A STUDY OF THE CORRELATES OF UPWARD SOCIAL MOBILITY
AMONG UNMARRIED CAREER WOMEN

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the
Graduate School of the Ohio State
University

by

Evelyn Elizabeth Ellis, B.S.
The Ohio State University
1951

Approved by:

[Signature]
Adviser
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List of Tables</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledgments</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Primary Group Relations During Childhood and Adolescence</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Alternatives to the Primary Group Relations Hypotheses</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Methods and Steps in Achieving Mobility</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Social Participation During Adulthood</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Indications of Neurotic Tendencies</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Tendencies Toward Cynicism and Unstable Morals</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Aspirations and Motivations</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Summary and Conclusions</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-Rating of Degree of Attachment to Parents During Childhood ....</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Relative Degree of Attachment to Each Parent Reported by 58 ..........</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Occupational Distribution of the Two Sub-Samples.</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Statistics Regarding Geographical Movements of 60 Career Women.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Factors Contributing to Occupational Success Listed by 58 Career Women</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Number of Intimate Friends Reported by 60 Career Women.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Incidence of Serious Conflict with Parents in Four Areas of Behavior</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Selected Statistics Regarding Social Participation of 60 Career Women</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Self-Ratings of Happiness During Adulthood by 58 Career Women.</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Changes in Outlook During the Careers of 58 Women.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Aspirations of 58 Career Women During Childhood and Adolescence.</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Motivations of 60 Career Women for Entering Present Occupation.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 - Present Aspirations of 60 Career Women.......... 66
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is deeply indebted to Dr. John F. Cuber, her major adviser during most of her pre-doctoral study and research. His advice and encouragement were of inestimable value throughout the writer's graduate career, and particularly during the period of the planning and execution of this study.

The writer is also indebted to Dr. Raymond F. Sletto and Dr. Brewton Berry of the Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, for their many valuable suggestions.

Gratitude is expressed to the business and professional women represented in the study, and to many other residents of Montgomery, Alabama, whose generous cooperation made the research possible.

Special thanks go to the writer's parents for their un-failing encouragement, as well as financial assistance.
A STUDY OF THE CORRELATES OF UPWARD SOCIAL MOBILITY
AMONG UNMARRIED CAREER WOMEN

I. INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is an exploratory study of the correlates of upward social mobility among a sample of successful unmarried career women in a Southern metropolitan city. The study was intended partially to test a number of largely unverified hypotheses in current social scientific literature.

Selection of social mobility as a phenomenon for study probably needs little justification. The rags to riches theme, which has been called "The American Dream,"\(^1\) has long loomed large in the minds of Americans. It, however, has often been dismissed rather lightly as a natural and desirable part of the workings of a democratic, open-class society. There has been relatively little scientific study of the underlying causes of mobility, the methods of achieving mobility, or the effects of status changes upon the individual.

Some of the social scientific literature regarding upward social mobility has viewed the experience as a somewhat traumatic one for the individual, growing out of neurotic drives and

resulting in further neurotic tendencies. This study was intended to test that general hypothesis, as well as others based upon personal observation and the suggestions of the dissertation committee.

A basic underlying hypothesis was that upward social mobility is caused to a great extent by deep-rooted personality factors, which in turn stem back to certain kinds of primary group relations. Other alternatives, however, were explored as thoroughly as possible. Some of the possible alternative explanations were that mobility might be attributed largely to (1) high vitality, (2) superior intelligence, or (3) chance. It was recognized that the country's changing occupational distribution and differential birth rate in a sense force mobility for some persons. That is, the recent expansion of the relatively high-status professional, semi-professional and white-collar fields and the corresponding contraction of various low-status groups have forced some occupational shifting in an upward direction. At the same time, the failure of high-status families to maintain a birth rate sufficiently high for them to replace themselves in the next generation has likewise created some "room at the top." But while the importance of those more or less impersonal factors is recognized, the question remains regarding selection of particular individuals for upward mobility.


Probably the most complete treatment of the presumed role of deep-seated personality factors in the drive for upward mobility is given by Karen Horney in her discussion of neurotic quests for power, prestige and wealth. The invariable basic cause, she says, is a "lack of genuine warmth and affection" on the part of other persons during the child's formative years. Horney lists among the possible contributing factors parental preference for other children, unjust reproaches, rejection by parents, jealousy of siblings or of a parent, and consistent parental interference with the legitimate wishes of the child.\(^3\) Referring to those in whom the desire for prestige is paramount, she says the underlying motivation is a hostility, usually taking the form of a desire to humiliate others. That desire, she says, is uppermost in "those persons whose own self-esteem has been wounded by humiliation and who have thus become vindictive." Such persons, Horney asserts, usually have gone through a "series of humiliating experiences in childhood." Those experiences might have been caused by the child's social situation--such as belonging to a minority group or being poor but having wealthy relatives--or by his individual situation, such as being rejected by his parents, being discriminated against for the sake of other children, or being alternately spoiled and snubbed.\(^4\)

\(^3\) Horney, op. cit., pp. 80-82.
\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 178-79.
Theories regarding selected factors presumably facilitating upward social mobility have been advanced particularly by Pitirim Sorokin and W. Lloyd Warner. Among the factors named by Warner and his associates were formal associations,\(^5\) education,\(^6\) and geographical mobility.\(^7\) Geographical movement is helpful, they say, because it makes determination of a person's background more difficult and, hence, the prejudicial effect of former status becomes less definitive.

Education\(^8\) was also named as a facilitating factor by Sorokin, who added that army, church, political, economic and professional organizations were other possible channels of vertical mobility.\(^9\)

Sorokin has also been prominent as an exponent of various hypotheses regarding the effects of upward social mobility upon the mobile individual. It should be pointed out that his hypotheses were expressed largely in terms of the characteristics of a mobile society. The implication, however, was that the societal characteristics are only a reflection of the personal characteristics of mobile individuals. Noting that upward mobility requires passing through different "social atmospheres" with different sub-cultural characteristics, Sorokin asserts that contact

---

5. Warner, Meeker and Eells, op. cit., p. 245.
7. Ibid., p. 136.
9. Ibid., p. 164.
with divergent customs and moral standards necessitates versatility and broad-mindedness which may shade into cynicism, unstable morals and "lack of firm convictions." At the same time, he says, that versatility and adaptability leads to "an increase of mental strain," which may result in psychoses, neuroses or nervousness. A further effect of mobility, Sorokin says, is that "the chances for intimate relations become less, and the socio-psychological loneliness of individuals is likely to become greater." In attempting to alleviate that loneliness, he adds, the individual may turn to a frantic "hunt for pleasure" or to an "imitation of intimacy actions" through hasty marriages or hasty love affairs.

In brief, students of social mobility have largely believed that upward movement frequently was inspired by emotional drives generated by unsatisfactory early primary group relations, and that mobility led to further deterioration of primary group relations with accompanying neurotic symptoms and tendencies toward moral relativism. This study is an attempt to test that hypothesis by objective, empiric procedures.

11. Ibid., pp. 510, 515.
12. Ibid., pp. 522-25.
II. METHODOLOGY

General Design of the Study

The central problem of the dissertation was to determine the correlates—largely social psychological correlates—of upward social mobility. The basic plan was to compare a selected group of mobile persons with a selected group of non-mobile persons with respect to a number of factors thought to be associated with upward mobility. If statistically significant differences between the two groups were found for any factors, it would be assumed that those factors actually are associated with upward social mobility.

Since time and money available were both limited, it was necessary in some ways to limit the scope of the study. Since the sample had to be small in size, it was deemed desirable to keep it as homogeneous as possible. If there were few uncontrolled variables, the number of categories into which the sample would be divided would be kept at a minimum, and the number of cases in each category consequently would be relatively large. Large samples and sub-samples, of course, are desirable because they tend to limit the operation of chance factors.

