DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 558 RC 007 269

AUTHOR Rojek, Dean G.
TITLE The Social and Psychological Consequences of Intragenerational Mobility. Working Paper 73.4.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Center of Applied Sociology.
SPONS AGENCY Economic Development Administration (DOC), Washington, D.C.; Illinois Univ., Urbana. Agricultural Experiment Station.; National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.
REPORT NO MH-19689; OER-417-G-72-7(99-7-13248)
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; Career Change; Economic Change; *Industrialization; Psychological Characteristics; *Psychological Patterns; *Rural Development; Social Influences; *Social Mobility; *Social Stratification
IDENTIFIERS Illinois

ABSTRACT

The relationship between prior and present socioeconomic status and 10 symptoms of social and psychological stress were examined for mobility effects. The analysis was confined to a 5-year, intragenerational mobility panel from 2 Illinois regions--Putnam County and segments of 3 other adjacent counties in north-central Illinois, and a portion of Iroquois County in central Illinois (the control region). In 1966, the Jones-Laughlin Steel Corporation developed a large steel mill in Putnam County. Then, in 1966, 1967, and 1971, area probability surveys of household heads were conducted. For this study, only those in the 1966 and 1971 surveys will be used. During the 5 year span a marked reshuffling of occupational structure occurred in both regions. In Putnam, 74.5% remained stable, while 11.5% moved upward and 14% downward. The control region displayed similar results, with 71.4% remaining stable. The findings provided little, if any, support for suggesting that mobility has disruptive consequences. The Durkheimian mobility hypothesis pointing to manifestations of anomia, stress or social isolation was not evident. (KM)

CENTER OF APPLIED SOCIOLOGY

University of Wisconsin - Madison

THE SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF INTRAGENERATIONAL MOBILITY

Dean G. Rojek

Working Paper 73.4

Cooperative Extension Programs

University of Wisconsin-Extension

* Research supported by the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences; University of Wisconsin, Madison; Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station, Champaign-Urbana; The Graduate Research Board, The University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana; The National Institute of Mental Health, PHS Research Grant MH-19689; and the Office of Economic Research, Economic Development Administration, Grant OER-417-G-72-7 (99-7-13248).

THE SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF INTRAGENERATIONAL MOBILITY

Introduction

Social scientists, in their quest to understand social mobility, have begun to speculate whether or not some of their initial avenues of exploration have not hovered dangerously close to becoming a quixotic search for the "Holy Grail." Numerous efforts have been made to study the consequential implications of mobility, but relatively little is definitively substantiated as to the social and psychological concomitants of such status movement. The need for a more comprehensive understanding of social mobility as it relates to social-psychological phenomena becomes increasingly more salient with the progressive industrialization and urbanization of American society. However, conclusive evidence linking the effects of upward or downward mobility to individual interpersonal relationships or to mental health is still wanting.

Durkheim (1951) initially formulated the problem in his classic discussion on suicide. He sought to conceptualize social and cultural sources of psychological stress under four types: egoism, altruism, anomie, and the illusive-footnoted fatalism. Society is viewed by Durkheim as controlling individuals through the moral power of the social environment. Human nature is such that when the "norm-states" of social aggregates are transcended, the individual is "lost in an infinity of desires." (Durkheim, 1951, p. 256) The eventual result of such unbounded passion creates states of disillusionment, disturbance, agitation, discontent, "irritated disgust with life," and "exasperated weariness." (Durkheim, 1951, pp. 256, 271, 284, 286, 289, 299-300).

Thus, Durkheim's discussions fathered an entire school of social thought that set out to investigate individualized and collective states of anomie. Utilizing Durkheim's insights, Merton (1957, p. 163) distinguished between simple anomie which refers to a state of confusion resulting from conflict between value systems, and acute anomie indicative of the disintegration of value systems. The need for social pressure or for the uniformity of behavior is seriously threatened when individuals or social collectivities find themselves in a transitional state. Durkheim saw these normless states as a type of anarchistic conflict leading to situations of acute social and psychological stress.

Durkheim's conceptual framework proved to be a catalytic launching pad for inquiry into the effects of a particular type of transitional experience, social mobility. This, coupled with the notion that individuals or social collectivities existed in a stratification space which produced certain "social distances" from one another, perked the curiosity of a series of investigations. Sorokin (1927) hypothesized that a mobility experience in a status-minded society might have some potentially disruptive consequences. He postulated a dissociative hypothesis which depicted the socially mobile individual as detached, isolated, lonely, and emotionally distressed. Others, namely Fromm (1941) and Horney (1937) offered a type of compensatory hypothesis which sought to explain upward mobility as a compensatory device for attaining prominence, love, and vitality resulting from a sterile or unfavorable family history. Numerous studies pointed to the upwardly mobile as being obsessive-compulsive: "they are apt to be schizoid, ... less suspicious, rigid or depressive, ... and may be more aggressive in their pursuit of a

career" (Langner and Michael, 1963, p. 430). Jaco (1959) reported that communities with high rates of mental disorder were characterized mainly by downward mobility. Lystad (1957) noted that schizophrenic patients were more downwardly mobile relative to their fathers, and Srole et al. (1962) found that individuals with pronounced psychiatric symptoms were downwardly mobile occupationally.

