the same dysjunction is in the high crystallization category. He also found that achieved-ascribed and ascribed-ascribed inconsistencies are stressful for all groups. He said that those in the younger age category for the latter two types of inconsistency are more likely to support the Democratic Party than those in the higher age category (1969: 917-919).
Segal also found mixed effects. He said that where there is status inconsistency there tends to be support for the Democratic Party if the lower status is visible. Where there is no visibility there tends to be withdrawal rather than party affiliation. But, he found that inconsistencies between race and education or occupation led to preference for the Democratic Party, whereas inconsistencies between race and income did not. Furthermore, where there is low religion and high education or income, there tends to be support for the Democratic Party, although the support is about that which would be found as an independent effect of religion (1969: 357-358).

The Australian sample used by Broom and Jones indicated that inconsistency does produce a tendency toward liberalism (or social change), although the results were not significant. Status inconsistency does reduce the possibility of a radical political response, although it does not improve the understanding of voting behavior (1970: 995).

Laumann and Segal found no significant effect of inconsistency with respect to support for social change. But, they found that support for the party of social change was greater when there was a dysjunction between achieved and ascribed status than there was when there was a dysjunction between achieved or ascribed statuses (1971: 48).

The effects of inconsistency are mixed according to Segal and Knoke. The majority of inconsistency subtypes
produce no significant effect with respect to support for social change. But, when there is a combination ascribed status and income, there are significant status inconsistency effects (1971: 951).

Mixed effects were also discovered by Olsen and Tully. They found that low ascribed and high achieved status will deviate from additive effects in the direction of support for the Democratic Party (the party of change). The reverse type of inconsistency will not show that tendency (1972: 563-571).

Finally, Jackson and Curtis found no significant relationship between political liberalism (social change) and status inconsistency. They say that liberalism is sufficiently explained by the additive effects of the independent variables (1972: 704-707).

In conclusion, we might say that the effects of status inconsistency with respect to the preference for political change appear to be mixed. The greatest effects (the greatest support for social change) are for dysjunctions between ascribed (low) and achieved (high) statuses. Some of the researchers have found no significant effect of status inconsistency, while others have demonstrated some effects. In short, the studies dealing with this dependent variable are many, while the results, or the effects of status inconsistency with respect to social change, are still being debated.
Right-Wing Extremism

An extension of social change is that of right wing extremism. It has been said that liberals are in favor of social change, moderates are less in favor of it, and conservatives are for the preservation of the status quo. If the social system is tending toward collectivism, internationalism, and liberalism with respect to individual liberties, anyone who would oppose such ideas might be thought of as being in favor of turning the clock back to a prior day. We might say that those who are in favor of turning the clock back to the way things were in a previous day are right-wing extremists.

Rush studied the relationship between right-wing extremism and inconsistency. He defined the extreme right as a millenarian political ideology which maintains as an ideal the principle of "limited individualism"; this principle being articulated as opposition to "collectivism" in government, international relations, modern social principles, and modern social structure and operation. He hypothesized that status inconsistents are more likely than status consistent to be right-wing extremists. He developed a 26 item questionnaire to establish right-wing extremism and found that about 21% of the population exhibited this tendency. When examining inconsistencies between income and education, he found that if an individual is high on education and low on income, he would tend to support the leftist groups, whereas
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on policy issues has no clear pattern, and there is hardly a trace of an overall left-right dimension (1969: 368). Kelly and Chambliss also found that liberalism isn't unidimensional (1966: 379).

There are two types of liberalism and conservatism, according to Lipset and Raab. There is economic liberalism and non-economic liberalism. The same is true of conservatism. Economic liberals tend to be non-economic conservatives and vice-versa. A non-economic liberal is one who favors individual freedoms and civil liberties. A non-economic conservative is one who thinks the state is more important than the individual and is inclined to yield individual civil liberties in the face of state demands. An economic liberal is one who favors the welfare state, and such related things as medicare. An economic conservative is one who is opposed to the welfare state idea (Lipset and Raab, 1970).

Robinson says there is no general connection between a person's stand on specific political and social issues, his party identification, his political behavior, and his more general attitudes toward change--his conservative or liberal philosophy (1968: 95). Axelrod points out that people tend to view each policy issue separately (1969: 369).

Robinson reports that Eysenck found the existence of a radicalism-conservatism scale rather than one of liberalism and conservatism (1968: 113). Robinson feels that perhaps distinctions along the "modernism" continuum might be better
than those along liberalism-conservatism continuum, because it might be more pervasive and relevant (Ibid.: 80).

Finally, Axelrod says that the clearest dimension (in terms of length, threshold, and average value) is populism, defined by an extreme representative who favors federal improvements of education, medical care, and job opportunities but is against current tax levels, civil liberties, and foreign involvement. This populist dimension is most distinct for non-voters (1969: 369).

In any event, the majority of those writing on the subject agree that a general, cross-issue continuum of liberalism and conservatism is not to be found. Yet, it is possible to define a liberal and a conservative position with respect to each issue. This was done with respect to social change, economic ideology, racial relations, and intolerance (see the appropriate discussions earlier in this chapter). Therefore, when we speak of liberalism and conservatism, we must be issue-specific. There may, incidentally, be high correlations between several liberal positions on several issues, but this must be detailed at the time of the specific discussion. Therefore, when we discuss whether or not inconsistents are more liberal than consistents, we must refer to specific issues.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE METHODOLOGIES USED BY PREVIOUS RESEARCHERS

Before beginning a chronological discussion of some of the methodologies used by previous researchers, we will enter a discussion of the difference between additive and interactive effects, and the significance this may have for status inconsistency research.

Additive and Interactive Effects

For the sake of discussion let's assume that we are trying to explain as much of the variance in racial attitudes as we can. That is, we are trying to find as many explanations for a given attitude toward "race" as we can find, and the amount, by percent, of the total "racial attitude" accounted for by each of the explanatory factors which we have discovered. If we find that 94% of a person's racial attitude can be accounted for by the independent effects of education, occupation, income, and racial-ethnic origin, we have explained most of "the racial attitude" of the individual. However, we have not accounted for the totality of that attitude. Six percent remains unexplained. In essence, status inconsistency research is trying to "explain" the
additional 6% of the racial attitude left unexplained by the
independent effects of several other variables, or as much
of the 6% as it can "explain."

The vast majority of the explanation of the dependent
variables, it seems, can be accounted for by the independent
effects of independent variables such as ethno-religious
group, age, sex, education, occupation, income, and region
of the country (Brandmeyer, 1965: 252), (Schmitt, 1965: 193),
(Fauman, 1969), (Segal, 1969: 358). That is, if we let each
of the aforementioned variables account for as much of the
variance in the dependent variable as it can, we are left
with little, by comparison, which is left unexplained or
which has not been accounted for.

Now, we might equate the term "additive effects" with
the use of the phrase "independent effects of each of the
independent variables." The question arises as to whether
or not anything beyond the independent effects of the vari-
ables used in the study actually exists (with respect to
explanatory power).

The effect of inconsistency has been equated with sta-
tistical interaction. That is, if we remove the independent
effects of the independent variables being considered, and
we take the remaining variance in the dependent variable
unaccounted for, the remaining variance is said to be the
result of statistical interaction. This interaction is said
to be due to status inconsistency.
Interaction has been used in two types of analysis (in general). The first method was proposed by Lenski in 1964. In this method of analysis, as described by Blalock, interaction is said to be the sum of the inconsistent cells of a contingency table minus the sum of the consistent cells of that same table (with respect to the dependent variable). For example:

| Variable 1 |       |
|鄙     |       |
| 鼻     | 碱     |
|       | 碱     |
|       | 碱     |

For example:

| Variable 1 |       |
|鄙     |       |
| 鼻     | 碱     |
|       | 碱     |
|       | 碱     |

He says that (50+60)-(20+70)=20 is taken to be the interaction term, where (50+60) is the sum of the inconsistent cells and (20+70) is the sum of the consistent cells. The "20," which is the interaction term, is taken to be the independent effect of status inconsistency. This "20" could also have been attained in the following way: (50-20)-(70-60)=20 (1967: 305-308).

Then, a test of significance is performed to determine whether or not the "20" is significant. Blalock makes the point that the above method of equating status inconsistency and interaction is conceptually dangerous and inaccurate. He says that (using stress data from Jackson) the interaction term which is equated with inconsistency could have been attained in a number of ways. For example, he presents the following charts:
There is an effect of 30 (stress) for dysjunctions between ascribed and achieved status. But, he says, this could be attained in several ways. Among the possibilities are the following:

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{ASCRIBED STATUS} & \text{ACHIEVED STATUS} \\
\text{HIGH} & \text{LOW} \\
\text{HIGH} & 40 & 70 \\
\text{LOW} & 40 & 40 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[(70+40) = (40+40) = 30\]

He says, then, that we have to identify (or make assumptions based upon theory) which will help us eliminate other possibilities. At present, he says, we cannot equate an interaction term with any specific inconsistency (1967: 305-308).

In a sense, this method of analysis suffers from the averaging of the consistent cells and from an averaging of the inconsistent cells. Not only is much information lost in the process, but conceptually it does not make much sense in many
cases for the consistently high cells to be grouped with the consistently low cells, as the inconsistency effects for each type may be very different.

The second method of analysis which equates inconsistency and interaction is that of multiple regression. Multiple regression has several subtypes, of which analysis of variance and multiple classification analysis are two. This method, however, partitions the interaction effects into various types of interaction. As an example of a regression equation, the one used by Jackson and Burke is presented:

\[ s = \text{the predicted symptom level} \]
\[ o_1 = \text{high occupation} \]
\[ o_2 = \text{medium occupation} \]
\[ o_3 = \text{low occupation} \]
\[ r_1 = \text{high racial-ethnic} \]
\[ e_1 = \text{high education} \]

(There are more of these, but this author is simplifying the presentation here.) The equation would be as follows:

\[ s = 44.34 - 1.04e_1 - .58o_2 - 1.15e_1 - .72o_3 + 1.21r_1 \]
\[ + 1.12r_2 + .89o_1e_3 + .90(o_1r_3 + e_1r_3) + \]
\[ 1.29(o_3r_1 + e_3r_1) \]

Dummy variables were used for the first six status terms. For example, if the respondent had high occupation, he was given a "1" for term "o_1", otherwise he was given a "0." The numbers (such as -1.04, -.58, -1.15, etc.) represent the
slope of the regression line, or the change in the independent variable which correlates with unit changes in the dependent variable. The 44.34 is a constant. Terms such as \( o_1 e_3 \) and \( o_3 e_1 \) are the interaction terms (1965: 561-562).

The magnitudes of the interaction terms (such as \( o_3 e_1 \) and \( e_1 r_3 \)) are then tested for significance, and the proportion of the variance the interaction term explains is given.

Analysis of variance and multiple classification analysis relate the magnitudes of the measurements of the dependent variables to positions with respect to the two variables being cross-classified to see if there is significant interaction, which is then taken as being the inconsistency effect. In some cases, as will be discussed in the following section, the tables which have been proven to have significant interaction then have that interaction partitioned by a comparison of the means of the cells to see if certain types of inconsistency differ most from the consistent cells and from other types of inconsistency. Where the interaction is insignificant, it is assumed that status inconsistency has little or no explanatory power beyond that of the additive effects of the independent variables.

Because of the partitioning of the interaction term in the case of multiple regression and the comparison of cells technique of MCA and analysis of variance, the second method of analysis does not suffer the major pitfall of the earlier Lenski technique.
In short, inconsistency is equated with the interaction term. Inconsistency is said to explain some of the variance in the dependent variable left unexplained by the independent effects of the independent variables. In the two methods explained in this section (the difference between the ' inconsistent cells and the consistent cells and regression), inconsistency and interaction are equated. The problem with equating inconsistency with interaction is that the effect of the specific type of inconsistency under examination is clouded with the effects of the other types of inconsistency, and it is said that high consistent and low consistent cannot be averaged. But, if interaction can be equated with inconsistency, and if interaction is the variance in the dependent variable not attributable to the combined additive effects of the independent variables, the specific type of inconsistency which has the pronounced effect upon the variance in the dependent variable can be determined by comparing the scores on the dependent variable for the various cells of the analysis of variance table to each other (if the interaction was found to be significant in the first place). Therefore, if the interaction term is used as a general indicator of the significance of the relationship between the two independent variables with respect to scores on the dependent variables and then the effects of the specific types of inconsistency are examined, the pitfall of equating total
inconsistency with interaction is avoided, as not all inconsistency subtypes are lumped together for the purposes of generalization.