One of the first decisions was to control sex, marital status and occupational status by limiting the sample to unmarried women of high occupational status. Women were selected.
for two major reasons. First, there was an interest in the career woman per se. In our society the successful career woman, mobile or non-mobile, is still sufficiently exceptional to merit study. Second, since a successful career is not the usual social expectation for women, it was thought that mobility drives might be more marked in mobile women than in mobile men. That is, since a mobile woman probably is not greatly motivated by a desire to conform with social expectations, it seemed likely that she is motivated largely by personality factors. Among mobile men social expectations might be more important and personality factors less important than for women. Single rather than married women were chosen because of the belief that the unmarried, due to their lack of intimate family ties, would be more vulnerable to the supposed effects of upward mobility and would, therefore, present more clear-cut evidence of their existence or non-existence. Women of high occupational status were preferred because only those with high status could have experienced extreme mobility. In short, the sample was selected not only so that it would be highly homogeneous, but also so that it would constitute a test of the hypotheses at an extreme of the mobility continuum.

The entire sample was drawn from one city, partly because of the time and money limitations, but also to keep possible regional differences constant throughout the study. Montgomery, Alabama, was selected as the locale for the research, since it satisfied
two major requirements. First, its population of 105,098 (1950
U.S. census) was large enough to insure an adequate number of
high-status career women, yet small enough to permit relatively
complete coverage with a small sample. Second, its extremely
low percentage of foreign-born (less than one percent, according
to the 1940 U.S. census) permitted virtual elimination of one
variable which had posed a problem for other students of social
mobility. For example, Stuart Adams reported that the intense
mobility drives of second-generation ethnic group members made
it extremely difficult to interpret results of a study comparing
the proportions of mobile persons among members of one profession
in three regions of the country with varying percentages of
foreign-born.¹

Although there was interest in over-all social mobility, in
this study movement was defined largely in terms of occupation.
Occupation was made the focal point for several reasons. First,
leading students of social stratification have concluded that
occupation is one of the best, if not the best, single indicators
of social status.² Second, occupation is the most tangible, easily
determined index of social status. Third, a simple, relatively

¹ Stuart Adams, "Regional Differences in Vertical Mobility in
² Warner, Meeker and Eells, op. cit., p. 40.
Cecil C. North and Paul K. Hatt, "Jobs and Occupations: A
Popular Evaluation," in Logan Wilson and William L. Kolb, eds.,
Sociological Analysis (Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York,
widely accepted method of reducing occupational status to numerical scores suitable for comparisons was available.

The method, developed by Cecil C. North and Paul K. Hatt, was based on ratings of occupations made by a cross-section of the American population. The ratings were made during interviews conducted by the National Opinion Research Center. Persons interviewed were asked to evaluate ninety different jobs at all status levels by giving their "own personal opinion" of the "general standing" of each job. Possible ratings were 5 (excellent), 4 (good), 3 (average), 2 (fair), and 1 (poor). Final rating of each job was the average of the individual ratings made by all persons interviewed. The resulting averages were reported on a scale with possible ratings ranging from 20 to 100. A separate scale for each major geographical region of the country also was computed by averaging the ratings of interviewees living in the section.

In this study the degree of mobility was measured by a comparison of the rating of respondent's occupation with the rating of her father's occupation. Mother's occupation also was determined, but was not used in computing the ratings, since comparatively few mothers had ever worked and even fewer had been employed for more than a few years before marriage. Therefore, it was assumed that mother's occupation had had a negligible influence upon the status of the respondents' families.

The North-Hatt method was slightly modified to take into consideration the fact that occupations of both men and women were important in this study, while North and Hatt were concerned only with occupations of men. Separate ratings were made for jobs when held by men and when held by women. It was believed (and later proved) that, because of different social expectations for men and women, ratings of specific occupations might vary somewhat with the sex of the occupant.

Final ratings of occupations not appearing specifically in the North-Hatt study were the average of individual ratings made by twenty persons, ten sociologists now living in Alabama and ten residents of Montgomery. As in the North-Hatt scale, individual ratings were on a five-point scale and final average ratings had a possible range of 20 to 100. The North-Hatt ratings for the Southern region were used for occupations appearing in that study.

The sample was comprised of women whose occupation had a rating of 75 or more. The group was divided into mobile and non-mobile sub-groups, in an effort to isolate characteristics particularly associated with mobility rather than with successful careers alone. A mobile person was defined as one whose occupational rating exceeded that of her father by more than ten points. A non-mobile person was defined as one whose occupational rating exceeded that of her father by ten points or less, or whose rating
was lower than that of her father. The sample included 27 mobile women and 33 non-mobile. Occupational ratings of the mobile respondents were an average of 26.0 points above father's occupational rating, while ratings of non-mobile respondents were an average of 1.8 points below father's rating.

The Sample

Selection of individuals for the sample was begun by compiling as complete a list as possible of leading career women in the city. Sources of names included the classified section of the telephone directory, lists of the names and occupations of members of all formal organizations thought to be comprised largely of employed women, newspaper stories and advertisements, personnel directors of the state government and Maxwell Air Force Base (two of the largest local employers), and lists prepared by several long-time residents of the city. In addition, each person interviewed was asked for further suggestions.

After those who were married and those whose occupational rating fell below 75 had been eliminated, 78 names remained. Eight more names eventually were eliminated because of a previous decision that, in order to have a wide range of occupations, not more than ten percent of the sample would come from any one occupation. In cases where a surplus of persons was in one occupation, the individuals included were chosen at random.
The total sample of 60 was drawn from the remaining 70 names. The respondents were interviewed roughly in order of occupational rating, beginning with those with the highest ratings. No refusals were encountered, but four persons were not interviewed because of temporary unavailability near the end of the research. It is doubtful if their elimination introduced any systematic bias, since a large proportion of those actually interviewed also were temporarily unavailable when first contacted, but arranged future appointments sometimes as much as three weeks later.

The other six persons listed but not interviewed were eliminated because of a desire to keep the sample divided as evenly as possible between the mobile and non-mobile groups. When, near the end of the research, it was discovered that there was an undue proportion of non-mobile persons, the remaining six respondents were selected because available information indicated they were more mobile than the possible alternatives.

The absence of refusals probably can be attributed to the fact that in virtually all cases the researcher had been introduced to the respondent by a mutual acquaintance or at least had obtained permission to say that the name of the respondent had been suggested by someone known and respected by her. Other contributing factors probably were the subtle flattery of being sought out as a successful career woman, as well as the researcher's position as an instructor at a local university branch, which apparently allayed crude suspicions about the purpose of the study.
The Schedule

Since the problem had been relatively unexplored by previous researchers, it was decided that field work should be done by intensive personal interviews rather than by written questionnaires. Questions were phrased largely in open-end form in the hope that they would elicit detailed information and, particularly in the earlier interviews, perhaps lead to the discovery of additional relevant factors. Each interview lasted from one to three hours. Time and place of interviews was determined largely by the desires of respondents, but in each case privacy and a minimum amount of interruption were insured.

The questions,¹ as previously stated, were based on social mobility theory, personal observations and suggestions of the dissertation committee. In addition, several other questions were incorporated after the earlier interviews indicated their possible importance.

The series of questions covered much of the life history of each individual, but particularly emphasized primary group relations during childhood and adolescence, number and type of social contacts during adulthood, and means of achieving present success.

Questions regarding the pre-adult period covered such things as birth order, number and sex of siblings, parental favoritism toward self or siblings, sibling rivalry, parental preference for

¹ The complete schedule appears in the Appendix.
children of one sex, harmoniousness of relations with parents, and degree of attachment to parents.

For the adult period a number of questions attempted to uncover possible indications of social isolation. Factors inquired about included number, residence and sex of intimate friends and duration of those friendships; associational memberships, present living arrangements, leisure time activities, and present relations with family.

Another series of questions for the adult period dealt with possible neurotic symptoms, such as "nervousness," psychosomatic illnesses, insomnia, and self-rating of happiness.

Several of Sorokin's hypotheses were covered by questions regarding possible changes in outlook on life, church membership and attendance, and attitude toward religion.

A complete history of geographical movements, education, and occupational changes was obtained for each person. That information was intended to give some clues regarding the relation of education to upward mobility, methods and steps in achieving high-status position, and the importance of geographical mobility.