Despite the myriad studies confirming a positive relationship between mental illness and mobility, other evidence has been marshalled to disclaim this notion. Hollingshead and Redlich (1954) found no significant relationship between mobility and mental disorder. Litwak (1960), and Aiken and Goldberg (1969) observed no effects of mobility as it applied to family participation or extended kin. While Parker and Kleiner (1966) found that nonmobile subjects at the middle-status occupational level had a higher illness rate than mobile subjects.

These confusing and often contradictory results prompted Wilensky (1966) to exclaim that for reasons of both theory and method, intergenerational occupational mobility may be the least promising variable in stratification research. On the theoretical side, as sources of social differentiation increase, and the economic environment is significantly altered, the comparison of son to father may be less meaningful. On the methodological side, non-comparable samples, categories, and measures may produce grossly inadequate evidence of mobility effects.

Thus, Durkheim's initial hypothesis produced a plethora of tentative findings, but after nearly half-a-century sociologists are still struggling with the problem. Undoubtedly, the inconclusive evidence can be attributed partly to non-comparability of samples, arbitrary

measures of the degree and kind of intergenerational mobility, and a host of dependent variables that are wantonly selected to tease out mobility effects. But, by far the most serious shortcoming of mobility studies has been their inability to methodologically demonstrate the existence of adverse effects directly attributable to social mobility and not to some other equally plausible explanation.

A Problem of Methodology

In analyzing the impact of mobility upon social and psychological well-being, a critical problem encountered in all such studies has to do with the issue of controlling for two points in time. That is, in assessing the effects of mobility on a particular dependent variable, it must be demonstrated that the resultant effect is in fact due to mobility, and not to some other undetected influence. Duncan (1966, p. 91) has succinctly stated the problem as follows: "The gist of the argument is that one is not entitled to discuss 'effects' of mobility (or other status discrepancy measures) until he has established that the apparent effect cannot be due merely to a simple combination of effects of the variables used to define mobility."

The issue at stake is that the mobile individual combines the behavioral attitudes of two classes: a class of origin, and a class of destination. For any effects of mobility to be present, these effects must be evident over and beyond those which can be accounted for by the additive effect of prior and present status. The consequence of mobility is membership in two classes, and any demonstrable mobility effect is one which deviates significantly from the combination of class of origin and class of destination.

Duncan (1966), in assessing the consequences of mobility on fertility, demonstrated the utility of the dummy-variable, multiple regression technique to represent how the additive model ferrets out the separate effects of membership in two classes. In the multiple-regression equation, the two independent variables are prior and present socio-economic status. The dependent variable is the particular measure of social disorganization under consideration. In the following model

$$\hat{Y} = a + A_i + B_j + e_{ij}$$

$\hat{Y}$ represents the predicted value of the dependent variable; 'a' is the mean for the excluded category; A_i is the effect of belonging to a class of origin; B_j is the effect of belonging to a class of destination; e_{ij} is the error or interaction term. Predicted values are compared to the observed values in order to detect any effect over and beyond the additive effects of the two independent variables.

Jackson and Burke (1965), in discussing the effects of status inconsistency, advanced Duncan's technique one step further to include a consideration of interaction effects. If the simple additive model can be shown to adequately predict symptom levels of stress, then status inconsistency effects are not present. However, if a significantly greater proportion of the variance can be explained by the introduction of an interaction term, that is, a multiplicative model with a better "fit", then the presence of status inconsistency may be tentatively inferred. In examining the relation between three status dimensions and symptoms of stress, a simple additive regression model was not fully adequate. Jackson and Burke found that a regression model incorporating

interaction terms explained a significantly greater proportion of the variance, and thus argued that status inconsistency supported their hypothesis. In a follow-up to this approach, Jackson and Curtis (1972) in an unpublished paper have examined mobility and inconsistency effects as two sides to the same conceptual coin. Mobility theories and multi-dimensionsal rank theories cannot be conceptually distinguished. In analyzing their data, these authors argue that if a simple additive model adequately explains effects of rank upon a dependent variable without recourse to more complex models, the hypothesis of mobility or inconsistency effects are unjustified.

However, Blalock (1967) has pointed out that the mere presence of statistical interaction is not sufficient proof that inconsistency or mobility effects are operating. Statistical interaction may appear for several reasons, only one of them being the presence of inconsistency or mobility effects. Hence, Jackson and Curtis utilize the presence of significant interaction as a "ceiling estimate": if the more complicated regression model does not significantly increment the explained variance, the multiplicative model is unnecessary; if interaction is present, it may be due to mobility or inconsistency effects or it could be due to random error.

One final methodological consideration has to do with the traditional approach of searching for mobility effects resulting from intergenerational mobility. As Duncan (1966) pointed out, intergenerational mobility plays no simple and straightforward role as a mechanism in the transformation of occupational patterns or its consequences. Intergenerational mobility is the result of a combination of processes with no single or

composite process adequately describing the dynamic interchange in its entirety. The availability of any number of plausible exogenous or endogenous variables acting as causal factors in intergenerational mobility seriously weakens the explanatory power of the status mobility model. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, the focus of analysis will be a five-year panel study. This type of survey has two distinctive advantages: 1) it narrows the span of time so that the causal linkage of mobility with social or psychological ramifications can be more cogently argued; 2) the use of panel data avoids the introduction of added measurement error due to occupational misclassification. That is, by interviewing respondents at two points in time, far more reliable measures of occupation can be obtained than through simple recall. Thus, if mobility effects are to be postulated, an examination of longitudinal data offers a far more appropriate test of that hypothesis.