Methodologies of Previous Studies

In this section the methodologies used by previous researchers will be reviewed chronologically. The same studies referred to in Tables 1 and 2 will be discussed in this section. A summary of the discussion in this section will be presented in Table 3.

In general, three different methodologies or methods of analysis have been employed by those who have studied the effects of status inconsistency in the past. The three methods we will label "the old Lenski method," "the new Lenski method," and "regression" (of which MCA and analysis of variance are subtypes). They will be discussed as they appear, chronologically, in the literature.

In 1954 Lenski made his classic study of crystallization (which was later termed inconsistency by other researchers). He said that to get a quantitative measure of inconsistency take the square root of the sum of the squared deviations from the mean of the four hierarchies scores of the individual and, subtracting the resulting figure from one hundred, one will have a measure of the individual's inconsistency. The more crystallized the individual's status (the lower the inconsistency or the more consistent the individual) the more consistent the individual's statuses. He then
Table 3. The Types of Methodologies Used by Previous Researchers in the Study of Status Inconsistency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Old Lenski</th>
<th>New Lenski</th>
<th>Regression</th>
<th>Other Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lenski, 1954</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenkel, 1956</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenski, 1956</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goffman, 1957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, 1962</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandmeyer, 1965</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson and Burke, 1965</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt, 1965</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly and Chambliss, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treiman, 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyman, 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenski, 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush, 1967</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauman, 1968</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segal and Knoke, 1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauman, 1968</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segal, 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broom and Jones, 1970</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laumann and Segal, 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segal and Knoke, 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsen and Tully, 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson and Curtis, 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compared the consistent with the inconsistent. He compared the most consistent 3/4 of the sample with the least consistent 1/4 of the sample (1954: 407).

Kenkel also used the Lenski method. He converted the scores on each hierarchy to percentiles and made a cumulative percentile ranking for each individual, which became his social status score.

To calculate inconsistencies, he did the same as Lenski had done, except he did not subtract the result from 100. That made Kenkel's result represent the inconsistency score rather than the consistency score. He further divided the sample into the half with the highest scores and the half with the lowest scores. He compared the two groups to see if the means on the four hierarchies differed for the two groups (1956: 366).

Lenski did the same thing in his 1956 study that he had done two years previously. He used \( \chi^2 \) (Chi squared) to compare the consistent to the inconsistent Lenski, 1956).

Goffman also dichotomized inconsistency. Using Tau, he divided the groups into high and low consistency scores. Those who were marked high were high on both income and education with occupation. Those who scored low were inconsistent on occupation with education and/or income (1957: 278).

In the classic Jackson study of 1962, Jackson measured status consistency by first dividing each dimension into
three ranks. Then, status consistentss were those who had
"high" marks on each dimension, "medium" ranks on each dimen-
sion, or "low" ranks on each. (This could be numerically
represented as 111, 222, or 333.) Moderate inconsistentss had
two like ranks and a one step deviation on the third (112,
323, 223, etc.). Then there were inconsistentss who had no
like ranks (123, 231, 312, etc.). Finally, there were the
two rank deviates. These people had two like ranks and a two-
step deviation on the third (113, 131, 331, etc.). He then
used a method of comparing the consistentss to the inconsis-
tents later popularized by Lenski—subtracting the consistentss from the inconsistentss (1962: 471). This method was
discussed earlier in this manuscript.

The original Lenski method then came into question in
an article written by Mitchell in 1964. He made the point
that if one rank was out of line with the rest, the effects
of one dimension will be counted more heavily than the rest
of the dimensions, when in fact "social reality" may not
find them to be unequal (1964: 318).

In 1965 Brandmeyer decided to use the Lenski method.
He said that anyone who had a score of 60+ would be con-
sidered consistent, and anyone with a score of 59 and below
would be considered inconsistent. Then he checked to see
if the inconsistentss had higher or lower ethnicity, educa-
tion, and occupation scores than did the consistentss, and
found negligible differences. But, taking into consideration
the Mitchell criticism of Lenski, he said that the real
differences could be concealed. For example, he said that a high and a low might average in the middle and appear to be the same as an individual who had scored in the middle. So, he made further checks. He found that the inconsistencies tended to have occupation scores at the "high" or "low" ends of the hierarchy, while the consistent tended to be in the middle. The same thing was found for the other two variables. To help correct this, he controlled for occupation, for example. He also compared the most inconsistent 1/4 of his sample to the most consistent 3/4 of his sample. He then compared the most inconsistent 1/4 to the most consistent 1/4 of his sample. Finally, he compared various inconsistency subtypes to see if they differed. For example, he would compare those with high occupation and low ethnicity to those with low occupation and high ethnicity (Brandmeyer, 1965).

Multiple regression analysis of variance was used by Jackson and Burke, despite the fact that not all of the assumptions of their model were met by their data. Firstly, the sample was a clustered rather than a random sample. Secondly, the data on the dependent variable happened to be other than interval data. Thirdly, all of the deviations that they found were lumped together into one interaction term (1965: 558). A more complete discussion of the method that they used can be found on Pages 62 and 63 of this text.
Schmitt used a combination of methods in his analysis. He employed the old Lenski method, multiple regression and the "t" test. He used three dimensions and obtained an average congruency measure. The three hierarchies were not equally weighted, with the education hierarchy getting the greatest weight (1965: 192-193).

Hyman, taking into consideration the Mitchell criticism of Lenski's new method (see pages 60 and 61), developed his own method. He gave percentile ratings on each of the hierarchies by which a person is ranked. He chose to call a person inconsistent when there was a 35 percentile difference in the ratings that the person received on the two dimensions. Considering Mitchell's criticism, he compared within various categories in order to hold constant those categories. For example, he compared the high occupation, low income inconsistenst to the high occupation and high income consistent, which served as a control upon income. This method eliminated many of the people who occupied middle positions (1966: 121-125).

The same year Kelly and Chambliss did research which was similar in some ways to that of Hyman. They summed the discrepancies between pairs of cumulative percentile ranks, with the greater the rank the greater the status inconsistency. They also used perceived rankings, asking the respondents how many percent do they think were below them on each of the scales. Their study compared both the 1/2 most consistent to
the 1/2 least consistent (as Kenkel had done) and the 1/4
least consistent to the 3/4 most consistent (as Lenks had

In the same year Treiman returned to regression, but
found no status discrepancy effect, per se (1966: 659-664).

In 1967 Lenks returned to the method he used in 1964
(subtracting the consistent cells from the inconsistent cells
in a two by two contingency table) (1967: 299).

Rush returned to "the old Lenks method." He used
three hierarchies and ten class intervals for each variable.
Frequency counts were made for each interval, then cumulative
percentile ranks for each hierarchy were established. The
score for each class interval was assigned on the basis of
the midpoint of the percentile range for that interval. For
purposes of comparison, the population was divided into the

Hyman used a method discussed previously (saying that
a status inconsistent person has a 35 or more percentile dis-
crepancy between pairs of status rankings). But, the 1967
study differed from the method discussed previously in that
this time he used categories rather than actual percentiles
for each of the hierarchies. Like Rush, he used the percen-
tile range midpoints in the computation of status inconsist-
ency for each individual (1967: 384).

Bauman used the original Lenks method and he tricho-
tomized inconsistency into those who were consistent,
moderately consistent and sharply inconsistent. He then compared the groups with the use of Chi squared ($X^2$) (1968: 47).

Segal and Knoke, in that same year, used "the new Lenski method" (Segal and Knoke, 1968).

The old Lenski method was the basis for research conducted by Fauman. Because the upper class was so small in his sample, he eliminated it from his analysis, so that only two classes were used. He also found, like Brandmeyer, that the highly crystallized respondents had a higher mean occupation and income rating than did the low crystallized respondents. To help correct for this, like Lenski had done, he dropped the highest 18 respondents with respect to ethnic rank. To divide the two classes, he arbitrarily selected 50 as his cutoff point. Those who had less than 50 were deemed low class; those 50 and above were deemed high class. The crystallization point was 60 and above. Fifty-nine and below were considered to be uncrystallized. (These two points were selected, he said, because the sample neatly divided there.)

He developed charts which, for each of the paired variables (such as high income and low ethnicity or high occupation and low education), had a percent who supported school desegregation. For each of the paired variables, he had "support" figures for "high" and "low" class, and "high" and "low" crystallization within each class (1968: 54-58).
Both Segal and Smith used the new Lenski method in 1969 (Smith, 1969: 915; Segal, 1969: 358).

Broom and Jones used a combination of the old Lenski method and regression in their analysis, in order to determine if one would give a better indication of the effects of inconsistency than another (1970: 989).

Segal, Segal and Knoke used regression for their analysis (a specialized method called Multiple Classification Analysis). They said that the coefficients can be transferred to those of multiple regression. They used the MCA because "the assumption of normality required by regression was violated by the standardization of our data thru computation of decile ranks" (1970: 350).

In general, multiple classification classification analysis is a useful technique. "The technique can handle predictors with no better than nominal measurement, and interrelationships of any form among predictors or between a predictor and a dependent variable. The dependent variable, however, should be an interval scale (or a numerical variable) without extreme skewness, or a dichotomy." Weak measurement, (nominal scales), on the predictor variables, correlated predictors, and non-linear relationships are conditions which the MCA program is designed to handle. In general, it is multiple regression using dummy variables. A key feature is its ability to show the effect of each predictor on the dependent variable both before and after taking into account the effects of all other variables. Other
techniques, they say, do this also (like multiple regression), but they require interval measurement. But, the technique assumes that the dependent variable is predictable from an additive combination of the predictor variables. The dependent variable could, incidentally, be made interval by coding responses as "1" or "0" as in dummy variable analysis (Andrews, Morgan and Sonquist, 1967: 8-17).

Segal and Knoke also used MCA. They said it requires no conversion of basic data. All data were treated as dummy variables. For example, if an individual had high achieved and low ascribed scores for certain status pairs, he was given a "1" for that pair. Any other combination that he might have had was given a "0". They also used "eta," which is a correlation ratio; that is, the ratio of the explained sums of squares attributable to a given independent variable to the total sums of squares. And, they used "beta," which is the substitution for a partial correlation coefficient in indicating the relative importance of several predictors (1971: 949).

Laumann and Segal used the basic multiple regression program (1971: 39).

The same method was used by Jackson and Curtis despite the fact that the multiple regression model has its obvious weaknesses, they say. They also mention that it is preferable to "the new Lenski method" in that while the multiple
regression method found no significance in several studies, significance was found by "the old Lenski method" (1972: 911).

Finally, Olsen and Tully used analysis of variance as their method. The interaction term, said to represent status inconsistency, was then tested for significance by use of the "F" test. They also made use of dummy variables, but only when the dependent variables were shown to be significant or when the inconsistent cells had noticeably high or low scores. Each of these cells was converted to a dummy variable which was included in the regression equation. And, to avoid "linear determinancy," the lowest category of each of the independent variables was omitted from the regression equation (1972: 560-566).

In short, at the beginning of the research into the effects of status inconsistency, "the old Lefenski method" was the major method used by researchers. Then, as failures of that method began to be found, "the new Lenski method" replaced it as the preferred method. At the same time, other methods (such as that used by Hyman) were tried. And, in the last few years, especially, types of regression programs have been the most used methods due to the failings of the previous methods.

Summary

The main question to be answered in this section is: "How have the different methodologies used by previous
researchers been related to the significance of their findings?"

It seems, first of all, that the differences between achieved and ascribed variables have produced the most significant findings with respect to the dependent variable (Lenski, 1954), (Lenski, 1956), (Segal and Knoke, 1968). Yet, other studies, which have not used ascribed variables, have found significance in their research (Goffman, 1957), (Rush, 1967), (Schmitt, 1965). It does now appear that the effects of status inconsistency are mixed, depending upon the methodology used and the variables selected (both independent and dependent).