The possibility that mobility might be attributed largely to unusual vitality or to high intelligence inspired questions dealing with health, vitality and high school and college grades. Other questions concerned aspirations and conscious motivations.
After the first ten interviews, which were regarded as a pre-test, the schedule was studied and slightly revised, largely by adding questions suggested by the interviews and by rearranging the items so that the "bad rapport" questions were near the end.

The major points covered by questions were clearly defined and were the same in all interviews, but the questions actually asked were not necessarily standardized in either form or order. While the schedule appearing in the appendix was used as a general guide, the interviews were thought of as more or less unstructured and questions frequently were of the funneled type. Since it was usually impossible to anticipate the answer to a given question, it often was necessary to ask a broad open-end question about a certain point, and then formulate more specific questions on the basis of the reply to the broad question.

The order of questions was variable because in answer to one question respondents frequently volunteered information which seemed to offer a natural bridge to another relatively "bad rapport" question. When that occurred, it was deemed best for rapport to seize the opportunity instead of slavishly following the schedule and being forced to reintroduce a difficult topic later. In many cases it was not necessary to ask a question specifically because all or part of the information wanted was given in answer to another question.

Throughout the interviews the interviewer attempted to utilize the techniques most likely to achieve the major objective—
thorough understanding of all relevant aspects of the life history of each respondent. Accordingly, techniques and questions were varied to meet the situation as it developed.

Reliability and Validity

The worth of any study depends considerably upon the extent to which its results are valid and reliable. A study is reliable if the same or highly similar results would be obtained consistently in repeated studies of the same phenomena, while it is valid if the researcher actually measured that which he intended to measure.

In this study one of the most widely-accepted tests of reliability, the test-retest method, was used. Eight respondents selected at random were carefully reinterviewed with the same schedule originally used. Periods ranging from five to seven months had elapsed between the first and second interviews. Of the 66% answers to questions, 88.4% percent were identical for the two interviews, 7.4 percent were highly similar, and 4.2 percent showed major differences. In view of the long period between interviews, the changing nature of many of the variables, and the intangibility of much of the information requested, that degree of reliability probably is as great as could be reasonably expected.

Validity is equally as important as reliability, and, particularly in the case of a pioneer study, is likely to be much more difficult to estimate. Some of the common indicators of validity include: (1) agreement with other studies of similar phenomena,
(2) use of results for successful prediction, (3) agreement with the opinions of persons regarded as experts, (4) agreement with expectations based upon generally accepted theory, (5) agreement with expectations based upon common sense, and (6) agreement of information collected through interviews with information on the same subject drawn from another source.

The first three possible indicators were ruled out in this study because of the unexplored nature of the problem and the type of information collected. The three other methods of estimating validity mentioned above were usable to some extent.

Comparison of respondents' answers with information drawn from another source was attempted for one factual question for which another source was available. That question was the occupation of the respondent's father. The second source of information was city directories. Because of the unavailability of many needed city directories, occupation of father could be determined in that manner in only 36 cases. In no case was there a discrepancy between information drawn from directories and from interviews.

While to a superficial observer occupation of father might appear to be a factual question which respondents would naturally answer in a matter-of-fact and honest manner, in actuality it was one of the most difficult of the "bad rapport" questions for mobile women, and for that reason was shifted from near the beginning of the schedule to near the end after the pre-test. The American glorification of the rags to riches theme might lead one to expect
mobile women to be proud of their rise in status. Many of the mobile persons interviewed, however, minimized the difference between the position of family and self, and attempted to evade questions designed to expose their plebeian antecedents. For example, one woman whose father was a railway mail clerk gave his occupational title only after she was asked four times for more specific information. Her first reply was "government work." When pressed for more specific details, she gave the following replies in this order: "federal government," "Post Office Department," "Railway Mail Service," and "railway mail clerk." Her hesitance and sullenness made it clear that she had understood the original question but had preferred not to answer it.

Virtually complete agreement was found when results were compared with generally accepted theory, particularly that of Horney and Sorokin, two of the major writers on pertinent subjects. All statistically significant differences were of the type expected, and most differences too small to be significant also were in the expected direction.

Results also coincided closely with common sense expectations, if common sense is defined as that of the trained behavior scientist rather than that of the average person. The rags to riches mythology probably has led the layman to believe that mobile persons are likely to be the most able and well-adjusted individuals rather than persons motivated partly by neurotic drives. Results, however, are in line with common sense expectations based upon general personality theory.
Other admittedly vague indicators of validity were the type of interview situation and the agreement of interview material with the researcher's informal observations. The interviewer, living in the city for almost a year and moving in much the same circles as the respondents, gained considerable knowledge of interviewees' community reputation and social participation and also heard numerous comments about respondents by their friends and business associates. While such information was often rather superficial, it was in general agreement with interview material.

In arranging the interview situation every possible effort was made to encourage honesty. It is generally believed by social scientists that the oral interview per se is likely to obtain more valid results than most other methods of collecting data, such as the written questionnaire. Each interview was conducted in privacy, and the respondent was assured at the beginning of the interview that any information given would be completely confidential. The reliability and purposes of the interviewer had previously been vouched for by some respected member of the community.

It seems probable that results have reasonable validity, although conclusions are based largely upon inference. As Lundberg states: "We assume high validity when we have guarded against the known possibilities of error, when there is no known reason why informants should intentionally mislead, and when the

results are not inconsistent with other known facts about the respondents or with other measures, the validity of which is accepted. 3 A more accurate estimate of validity probably cannot be made until other studies of similar phenomena have been made.

III. PRIMARY GROUP RELATIONS DURING CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE

The Hypotheses

The basic hypothesis regarding the role of early primary group relations, suggested particularly by Horney, was that mobility drives are often the outgrowth of a series of humiliating experiences which have wounded the child's self-esteem. According to Horney, those humiliating experiences might have occurred largely within the family group. Such experiences might be the result of parental rejection, parental preference for other children, jealousy of a sibling or of a parent, or consistent parental interference with the legitimate wishes of the child. On the other hand, such experiences might have been the result of the child's social situation outside the family group. Among the possibilities are minority group membership and poverty. In any case, Horney says, the basic evil is a "lack of genuine warmth and affection" from others.

Another hypothesis, suggested by a member of the dissertation committee, was that the future career woman might have been reared in a male-dominated home—either one with a domineering father or one with an undue proportion of male siblings—and, thus, unconsciously have absorbed typical masculine values regarding careers. Even without a male-dominated home, there

was the possibility of unusual identification with the father or with brothers, which again might lead to preponderantly masculine values.

Another hypothesis was that one or both parents might have desired a boy at the time of the respondent's birth, and, refusing to give emotional acceptance to a girl, might have encouraged her in typically masculine pursuits.

Findings

Each respondent was encouraged to give a detailed account of her family relations during childhood and adolescence. When necessary, specific questions were asked regarding parental favoritism, sibling rivalry, degree of attachment to parents, differential attachment to either parent, parental desire for a boy at the time of the respondent's birth, and number and sex of siblings.

Results to a great extent substantiated the basic hypothesis regarding the role of humiliating experiences. Marked parental favoritism toward another sibling or siblings was reported by 56.0 percent of the mobile women, but by only 27.3 percent of the non-mobile. The difference is statistically significant (C.R. = 2.32).

Another probably important point is that among the mobile group the women reporting favoritism toward siblings were more highly mobile than those not indicating favoritism. Those whose
parents had preferred another child had risen an average of 31.5 points, while those not reporting favoritism had risen an average of 22.0 points. Despite the smallness of the numbers involved, the difference is statistically significant (C.R. = 2.35).

In a number of cases parental rejection of self and preference for a sibling apparently completely permeated memories of childhood, and was clearly and sometimes consciously related to present accomplishments and ambitions.

Quotations from interviews with five mobile respondents may make clearer the nature and effects of parental favoritism:

1. "My youngest sister was the favorite child. I was upset about it for years. She is the only person I was ever jealous of. She was the prettiest child. She had long blonde curls and big blue eyes. She was little and dainty and always wore little ruffled pink and blue dresses. I was big and gawky, and wore plain things, and had straight dark hair."