Method of Analysis

Capitalizing on Duncan's (1966) critique of previous mobility research, and the techniques pioneered by Jackson and Burke (1965), and Jackson and Curtis (1972), a dummy-variable, multiple-regression method of analysis will be employed. The two independent variables will be prior and present occupational levels; the dependent variables being the various measures of social and psychological well-being used in previous research of this kind. Respondents will be first cross-classified in a mobility matrix, with each cell representing the observed mean of the particular dependent variable under consideration. An additive, multiple-regression equation will be used to predict the expected scores for the same dependent variable. Significant, system-

atic discrepancies between observed and predicted scores for the same dependent variable will be indicative of mobility effects. Following Jackson and Curtis (1972), interaction terms will be introduced into the additive model to assess the efficacy of a more complicated model. In those instances where significant interaction is not present, mobility effects can be discounted.

The Data

In 1965 Jones-Laughlin Steel Corporation announced plans for the development of a large steel mill in Putnam County, Illinois. A longitudinal study was launched to monitor the impact of industrial development in this rural area. The data were collected by the Rural Industrial Development Project in two areas in Illinois: Putnam County and segments of three other adjacent counties in north-central Illinois, and a portion of Iroquois County in central Illinois, serving as a control area. An area probability sample survey of heads of households was conducted in 1966, 1967, and again in 1971. For purposes of this study, only those individuals who were in the 1966 and 1971 survey, i.e., a modified panel, will be used. The respondent's occupation in 1966 and 1971 served as sources for the independent variable, and responses only to the 1971 survey supplied the dependent variable. Each region will be analyzed separately, thus allowing the advantage of replicating significant findings.

Occupational classifications were collapsed into five categories: Professional and Managerial, Sales and Clerical, Craftsman and Operatives, Laborers and Service Workers, and finally, those not active in the labor force. Farm owners and farm managers were not included in this study

for two reasons. First, the enormous variance in responses within this occupational category indicates the extreme heterogeneity of those commonly referred to as "farmers." Socio-economic status indicators were highly varied, particularly income variables, and responses to most measures of mobility effects were quite erratic and inconsistent. Secondly, whether movement out of this occupation is upward or downward mobility is a point of conjecture. For the most part, the only observable "mobility" was from active farming to being out of the labor force. Undoubtedly, movement in or out of this occupation is severely hampered by the size of the capital investment in any farming enterprise.

The dependent variables used to detect the absence or presence of mobility effects will be reflective of the indicators used in other studies of this nature. Blau (1956), reviewing the area of social mobility and interpersonal relations, cited empirical studies showing that socially mobile individuals manifested greater racial prejudice than the nonmobile. Two social distance scales, composed of six items each, will be used to test this hypothesis: social distance from Negroes, and from Latin Americans. (See Appendix A) Durkheim's (1951) anomie hypothesis will be assessed by employing a measure of the respondent's attitudes toward legal institutions, and two measures of alienation: an anomia scale, and a powerlessness scale (see Appendix B). Tumin (1967) viewed the disruptive consequences of mobility as producing states of social isolation. An index of social integration will be obtained from measurement of the number of voluntary associational affiliations listed by the respondent (see Appendix C). Bradburn and Caplowitz (1965) suggested that downwardly mobile

individuals often appear to be adversely affected in their over-all sense of well-being. The two measures of happiness used by them, an indication of the degree of happiness today and five years ago, have been incorporated into this data set as well. These two variables will serve as a subjective evaluation of individual morale (see Appendix D). Finally, the use of the twenty-two item psychiatric impairment index developed in conjunction with the Midtown Manhattan Study will be used to ascertain the presence of psychosomatic symptoms among mobile individuals. The twenty-two item index will be decomposed into two scales: a psychological subset, and a general and specific physiological subset (see Appendix E).

Findings

Table 1 contains the 1966-1971 intragenerational mobility matrices for the Putnam and Watseka regions. Considering the relatively short, five-year time span, a marked re-shuffling of the occupational structure occurred in both regions. In the Putnam region, 74.5% remained stable (cells along the diagonal), while 11.5% moved upward (cells above the diagonal) and 14.0% moved downward (cells below the diagonal). The Watseka region displayed similar results: 71.4% were stable, 14.3% moved upward, and 14.3% moved downward. Extreme upward or downward mobility is most unlikely in a five-year period, thus several cells are empty in both regions.[1]

1 Those not active in the labor force in 1971 were not considered part of the mobility matrix per se. For the Putnam region, the 157 "Not Actives" were deleted giving a base of 435. The stable group totaled 324 (74.5%), the upwardly mobile 50 (11.5%), and the downwardly mobile 61 (14.0%). For the Watseka region the 58 "Not Actives" were also deleted leaving a base population of 161. The stable group totaled 115 (71.4%), the upwardly mobile 23 (14.3%), and the downwardly mobile 23 (14.3%). The difference in the 1966 and 1971 marginals for those not in the labor force gives a crude estimate of the retirement rate for the five-year panel: 7.4% for Putnam, and 5.5% for Watseka. For the Putnam region, 4 "Not Actives" in 1966 moved back into the labor force in 1971; for Watseka, 7 "Not Actives" were in the labor force in 1971.