It also would seem that inconsistency effects are more likely to be seen when the researcher compares the most consistent 1/4 of the population to the least consistent 1/4 of the population, than if he had compared the most consistent 1/2 of the population to the least consistent 1/2 of the population. The most consistent 1/4 would differ in attitudes from the least consistent 1/4 more than the most consistent 1/2 would differ from the least consistent 1/2 of the population if inconsistency effects can be thought of as being on a continuum.

Also related to the significance of the findings is the statistical method employed by the researcher. Almost half of the studies which used, primarily, the old Lenski method, found significance with respect to the dependent variables
which they measured (Lenski, 1954; Kenkel, 1956; Rush, 1967). Those which used primarily the second Lenski method also found significant results with respect to differences between the consistent and inconsistent groups with respect to the dependent variables tested (Jackson, 1962), Lenski, 1967), (Segal and Knoke, 1968), (Smith, 1969), (Segal, 1969). And, the researchers who have used variations of the regression model have found very few significant differences between the inconsistents and the consistent (Jackson and Curtis, 1972: 711).

Generally speaking, the old Lenski method was the first used, the new Lenski method was the second used, and regression is the one currently in vogue. Perhaps this is because little significance has been found with the use of this method, and the other methods have been shown to have many methodological holes. Finding significance where there is none can be dangerous business for the social sciences.

As with most research, therefore, the methods employed in the study undertaken help to determine the results which are received and the conceptual benefits which can be derived from that research.

Finally, it has been mentioned that the use of income data (total family income) cannot be used as a means of measuring individual inconsistency, it is thought by some researchers. Yet, most of the studies have used income as one independent variable. And, the dependent variables
examined have not been shown to be similar from one study to
the next or even within the same study. That is, researchers
have operationalized such things as liberalism and conserva-
tism differently from each other and have assumed that
liberalism and conservatism (frequent dependent variables)
are two ends of the same continuum.

In short, there has been such variety with respect to
the use of dependent variables, such inadequate methodology
in some studies with respect to the measurement of inconsist-
ency, and even usage of independent variables which cannot,
it seems, be used as part of a means to measure inconsist-
ency, that perhaps more, and definitive, research is needed
in this area of research.
CHAPTER III

CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

Conceptual Model, Dependent Variables and Hypotheses

On Page 14 of this text we outlined some conceptualizations which had been done in the field of status inconsistency research. At this point we will expand that model based upon what we had found with respect to the findings of previous research in this area (the reader is referred to the discussion in this text on Pages 29-57).

1. Each individual may be ranked along several dimensions or indicators of social status.

2. His social status is the result of his ranking on these dimensions.

3. An individual who holds different status rankings on the various status dimensions is defined as being status inconsistent. (That is, if an individual ranks "high" in status on one dimension and "low" on another, he is defined as being status inconsistent. This author takes into consideration here the ranking of some individuals as being moderately inconsistent, such as Jackson did in 1962 (1962: 471), but for the present study, which uses trichotomous ranking, those who had a "middle" score on a dimension were eliminated to maximize differences between status inconsistents and consistents. There will be more of this discussion in the following section on operationalization.)

4. The expectations associated with the rankings which a person holds rather than the objective ranks, per se, may determine the individual's status inconsistency.

5. An individual who is status inconsistent may try to alleviate the inconsistency to reduce the internal cross pressures.
6. An individual who is status inconsistent is beset by cross pressures, as the expectations associated with the various rankings may conflict with each other.

7. The inconsistent individual with high achieved and low ascribed ranking would tend to be in favor of social change to alleviate the inconsistency, as it is the society which is "to blame" for his inconsistency (Geschwender, 1967: 170). An individual who has high ascribed status and low achieved status would tend to think of himself as a personal failure and would tend to develop psychosomatic symptoms of stress (Jackson, 1962: 469-478). The effects of the other types of inconsistency appear to be mixed or contradictory.

8. Advancing age increases crystallization.

9. The more crystallized the individual's statuses, the more salient become achieved-ascribed discrepancies.

Now, with respect to the above general formulation and to the design of the present study, we can talk in terms of the dependent variables used in the present research. Following that discussion, the hypotheses to be tested will be presented.

In order to understand the reasons for the choice of the dependent variables which were used in this research, it is thought that the reader would profit by a step-by-step discussion of the procedure followed by this researcher.

After having made a detailed review of the literature, this researcher selected thirty-one questions from the SRC questionnaire which was submitted to the sample. These questions were thought by this researcher to be related to status inconsistency (as had been shown by previous research) or were questions (like those dealing with abortion) which
were relevant to present social problems. Six of these questions dealt with abortion, one dealt with the death penalty, one dealt with the court's treatment of criminals, one with premarital sexual relations, three with intolerance for anti-religious persons, three with intolerance for individuals with communist leanings, eleven dealt with racial attitudes, one with attitudes toward busing school children, and four with "the vote." The 31 questions were submitted to factor analysis. Eleven factors were discovered. The percent of variance explained by each of the factors is listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percent Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No single factor or factors were distinguishably outstanding with respect to the amount of variance explained by that factor. Although the eleven factors were empirically distinct, they were not conceptually distinct. That is, because these factors had Eigen values of 1 or greater, they are empirically distinct by definition. However, we could
not distinguish between them conceptually. An examination of the questions used was then undertaken. Some of the questions were then eliminated after consultation with the researcher's advisors.

The six questions dealing with abortion were eliminated because they were thought to be (with respect to expected answers) related to the ethno-religious group of the respondent. That is, Catholics were thought to be less often in favor of abortion than non-Catholics. And, the four questions dealing with "the vote" were eliminated because the party which is economically conservative also tends to be more non-economically liberal (Lipset and Raab, 1970). And, one party (or a vote for such a party) could not be interpreted as being either a liberal vote or a conservative vote. Finally, two questions dealing with race relations were eliminated because they were "linked" questions. That is, those who responded in the negative to the first had no chance to answer the second. This process left 19 questions to be resubmitted to the factor analysis technique.

The 19 questions developed 7 factors. The 7 factors and the percents of variance explained by them are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percent Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of these factors were statistically significant in that they all had eigen values of 1.00 or greater. The same was true for the previous 11 factors.

The final two factors (six and seven) were eliminated because they were complicated conceptually to the point of not being nameable. Furthermore, they were two of the lowest three with respect to the amount of variance explained.

Then we took the top five loadings for each factor as the questions associated with that factor. The fifth loading complicated the analysis because one of the questions dealing with race relations appeared in three of the five factors as the fifth loading. Therefore, we eliminated the fifth loading which eliminated that question of race relations from three factors although leaving it in one factor. Then, the fourth highest loading on each factor was eliminated because it was contaminated by one question on anti-communism and one on anti-religion. That is, these questions appeared in more than one factor, and, if we were to eliminate the fourth loading, that problem would be solved. We were then left with five factors and three questions (or loadings) on each.

Finally, we eliminated the third factor. The lowest percent of the variance explained was due to this factor, and, the three questions associated with this factor were conceptually indistinct from those of factor 5.
We had left four factors (which explained 63.37% of the variance). Each of these factors had three loadings or questions. They are listed below.

Factor 1: Question 1: In the case of a man who admits that he is a communist: suppose he is teaching college. Should he be fired or not?

2: In the case of a man who admits he is a communist: Suppose he wrote a book which is in your public library. Someone in your community suggests that the book should be removed from the library. Would you favor removing it or not?

3: In the case of someone who is against all churches and religion: If some people in your community suggested that a book he wrote against churches and religion should be taken out of your library, would you favor removing this book or not?

Factor 2: Question 4: Negroes shouldn't push themselves where they're not wanted (agree strongly, agree slightly, disagree slightly, disagree strongly).

5: White people have a right to keep Negroes out of their neighborhood, and Negroes should respect that right. (The same responses as the above question.)

6: In general, do you think that the courts in this area deal too harshly or not harshly enough with criminals?

Factor 3: Question 7: ...somebody who is against all churches and religion...If such a person wanted to make a speech in your city (town, community) against churches and religion should he be allowed to speak, or not?
8: ...should such a person be allowed to teach in a college or university, or not?

9: ...admitted communist...Suppose this admitted communist wanted to make a speech in your community. Should he be allowed to speak or not?

Factor 4: Question 10: Do you think white students and Negro students should go to the same schools or to separate schools?

11: Do you think Negroes should have as good a chance as white people to get any kind of job, or do you think white people should have the first chance at any kind of job?

12: If your party nominated a Negro for President, would you vote for him if he were qualified for the job?

Now, each of the questions associated with any given factor was given a certain weight which was determined by the related factor matrix. That is, each of the weights shown would be the emphasis placed upon that question in the determination of the factor score for that individual.

Factor Number 1: Question Number 1: Weight: .74818
2: .78779
3: .45742

2: 4: .63002
5: .62598
6: -.61409

3: 7: .78882
8: .67385
9: .52634

4: 10: -.61650
11: -.68972
12: -.34098
It should be noted that question number 6 has a negative weight assigned to it. The responses to the questions were ordered in such a way that a positive (yes) response to one question would be an indication of a liberal position and a negative (no) response to another question would be an indication of a liberal position. Also, by reversing the response order, a check is made on response sets on the part of the individual. In essence, it acts as a check on the individual to make sure that he is not just giving all positive responses to the questions. Therefore, to maintain continuity (to make sure that the higher the number the more liberal the position, for example), some of the factors are given negative weights. That is, for example, a "1" response to question 4 would be considered a conservative response, whereas a "1" response to question 6 would be considered a liberal response.

Now, the problem of naming the factors remains. It can be seen by inspection that Factor 1 resembles Factor 3 and Factor 2 resembles Factor 4. By definition, these factors are empirically distinct, but they are not, by admission, as conceptually distinct. Dealing first with Factors 1 and 3: we can see that they both deal with intolerance of communists and those who are anti-religious. Unfortunately, this author could not arrive at conceptually distinct names for the two forms of intolerance. Therefore, he has decided (after much deliberation) to term them Intolerance 1 and Intolerance
2. It is recognized by this author that if he had used two questions, instead of three, the problem would have been solved, as one of the intolerance factors would have been for communists and the other for those who were anti-religious. But, this would have further narrowed the explained variance to a very low level. In short, this author decided, after careful weighing, to live with the somewhat awkward names given these factors instead of losing explanatory power.

The second and fourth factors are similarly conceptually intermingled, though empirically distinct. However, in this case a distinction can be drawn. Questions 4, 5, and 6 all deal with the relationship between groups (white and black, and those defined as criminal and those doing the defining). In short, these questions deal with tolerance toward the out-group, the deviants by definition. Therefore, a name "preservation of the status quo" can be applied to this factor. It is assumed that one who would preserve the status quo would think that Negroes shouldn't push themselves where they are not wanted, would think that whites have the right to keep Negroes out of their neighborhoods, and would think that courts aren't dealing harshly enough with criminals.

The fourth factor can be labelled "prejudice." The prejudiced individual would not want his children to go to the same school as Negroes, would tend to think that whites should have the first chance at getting a job, and would not vote for a qualified Negro for President.
Now, with respect to the liberal-conservative positions on each factor we might say that with respect to Factor 1, a liberal position would be defined as being tolerant with respect to communists and anti-religious persons (Laumann and Segal, 1971). The same could be said of Factor 3.

Factor 2 could be defined in such a way that those most in favor of the preservation of the status quo would hold conservative positions. They wish to "conserve" or preserve the status quo. Factor 4 could be defined in such a way that those who are prejudiced are those who are conservative (Lipset and Raab, 1970). This is an aspect of non-economic liberalism.

In short, we now have four factors made up of three questions each which are our dependent variables. They are listed below.

Factor 1: Intolerance 1
Factor 2: Preservation of the Status Quo
Factor 3: Intolerance 2
Factor 4: Prejudice

A low score on the first two factors would be indicative of what is defined as being the conservative position, while a low score on the last two factors would be indicative of what is defined as being the liberal position.

It remains in this section to draw hypotheses with respect to these dependent variables.

Several comparisons will be made in this paper. The inconsistencies will be compared to the consistent and to
other inconsistencies. In light of this, the following comparisons will be made:

1. High achieved-low ascribed
2. High ascribed-low achieved
3. High achieved-low achieved

Now, three independent variables are being used: education, occupational prestige, and ethno-religious group. The first two are achieved and the last ascribed. Now, for comparison 1, there are two possibilities. There could be a high occupational prestige rating and low ethno-religious group rating or high educational rating and low ethno-religious group rating. The same two possibilities exist for comparison 2: high ethno-religious group and low education or occupation. The third comparison also has two possibilities, depending upon which is high, education or occupational prestige.