2. "My second sister was the favorite child. My parents said so. She was the best, the prettiest, and the sweetest child. She was held up as an example for the rest of us. Everytime we went somewhere, my mother asked the rest of us why we couldn't act like Mary did. I was very jealous. She is the only person I ever envied. That is why I graduated with honors. I thought the only thing I could beat her on was grades, so I tried to do that. The first quarter in college I made all A's." (This respondent
won virtually every academic and social honor possible at her college.)

3. "My mother always showed favoritism toward my older sister. She was very talented; I wasn't. I was very conscious of it as a child. She always had a new Sunday coat every year, and I wore it to school the next year. I still think of that often—with bitterness. I was not at all close to either parent. I particularly resented their better treatment of my sister."

(This respondent, one of the most highly ambitious women interviewed, has as her goal a position giving national fame.)

4. "My younger sister was the pet. When I graduated from high school, my parents told me I was too dumb to go to college and advised me to go to business school. Instead, I entered nurses' training because that was the best I could do without money. But they sent my sister to college and on for a Master's degree. After I got out of the army (as a nurse), I worked my way through an M.D. degree with a little help from the G.I. Bill. I think I did it mostly to show my parents I wasn't the family dunce. Now my sister is married and just vegetating."

5. "By the time I got to high school the preference for my older sister was frankly recognized in the family. One annoying way it showed up was that my father always paid my sister her allowance promptly, but found excuses for stalling me. Finally, my sister and I worked out an arrangement whereby she collected
both allowances in return for a percentage of mine. And my parents thought it was funny. I still hate them when I think about that. I've been trying ever since to show them. I think I have already shown them, but I still keep trying to drive myself further." (This respondent also is openly in pursuit of national renown.)

Findings regarding humiliating experiences outside the family also were in line with the Horney theory. Relatively complete community rejection was reported by 20.0 percent of the mobile women, but by none of the non-mobile. The difference is statistically significant (C.R. - 2.50).

Causes of community rejection were:

Two women were members of ethnic groups (one Greek and one Jewish), and grew up in Southern communities where they were rejected by the majority and where there was a virtual absence of other ethnic group members to fill the gap.

Another woman was reared in a family which subsisted on relief payments for eight years during the depression of the 1930's. The family lived in a small Southern town inhabited almost exclusively by the "old plantation aristocracy." (The town's "aristocracy" is frequently referred to as the most snobbish in Alabama.) The father's semi-skilled occupation had never given high status, but the loss of even that occupation led to a steady diet of snubs during the respondent's adolescence.
In two other cases, the respondents during adolescence won "bad reputations" by thoughtless but apparently not particular serious infractions of the moral codes of Puritanical small Southern towns, and so were placed outside the pale.

A further indication of the "lack of genuine warmth and affection" in the mobile women's backgrounds is seen in the results of questions about degree of attachment to parents. In addition to detailed information about relations with parents, each respondent was asked to rate her attachment to parents during childhood and adolescence as more than average, average or less than average. Replies indicated that mobile women were more likely than non-mobile to rate the degree of attachment as "less than average." The difference between groups is statistically significant. Answers to the question are given in Table 1.

Findings did not support the two secondary hypotheses regarding the role of early primary group relations. The hypotheses were: (1) the future career woman learned typically masculine values about careers as a result of unusual identification with father or with male siblings, or as a result of growing up in a predominantly male family; (2) because of a desire for male children, the parents encouraged the mobile woman in the direction of masculine pursuits and values.
Table 1. Self-Rating of Degree of Attachment to Parents During Childhood and Adolescence by 58 Career Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Rating of Attachment</th>
<th>Percentage of Mobile Women N = 25</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-Mobile Women N = 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than average*</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than average**</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* C.R. = -1.92  
** C.R. = -2.24

More attachment to father than to mother was indicated by only small minorities. The difference between groups was not significant. Answers to the question regarding differential attachment to either parent are given in Table 2.

Neither mobile nor non-mobile groups had undue proportions of individuals reared in families composed predominantly of males. Of the mobile group, 14.8 percent had families more than half of whose members were males. The comparable figure for the non-mobile group was 18.2 percent. In fact, contrary to the hypothesis that career women might have absorbed masculine values from predominantly male families, a possibly important finding was that a probably undue proportion of both groups of respondents came from predominantly feminine families, more
than half of whose members were females. The figures were 70.4 percent for the mobile group, and 72.7 percent for the non-mobile. One might speculate that the results of favoritism and sibling rivalry might be more pronounced when the competitor is of the same sex. It was true that of the persons reporting parental favoritism toward a sibling, fifteen named a sister as the favorite child, while only nine named a brother.

Table 2. Relative Degree of Attachment to Each Parent Reported by 58 Career Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Degree of Attachment</th>
<th>Percentage of Mobile Women</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-Mobile Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More attachment to mother than to father</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More attachment to father than to mother</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference between parents</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between mobile and non-mobile groups were not statistically significant.

Only three women—two mobile and one non-mobile—had been informed that their parents had wanted male children at the time they were born. The numbers were too small for tests of significance.
Three other family factors inquired into—birth order, number of siblings, and broken families—revealed no significant differences between groups or between the total sample and what might be expected in the general community.

Summary

The primary group relations of respondents during childhood and adolescence were inquired into with a view to testing three hypotheses:

1. Mobility drives result largely from a series of humiliating experiences which have wounded the self-esteem. The humiliating experiences might have occurred within or without the home, but a lack of affection from others would have been an important factor in any case.

2. The careers of mobile women result largely from unusual identification with father or brothers and consequent learning of typically masculine values.

3. Because of a desire for male children, the parents have encouraged the mobile women in the direction of masculine pursuits and values.

Only the first hypothesis was supported by the findings. Parental favoritism toward another child and rejection by the general community were both found in larger proportions of the mobile women than in the non-mobile. In addition, a larger
proportion of the mobile women reported less than average attachment to parents during childhood and adolescence. All three differences between groups were statistically significant.
IV. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PRIMARY GROUP RELATIONS HYPOTHESES

There were at least three possible alternatives to the explanation of upward social mobility in terms of deep-rooted personality factors. They were that mobility could be attributed largely to high intelligence, unusual vitality or to chance.

It seemed impractical to attempt formal measurement of intelligence. In the absence of more exact methods, each respondent was asked about her academic achievements in high school and college. While it was recognized that there is only a moderate correlation between scholastic grades and intelligence, it was thought that such information would have the additional value of indicating the extent to which the successful career women had been notable for outstanding achievement during youth. Therefore, each respondent was asked to rate her high school and college grades as above average, average or below average for her school. Each person also was asked about the number and type of academic honors won. In addition, each was asked specifically if she had been valedictorian or salutatorian in her high school class, and if she had been either a member of Phi Beta Kappa or an honor graduate at college.

A question regarding factors contributing to success gave respondents an opportunity to indicate the role of chance in their careers. Each person also was asked to rate her vitality as above average, average, or below average.
No significant differences between the mobile and non-mobile groups appeared with respect to any of the questions. The answers, however, indicated that both groups probably were characterized by more than average academic distinction and more than average vitality.

Above average grades for high school and college were reported by 68.0 percent of the mobile women and 69.7 percent of the non-mobile. All other respondents said their grades were about average, none falling below average.

The non-mobile group included three members of Phi Beta Kappa, one member of an honorary fraternity leading to Phi Beta Kappa, one person who ranked first in her college class, and one who ranked second. Thus, 18.2 percent had demonstrated outstanding scholarship.

In the mobile group were two women who ranked first in their college classes, one of whom received only A's during her entire four years, and three other college honor graduates. The percentage showing outstanding scholarship was 18.5.

The non-mobile group included two high school valedictorians and two salutatorians, for a combined percentage of 12.1. The mobile group had one high school honor graduate, 3.7 percent of the sample.

Academic honors were defined as scholarships, fellowships, honor graduations, honorary fraternities, and trophies, medals
or prizes awarded for academic pursuits. Women in the non-mobile group had won an average of 0.82 of such honors, mobile women an average of 0.62.

While there were no group differences, it is probable that both groups demonstrated academic scholarship considerably higher than would be found in a random sample of college students or graduates. It probably is safe to assume further that the academic distinction indicates somewhat superior intelligence on the average, and that intelligence was not without influence in the successful careers of both mobile and non-mobile women. At any rate, the information indicates that the successful women's records of superior achievement, on the average, extend back at least as far as high school or college.