Table 1
Mobility Matrices for Putnam and Watseka Regions

1971 Occupation	Putnam: 1966 Occupation					Total
	I	II	III	IV	V	
I. Professional-Managerial	103	12	8	2	2	127
%	(81.1)	(9.4)	(6.3)	(1.6)	(1.6)	(100%)
II. Sales-Clerical	10	25	5	0	0	40
%	(25.0)	(62.5)	(12.5)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(100%)
III. Craftsmen-Operatives	14	14	178	19	1	226
%	(6.2)	(6.2)	(78.8)	(8.4)	(0.4)	(100%)
IV. Laborers-Service	0	0	23	18	1	42
%	(0.0)	(0.0)	(54.7)	(42.9)	(2.4)	(100%)
V. Not Active	5	1	30	12	109	157
%	(3.2)	(0.6)	(19.1)	(7.6)	(69.4)	(100%)
Total	132	52	244	51	113	592

1971 Occupation	Watseka: 1966 Occupation					Total
	I	II	III	IV	V	
I. Professional-Managerial	34	3	8	0	4	49
%	(69.4)	(6.1)	(16.3)	(0.0)	(8.2)	(100%)
II. Sales-Clerical	6	10	1	2	0	19
%	(31.6)	(52.6)	(5.3)	(10.5)	(0.0)	(100%)
III. Craftsmen-Operatives	8	8	56	2	1	70
%	(11.4)	(4.3)	(80.0)	(2.9)	(1.4)	(100%)
IV. Laborers-Service	0	1	5	15	2	23
%	(0.0)	(4.3)	(21.7)	(65.7)	(8.7)	(100%)
V. Not Active	9	4	6	0	39	58
%	(15.5)	(6.9)	(10.3)	(0.0)	(67.2)	(100%)
Total	57	21	76	19	46	219

Table 2

Observed Mean Scores and Discrepant Values

1971 Occupation	1966 Occupation: Observed Means I	II	III	IV	Observed Minus Predicted Means I	II	III	IV
1-A. Social Distance-Latin Americans: Putnam								
I	.16	.08	.25	.50	-.03	+.07	+.07	+.11
(N)	(103)	(12)	(8)	(2)				
II	1.50	.24	.40	--	+.66	-.26	-.20	
(N)	(10)	(25)	(5)	(0)				
III	1.14	.79	.67	.53	+.25	+.24	+.01	-.56
(N)	(14)	(14)	(178)	(19)				
IV	--	--	.35	1.28			-.17	-.67
(N)	(0)	(0)	(23)	(18)				
1-B. Social Distance-Latin Americans: Watseka								
I	.38	3.33	.67	--	-.28	+2.06	-.43	
(N)	(34)	(3)	(8)	(0)				
II	2.33	1.60	--	.00	+1.17	-.17		-1.09
(N)	(6)	(10)	(1)	(2)				
III	1.00	.00	.98	1.00	+.55	-1.06	.00	-.18
(N)	(8)	(3)	(56)	(2)				
IV	--	--	1.00	1.53			-.05	+.17
(N)	(0)	(1)	(5)	(15)				
2-A. Social Distance-Negroes: Putnam								
I	1.06	.67	1.62	1.00	-.01	-.01	+.54	-.66
II	2.10	1.20	1.40	--	+.40	+.07	-.32	
III	1.28	1.14	1.52	1.0	-.14	-.10	+.08	-.76
IV	--	--	.78	2.06			-.68	+.60
2-B. Social Distance-Negroes: Watseka								
I	1.09	2.33	3.38	--	-.20	+.70	+1.10	
II	2.17	2.00	--	1.00	+.56	+.07		-1.10
III	1.75	1.00	1.68	.50	+.85	-.16	-.12	-.84
IV	--	--	1.20	1.73			-.27	+.14

Table 2 (continued)

1971 Occupation	1966 Occupation: Observed Means				Observed Minus Predicted Means			
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
3-A. Legal Institution-Attitudes: Putnam								
I	41.04	39.58	43.00	41.50	+.04	-1.25	+1.52	+.54
II	38.40	40.68	42.61	--	-1.03	-.37	+1.75	
III	40.00	39.57	39.98	39.37	+.50	+.26	-.06	-.09
IV	--	--	42.17	41.41			-.27	-.35
3-B. Legal Institution-Attitudes: Watseka								
I	43.91	41.67	37.62	--	+.47	-1.17	-2.29	
II	41.00	43.00	--	34.01	-1.46	+1.13		-4.88
III	40.75	40.09	39.07	41.03	-1.42	-1.68	+.32	-.93
IV	--	--	42.80	40.41			+3.12	+.07
4-A. Anomia: Putnam								
I	12.26	14.25	13.01	12.02	-.01	+.96	-1.06	-1.97
II	13.11	12.88	12.40	--	+.98	-.41	-.67	
III	12.57	14.21	14.40	15.05	-.93	-.30	+.11	-.45
IV	--	--	13.30	16.17			-.53	+1.13
4-B. Anomia: Watseka								
I	10.71	17.67	17.62	--	-1.09	+4.54	+1.48	
II	15.67	12.60	--	21.00	+2.11	-2.16		+6.16
III	15.50	13.33	15.37	16.50	+3.45	-.12	-1.10	+2.75
IV	--	--	16.01	15.73			-.34	-.48
5-A. Powerlessness: Putnam								
I	13.37	14.33	13.88	13.01	+.04	-.16	-.48	-.38
II	13.02	13.28	13.80	--	+.46	-.42	+.36	
III	13.07	16.36	15.22	15.16	-.90	+1.02	+.02	-.43
IV	--	--	15.01	16.67			+.52	+.91
5-B. Powerlessness: Watseka								
I	12.24	17.33	16.75	--	-.68	+3.33	+1.41	
II	13.67	14.10	--	22.00	-.36	-.62		+5.32
III	17.75	12.03	15.95	16.50	+3.85	-2.72	+.16	-1.62
IV	--	--	14.80	16.27			+.30	-.16