Therefore, we can renumber the comparisons as follows:

1. High achieved-low ascribed
   a. high occupational prestige and low ethno-religious group
   b. high educational rating and low ethno-religious level

2. High ascribed and low achieved
   a. high ethno-religious group and low occupational prestige
   b. high ethno-religious group and low educational level

3. High achieved and low achieved
a. high educational level and low occupational level
b. high occupational level and low educational level

It has been shown that the previous research in the area of status inconsistency has indicated mixed effects with respect to significance of inconsistency with respect to dependent variables. However, we can make decisions based upon the weight of evidence in this area of approach. Therefore, we can say that generally no significance has been found with respect to the effect of status inconsistency upon the dependent variable "tolerance" (see Table 2, Page 32, of this text). It was found by Olsen and Tully that inconsistencies between achieved and ascribed variables appeared to have the most effect with respect to this dependent variable, but even the effect of this type of inconsistency was not significant (1972: 559-563). The independent effects of education, however, appear to have a decisive influence with respect to the tolerance for opposing opinions of the individual (Laumann and Segal, 1971). Therefore, we can only hypothesize that the status inconsistencies will differ from the status consistents. We hope that by tightly controlling our design, with a national sample, we can lay firm evidence either for or against the idea that status inconsistencies tend to be more tolerant than the status consistents.

The second factor (preservation of the status quo) presents special problems. Dahl mentioned that those most in
favor of the existing stratification system tend to be those who benefit most from that system. They are termed conservatives (1967: 363). Lenski had found that achieved-ascribed inconsistencies tended to be more liberal than status CONSISTENTS. He said that the group of INCONSISTENTS with low ascribed status tended to be the most liberal (1954: 408-411).

Brandmeyer, however, found that low ascribed INCONSISTENTS tended to be more liberal than the CONSISTENTS, like Lenski, but also found that the INCONSISTENTS of low occupation to be more conservative than the CONSISTENTS of low occupation (1965: 247-252).

Olsen and Tully found that low ascribed-high achieved INCONSISTENTS will be more often in favor of social change than will the status CONSISTENTS, but the reverse type of inconsistency will not show this tendency (1972: 563-571).

We might say, therefore, that we would expect the low ascribed-high achieved INCONSISTENTS to be more liberal than the status CONSISTENTS with respect to Factor 2 (preservation of the status quo). The reverse type of inconsistency (high ascribed-low achieved) would simply be said to be expected to differ from the status CONSISTENTS, though the direction of this difference would not be specified in the hypothesis. In fact, it is the low ascribed INCONSISTENTS who are theorized to be least in favor of the existing stratification system because it is that system which has given them a low status ranking which they cannot, by effort, alter (Geschwender, 1970).
Finally, the Table on Page 32 indicates that researchers have not found significant status inconsistency effects with respect to prejudice. Therefore, the most specific hypothesis which we can develop would say that the status inconsistents are expected to differ from the status consistent, without specifying direction of that difference.

With respect to differences between achieved statuses (comparisons 3a and 3b) we cannot specify direction of the hypothesis with respect to any factor, as that type of inconsistency has been found to be less significant than any other form of inconsistency (comparisons 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b). The responses to achieved inconsistencies appear to be more moderate (Geschwender, 1970: 170).

In short, we have hypothesized the following:

Factor 1: \( H_0 \): Status inconsistents do not differ from the status consistent with respect to tolerance for those of opposing opinions.

\[ H_1 \]: Status inconsistents differ from the status consistent with respect to tolerance for those of opposing opinions.

Factor 2: \( H_0 \): Status inconsistents do not differ from the status consistent with respect to attitudes favorable to the preservation of the status quo.

\[ H_{11} \]: Status inconsistents with low ascribed and high achieved status tend to be more liberal than the status consistent with respect to attitudes unfavorable to the preservation of the status quo.

\[ H_{12} \]: Status inconsistents of high ascribed and low achieved status or between achieved statuses differ from the status consistent with respect to attitudes favorable to the preservation of the status quo.
Factor 3: (The same as Factor 1)

Factor 4: $H_0$: The status inconsistencies do not differ from the status consistents with respect to attitudes of a prejudicial nature.

$H_1$: The status consistents differ from the status inconsistencies with respect to attitudes of a prejudicial nature.

One of the major purposes of the present research is to clarify many of the contradictory findings in the field of status inconsistency research. It is hoped that by tightly controlling the design of the present research through the "control" of extraneous variables and through precise operationalization, we can pave the way for more securely founded hypotheses by those who would do similar research in the future.

It should, of course, be remembered that we first test for interaction effects. Where there is no significant interaction, there is no need for the further testing of hypotheses, for there is no significant effect of inconsistency. The above hypotheses would apply only after significant inconsistency effects have been discovered.

In other words, the first test is for significance of interaction. Then the test for direction of the hypothesis is begun. So, the following hypothesis is the first tested in the case of all four factors:

$H_0$: There is no effect of status inconsistency (no interaction effect) with respect to Factor 1

$H_2$: There is an effect of status inconsistency (interaction effect) with respect to Factor 1.

The same test will be performed on Factors 2, 3, and 4.
Operationalization

Independent Variables

As mentioned, three variables were used as independent variables. The three were education, occupation, and ethno-religious group.

Education will be trichotomized, as will the other two independent variables. The same trichotomy will be used as was used by Jackson and Curtis. The three categories they used were those with less than a high school diploma, those with a high school diploma, and those with more than a high school diploma. (For a more comprehensive discussion of how others have treated the education variable, see Chapter I of this text.

The first twelve categories of the NORC codebook for 1972 (no formal schooling through 11 years of school) would be for those who fit into the first category. Those who would be in the second category would have responded in the affirmative to category 13 (12th grade completed). And, those who answered 1-8 years of college would have been put in the third category.

If differences do exist between the inconsistencies and the consistents, they are more likely to show up with the use of a trichotomous classification than they would be with the use of a dichotomous arrangement. Underclassifying of data leads to lost information. And, it would seem that moderate inconsistencies (one rank deviants) would be less likely to show the symptoms of inconsistency. Therefore, the middle category
of the trichotomy will be eliminated from the analysis. (More
discussion on this point will be presented in Chapter II). At
any rate, the moderate inconsistents would be grouped with both
the inconsistents and the consistents if the most consistent
1/2 of the sample were compared to the least consistent 1/2 of
the sample, thus clouding any effect inconsistency may have.
This is what is often done when the independent variables are
dichotomized.

Occupation will also be trichotomized. (Pages 19 and 20
of this text will provide the reader with a more complete dis-
cussion of how the occupation dimension of social status has
been treated in the past.) Both Schmitt and Jackson used the
NORC study of occupational prestige. They trichotomized occu-
pation into 1) professional and business occupations; 2)
clerical and sales and skilled labor; and 3) semiskilled,
unskilled and service. Any doubtful occupations were fit in
with the use of the NORC study of occupational prestige
(Jackson, 1962: 471; Schmitt, 1965: 192). We will do approxi-
mately the same. The difference is that we will take those
occupations which have prestige scores of 48 and above (about
134 occupations) as the high group1 those which have prestige
scores of 47-33 as the middle category (about 169 occupations);
and those which have prestige scores of 32 and below (about 131
occupations) as the "low" category. This is about the same as
that done by Jackson, but this author feels it will be more
accurate, in that some of the occupations which nominally fit
into one category have prestige rankings which would seem to place them into another category (in the Jackson method).

For example, the NORC codebook lists "managers and superintendents" as occupation number 216, with a prestige rating of 38. This occupation is under the category of "Managers and Administrators, except farm." By prestige rating, it would more appropriately fit under the classification of "sales workers." In other words, the ranking by prestige score is far more accurate in that it is precise. There would be no oversimplifying by lumping together people with the same nominal job classification.

The other variable to be used as an independent variable is ethno-religious group membership. This study will use the method used by Laumann and Segal. Laumann and Segal ranked 15 ethno-religious groups as far as prestige was concerned. Those groups were, in order of decreasing prestige: 1) German Methodists; 2) German Presbyterians; 3) Anglo-American Methodists; 4) Anglo-American Presbyterians; 5) German Lutherans; 6) Anglo-American Baptists; 7) Protestants whose origin is not ascertainable; 8) Italian Catholics; 9) Anglo-American Catholics; 10) Irish Catholics; 11) German Catholics; 12) French Catholics; 13) Slavic Catholics; 14) Polish Catholics; 15) Jews (1971: 44). This parallels the use of the ethnic variable made by many other researchers (see Chapter I of this text). Segal and Segal and Knoke ranked the Protestants as the "high" religious group and Catholics as the "low" group (1969: 357).
1968: 156-157). Jackson had trichotomized ethnic group based upon country of origin of ancestors. The "high" group was for the old English or American stock. The "middle" category was for those who traced their ancestry back to North-Western Europe; the "low" group was for those who traced their ancestry back to South-Eastern Europe, who were Jewish, American Indian or were Negroid (1962: 471). There seems to be much agreement as to the classification, by prestige level, of the various ethno-religious groups.

What this researcher has done, essentially, is use the Laumann and Segal classification and to add groups which were part of the 1972 NORC survey to that classification. The additions were given their place in the classification based upon either their religion, their country of origin, or both.

The NORC survey did not have a single ethno-religious category; instead it had a separate ethnic and separate religious categories. Therefore, each group had to be matched to see into which group or category it fit.

Laumann and Segal's ranking was first trichotomized. Because, as mentioned, the middle category is being eliminated from the analysis, we were more concerned that some group would get into the high or low categories if it did not "belong" there than if it were to be placed into the middle category. Below is the trichotomized Laumann and Segal classification.
High

German Methodists
German Presbyterians
Anglo-American Methodists
Anglo-American Presbyterians
German Lutherans

Medium

Anglo-American Baptists
Protestants (origin not sure)
Italian Catholics
Anglo-American Catholics
Irish Catholics

Low

German Catholics
French Catholics
Slavic Catholics
Polish Catholics
Jews

The NORC codebook had the following possibilities as responses to the ethnic classification:

Africa, Austria, Canada (French), Canada (Other), China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, England and Wales, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands (Dutch, Holland), Norway, Philippines, Poland, Puerto Rico, Russia (USSR), Scotland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, West Indies, other, no information, not possible to code.

The survey also (for religion) listed Protestant, Catholic and Jew. It further subdivided the Protestants as Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Episcopal, other, no denomination given, nondenominational church, no answer and not applicable (Catholic or Jew). Furthermore, the "other" Protestant denominations were listed. There were 78 of these. They ranged from the Holiness sect to The Church of Christ to Wesleyan. The vast majority of the Protestants did not fit into the "other" category. And, those who did were generally
(with very few exceptions) placed into the middle category, thus eliminating them from the analysis. Therefore, the possibility of making a misclassification error was very slight indeed.

It should also be noted that if a group to be classified happened to be of both "high" and "medium" categories, for example, they were eliminated from the analysis to make certain that there were no classification errors. One such example would be Catholics from Sweden. They could not justifiably be ranked on the basis of either their ethnic origin or their religion, the former being "high" and the latter being "medium" or "low." They were, therefore, eliminated from the analysis. The number of such cases was very slight.

Now, the "high ethno-religious group" was composed of the following groups:

High Ethno-Religious Group

Methodists from French Canada, other Canada, England and Wales, France, Germany, Ireland, Scotland, or Spain.
Lutherans from French Canada, England or Wales, Germany, Ireland, and Scotland.
Presbyterians from French Canada, other Canada, England or Wales, France, Germany, Ireland, or Scotland.
Episcopali ans from every country listed except Africa, Mexico, the Phillipines, Puerto Rico or the West Indies.
Congregationalists from every country listed except Africa, Mexico, the Phillipines, Puerto Rico or the West Indies.
People from Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden or Switzerland who were Protestant.

The "middle ethno-religious group" is listed below.
Middle Ethno-Religious Group

Baptists from French Canada, other Canada, England or Wales, France, Ireland, Poland, Russia or Scotland.

Catholics from French Canada, other Canada, Denmark, England or Wales, Finland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Scotland, Spain, Sweden, or Switzerland.