Both mobile and non-mobile groups were composed predominantly of women who rated their general vitality during adulthood as above average. Percentages were 72.7 for non-mobile, and 66.7 for mobile. Only one woman in each group reported less than average vitality, the remainder choosing average as their reply. It probably is also safe to assume that the high level of vitality was not without influence in their careers.

Comparatively few women in either group considered chance an important factor in their achievement of high-status positions. Percentages were 7.4 for the mobile group, and 9.1 for the non-mobile.
Three possible alternatives to the explanation of upward mobility in terms of deep-rooted personality factors were that it was the result of high intelligence, unusual vitality or chance. None of the alternatives was supported by findings.

A large majority of both mobile and non-mobile groups, however, reported more than average vitality and more than average academic distinction. The academic accomplishment probably is at least a rough indicator of somewhat superior average intelligence. At any rate, it indicates that the successful women's records of superior achievement, on the average, extend back at least as far as high school or college. While there were no significant group differences, it is probable that superior intelligence and high vitality were career assets in both groups of successful women.
V. METHODS AND STEPS IN ACHIEVING MOBILITY

The Hypotheses

Each respondent was asked questions dealing with three specific hypotheses regarding methods of achieving high occupational status. Two of the hypotheses, formulated especially by Warner and his associates, were that advanced education\(^1\) and geographical mobility\(^2\) are factors facilitating upward mobility. The third hypothesis was that, with the "maturing" of the American economy, the professions have offered a better road to mobility than has business.

Other possibilities were that the mobile women went through more of a "floundering period" than the non-mobile, perhaps holding a greater number of jobs for briefer periods before achieving high status, and that the mobile required a longer time period than the non-mobile in reaching high-status positions.

Other factors inquired into, and about which no particular hypotheses were entertained, included the extent to which respondents had been handicapped by being women, and factors contributing to success.

Findings

In no case was a statistically significant difference found between the mobile and non-mobile groups.

2. Ibid., p. 436.
Both groups had an average of 3.7 years in college. The average is much beyond that of the general community. Therefore, education presumably can be considered a somewhat important factor in the success of both groups.

Attempts to measure the influence of education in the rise of mobile women probably should be based upon comparison of respondent's education with father's education. Questions regarding parents' education, however, were dropped from the schedule after the pre-test indicated that respondents, particularly mobile respondents, usually were unable to provide such information. Occupations of mobile women's fathers, of course, hint that their educational level was considerably lower than that of the daughters. In only one case was there an occupation which would necessarily require any college training. Types of occupations of the mobile respondents' fathers were: professions, 1; (high school teacher); small business, 11; white collar workers, 8; farmer, 1; skilled workers, 3; and semi-skilled workers, 3.

The distribution among business, professional and executive positions also was almost identical for mobile and non-mobile women. Therefore, the hypothesis that the professions offer an easier avenue to mobility than does business was not supported. The occupational distribution of respondents is shown in Table 3.

No specific question regarding geographical mobility yielded statistically significant group differences. There were, however,
numerous small differences, without exception pointing in the
direction of greater geographical mobility for the occupationally
mobile women. Statistics regarding geographical mobility appear
in Table 4.

While no specific difference is statistically significant,
it is doubtful if chance would result in so many small differences
in the same direction. It seems probable that the occupationally
mobile women do tend to be slightly more geographically mobile.

Table 3. Occupational Distribution of the Two
Sub-Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Occupation</th>
<th>Percentage of Mobile Women</th>
<th>N = 27</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-Mobile Women</th>
<th>N = 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business (owners)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between the mobile and non-mobile groups
were not statistically significant.

Respondents can be compared in regard to inter-state movements
with 1,242 male workers at all occupational levels studied by
Percy E. Davidson and H. Dewey Anderson in San Jose, California.

3. Percy E. Davidson and H. Dewey Anderson, Occupational Mobility
   in an American Community, Stanford University Press, Stanford
   University, California, 1937, p. 114.
Davidson and Anderson found that 50 percent of the workers had made at least one occupational change involving inter-state movement. The mean number of such changes for those making them was 1.6 per person. In this study 59.3 percent of the mobile respondents and 48.5 percent of the non-mobile had made job changes involving state to state movement. The mean number of such changes for those making them was 2.38 for mobile women, and 1.56 for non-mobile.

Table 4. Statistics Regarding Geographical Movements of 60 Career Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mobile Women N = 27</th>
<th>Non-Mobile Women N = 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent born in Alabama or an adjacent state</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of years residence in Montgomery</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of jobs held in Montgomery</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of cities worked in</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of states worked in</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of cities lived in before working</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of states lived in before working</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent having worked outside the United States</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between mobile and non-mobile groups were not statistically significant.
The hypothesis that, because of their lower starting point, mobile women achieved present high status at a later age than non-mobile women was not substantiated. The average age at the time present status was achieved was almost the same for both groups: 32.2 for non-mobile, 31.1 for mobile.

There is, however, a statistically significant group difference with respect to present age. The average age of mobile women is 35.8 years, and of non-mobile 43.0 (C.R. = 2.86). The interviews did not clearly indicate any explanation of the difference. One hypothesis, based upon the personal observations of the researcher and some comments by respondents, is that during the period before 1910 an undue proportion of the highly motivated Southern women who eventually would become mobile left the South in search of greater opportunity elsewhere. The mobile women left in Montgomery now, thus, would be largely those who had reached working age in the 1910's, when prosperity and increased industrialization in the South had made it less necessary to seek opportunity outside the region.

Questions regarding a possible longer "floundering period" for mobile women did not show statistically significant differences, but again several small differences all in the same direction hinted that mobile women might change jobs more frequently than non-mobile and occupy more lower-status jobs during their climb to high status.

Mobile women had held an average of 4.0 jobs, non-mobile 4.2. But because of the considerably lower average age of mobile
women, their average tenure in one job was 3.45 years as compared with 5.0 for non-mobile.

Non-mobile women had held their present positions an average of 6.6 years, mobile 5.0 years. Before achieving their present high-status occupations non-mobile women were employed in an average of 2.4 lower-status jobs, mobile women in 2.8. Non-mobile women had held an average of 0.88 former jobs equivalent or higher in status than their present positions, mobile women 0.59.

A question regarding factors contributing to success showed similar opinions in the mobile and non-mobile. The outstanding conclusion was that successful human relations had contributed largely to the careers of both groups of women. The two factors listed most frequently were ability to get along with people and a liking for people. Also of interest was the infrequent mention of certain factors, such as good training, family background and superior intelligence. The complete list of answers to the question appears in Table 5.

Proportions of respondents reporting having been handicapped by being women were almost identical for the two groups—mobile 25.9 percent, and non-mobile 24.2. It is of interest that those indicating a sex handicap were concentrated almost entirely in occupations traditionally regarded as masculine strongholds. This agrees with the conclusions of Marguerite Wykoff Zapoleon, Chief

Table 5. Factors Contributing to Occupational Success
Listed by 58 Career Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Listed*</th>
<th>Percentage of Mobile Women</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-Mobile Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 25</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get along with people</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A liking for people</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard work</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in work</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good training</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to do detail work</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family background</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior intelligence</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-doubt</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not including factors named by only one person.
** No difference between mobile and non-mobile groups was statistically significant.

of the Employment Opportunities Branch of the Women's Bureau in the United States Department of Labor. Occupations of the respondents reporting having been handicapped by being women were:
attorneys, three; college professors, three; bacteriologists, two;
physician, one; historian, one; realtor, one; chartered life under­
writer, one; and high-ranking executives in various departments of
the state government, three.

Six women reported that sex discrimination had made it more
difficult for them to obtain desirable positions in their fields.
Four indicated that they were employed in satisfactory positions,
but were paid less than men in comparable jobs. Four women with
advanced college degrees said they had been handicapped by sex
in their schooling. Three of them said they had found a sex dis­
crimination in the awarding of scholarships and fellowships, while
one, a physician, reported a preference for men as applicants for
schools of medicine. The three attorneys unanimously indicated
that many possible clients prefer male attorneys.