Table 2 (continued)

1971 Occupation	1966 Occupation: Observed Means I	II	III	IV	Observed Minus Predicted Means I	II	III	IV
6-A. Organizational Affiliations: Putnam								
I	3.63	1.75	2.25	2.01	+.18	-1.75	-.46	-.58
II	2.90	2.48	2.40	--	+.02	+.01	+.25	
III	1.67	3.50	2.31	1.89	-1.26	+.98	+.10	-.16
IV	--	--	1.47	1.25			-.12	+.01
6-B. Organizational Affiliations: Watseka								
I	3.79	3.33	1.50	--	+.08	+.04	-.35	
II	1.60	3.01	--	1.26	-1.23	+.59		-1.02
III	3.25	4.59	2.39	1.89	-.85	+.98	+.14	-.55
IV	--	--	1.60	1.00			+.29	+.33
7-A. Happiness Today: Putnam								
I	1.66	1.92	1.50	1.69	+.01	+.26	-.20	-.15
II	2.00	1.88	1.57	--	+.16	+.03	-.32	
III	1.85	1.57	1.80	1.95	+.12	-.18	+.01	+.02
IV	--	--	1.78	2.00			-.01	+.07
7-B. Happiness Today: Watseka								
I	1.85	2.00	2.00	--	-.04	+.17	+.16	
II	2.00	1.90	--	2.01	+.07	+.04		+.11
III	2.12	1.67	1.84	2.50	+.18	-.20	-.05	+.35
IV	--	--	2.04	1.67			+.25	-.09
8-A. Happier Five Years Ago: Putnam								
I	2.00	2.33	2.02	1.58	-.02	+.24	+.07	-.28
II	2.04	1.92	2.04	--	+.07	-.08	+.17	
III	2.07	2.21	2.04	1.84	-.06	+.01	.00	-.05
IV	--	--	2.03	2.00			-.07	+.04
8-B. Happier Five Years Ago: Watseka								
I	1.97	1.33	1.88	--	-.03	-.58	-.17	
II	2.16	2.01	--	2.03	+.05	-.02		+.05
III	1.62	2.67	1.91	1.53	-.24	+.89	.00	-.18
IV	--	--	2.03	1.87			-.06	+.02

Table 2 (continued)

1971 Occupation	1966 Occupation: Observed Means I	II	III	IV	Observed Minus Predicted Means I	II	III	IV
9-A. Psychological Subset: Putnam								
I	.93	.75	.25	1.02	+.09	-.26	-.48	-.58
II	.60	1.56	.20	--	-.39	+.37	-.74	
III	.57	.86	.99	1.47	-.39	-.30	+.08	-.27
IV	--	--	.70	2.50			-.38	+.60
9-B. Psychological Subset: Watseka								
I	1.30	1.33	1.75	--	-.10	-.12	+.34	
II	.83	1.00	--	1.01	-.13	.00		+.52
III	1.88	.33	1.14	2.00	+.64	-.96	-.10	-.49
IV	--	--	1.40	.93			-.06	-.04
10-A. Physiological Subset: Putnam								
I	.44	.33	.25	1.0	+.04	-.28	-.16	+.29
II	.30	.72	.00	--	-.08	+.13	-.39	
III	.50	.43	.42	.16	+.14	-.14	+.05	-.51
IV	--	--	.09	1.17			-.35	+.44
10-B. Physiological Subset: Watseka								
I	.47	.67	1.00	.50	-.09	+.31	+.38	-.09
II	1.33	.70	--	.00	+.50	+.08		-.99
III	.50	.00	.50	.00	+.02	-.26	+.35	-.71
IV	--	--	.00	1.79			-.63	+.96

The percentages in the parentheses across each row indicate the percentage-shift in occupational categories from 1966 to 1971. The higher the percentage along the diagonal, the greater the degree of nonmobility for the occupational category. It would be expected that the smallest amount of movement would occur in the professional-managerial category, and the greatest movement to be at the lowest occupational categories. The Putnam region seems to bear this out, while the Watseka region shows slightly less stability.