People from countries other than Africa, Denmark, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Sweden, Switzerland, the West Indies or other not possible to code who happened to be one of the "other" Protestant denominations other than Congregationalist (and other than those whose denomination was not specified or was a member of a nondenominational church or who did not answer.

The "low ethno-religious group" is listed below.

Low Ethno-Religious Group

Catholics from Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland or Russia.
Jews from any country.
People from Africa, Mexico, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, or the West Indies of any religion.

Now, it might be noticed that some groups are not included. This would be true for either of two reasons. If the group was not classifiable due to cross-references or if the group did not have any people in it (such as Japanese Catholics), it was omitted from the analysis. Not all groups were represented in the sample.

And, when a statement such as "people from countries other than" is made, that means "of those countries which were mentioned by the respondents," obviously.

Episcopalian and Congregationalists were placed in the "high" category because they are universally considered to be of "high" status ranking (Lipset and Raab, 1970: 172). Africans are universally put in the "low" category, as are
Phillippines, Puerto Ricans, and West Indians, as they are not of pure Caucasian descent (Jackson, 1962: 471; Smith, 1969: 914).

Individuals who were Protestant and were from Northern and Western Europe (Nordic) were put in the "high" category because of the region of origin of their ancestors. Protestants, being universally (as far as researchers have classified them) considered to be of higher status than are the Catholics, would be in either the "middle" or the "high" category. Those who had ancestors from Northern and Western Europe were put in the "high" category and the rest were put in the "medium" category. The same was true of the Catholics, although we were there dealing with the "middle" and "low" groups.

In short, very few, if any, judgmental calls were needed. Protestants were ranked higher than non-Protestants; Northern and Western Europeans and old American or Canadian stock ranked higher than non-Northern and Western Europeans or those of old American or Canadian stock; and Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians, and Methodists were put in the "high" category. The basis for such classification is voluminous, as virtually all studies which have employed the ethnic and/or religious variables have used such a classificatory scheme.

Finally, income was not included as an independent variable in order to avoid the measurement of individual inconsistency by the use of a "group" variable such as total family income. To obtain measures of individual inconsistencies we need individual measures of that individual (Jackson, 1962: 471).
Design Controls

Other than the three independent variables, several other variables were included in the analysis. The extraneous variables were "held constant" in order to minimize their effect upon the dependent variable. The variables which were "held constant" in this way were region of the country and age. That is, for a certain analysis such as high ethno-religion and low education compared to the consistents, the comparison was made within certain age groups to prevent age from having an influence upon the analysis. That is, the comparison was made after the effect of age was removed. This was done by the computer (SAS program). The computer took out of the analysis the main effects of age and region of the country and then ran the requested analysis. In effect, this runs the analysis within certain age and region categories. Also, when a comparison was being made between a certain pair of status dimensions and the inconsistency they produced and the dependent variables, the third independent variable was held constant or removed from the analysis by first taking into consideration the main effects of that variable. For example, if we were computing the inconsistency effects of education and ethno-religious group, the effects of occupation would be first weighed by the computer so that occupation did not cloud the analysis.

In order to remove the effects of age and region of the country, and to still have a number in each of the cells of the analysis of variance program sufficient to satisfy the
assumptions of the program, age was trichotomized and region
of the country was dichotomized. Age was broken down into less
than or equal to 30, 31-45, and 46 and above (Page 28 of this
text has a detailed discussion of age).

Most studies have also controlled for age, but they have
dichotomized it. We were fortunate, given the size of our
sample, to be able to trichotomize it. Lenski broke the age
category at 40 years (1954: 407) and Jackson used age 45 as
the dividing point (1962: 471). Age was controlled, in part,
because of the different emphasis placed upon education in the
older and younger age groups. We selected 45 as one cutoff
point. We further divided the younger age group in half, at
age 30. In effect, this left us with three fairly equal age
groups. Furthermore, the lines of division make conceptual
sense in that we are dealing with youth, adulthood and maturity
or middle age, three distinct groupings. "Never trust anyone
over 30" implies a passage from youth. If sample size had per-
mitted it, a fourth division, over 65, would have been added.
At any rate, the trichotomizing of age does as much or more
than any previous study to avoid the independent influence of
age.

Region of the country was dichotomized. It was broken into
South and non-South. Lipset and Raab also use this breakdown
as it has been found that the attitudes in the South differ
significantly from those in the non-South (1970: 329). The
Southern states were considered to be the following: Delaware,
Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, Washington, D. C., North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana and Texas. The rest were considered to be non-South. Again, if our sample size had permitted, it would have been nice to be able to do more than dichotomize. We might have broken down the country into several sections, such as Midwest, Northeast, etc. Yet, we were fortunate, given our sample size, to be able to control for region of the country at all. That is more than most other studies have been able to do.

Finally, "race" was controlled in that only Caucasians were included in the analysis. The size of our sample permitted this and the dependent variables chosen required this. Our analysis is further refined by not including those of the Negroid race. The independent effects of race are thereby eliminated.

Status Inconsistency Determination

In order to measure inconsistency (using trichotomized independent variables) the middle category of each variable was omitted. This prevented the contamination of "real" status inconsistency effects by one step deviations in inconsistency (or what we might term moderate inconsistency). That means that the following cells were entirely omitted from the analysis (the omitted cells have X's in them):
In essence, 5/9 of the data have been omitted from the analysis in order to make certain that if there are effects of status inconsistency, they will be evident. If we find we are unable to reject the null hypothesis, we will be quite certain that status inconsistency has no effect.

This procedure is similar to one often used in the past by researchers. They also eliminated the moderate inconsistencies for the same reason (Brandmeyer, 1965; Treiman, 1966; Kelly and Chambliss, 1966).

Therefore, the cells with two-step deviations are considered to be the inconsistent cells, and the cells with no deviations are considered to be the consistent cells. In the above chart, the upper left and lower right cells are the consistent cells, and the upper right and the lower left cells are the inconsistent cells.

Sampling Design

The sampling was done by the NORC. They describe their own sampling procedures:

Sampling Information

Individuals interviewed for the Spring 1972 general social survey are a representative cross section of the non-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Prestige</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
institutional population of the United States, 18 years of age or older. The sample is a standard multistage area probability sample to the block or segment level. At the block level, however, quota sampling is used with quotas based on sex and age.

The primary sampling units employed are derived from the updated NORC 1953 master sample. Within each selected PSU localities were ordered according to the following categories: cities with block statistics, other urban places, urbanized minor civil divisions, and non-urbanized MCD'S. Places within each of these categories were ordered by their 1960 populations. Localities were selected from this list using a random start and applying a designated skip interval to the cumulative 1960 population.

In places for which 1960 census block statistics were available, blocks were selected with probabilities proportionate to the population in the block. In places without block statistics, census enumeration districts were selected with probabilities proportional to the number of households. The selected districts were divided into segments and estimates of the number of households within each segment were obtained by field counts. The selection of segments was then made with probability proportionate to the number of households.

The average cluster size in this master sample was 7.0 respondents per cluster. The cluster sizes, however, were recalculated for this survey to better reflect the 1970 shift in the population from the east to the west coast, and from rural to urban areas. This adjustment resulted in a range of cluster sized from 6.56 in the rural west to 9.48 in the urban west.

At the block or segment level, the interviewer was required to begin her travel pattern at a previously designated random dwelling unit, and to proceed in a specified direction until her quotas were filled. The quotas call for approximately equal numbers of men and women; the exact proportion in each location was determined by the 1970 census whenever data were available, and was assumed to be .50 elsewhere.

In addition, the interviewer was required to select the respondent from among the persons present in the dwelling unit at the time of her call, in the following order:

1st choice: males 18-29
2nd choice: females 60+
3rd choice: females 18-29
4th choice: males 30-59
5th choice: females 30-59
6th choice: males 60+

The order of preference was set in order to bring the age and sex distributions in line with the distributions in the population. This order is based on previous NORC Amalgam surveys. To further insure that the sample would be representative, and to minimize the effect of the unavailability of
certain age-sex groups at the first time the interviewer called, the interviewer was instructed to interview only after 6:00 p.m. on weekdays, and at any time during the weekend.

Although the mean squared error cannot be estimated directly from a quota sample, NORC has suggested that, for most purposes, this sample of 1600 could be considered as having about the same efficiency as a simple random sample of 1,000 cases.

Test Statistics

The "old Lenski" method and the "new Lenski" method have been shown to have conceptual weakness. As mentioned in the previous chapter, varieties of multiple regression (analysis of variance and MCA) have been used in its place because of their ability to find no significance where previous studies have found significance (See Table 3). When the assumptions of this method or combination of methods are met, the tests tend to be more powerful.

Analysis of variance can be used whenever we are testing the relationship between means of two groups or more. It can be used whenever there is a single interval scale and two or more nominal scales (Blalock, 1960: 242). The model further assumes that there has been independent random sampling, normal populations for each category, the populations from which the categories were drawn are equal in variance, and the hypothesis is a null hypothesis (Ibid.: 248). Furthermore, the model assumes additivity in the population (no interaction) (Ibid.: 258).

The present sample uses ordinal data with respect to education, occupational prestige and ethno-religious group. The education dimension was trichotomized based upon level of
education. The occupational and ethno-religious groups were ranked based upon societal estimation of the prestige of various occupations or ethno-religious groups. Therefore, we have at least nominal data. We have, in fact, ordinal data in this regard.

The interval scale is the mean for each cell on the factor in question. Each cell mean represents the degree of liberalism or conservatism with respect to that factor for the cell in question. Some may question the idea that we have a true interval scale. It may be said that we have, at best, a high ordinal scale. Jackson and Burke pointed out that high ordinal data may be substituted for interval data. The effect of such a substitution is significant (1965: 558). Therefore, even if we have but high ordinal data, we have met the first of the assumptions of this test statistic.

The model also assumes independent random sampling. This requirement has also been met. Although a simple random sample was not used, which is the most efficient and upon which the probabilities of the test statistics are based, the NORC has calculated that the method employed has the same effect as a simple random sample of 1000. In essence, by the use of quota cluster sampling we gain the advantage of including all segments of the population, but less the benefits of randomness in the process. However, we began with a large "N," so we can "afford" to sacrifice some of that "N" in exchange for the conversion to simple random sampling. In effect, we have simple
random sampling within clusters and within quotas. By the use of this method, it seems, we get the benefits of both methods.

Equality of variances in the subcells and normality of the populations are assumed in the testing for interaction, which is the first test to be performed (Blalock, 1960: 258).

As mentioned, the null hypothesis is the hypothesis that is tested against the alternate hypothesis.

Finally, the model assumes additivity in the population (no interaction). This is the first test to be performed (Ibid.; 258). If interaction is found, then it is said that inconsistency has an effect beyond the simple main effects of the component variables.

If interaction is found, the means for the cells of the contingency table are tested to see if they differ significantly from each other. For example, if we are testing occupation and education inconsistency and find significant interaction, we then test high occupation and low education (the mean on that factor for that cell) against the mean for the reverse type of inconsistency. Also, the mean for each type of inconsistency will be tested against the means for both the high and the low consistent. The means for the consistent will not be lumped together into a grand mean, as that would be conceptually meaningless.

When interaction is found, all that can be said is that there is an inconsistency effect. No mention can be made of the direction of that effect. That is, no mention can be made
of the effect of each specific type of inconsistency. Therefore, we must test the means for the cells in order to make statements about which type of inconsistency is more liberal or conservative with respect to any given factor.

This testing of the difference between means is done by the use of the "t" test, whose formula is listed below.

\[ t = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu}{s / \sqrt{n}} \]

(Blalock, 1960: 145-146)

The "t" test is used instead of the "Z" test because the standard deviation of the population can only be estimated.

The assumptions of the "t" test are simple random sampling and interval scales. These requirements have been met (see above). The \( \bar{x} \) and the \( \mu \) represent the means of the two cells. If we find that the two means differ significantly from each other, we can, by inspection, say, for example, that one type of inconsistency (high occupation and low education) tends to be more conservative than the reverse type of inconsistency with respect to the chosen factor. The same could be said when comparing a certain type of inconsistency to a certain type of consistency.

And, when no interaction effects are found, we can only say that inconsistency has not been shown to significantly affect attitudes with respect to the factor in question.