Some comments by respondents follow:

1. By an attorney now co-owner (with another woman) of an
abstract company and largely inactive in other legal practice:
"Straight legal practice is difficult for a woman. When I was
practicing, other lawyers just sent me things they didn't want
to be bothered with--collections, etc. I never had but one jury
trial, which I won, and never had a divorce case. I got a lot
of Negroes out of the clutches of loan sharks, and got a number
of paroles for convicts. I got a lot of satisfaction out of some
of that work. Being a woman hasn't been much of a handicap in
the abstract business. The men lawyers send us a lot of business. The only thing is that we never try to give opinions on the value of property titles. We think we are as capable of doing it as any man in town, but the men lawyers would resent competition."

2. Another attorney, engaged in private practice, commented: "Sex is, of course, a handicap to a woman lawyer. I don't think public opinion in Alabama is ready for women to handle criminal cases. I haven't had one yet, and would not accept one unless something about the circumstances especially appealed to me. But everything else is all right for a woman."

3. A high-ranking executive in state government: "My salary would be higher if I were a man. I get the minimum for my position, while men in similar jobs usually get the maximum. I am at a disadvantage because most people can never see a woman as anything more than a highbrow secretary."

4. A college department head: "I get a lower salary than men with less training. Also there is a preference for men as department heads. That narrows the field of opportunity."

5. A bacteriologist: "I did most of my graduate work in chemistry, but am in bacteriology because I couldn't get a job in chemistry in Alabama. The state laboratories, among other places, will not hire a woman chemist."

6. A historian, formerly a college professor, and now in research: "When I was doing my graduate work there was a feeling in the department that women just get married and don't
contribute anything. Also they are harder to place. Jobs in the academic field are harder to get. My department always said a woman had to be not twice as good as a man, but five times as good."

7. An attorney, now a judge in the State Court of Appeals: "I have had to work twice as hard as a man to get equal credit. At least I have always believed I had to work twice as hard. People are always quicker to criticize a woman."

Summary

Hypotheses regarding methods and steps in achieving mobility included:

1. Advanced education is an avenue to social mobility.

2. Geographical mobility may facilitate social mobility.

3. The professions offer a better road to mobility than does business.

4. Mobile persons go through a longer "flourishing period" than non-mobile, holding a larger number of comparatively low-status jobs for briefer periods.

5. Mobile persons require a longer time period than non-mobile to reach high-status positions.

Other factors inquired into, with no particular hypotheses in mind, were the extent to which respondents had been handicapped by being women, and factors contributing to success.
No statistically significant group differences were found with respect to any of the above items. A number of small differences all in the same direction, however, indicated that mobile women probably are slightly more geographically mobile, and probably change jobs more frequently than the non-mobile women and occupy more lower-status jobs before achieving high status.

Both groups had average educational attainment far above the average for the community, hinting that advanced education was of some importance in the careers of both mobile and non-mobile women. Both groups indicated that the factors contributing most to success were ability to get along with people and a liking for people. A sex handicap was reported by approximately one-fourth of the women in each group, and was concentrated among those in occupations traditionally regarded as masculine fields.
VI. SOCIAL PARTICIPATION DURING ADULTHOOD

The Hypotheses

The basic hypothesis of the entire study was that upward social mobility frequently is inspired by emotional drives generated by unsatisfactory early primary group relations, and that mobility leads to further deterioration of primary group relations during adulthood.

The assumption, suggested particularly by Sorokin,¹ was that the mobile person as a result of childhood conditioning is less than normally capable of achieving lasting, satisfactory primary group relations. That incapacity would then be further encouraged by movement through different class sub-cultures, accompanied perhaps by more than average geographical mobility, which again would lead to temporary, superficial social relations.

Sorokin further suggested that in an attempt to alleviate the resulting socio-psychological loneliness the mobile person might turn to a frantic "hunt for pleasure" or to an "imitation of intimacy actions" through hasty marriages or hasty love affairs.²

Findings

In general, the theory that mobile individuals are more socially isolated than non-mobile was upheld by the findings.

². Ibid., pp. 524-25.
Significant group differences were found with respect to number of friends, length of friendships, and conflict with parents during adulthood.

Each respondent was asked to give the number of persons she regarded as intimate friends, the number of intimate friends in Montgomery, and the number of intimate friends known more than five years. (The number of years was set rather arbitrarily in an attempt to determine the degree of permanence of friendships.) Replies indicated that mobile women had both fewer and less permanent friendships than non-mobile women. Means for the items appear in Table 6.

Some comments by mobile respondents about friends follow:

1. "There isn't anyone I consider an intimate friend. I used to have many intimate friends, but I have lost touch with them since I started my business."

2. "I don't have any really intimate friends. Most of my old friends are married, and married people run with a different crowd. I told you being unmarried at my age is a lonely life. I probably should exert myself more."

3. "I don't have more than about two intimate friends. Do you think anybody has many intimate friends?"

4. "I don't have any intimate friends. Since I started my second store, I haven't done anything except work."

5. "There are about four people I consider intimate friends—all old boy friends. I don't like women."
Another hypothesis regarding primary group relations was that at least a partial rejection of parents results from the mobile person's movement through class sub-cultures with different standards, as well as from emotional factors. Because of the lack of comparability of the ages of respondents and of parents, of number of parents living, and of spatial distance of parents, the only serious attempt at measurement of such rejection was through the presence or absence of serious conflict during adulthood in four areas of belief or behavior.

In all four areas—religion, respondent's career, politics, and respondent's personal conduct—a greater incidence of serious disagreement was reported by the mobile group. Only with respect
to personal conduct, however, was the difference statistically significant. In one other area, respondent's career, the difference approached significance. But, since one difference is significant and all others are in the same direction, it seems probable that the differences are more authentic than would be indicated by the critical ratios. It is interesting to note that the most conflict was in the more personal areas—conduct and career—and the least in the more abstract and impersonal areas of religion and politics. Percentages reporting conflict in the various areas are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Incidence of Serious Conflict with Parents in
Four Areas of Behavior Reported by 58 Career Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Behavior</th>
<th>Mobile Women</th>
<th>Non-Mobile Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 25</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's Career*</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's Personal Conduct**</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* C.R. = 1.82
** C.R. = 2.17

Comments by mobile women about their family relations follow:

1. "I disagree with my parents about almost every possible subject, and have for years. I remember that when I was 13, I
went home from school one afternoon and announced that I was an agnostic and a believer in racial equality. (My parents are devoutly religious and ardent upholders of white supremacy.) A few years later I announced that I was a socialist. I try to avoid arguments now, but the fur still flies occasionally. My parents have disapproved of almost everything I have done as an adult, both with respect to conduct and career, but they are rather proud of me in a way. I don't think they have ever quite decided whether they are swans who hatched an ugly duckling, or ducks who hatched a swan."

2. "I am not at all close to either parent. I live with them because they are financially dependent on me, and I can't afford to maintain two homes. I just ignore my father. I seldom even speak to him. My parents heartily disapprove of my conduct, particularly drinking. I am trying to get transferred to a job outside Montgomery to get away from home." (A few weeks after the interview this respondent moved from her parents' home to an apartment in Montgomery.)

3. "I have fought with my parents for years about personal conduct. They have approved of my career in general, but were quite upset when I accepted a job overseas. They just didn't think it was proper for an unmarried girl to be travelling around Asia alone."

4. "My parents bitterly disapprove of my personal conduct—drinking, smoking and dates. My mother never saw a man she
thought was good enough to marry me. I didn't have dates until I was sixteen, because my mother wouldn't let me, and I didn't want to sneak around. I didn't have many until I left home."

5. "I like to see my parents, but I am always profoundly bored after a couple of days. We really have little in common."

6. "My parents disapproved of my starting a business. They thought it was risky and a little unbecoming for a woman."

7. "My parents have thoroughly disapproved of my career. They think a woman's place is in the home, and would much prefer that I get married."