In Table 2 the observed means of the dependent variable are constructed for each cell of the mobility matrix given in Table 1, with the exception that those not active in the labor force in 1971 have been dropped from the analysis. Adjacent to each of these tables, a second table indicates the magnitude of the discrepancy between the observed and predicted mean score. The predicted means were obtained from an additive, dummy-variable, multiple-regression model. Where the signs are positive, the observed mean was higher than the predicted mean; negative signs indicate observed scores lower than the predicted mean. If "true" mobility effects are operating, the direction and magnitude of the discrepancy should be readily observable. As one moves above the diagonal, a consistent difference should be present if upward mobility produces increased social distance, alienation, psychic stress, etc. Similarly, the downwardly mobile should also reveal some interpretable discrepancies, if mobility effects are present. A cursory examination of Table 2 reveals no consistent pattern whatsoever. The two measures of social distance, for example, show not only inconsistencies within each mobile category, but also from one social distance measure to another. Not one of the ten dependent variables appears to avail itself to an interpretation of social or psychological maladjustment resulting from a particular type of mobility experience.

Following Jackson and Curtis (1972), multiplicative terms were introduced into each regression model to test for interaction effects. If the interaction term significantly increments the explained variance, then the presence of mobility effects may be plausible, but not definitive. Table 3 shows that for the Putnam panel, the additive

model suffices in all instances except for organizational affiliation and the physiological subset. For the Watseka panel, significant interaction occurs in four of the models: social distance from Latin

Table 3

Percent of Variance Explained

Dependent Variable	Putnam		Watseka	
	Additive	Multiplicative	Additive	Multiplicative
1. Latin Americans	4.6%	7.3%	8.4%	14.4%*
2. Negroes	6.8%	9.3%	5.1%	13.6%
3. Legal Institution	2.7%	3.7%	15.8%	24.1%*
4. Anomia	7.0%	8.1%	16.5%	25.9%*
5. Powerlessness	7.1%	8.3%	15.6%	28.9%*
6. Org. Affiliation	14.0%	17.2%*	21.9%	28.0%
7. Happiness Today	3.7%	5.1%	2.8%	5.9%
8. Happier 5 Years Ago	5.7%	7.1%	2.8%	10.0%
9. Psychological	3.2%	5.2%	3.3%	5.1%
10. Physiological	4.9%	5.8%*	8.5%	11.0%

* Significant at $\geq .05$ level.

Americans, attitudes toward legal institutions, anomia, and powerlessness. The two significant interaction terms in the Putnam panel were not replicated in Watseka, and the four cases in Watseka were not supported in Putnam. Furthermore, for variables that have been repeatedly discussed in the mobility literature, their relationship to past and present SES is somewhat questionnable in light of the exceedingly small variance explained.

As has been previously stated, the mere presence of significant interaction in Table 3 is not sufficient proof in itself that vertical mobility has an adverse influence on individuals. The additional variance explained by all the interaction terms combined may collectively increment the R^2 but not substantiate the uniqueness of specific mobile groups. For this reason, Table 4 was constructed to summarize the overall pattern in Table 2, and to clarify the interaction effects found in Table 3. Weighted mean scores were computed for the predicted values from the additive model. Following Kessin (1971) and Treiman (1966) t-tests were applied to test for a significant difference between the observed mean and the predicted mean.

Comparing the results of Table 4 with Table 3, the two significant interaction effects in the Putnam panel can be attributed only to the upwardly mobile group. In both instances, the observed mean is significantly lower than the predicted mean. In the Watseka panel, the differences found to be significant in Table 3 are somewhat misleading. The Latin American social distance measure is no longer significant in Table 4; powerlessness and the legal attitude scores are significant only for the upwardly mobile; the anomia score is significant only for the stable group. Thus, the weak findings in Table 3 are further attenuated by testing for a difference between means for the three specific types of mobility.

Summary and Conclusion

The relationship between prior and present SES and ten symptoms of social and psychological stress were examined for mobility effects. The analysis was confined to a five-year, intragenerational mobility panel from two regions. The findings provide little, if any, support

Table 4

Observed and Weighted Predicted Mean Scores

Mobility Experience	Putnam			Watseka		
	Observed	Predicted	t	Observed	Predicted	t
1. Latin Americans						
Stable	.51	.57	1.00	.93	.99	.43
Upward	.38	.53	1.02	1.43	1.30	.42
Downward	.82	.93	1.27	1.17	.87	1.01
2. Negroes						
Stable	1.38	1.30	1.14	1.54	1.62	.60
Upward	1.10	1.37	1.51	2.17	1.96	.67
Downward	1.20	1.27	.44	1.56	1.34	.71
3. Legal Institution						
Stable	40.45	40.46	.04	41.02	40.56	1.18
Upward	40.88	40.51	.62	39.26	37.07	2.51*
Downward	40.46	40.71	.46	40.95	41.67	.85
4. Anomia						
Stable	13.70	13.72	.11	13.80	14.91	2.94*
Upward	13.90	14.07	.35	17.30	16.20	1.53
Downward	13.34	13.66	.73	15.44	13.62	1.89
5. Powerlessness						
Stable	14.60	14.45	.86	15.16	14.98	.55
Upward	14.42	14.91	1.11	17.30	14.73	3.95*
Downward	14.54	14.66	.32	15.33	14.12	1.73
6. Org. Affiliation						
Stable	2.72	2.58	1.41	2.79	2.49	1.69
Upward	2.06	2.81	2.96*	1.70	1.88	1.02
Downward	2.21	2.02	.83	2.52	3.04	1.37
7. Happiness Today						
Stable	1.77	1.76	.01	1.88	1.87	.00
Upward	1.84	1.83	.05	2.04	1.94	.91
Downward	1.79	1.78	.04	2.00	1.88	1.05
8. Happier 5 Years Ago						
Stable	2.02	2.03	.49	1.93	1.94	.21
Upward	1.98	1.94	.56	2.00	1.89	1.03
Downward	2.08	2.11	.46	2.02	1.87	1.22
9. Psychological						
Stable	1.10	.97	1.65	1.15	1.23	.48
Upward	.94	1.26	1.60	1.48	1.04	1.19
Downward	.69	.92	.39	1.35	1.64	.42
10. Physiological						
Stable	.49	.42	1.46	.58	.59	.08
Upward	.30	.81	2.82*	.52	.63	.40
Downward	.30	.44	.77	.52	.57	.18