Lastly, throughout the research, the .05 level of significance has been chosen, arbitrarily. The exact probability associated with any given test will be presented, however.
At this point we turn to a discussion of the findings of this research project.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

In order to present the findings of this research, several approaches have been considered. It seemed, after much deliberation, that a factor-by-factor discussion of the findings would be most easily read and understood. Therefore, we now turn to a discussion of the findings with respect to Factor 1: Intolerance 1.

Factor 1: Intolerance 1

Independent Effects

The mean for all responses to questions related to Factor 1 was 2.90753. Any value greater than 2.90753 was considered to be more liberal than the average with respect to Factor 1. There were two possible responses to each of the questions in Factor 1, making a total of six possible answers. Therefore, 2.90753 is about midway between the yes's and the no's with respect to tolerance.

Now, we are interested, firstly, in the means for the various age, area, educational, occupational prestige and ethno-religious groups with respect to Factor 1, and the significance of these means. We want to see if the various
categories do make a difference with respect to attitudes associated with Factor 1.

The means for the various categories are listed on the following page.

In the table on the following page, and hereafter, age group 1 will be considered to be those in the youngest age category. Age group 3 is the oldest age group. Age group 2 is in the middle. Area 1 is non-South. Area 2 is South. Educational group 1 is the group which has more than a high school diploma. Educational group 3 has less than a high school diploma. Educational group 2 has a high school diploma. Occupational prestige group 1 is the group with the highest occupational prestige. Occupational prestige group 2 is second, and occupational prestige group 3 is third. Ethno-religious group 1 is the highest prestige ethno-religious group. Group 2 is second and group 3 is third.

Now, it can be seen by examination that three of the five categories (age, area and educational group) significantly affect an individual's attitudes with respect to Factor 1. All three of these variables are highly significant with respect to differences in attitudes (with respect to Factor 1) associated with the various categories in each classification. In other words, we have found that (for example) the different age groupings differ from each other with respect to attitudes associated with Factor 1.

We can see that age group 1 (the youngest people) tend to be more liberal than the middle age category which is more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Partial SS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>3.216201</td>
<td>0.748214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>3.059974</td>
<td>0.756696</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.93490935</td>
<td>17.75316</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>2.709142</td>
<td>0.728072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>3.010099</td>
<td>0.770916</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.70370052</td>
<td>12.70904</td>
<td>0.0004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>2.666755</td>
<td>0.717982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>3.294662</td>
<td>0.673827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3.023162</td>
<td>0.749821</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.97255769</td>
<td>27.82205</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>2.523172</td>
<td>0.680645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3.154169</td>
<td>0.707836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>2.950113</td>
<td>0.805670</td>
<td>1.27550080</td>
<td>1.42104</td>
<td>0.2407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2.704948</td>
<td>0.721568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>2.958305</td>
<td>0.752706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>2.863671</td>
<td>0.772362</td>
<td>0.51375658</td>
<td>0.57238</td>
<td>0.5698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>3.006508</td>
<td>0.800251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1"**" means that the findings (or the associated probabilities) are highly significant. That is, the probability is .001 or less. If the probability is between .05 and .001, "+" will appear by the probability.
liberal than the oldest age group. The youngest group has a rounded mean of 3.22 while the oldest has a rounded mean of 2.71. The middle group is 3.06. These means for Factor 1 were found to differ significantly. Today, young people seem to be more tolerant than older people.

It was also found that area of the country makes a difference with respect to attitudes of tolerance. The differences between areas 1 and 2 with respect to attitudes associated with Factor 1 were found to be highly significant. The South was found to be less tolerant than non-Southern states, as expected.

The most highly educated group was also found to be more liberal than the less highly educated groups. Again, the findings in this area are highly significant. It also seems as if educational groups 1 and 3 are more homogeneous in attitudes than is group 2 (as indicated by the standard deviations). Education is positively correlated with tolerance.

Occupational prestige groups and ethno-religious groups have not been found to be significantly related to differences in attitudes associated with Factor 1 within classes. Interestingly, ethno-religious groups 1 and 3 appear to be more tolerant than ethno-religious group 2. Lipset and Raab may account for this curvilinear relationship by saying that the group most in danger of being displaced (the middle
group) is the one most intolerant toward dissidents (Lipset and Raab, 1970).

As expected, the higher occupational prestige groups are more liberal than the lower occupational prestige groups, though the differences are not significant. This is interesting in light of the fact that educational attainment would seem to be related to the job one holds in society. And, education was found to be significantly related to Factor 1. Perhaps confounding effects, like those of income, have entered the analysis here. It would have been helpful to control income (although it was family income) to see if the occupational differences would then have been found to be significant.

It should be mentioned that the partial sums of squares takes into consideration (removes the effects of) the other variables considered. That is, when we discuss the effects of the educational variable upon Factor 1, the effects of age, area, occupational prestige and ethno-religious group have been removed.

At this point we turn to a discussion of the inconsistency effects which were discovered with respect to Factor 1.

Inconsistency Effects

On the following page a table containing the information pertaining to this section is presented.

It should be noted here that of the 27 comparisons listed, we are using only 12, as we are omitting category 2
Table 5. Adjusted Means (The Associated N's, Partial Sums of Squares, F Values and Probabilities) for Factor 1 Associated with Various Combinations of Educational Group, Occupational Prestige Class, and Ethno-Religious Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Partial SS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Prest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.3099</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.96004472</td>
<td>0.53480</td>
<td>0.7136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.2043</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.96004472</td>
<td>0.53480</td>
<td>0.7136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.0965</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.96004472</td>
<td>0.53480</td>
<td>0.7136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.9777</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.96004472</td>
<td>0.53480</td>
<td>0.7136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2.9772</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.96004472</td>
<td>0.53480</td>
<td>0.7136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.0094</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.96004472</td>
<td>0.53480</td>
<td>0.7136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.6718</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.96004472</td>
<td>0.53480</td>
<td>0.7136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.6528</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.96004472</td>
<td>0.53480</td>
<td>0.7136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.5202</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.96004472</td>
<td>0.53480</td>
<td>0.7136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Prest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.2302</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01071996</td>
<td>2.23418</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.9054</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01071996</td>
<td>2.23418</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.6449</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01071996</td>
<td>2.23418</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.0855</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01071996</td>
<td>2.23418</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.0283</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01071996</td>
<td>2.23418</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.5668</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01071996</td>
<td>2.23418</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.4596</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01071996</td>
<td>2.23418</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.9116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01071996</td>
<td>2.23418</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.5909</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.01071996</td>
<td>2.23418</td>
<td>0.0628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.9699</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23661907</td>
<td>0.68866</td>
<td>0.6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.9133</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23661907</td>
<td>0.68866</td>
<td>0.6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.9158</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23661907</td>
<td>0.68866</td>
<td>0.6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.9491</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23661907</td>
<td>0.68866</td>
<td>0.6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.9084</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23661907</td>
<td>0.68866</td>
<td>0.6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.8658</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23661907</td>
<td>0.68866</td>
<td>0.6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.0786</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23661907</td>
<td>0.68866</td>
<td>0.6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.0670</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23661907</td>
<td>0.68866</td>
<td>0.6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.7747</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23661907</td>
<td>0.68866</td>
<td>0.6028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from each trichotomy. We are dealing with comparisons numbered 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 21, 25, 27. The others have been included in the table to give the reader additional information. Some comments pertaining to the 15 additional comparisons will be made from time to time throughout the following discussion.

Because none of the probabilities in this table (Table 5) is less than .05, we must say that status consistent do not differ from the status inconsistent with respect to Factor 1. We have, in effect, failed to reject the null hypothesis. This is true for any of the six comparisons listed earlier. There is no significant interaction between education group and occupational prestige group, ethno-religious group and educational group, or ethno-religious group and occupational prestige group. Therefore, we say that the effect of inconsistency with respect to Factor 1 appears to be insignificant.

The reader may notice that (speaking of comparisons 1 and 9) the consistently high group (comparison 1) appears to be decidedly more liberal than the consistently low group (comparison 9). This is a true statement, as far as Factor 1 is concerned. However, the additive effects of education group and occupational prestige group account for the differences in liberalism with respect to Factor 1, rather than any interaction effect. The same is said with respect to inconsistent cells compared to consistent cells. The
differences in liberalism are attributable to the additive effects of the independent variables.

Inconsistency effects between ethno-religious group and educational group, although not significant, approach significance (probability = .06). Therefore, with this in mind, we will analyze the results in that section. A fourfold contingency table is presented below with the adjusted means in the body of the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethno-Religious Group</th>
<th>Educational Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The adjusted means above have been rounded off

Five different comparisons can be made with respect to this table. We can compare:

1) high ethno-religion and low education to the consistently high's.
2) high ethno-religion and low education to the consistently low's.
3) high education and low ethno-religion to the consistently high's.
4) high education and low ethno-religion to the consistently low's.
5) high education and low ethno-religion to high ethno-religion to low education.

These comparisons will be made by the use of the "t" test. The results of the "t" test are listed in Table 6. In
Table 6. "t" Values for Comparisons Between Types of Inconsistency for Ethno-Religion and Education and Types of Consistency for Factor 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Inconsistency</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno-Religion and Low Education and Consistent &quot;Highs&quot;</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno-Religion and Low Education and Consistent &quot;Lows&quot;</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Education and Low Ethno-Religion and Consistent &quot;Highs&quot;</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Education and Low Ethno-Religion and Consistent &quot;Lows&quot;</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno-Religion and Low Education and High Education and Low Ethno-Religion</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>13.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
order to calculate \( \hat{\sigma} \), the mean square for error was used. In this case it was .449 and was equal to \( \hat{\sigma}^2 \).

For the .05 level of probability, the associated "t" value is 12.71. For the .01 level it is 63.66, and for the .001 level it is 636.62 (Blalock, 1960: 442). Any value above 12.71 would be considered significant at the .05 level of probability.

As can be seen from Table 6, only one of the comparisons is significant. That is comparison 5. Two others, comparisons 1 and 4, are close to significance. This reflects the idea that the overall significance for the table was .06, which is close to significance, but is not truly significant.

We can say that the high ethno-religion and low educational group tends to be significantly more conservative than the high educational and low ethno-religious group, with respect to tolerance, as measured by Factor 1. Table 6 only tells us that the two groups differ, but the table on Page 119 tells us the direction of that difference.

We can also see that educational group seems to make more of a difference than ethno-religious group with respect to attitudes associated with Factor 1. This was found previously when we discussed independent effects. Here we can see by inspection that this is true as the difference for ethno-religious group means is greater between educational
categories than it is within educational categories. This can further be seen in the table on Page 120. The two comparisons which approach significance are those (numbers 1 and 4) which compare inconsistencies between ethno-religious group and educational group to the consistents, where the consistents have an educational rating which is different from the inconsistents. The two comparisons which are not near significance (numbers 2 and 3) have educational ratings for the consistents which are the same as those for the inconsistents. In other words, educational effects account for most of the differences in "t" values among the four comparisons. For the fifth, we also see the two groups differing with respect to educational level. Therefore, we must say that the difference in means for the two groups is primarily due to the effects of education, rather than inconsistency effects, \textit{per se}. However, the fact that the two groups differ more than an insignificant amount enables us to say that the two groups differ with respect to Factor 1, and the direction of that difference. Why this difference does exist we must constantly bear in mind.

Again, we have found no significant interaction or inconsistency effect for the various combinations of inconsistency with respect to Factor 1. Therefore, we conclude that attitudes associated with Factor 1 can be sufficiently explained by the additive effects of the independent variables.
Factor 2: Preservation of the Status Quo

Independent Effects

The mean for Factor 2 was 1.51701. Any number greater than 1.51701 is considered to be more liberal than the average. The means for the independent effects of age, area of the country, educational group, occupational prestige group and ethno-religious group are listed on the following page in Table 7.

Again, age, area of the country, and educational group were found to be significant. Occupational prestige group and ethno-religious group were not found to have a significant effect upon attitudes toward the preservation of the status quo.

It was found that the youngest age group (Age Group 1) was less often in favor of the preservation of the status quo than was the second age group, which was less often in favor of the preservation of the status quo than was the third age group, the oldest. We would then say that the youngest age group is the most liberal. That is, they are more likely than the other groups to favor social change.