One hypothesis added after the first ten interviews was that a disproportionately large number of mobile women acquire pets in an effort to alleviate the loneliness resulting from superficiality and impermanence of primary group relations. A highly significant group difference in the ownership of pets actually was found (C.R. = 3.05). Percentages were 40.0 for mobile women, and 15.2 for non-mobile. In a number of cases the mobile women commented that they had bought pets with the conscious intention of finding an outlet for affection.

Sorokin's theory that the mobile person may turn to a mad "hunt for pleasure" in an attempt to overcome loneliness also received some support. A statistically significant difference (C.R. = 2.26) was found in the proportions of mobile and non-mobile women who named as their major leisure time activities drinking
and going to parties and night clubs. Percentages were 22.2 for mobile and 3.0 for non-mobile respondents.

The question regarding use of leisure time also showed two other statistically significant differences. A larger proportion of the mobile women said they spend a large part of their free time in self-improvement activities (education, research, and business activities other than regular occupation), while a larger proportion of non-mobile women said reading is a major pastime. Percentages were: self-improvement—mobile 24.0, non-mobile 3.0 (C.R.—2.33); reading—mobile 32.0, non-mobile 62.6 (C.R.—2.53).

Two other non-significant differences also hinted that non-mobile women may place greater emphasis upon more or less routine, conventional amusements. Of the non-mobile 36.4 percent named movies as a major activity and 27.3 listed card playing. Comparable figures for mobile women were 24.0 percent for movies and 12.0 for card playing.

No significant differences were found with respect to six other questions bearing upon possible social isolation. Factors covered included living alone or with others, ownership of house or furnishings (as an indication of sense of permanence of residence), membership and participation in organizations, divorce (as a possible indication of hasty marriages), children, and use of leisure time for solitary or social activities. Some of the statistics appear in Table 8.
Table 8. Selected Statistics Regarding Social Participation of 60 Career Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mobile Women</th>
<th>Non-Mobile Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent never married</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent widowed</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent divorced</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent having had children</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of organizational memberships</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent living alone</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent owning houses or furnishings</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between mobile and non-mobile groups were not statistically significant.

Summary

The basic hypothesis was that social mobility is inspired to a great extent by unsatisfactory early primary group relations, and that the resulting personality factors coupled with movement through different class sub-cultures lead to relatively impermanent, superficial primary group relations during adulthood.

In general, findings upheld the theory that mobile individuals are more socially isolated than non-mobile. Significant group differences were found with respect to total number of
intimate friends, number of intimate friends in Montgomery, length of friendships, and conflict with parents during adulthood.

Significant differences also were found in regard to two questions dealing with possible attempts to alleviate loneliness. Larger proportions of mobile women reported owning pets as well as spending much of their leisure time drinking and going to parties and night clubs. The latter question was an attempt to test Sorokin's statement that mobile persons are likely to turn to a "hunt for pleasure."
VII. INDICATIONS OF NEUROTIC TENDENCIES

One basic hypothesis, implicit in the writings of both Horney and Sorokin, was that mobile persons tend to be more neurotic than non-mobile persons. Since it was impossible to use clinical psychological techniques, three questions were asked in an attempt to uncover at least crude symptoms of neurosis.

Each woman was asked to rate her degree of "nervousness" as more than average, average, or less than average. If any "nervous" complaints were indicated, the person was asked for further details. Each person also was asked for a self-rating of happiness during adulthood on a five-point scale. The assumption, of course, was that neurotic persons tend to be less happy than the average person. In addition, other health problems were inquired about with a view to determining the presence or absence of psychosomatic illnesses.

A significant group difference was found only with respect to the incidence of relatively severe symptoms of types generally regarded as emotionally based. Percentages having marked symptoms of psychosomatic or similar ailments were 32.0 of the mobile women and 9.1 of the non-mobile (C.R.--2.10).

   Sorokin, op. cit., p. 515.
In addition to having a greater incidence among mobile women, the ailments tended also to be more incapacitating in that group. Complaints of the non-mobile women were migraine headaches, "nervous headaches," and "nervous indigestion." No one in the group had more than one type of psychosomatic illness.

In the mobile group half of those with such complaints had more than one type of disorder. Specific problems included severe allergies, phobias, "nervous dermatitis," ulcers, insomnia, "nervous indigestion," and migraine headaches.

The problems of at least three of the mobile women were serious enough to interfere considerably with normal living. For example, one respondent, one of the most highly mobile persons in the sample, in the six months preceding the interview had been seriously ill three times with a type of pneumonia which her physician said was largely an outgrowth of allergies. The illnesses were further complicated by the fact that she is allergic to penicillin, which is the usual treatment in such cases. She also has a number of other allergies, including a highly inconvenient allergy to soap and all common soap substitutes. In addition, she has such an overpowering fear of darkness that for years she has arranged to work in the afternoon or evening so she can sleep only during the daytime.
The intensity of the phobia was further evidenced by her ownership of two vicious dogs, which she said were bought deliberately as watchdogs, and by the fact that all windows of her second-floor apartment were locked and nailed shut, while the only outside door had three separate locks.

Group differences in self-ratings of nervousness were not significant. Percentages were: mobile--more than average 33.3, average 48.1, below average 18.5; non-mobile--more than average 24.2, average 45.4, below average 30.3.

Self-ratings of happiness during adulthood again did not show significant group differences. It perhaps is noteworthy, however, that the answers of both groups had a more or less normal distribution, and did not show the heavy majority of "very happy" ratings given by married women in the various marriage prediction studies. The marriage prediction studies, of course, are not exactly comparable, since the rating referred only to the happiness of the person's marriage. In the Burgess-Cottrell\(^1\) study 55.4 percent of the wives rated their marriages as "very happy," while in the Terman\(^2\) study 34.6 percent of the wives in the sample said their marriages were "extraordinarily happy," and 35.9 percent "decidedly more happy than average."

Percentages of various answers given by respondents in this study appear in Table 9.

Table 9. Self-Ratings of Happiness During Adulthood by 58 Career Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage of Mobile Women</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-Mobile Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 25</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very happy</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unhappy</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between mobile and non-mobile groups were not statistically significant.

Summary

Various students of social mobility have assumed that mobile persons tend to be more neurotic than the average person. In an attempt to find at least crude indications of neurosis, each person was asked for a self-rating of happiness during adulthood, a self-rating of nervousness, and for a detailed description of any health problems.

Mobile women had a significantly greater incidence of psychosomatic and similar ailments thought to be emotionally based. Group differences in the self-ratings of happiness and nervousness were not significant.
VIII. TENDENCIES TOWARD CYNICISM AND UNSTABLE MORALS

One hypothesis suggested by Sorokin\(^1\) was that the mobile person's contact with different sub-cultures having divergent customs and moral standards may lead to cynicism, "lack of firm convictions" and unstable morals.

In an attempt to find evidence of such changes, each person was asked an open-end question about any changes since her career was begun in regard to general outlook on life and opinion of people. In addition, each person was asked about church membership and attendance.

The only significant difference was in the disproportionately large number of mobile women indicating that their careers had made them more cynical. Answers to the question regarding changes in outlook appear in Table 10.

Some comments by mobile respondents follow:

1. "I used to assume people were good unless they proved otherwise. Now people have to prove to me that they are good—ethically and occupationally—not so much morally. I have no interest in other people's morals. I have become more tolerant about that since I got away from my former sheltered life. But I have found out that it isn't what your skill is that counts in business, but who you know."

\(^1\) Sorokin, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 508-09, 519, 526.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Percentage of Mobile Women</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-Mobile Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 25</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cynical*</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More tolerant</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More understanding</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More self-confident</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowered moral standards</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less snobbish</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.R.—2.54

2. "I used to trust everybody. Now I trust nobody."

3. "I have become much more aware of the politics involved in everything. There is a lot of truth in remarks about who you know being more important than what you can do. I am pretty cynical about it."

4. "I have found out things aren't as rosy as I had thought. I don't accept people with blind trust. I used to think nobody would lie or steal. Now I know better."

5. By a college art professor: "I am much more aware of how a community works. I am a little cynical about the string-pulling and selfish interests. For example, the local art gallery is so tied up with 'old family' politics that we can't
use it for exhibitions." (The gallery is directed by the young
debutante daughter of an "old family.")