*Significant at $\geq .05$ level

for suggesting that mobility has disruptive consequences. The use of dummy-variable, additive regression models proved to represent adequately the effects of social stratification, thereby negating the need for any further complicating explanation. The Durkheimian mobility hypothesis pointing to manifestations of anomie, stress or social isolation were not conclusively evident in the panel under study. Those few effects that were detected were not mutually supported in both regions.

Stratification research has continued to evolve from its not too distant theoretical and methodological embryonic state. The profound changes wrought by the industrialization of primitive societies have been sufficiently documented to offer tentative support for the classical stratification model. New, sophisticated methodological techniques now available provide a far more effective test of mobility effects. Yet, a gnawing sense of uncertainty clouds the entire field of endeavor. Past research is anything but definitive as to the ramifications of mobility. While the theory and methodology may be sound, the operationalization of the problem may be grossly inadequate.

Specifically, the issue revolves around the possible utilization of improper indicators of social mobility. Considering the context in which mobility occurs may warrant a modification or tempering of the "classical" presumed consequences of social mobility. The dramatic transformation of a primitive, tribal society into a transistorized, air-conditioned, jet-set, may substantiate traditional stratification hypotheses. However, the gradual but determined industrializing process in a so-called post-industrialized society, may call for a muted form of mobility research. The process of change in an already transformed society may pose a

different set of problems than are being analyzed with the antiquated calibers of occupational mobility. Vertical mobility may prove to be a minor social alteration when confronted with the numerous types of lateral, sectoral or residential mobility demanded in an industrialized setting. Thus, the death knell has not yet sounded for mobility studies despite the growing deterioration of vital signs.

References

Aiken, Michael, and David Goldberg

1969 "Social Mobility and Kinship: A Re-examination of the Hypothesis." American Anthropologist 71 (April): 261-270.

Blalock, Hubert M.

1967 "Status inconsistency and interaction: some alternative models." American Journal of Sociology 73 (November): 305-315.

Blau, Peter M.

1956 "Social mobility and interpersonal relations." American Sociological Review 21 (June): 290-295.

Bradburn, Norman, and David Caplovitz

1965 Reports on Happiness. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Duncan, Otis Dudley

1966 "Methodological issues in the analysis of social mobility." Pp. 51-97 in Neil J. Smelser and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds., Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Durkheim, Emile

1951 Suicide. New York: The Free Press.

Fromm, Erich

1941 Escape from Freedom. New York: Rinehart.

Hollingshead, August B., and Frederick C. Redlich.

1955 "Social mobility and mental illness." American Journal of Psychiatry 112 (September): 179-85.

Horney, Karen

1937 The Neurotic Personality of Our Time. New York: Norton.

Jackson, Elton, and Peter Burke

1965 "Status and symptoms of stress: additive and interaction effects." American Sociological Review 31 (August): 556-64.

Jackson, Elton, and Richard Curtis

1972 "Effects of vertical mobility and status inconsistency: a body of negative evidence." American Sociological Review 37 (December): 701-713.

Jaco, E. G.

1959 "Social stress and mental illness in the community." Pp. 388-409 in M. B. Sussman, ed., Community structure and analysis. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Kessin, Kenneth

1971 "Social and psychological consequences of intergenerational occupational mobility." American Journal of Sociology 77 (July): 1-18.

Langner, Thomas S. and Stanley T. Michael

1963 Life Stress and Mental Health. New York: The Free Press.

Lystad, M. H.

1957 "Social mobility among selected groups of schizophrenic patients." American Sociological Review 22 (July): 288-292.

Litwak, Eugene

1960 "Occupational mobility and extended family cohesion." American Sociological Review 25 (February): 9-21.

Merton, R. K.

1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Parker, S., and Kleiner, R. J.

1966 Mental Health in an Urban Negro Community. Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press.

Sorokin, Pitrim A.

1927 Social Mobility. New York: Harper.

Srole, Leo, et al.

1962 Mental Health in the Metropolis: The Midtown Manhattan Study. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Treiman, Donald

1966 "Status discrepancy and prejudice." American Journal of Sociology 61 (May): 651-64.

Tumin, Melvin M.