It was also discovered that the non-Southern states tend to be more liberal than the Southern states with respect to Factor 2.

Educational group was also found to be significantly related to attitudes toward the preservation of the status quo. The more educated the group, the more liberal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Partial SS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1.886778</td>
<td>1.256646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1.617881</td>
<td>1.197408</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.30711782</td>
<td>19.54039</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1.215963</td>
<td>1.012449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>1.648822</td>
<td>1.151136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1.007293</td>
<td>1.046453</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.51899920</td>
<td>30.24789</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1.907431</td>
<td>1.171825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1.509071</td>
<td>1.155012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.51099562</td>
<td>17.82756</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>1.126621</td>
<td>1.032382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Prestige Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.743105</td>
<td>1.241774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1.503410</td>
<td>1.156650</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57308602</td>
<td>1.61219</td>
<td>0.1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1.261097</td>
<td>1.051137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethno-Religious</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1.503041</td>
<td>1.080910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1.435169</td>
<td>1.166526</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.91874418</td>
<td>0.86575</td>
<td>0.5758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.575020</td>
<td>1.275066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In fact, of all groups in the left hand column of Table 7, Educational Group 1 was found to be the most liberal, and Area 2, the South, was found to be the most conservative, as measured by the means on Factor 2.

Occupational prestige was not found to be significantly related to Factor 2, although it can be seen that the higher the occupational prestige, the more liberal with respect to Factor 2. Again, income may have been an intervening variable. Perhaps that accounts for the insignificance of that factor. The higher income groups would have the most to lose with respect to the preservation of the status quo.

The lowest ethno-religious group was found to be the most liberal with respect to the preservation of the status quo, followed by the highest prestige ethno-religious group, followed by the middle ethno-religious group. We can again say that perhaps the group most in danger of status displacement is the group less likely to favor social change. Perhaps that accounts for the insignificance of the ethno-religious factor, as an independent effect. There is no general positive correlation between ethno-religious group and liberalism with respect to Factor 2.

We now turn to a discussion of the inconsistency effects which were discovered with respect to Factor 2.

Inconsistency Effects

On the following page a table (Table 8) is presented with the information relating to this section.
It can be noticed that inconsistencies between ethno-religious group and education were found to be highly significant with respect to attitudes associated with Factor 2. Inconsistencies between ethno-religious group and occupational prestige were found to be significant in this regard. Finally, inconsistencies between educational group and occupational prestige were not found to be significantly related to attitudes favorable to the preservation of the status quo. We see that achieved-ascribed inconsistencies tended to be significant, whereas achieved-achieved inconsistencies did not. We will first analyze inconsistencies between ethno-religious group and educational group. Below a table is presented which reflects the relevant information from Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethno-Religious Group</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same five comparisons will be made with this chart as were made with the chart on Page 119. They are listed below.

1. high ethno-religion and low education to the consistently high's.
2. high ethno-religion and low education to the consistently low's.
3. high education and low ethno-religion to the consistently high's.
Table 8. Adjusted Means (The Associated N’s, Partial Sums of Squares, F Values and Probabilities) for Factor 2 Associated with Various Combinations of Educational Group, Occupational Prestige Class, and Ethno-Religious Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Partial SS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.8756</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.00981421</td>
<td>1.58143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.7977</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.510</td>
<td>2.63312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.4510</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1726</td>
<td>1.2051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.1726</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3463</td>
<td>0.9702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.2051</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3345</td>
<td>0.9702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1.2849</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3345</td>
<td>0.9702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.8756</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.00981421</td>
<td>1.58143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.7977</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.510</td>
<td>2.63312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.4510</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1726</td>
<td>1.2051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.1726</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3463</td>
<td>0.9702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.2051</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3345</td>
<td>0.9702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1.2849</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3345</td>
<td>0.9702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.8756</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.00981421</td>
<td>1.58143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.7977</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.510</td>
<td>2.63312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.4510</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1726</td>
<td>1.2051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.1726</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3463</td>
<td>0.9702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.2051</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3345</td>
<td>0.9702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1.2849</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3345</td>
<td>0.9702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. high education and low ethno-religion to the consistently low's.

5. high education and low ethno-religion to high ethno-religion and low education.

The "t" test results for these comparisons are presented in Table 9. The mean squared for error, used in the computations in Table 9, was .33. Again, the "t" values for the .05, .01, and .001 levels of probability are 12.71, 63.66, and 636.62, respectively (Blalock, 1960: 442).

From Table 9 it can be seen that all of the comparisons are significant at the .05 level of probability, and none is significant at the .01 or .001 levels. From the examination of the chart on Page 126 we can say, therefore, that the high education and low ethno-religious group tends to be more liberal than the consistently "highs," the consistently "lows" or the inconsistencies of the opposite type. And, the inconsistencies who have high ethno-religious group and low education tend to be more conservative than the reverse type of inconsistency or the consistently highs, but less conservative than the consistently low. In this respect, the order of liberalism and conservatism for the four cells on Page 126 is the same as the four cells on Page 119, where the same two variables were compared for Factor 1.

High achieved and low ascribed status tends to be the most liberal group with respect to social change, as it is the society which keeps them in low status due to its ranking of the ethno-religious dimension. And, it is the
Table 9. "t" Values for Comparisons Between Types of Inconsistency for Ethno-Religion and Education and Types of Consistency for Factor 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno-Religion and Low Education and Consistent &quot;Highs&quot;</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>16.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno-Religion and Low Education and Consistent &quot;Lows&quot;</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>13.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Education and Low Ethno-Religion and Consistent &quot;Highs&quot;</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Education and Low Ethno-Religion and Consistent &quot;Lows&quot;</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>38.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno-Religion and Low Education and High Education and Low Ethno-Religion</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consistently low group which is the most conservative. This group has low education, which in part accounts for this fact. However, as we can see by comparison 2, in Table 9, low education is not the sole answer, as both groups have low education. And, we have previously found that the independent effects of ethno-religious group are insignificant. Therefore, we cannot attribute the difference solely to education or ethno-religious group.

It can be said, therefore, that there are inconsistency effects with respect to Factor 2, the preservation of the status quo. These effects are manifest when we compare high achieved and low ascribed inconsistents to the consistently "highs" and the consistently "lows" or to the reverse type of inconsistency.

We have seen that high achieved and low ascribed tend to be more liberal than expected and the consistents of low status tend to be more conservative than expected on the basis of the additive model. To add the inconsistents together would hide the true effects of inconsistency, as the high ascribed and low achieved inconsistents differ substantially from the reverse type of inconsistency. This is a mistake made by some previous researchers and explains the mixed and contradictory findings (in part) of much of previous inconsistency research.

Returning to the hypotheses described earlier, we have found that we have rejected the null hypothesis and have
accepted the alternate hypothesis with respect to Factor 2 for achieved-ascribed inconsistencies between ethno-religious group and educational group. For differences between educational group and occupational prestige group we have failed to reject the null hypothesis.

At this point we turn to a discussion of ethno-religious-occupational prestige inconsistencies and their effects upon attitudes associated with Factor 2.

The following chart reflects information also contained in Table 8 on Page 126.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethno-Religious Group</th>
<th>Occupational Prestige Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table on Page 126 indicates that we have found significant interaction with respect to Factor 2 for these two variables. The probability of occurrence for results such as the above is .0326. Therefore, we have found significant interaction and an inconsistency effect.

Now, to see the form of that interaction, we can make the same five comparisons which were made on Pages 119 and 126, using occupational prestige instead of education. The results of these comparisons are presented in Table 10.
Table 10. "t" Values for Comparisons Between Types of Inconsistency for Ethno-Religion and Occupational Prestige and Types of Consistency for Factor 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno-Religion and Low Occupational Prestige and Consistent &quot;Highs&quot;</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno-Religion and Low Occupational Prestige and Consistent &quot;Lows&quot;</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Occupational Prestige and Low Ethno-Religion and Consistent &quot;Highs&quot;</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>12.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Occupational Prestige and Low Ethno-Religion and Consistent &quot;Lows&quot;</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Occupational Prestige and Low Ethno-Religion and Low Occupational Prestige and High Ethno-Religion</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>11.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be seen that only one of the above comparisons is significant at the .05 level of probability. That comparison is for the high occupational prestige and low ethno-religious group and the consistent "highs." The former group is significantly more liberal than the consistent "highs." The former group is significantly more liberal than the consistent "highs." It has been seen from Table 8 the probability of .0326 is barely significant, and Table 10 reflects that marginality. Once again, however, the most liberal group is the low ascribed and high achieved group. This is the group most likely to be in favor of social change or less likely to favor the preservation of the status quo. The group which seems to be second with respect to not being in favor of the preservation of the status quo is also the group with low ascribed status, but with low occupational prestige as well. This is the same result as for the comparison for Factor 2 on Page 126 between educational group and ethno-religious group. In that comparison, the low ascribed and high achieved inconsistents were also the most liberal.

Returning to the hypotheses discussed earlier, we see (with probability of .0326) that we reject the null hypothesis and say that the status consistsents differ from the status inconsistents with respect to Factor 2 (the preservation of the status quo) for ethno-religious and occupational prestige inconsistencies. We have also found that the most
liberal group in this regard tends to be the low ascribed-high achieved inconsistencies, who were found to be significantly more liberal than the consistent highs, although this may reflect the independent effects of ethno-religious group, as the inconsistencies of the reverse type did not significantly differ from the consistent "highs." But, we have found significant interaction (which means that we have an inconsistency effect). Therefore, we have been able to reject the null hypothesis.

So, with respect to Factor 2, we have found significant inconsistency effects for achieved-ascribed inconsistencies of both ethno-religious and educational and ethno-religious and occupational types. We have found no significant interaction effects for achieved-achieved inconsistencies. For both significant comparisons, the most liberal group with respect to Factor 2 was found to be the high achieved-low ascribed inconsistencies.

At this point we turn to a discussion of Factor 3: Intolerance 2.

Factor 3: Intolerance 2

Independent Effects

The mean for all questions relating to Factor 3 (Intolerance 2) was 2.96118. Unlike the previous two factors, the lower the number, the more liberal. Therefore, any mean below 2.96118 is considered to be more liberal than the
average. The following page has a table (Table 11) which lists the independent effects of the independent variables, with the means, F values and probabilities associated with each of the categories.

It can be seen by inspection that four of the five categories are significant with respect to Factor 3. The exception is ethno-religious group. It will be remembered that for Intolerance 1 two variables were not found to be significantly related to the dependent variable. These were occupational prestige group and ethno-religious group. For Factor 3 occupational prestige is not highly significant, but rather significant (for the meaning of these terms, see Page 114).

In other words, the four significant categories have been found to be related to attitudes associated with Factor 3, Intolerance 2. For example, the age of a person has been found to make a difference with respect to his attitudes associated with Factor 3.

We have found that the younger the individual the more likely it is that he holds tolerant opinions with respect to attitudes associated with Factor 3. It was also discovered that non-Southern states tended to be more liberal than Southern states. And, the more educated the individual, the more likely it is that the individual is liberal. The higher occupational prestige groups were also found to be significantly more liberal than the less prestigious occupational groups. None of the above results is surprising, as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Partial SS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>2.516254</td>
<td>0.661852</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.70514090</td>
<td>27.52361</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>2.815074</td>
<td>0.899714</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3.243592</td>
<td>0.936660</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.661852</td>
<td>27.52361</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>2.863112</td>
<td>0.933999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.01116558</td>
<td>10.43673</td>
<td>0.0013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3.219201</td>
<td>0.784183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>2.545310</td>
<td>0.710053</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.69796750</td>
<td>27.51739</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>2.853580</td>
<td>0.844222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>3.400514</td>
<td>0.952939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2.709887</td>
<td>0.771392</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.88953485</td>
<td>4.24466</td>
<td>0.0145*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>2.867089</td>
<td>0.805970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>3.253529</td>
<td>1.063211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>2.966809</td>
<td>0.893992</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00698266</td>
<td>0.00606</td>
<td>0.9944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>2.965811</td>
<td>0.886934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.903443</td>
<td>1.038033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as they have been seen with respect to Factors 1 and 2, with the exception of the last one. Even though occupational prestige has not been found to be significant with respect to Factors 1 or 2, the direction of the results have been as expected, and in the same direction (toward liberalism for the higher prestige groups) as for the significant findings with respect to Factor 3.