1967 Social Stratification. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Wilensky, Harold L.

1966 'Measures and effects of social mobility." Pp. 98-140 in Neil J. Smelser and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds., Social Structure and Mobility in Economic Development. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Appendix A

1. Latin American Social Distance Scale

I would admit:

A. To employment in my occupation.

B. To citizenship in my country.

C. To close kinship by marriage.

D. To my street as neighbors.

E. As visitors to my country.

F. To my club as personal chums.

Items were coded as follows:

0 = Yes, I would admit
1 = No, I would not admit

Mean: .829 Standard Deviation: 1.281 Cronbach's Alpha: .743

---

2. Negro Social Distance Scale

I would admit:

A. To employment in my occupation.

B. To citizenship in my country.

C. To close kinship by marriage.

D. To my street as neighbors.

E. As visitors to my country.

F. To my club as personal chums.

Items were coded as follows:

0 = Yes, I would admit
1 = No, I would not admit

Mean: 1.599 Standard Deviation: 1.437 Cronbach's Alpha: .772

Appendix B

Legal Institution Scale

What is your opinion on the following statements:

A. On the whole, policemen are honest.

B. On the whole, judges are honest.

C. A person should obey the laws no matter how much one has to go out of the way to do it.

D. In the courts a poor man has the same chance as a rich man.

E. Laws are made just for the good of a few.

F. A person should tell the truth in court, no matter what.

G. It is O.K. for a person to break the law if he doesn't get caught.

H. It is O.K. to lie in court in order to protect a friend who is on trial.

I. Almost anything can be fixed up in the courts if you have enough money.

J. People who break the law are nearly always caught and punished.

K. Just because a person gets himself in a corner is no reason to break the law.

Items were coded as follows:

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Undecided
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

(Items E, G, H, I, reverse coded)

Mean: 40.604 Standard Deviation: 4.115 Cronbach's Alpha: .675

Appendix B (continued)

Anomia Scale

What is your opinion on the following statements:

A. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

B. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.

C. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.

D. These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on.

E. There's little use in writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.

Items were coded as follows:

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Undecided
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

Mean: 14.307 Standard Deviation: 3.552 Cronbach's Alpha: .734

Powerlessness Scale

What is your opinion on the following statements:

A. Many times I feel that it does not do any real good to think about what to do. You might just as well flip a coin.

B. The ordinary person has very little control over what a politician does in office.

C. I don't see how you can really tell how other people are going to act.

D. Success is mostly a matter of getting good breaks.

E. It is nearly impossible for a person to make a go of it in business because of the big corporations and chain outfits.

Items were coded as follows:

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Undecided
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

Mean: 15.011 Standard Deviation: 3.140 Cronbach's Alpha: .688

Appendix C

Organizational Memberships

Please tell me the names of the various clubs and organizations to which you belong:
(Total number of organizations listed served as an index of organizational affiliations)

Mean: 2.38 Standard Deviation: 1.81

Appendix D

NORC Happiness Items

Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days:

1. Very happy
2. Pretty happy
3. Not too happy

Mean: 1.84 Standard Deviation: .55

Compared with your life today, how were things four or five years ago:

1. Happier
2. About the same
3. Not quite as happy

Mean: 1.94 Standard Deviation: .51

Appendix E

Psychological Symptom Index

A. I have had periods of days, weeks, or months when I couldn't take care of things, because I couldn't get going.

B. In general, would you say that most of the time you are in high (very good) spirits, good spirits, low spirits, or very low spirits.

C. I have periods of such great restlessness that I cannot sit long in a chair (cannot sit still very long).

D. Are you the worrying type (a worrier).

E. Are you bothered by nervousness (irritable, fidgety, tense). Would you say: often, sometimes, or never.

F. Do you feel somewhat apart even among friends (apart, isolated, alone).

G. Nothing ever turns out for me the way I want it to (turns out, happens, comes about, i.e. my wishes aren't fulfilled).

H. You sometimes can't help wondering if anything is worth while anymore.

Items coded as follows:

0 = Non-pathognomonic response
1 = Pathognomonic response

Means: 1.195 Standard Deviation: 1.513 Cronbach's Alpha: .681

General and Specific Physiological Symptom Indices

A. I feel weak all over much of the time.

B. Every so often I suddenly feel hot all over.

C. Have you ever been bothered by your heart beating hard. Would you say: often, sometimes, or never.

D. Would you say your appetite is poor, fair, good, or too good.

E. Have you ever been bothered by shortness of breath when you were not exercising or working hard. Would you say: often, sometimes, or never.

F. Have you ever had any fainting spells (lost consciousness). Would you say: often, sometimes, or never.

G. Do you have any trouble in getting to sleep or staying asleep. Would you say: often, seomtimes, or never.

H. I am bothered by acid (sour) stomach several times a week.

I. My memory seems to be all right (good).

J. Have you ever been bothered by "cold sweats." Would you say: often, somtimes, or never.

K. Do your hands ever tremble enough to bother you. Would you say: often, sometimes, or never.

L. There seems to be a fullness (clogging) in my head or nose much of the time.

M. Are you ever troubled with headaches or pains in the head. Would you say: often, sometimes, or never.

Items were coded as follows:

0 = Non-pathognomonic response
1 = Pathognomonic response

Means: .762 Standard Deviation: 1.114 Cronbach's Alpha: .623