At this point we turn to a discussion of the inconsistency effects associated with Factor 3.

Inconsistency Effects

On the following page a table containing the information pertaining to this section is presented.

It can be seen from the table that there are no significant findings. We must conclude, therefore, that with respect to Factor 3, there are no interaction effects and therefore no inconsistency effects. Status inconsistency, per se, does not make a person more tolerant, as measured by Factor 3, Intolerance 2. The same results were discovered with respect to Intolerance 1. This is not to say that the high consistents (number 1 on Page 137) do not significantly differ with respect to Factor 3 from the high occupational prestige and low educational group, for they certainly may. But, the significant differences between these two groups are due to the independent effects of the education variable rather than the effects of status inconsistency, per se.
Table 12. Adjusted Means (The Associated N's, Partial Sums of Squares, F Values and Probabilities) for Factor 3 Associated with Various Combinations of Educational Group, Occupational Prestige Class, and Ethno-Religious Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Partial SS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Occupational Prest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.5694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.5211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.7191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.7396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2.9081</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.20756286</td>
<td>0.95821</td>
<td>0.5689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.0906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.3020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.1301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.3717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Religious</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.5716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.0005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.2419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.6867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.9184</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.10268269</td>
<td>0.91268</td>
<td>0.5423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3.2230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.5069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.9495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.3052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Religious</td>
<td>Occupational Prest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.8997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.9193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.9615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.8569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.8380</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.59049060</td>
<td>1.12442</td>
<td>0.3435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.0555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.8904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.7509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.1539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have seen that Intolerance 2 does distinguish between groups (witness the significant independent effects on Page 135) but that status inconsistency has no particular effect with respect to this dependent variable.

We now turn to our fourth and last factor, Factor 4, Prejudice.

Factor 4: Prejudice

Independent Effects

The mean for all responses related to Factor 4 was 1.86194. Any number less than 1.86194 is considered to be a more liberal response with respect to Factor 4 than the average.

On the following page a table relating to the independent effects of the independent variables is presented. The following discussion pertains to that table.

It can be seen from Table 13 that three of the five variables were found to be significant with respect to Factor 4, Prejudice. The significant variables were age, area of the country and educational group. Non-significant variables were occupational prestige and ethno-religious group. It was found that the younger age group is the least prejudiced (or the most liberal with respect to prejudice). It was also found that the South tends to be more prejudiced than non-Southern states. And, the more education a person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Partial SS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>1.761410</td>
<td>0.275308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.816726</td>
<td>0.354596</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.74350369</td>
<td>7.18327</td>
<td>0.0012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1.920641</td>
<td>0.419676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1.783752</td>
<td>0.314460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.15326207</td>
<td>50.7031</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1.732475</td>
<td>0.211964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1.799196</td>
<td>0.312278</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.02603158</td>
<td>12.4673</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>2.006736</td>
<td>0.477215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige Group</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1.782091</td>
<td>0.272103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11922513</td>
<td>0.4912</td>
<td>0.6180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.807741</td>
<td>0.332847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>1.964008</td>
<td>0.463249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.822264</td>
<td>0.335621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>1.893062</td>
<td>0.413375</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.26109471</td>
<td>1.0757</td>
<td>0.3423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1.812870</td>
<td>0.344692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
has completed, the lower his prejudice score on the three questions associated with Factor 4.

Occupational prestige group was found to be non-significant with respect to Factor 4, although the results were directional. That is, the higher occupational groups tended to be the more liberal, with the lowest prestige occupations tending to be the most conservative with respect to this factor.

Again, the middle ethno-religious group tended to be the most conservative. As previously theorized, perhaps this group is fearful of status displacement.

Again, the highest educational category tended to be the most liberal, and the South tended to be the most conservative with respect to prejudice level.

At this point we turn to a discussion of the effects of inconsistency with respect to Factor 4, Prejudice.

Inconsistency Effects

On Page 141 a table containing the information pertaining to this section is presented.

Because none of the probabilities is less than .05 in Table 14, we must conclude that there is no significant inconsistency effect with respect to Factor 4. That is, because there is no interaction effect, any effects of inconsistency (effects beyond the additive) are insignificant. In other words, the additive effects of the independent
Table 14. Adjusted Means (The Associated N's, Partial Sums of Squares, F Values and Probabilities) for Factor 4 Associated with Various Combinations of Educational Group, Occupational Prestige Class, and Ethno-Religious Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Partial SS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.7931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.7688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.7743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.8300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.8577</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.9157</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.9377</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.9613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.0675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethno-Religious</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.7975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.8316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.9680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.7953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.8760</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2.0453</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.7677</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.9245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.9915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Prest.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.8746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.8372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.8974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.8692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1.8631</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.9934</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.8801</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.9240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.8721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
variables sufficiently account for the variance in the dependent variable, Prejudice.

We therefore cannot reject the null hypothesis. We conclude that there are no significant interaction effects, hence no inconsistency effects which were significant, and hence the status inconsistencies do not differ from the status consistent, except by virtue of the effects of the independent variables.

At this point we turn to a summary of the previous findings.

Summary of Findings

The following table contains the information pertaining to this section.

We can see that age, area of the country, and educational group are always significant. We have found that younger people tend to be more liberal than older people with respect to the four factors. Age is inversely related to liberalism, as far as the four factors are concerned. Education is directly related to liberalism. The more education the person has, the greater the chance that that person will be liberal with respect to the four factors in this study. And, we have seen that the South tends to be more conservative with respect to the four factors than the non-Southern states.

In three cases (Factors 1, 2, and 4) the higher occupational groups tended to be more liberal with respect to the
Table 15. A Summary of the Significance of the Independent and Interactive Effects with Respect to the Four Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>S S S S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of the Country</td>
<td>S S S S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Group</td>
<td>S S S S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Prestige Group</td>
<td>D D S D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Religious Group</td>
<td>N N D N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inconsistency Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education-Occupation</td>
<td>N N N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Religious-Education</td>
<td>N S N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Religious-Occupation</td>
<td>N S N N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Factor 1 is Intolerance 1; Factor 2 is Preservation of the Status Quo; Factor 3 is Intolerance 2; and Factor 4 is Prejudice.

2An "S" means that the findings were significant; a "D" means that the findings were directional; and, an "N" means that the findings were non-significant.
four factors. That is, there was a direct relationship between occupational prestige and liberalism with respect to the four factors, though the findings were not significant. In one case (Factor 3), the directional findings were significant.

The independent findings for ethno-religious group were non-significant. However, in three of the cases (Factors 1, 2, and 4), the middle ethno-religious group tended to be the most conservative. It was theorized that this may have been due to a fear of status displacement, as this group would be the most threatened, it would seem (Lipset and Raab, 1970). For Factor 3, the findings tended to be directional, with the lower the ethno-religious group the more liberal. It is rather surprising to this author that the findings for Factor 3 were not significant for ethno-religious group, as two of the questions for this factor dealt with questions about religion.

With respect to inconsistency effects, we have seen that in only two cases was there significant interaction. The two significant cases were in the ethno-religious-education and ethno-religious-occupation categories for Factor 2. In the remaining ten cells of Table 15 at the bottom, there was no significant interaction and therefore no inconsistency effect.

For the two significant interactions some patterns were found. It was found that the low ethno-religious-high
achieved inconsistent group tended to be the most liberal, with respect to Factor 2, as expected. Differences between ethno-religious group-education group cells with respect to means for Factor 2 tended to be greater than differences for cells of the ethno-religious-occupation comparisons. This reflects, in part, the strength of the education dimension.

It might be theorized that where there is low ascribed and high achieved status, the individual is more prone to favor social change than any other type of inconsistency.

At this point we turn to our conclusions with respect to the present research.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS
FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Conclusions

Given the findings summarized on Page 143, we must conclude that status inconsistency, as measured here and in many other studies, is not a very powerful tool for the explanation of variance in the dependent variable. Few studies which have been neatly controlled have found significance with respect to the effects of status inconsistency. The present study has found significance only for achieved-ascribed inconsistency and then only for one of the four dependent variables. Furthermore, it appears that only when the ascribed variable is the low measure are the effects outstanding. This is truly a narrow focus for inconsistency research considering the amount of research which has permeated the area.

Perhaps the ease of measuring something which is quantifiable accounts in part for the result of effort spent studying status inconsistency, but it is the opinion of this researcher that future research might be more fruitfully utilized elsewhere.
An attempt has been made in this study to tightly control the design in such a way as to eliminate many of the pitfalls and associated doubts clothing previous research. For example, we trichotomized age and dichotomized area of the country, eliminated blacks and trichotomized the remaining independent variables in an effort to control the conditions as much as possible. We feel we have succeeded in that area. However, even with such controls, we find little effects of status inconsistency. Therefore, we conclude that status inconsistency has little effect upon the dependent variables we have used. An exception might be the second factor, Preservation of the Status Quo. Even there, as mentioned above, the effects are quite specific.

This is not to say that the findings of status inconsistency should be discarded, but rather it must be borne in mind that most of the variance in the attitudes associated with the four factors used here can be explained in large part by the additive effects of the independent variables.

Limitations

It might be suggested that the sampling technique is not of the random variety. As mentioned on Page 107, it is considered to be equivalent to a simple random sample of 1000. Because of the loss of some of the "N" in the conversion to simple random sampling, in part, we had to limit the variables which could be "controlled" and the breakdown of such variables. For example, we had to eliminate controls
for income, as that would have created unacceptably small cells. And, we could only dichotomize area of the country for the same reason. This situation is not, of course, unique to the present study. This author does not feel that the effects of such a limitation are great, considering the controls which were provided. Furthermore, income is highly correlated with occupation and education. Therefore, controls upon the latter two are thought to be sufficient for our purposes.

Perhaps a more important limitation is that of the use of objective measures of inconsistency. As mentioned earlier, the expectations associated with the various status rankings may determine the inconsistency, rather than what the sociologist would consider inconsistent statuses. Actually, it is how the respondent perceives the expectations associated with his various rankings which may be the determinant of perceived inconsistency. In effect, we have merely measured objective inconsistencies. And, we have only measured such inconsistencies of status on dimensions thought by the sociologist to be important. This is not to say that they are not important, or that the expectations associated with different rankings will not produce status inconsistency. Rather, we recognize that there is a vast area left unexplored. Still to be examined is the area of status inconsistency as perceived by the respondent. However, such an examination is immersed in many methodological
problems (such as the standardization of inconsistency across respondents) and perhaps explains the sociologists' use of objective data. In any event, this limitation should be recognized.

Another possibly severe limitation is the operationalization of the ethno-religious variable. It has been shown that some of the lowest ranking ethno-religious groups (like the Jews) tend to be the most tolerant toward dissenters (Laumann and Segal, 1971). This may help to explain the fact that the middle ethno-religious category was found to be the most conservative, as they are the most threatened. But, some of the other lower ranking ethnic groups tend to be conservative with respect to some dependent variables (such as tolerance). Therefore, the categories, as used, may be more different within themselves than they are from other categories. For example, the Jews may have more in common with the Episcopalians as far as attitudes are concerned, than they do with Slavic Catholics. This must be considered. However, we are dealing with objective ethno-religious status rankings, and not with rankings along an attitude scale for the various groups. That is, our measure of ethno-religious group (or our categorization of it) is simply perceived status ranking. If in fact they differ within groups in attitude that is tangential to our purposes. For, if we would align the groups by attitude instead of prestige, our use of the ethno-religious variable
would become the use of attitudinal classification. And, this is not what we were trying to do.

Suggestions for Future Research

We would suggest, in the future, that research take into consideration the limitations of the present research. That is, if true random sampling could be accomplished (if funds are available for such an undertaking) one possible problem could be eliminated.

And, if the methodological quagmire could be vaulted, a study dealing with the expectations associated with inconsistency would be helpful. That is, if the researcher could find out what the respondents consider to be inconsistency and measure the effects of such perceived inconsistency, a broad step toward the understanding of status inconsistency would have been taken.

It is also suggested that income be included as an independent variable if measures on it could be individual income rather than family income. It may serve as a good variable to control.

Perhaps, it is even suggested by this author, other areas of research would be more sociologically fruitful, given limitations of funds and time.
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