6. By a personnel director: "It has been disillusioning
to find out what little things people will do. I recently had
a case of one girl blackmailing another. It has made me more
cynical about people."

Group differences in church membership and attendance were
not significant. Ninety-seven percent of the non-mobile women
are church members, and 85.2 percent of the mobile.

Answers to the question about regularity of attendance
were:

Regularly (at least twice a month)--mobile 53.9 percent,
non-mobile 72.7 percent.

Occasionally (less than twice a month but more than once
a year)--mobile 19.2 percent, non-mobile 18.2 percent.

Never or virtually never (less than twice a year)--mobile
26.9 percent, non-mobile 9.1 percent.

Summary

One of the hypotheses contributed by Sorokin was that
the mobile person's contact with different class sub-cultures
having varying moral standards may lead to cynicism and un-
stable morals.

In an attempt to find evidence of such phenomena, each
respondent was asked about changes in outlook on life, and
church membership and attendance. The only significant group difference was that a larger proportion of mobile than non-mobile women reported increased cynicism.
IX. ASPIRATIONS AND MOTIVATIONS

The basic assumption of the study, as previously stated, was that mobility drives are to a great extent the outgrowth of personality factors of which the individual may not be consciously aware. There also was an interest, however, in the conscious motivations and aspirations of respondents.

Each person was asked questions regarding aspirations during childhood and adolescence, degree of interest in excelling in academic work during high school and college, conscious motivation for entering present occupation, and present aspirations. Replies to those and other questions were studied for indications of conscious knowledge of personality "depth factors." A series of questions attempted to determine whether respondents' careers were actually major ends or only second-choice substitutes for marriage. Answers to all other questions also were carefully studied in an attempt to infer an answer to that question. Another question was intended to determine the extent to which careers had been inspired by financial responsibility for dependents.

The question regarding aspirations during childhood and adolescence revealed that comparatively few respondents gave serious thought to careers during that age period. Group differences were not significant.

For purposes of comparison aspirations were grouped into three categories: high--aspirations for goals which would lead
to national recognition or at least recognition throughout the South; medium—aspirations for relatively high-status business, professional or semi-professional jobs, but not recognition beyond the local community; low—no definite aspirations or aspirations for jobs at or below the white collar level. Percentages of respondents with various levels of aspiration are given in Table 11.

Table 11. Aspirations of 58 Career Women During Childhood and Adolescence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Aspirations*</th>
<th>Percentage of Mobile Women** N = 25</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-Mobile Women N = 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Categories are defined on pages 63-64.
** Differences between mobile and non-mobile groups were not statistically significant.

A significant group difference was found in the proportions of mobile and non-mobile women who had a conscious desire to excel in high school and college grades. Percentages were 32.0 for mobile and 3.0 for non-mobile (C.R. = 2.99). Of the mobile women who wished to excel, 37.5 percent explained their aspirations in terms of family or community rejection and a resulting
desire to prove their worth. The others were unable to give explanations.

The question regarding conscious motivation for entering present occupation yielded only one significant difference. A larger proportion of non-mobile women said they were motivated by a desire to serve others. The most common answer to the question was that the respondent entered her occupation simply because of an interest in the field. Percentages of respondents giving various answers appear in Table 12.

Table 12. Motivations of 60 Career Women for Entering Present Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Percentage of Mobile Women N = 27</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-Mobile Women N = 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the field</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to serve others**</td>
<td>00.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with former job</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not including motivations named by only one person. ** C.R.—2.44.

No significant group differences were found with respect to present aspirations. Answers were placed in these categories: high aspirations—recognition throughout the country or region;
medium—marked advancement beyond present status but short of national or regional recognition; low—little or no advancement beyond present status. Percentages of respondents with various levels of aspiration are given in Table 13.

Table 13. Present Aspirations of 60 Career Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Aspirations*</th>
<th>Percentage of Mobile Women** N = 27</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-Mobile Women N = 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Categories are defined on pages 65-66.
** Differences between mobile and non-mobile groups were not statistically significant.

Respondents were asked specifically if one of their major aspirations was for greater wealth or income. Percentages giving affirmative answers were 11.1 of the mobile women, and 12.1 of the non-mobile.

One interesting question was the extent to which respondents had a conscious knowledge of personality "depth factors" which might have contributed to their achievement of high status. Answers to various questions indicated an at least partial understanding by 20.0 percent of the mobile women, but by none of the non-mobile.
Two mobile women specifically mentioned inferiority feelings which had led to a compulsive desire to prove personal worth. In one case the inferiority feelings had resulted from community rejection, in the other from both family and community rejection. In two other cases community rejection was named as a factor, and in one family rejection and jealousy of a sister.

Five specific factors were considered in an attempt to determine whether respondents' careers were major ends or only second-choice substitutes for marriage. They were: (1) whether person returned to college after the usual age for marriage, (2) expressions of bitterness about marital status, (3) desire to continue career in event of marriage, (4) in the cases of widowed or divorced women, whether career was continued during marriage, and (5) whether initial step in achieving present high status was taken after the usual age for marriage.

The evidence, while not completely conclusive, indicated that careers were more likely to be major ends in the mobile group than in the non-mobile. Both the third and fourth factors mentioned above showed statistically significant group differences.

A desire to continue working in event of marriage was indicated by 51.9 percent of the mobile, and 27.3 percent of the non-mobile (C.R.—2.00). Of the women previously married and now widowed or divorced, 75.0 percent of the mobile and 8.3
percent of the non-mobile continued working while married (G.R.--3.10).

No significant differences were found in connection with the other three factors. Of the mobile, 40.8 percent returned to college after working several years, and of the non-mobile 48.5 percent. Average age at the time the first definite step was taken toward achieving present high status was 27.5 for non-mobile respondents and 26.2 for mobile. Bitterness or dissatisfaction about present marital status was expressed by 25.9 percent of the mobile women and 21.2 percent of the non-mobile. It might be pointed out that no specific question was asked on that subject, all such comments being volunteered in connection with other questions.

The complete schedule of each respondent also was studied in an attempt to make inferences regarding the extent to which her unmarried status influenced her career. The conclusion, which is based largely upon respondents' comments but also contains some element of personal opinion, was that the careers of a few of the mobile women and of a large minority of the non-mobile could be attributed chiefly to their failure to have normal marriages. That is, if they had been able to achieve successful, lasting marriages, they probably would never have worked after marriage. Most of the women probably conclusively
influenced by marital status apparently turned to careers because of financial necessity, but in some cases an attempt at compensatory adjustment seems to have been more important than monetary factors.

Marital status probably had some influence in the careers of all respondents, but it seemed to be definitive only with respect to those briefly described in the next two paragraphs.

The mobile group included two widows who started businesses when they were widowed after more than ten years of marriage, during which they had not worked. One of the widows commented: "My interest was always making money, because I needed it. When my husband died, I had to support myself and two children." A third mobile woman, never married, lived with her parents without working for six years after college. She started working for the first time at the age of 27, soon after her identical twin sister was married.

The non-mobile group included eight widows who had not worked during marriage but who started businesses or entered high-status occupations after their husbands had died, three women who returned to college for graduate or professional degrees after being widowed, divorced or having an engagement broken, one woman who entered her present high-status occupation after her engagement was broken, one who lived with her parents without working for five years after high school, and one
relatively young woman who said she still is simply "killing time" while waiting for a husband to materialize.

A final question regarding motivations was the extent to which careers had been forced by financial responsibility for dependents. Percentages having had at any time other persons dependent or partially dependent upon them were 48.5 of the non-mobile women and 33.3 of the mobile. Since the proportion was less than half in each group, dependents could not have been an important factor in more than a minority of cases. The group difference was not significant.

Summary

Each respondent was asked a number of questions relating to conscious motivations and aspirations. Two problems of particular interest were whether careers were actually major ends or only second-choice substitutes for marriage, and the extent to which respondents were consciously aware of personality "depth factors" which might have contributed to their achievement of high status.

Replies indicated that careers were more likely to be major ends among mobile women than among non-mobile. A significantly larger proportion of mobile respondents indicated a desire to continue careers in event of marriage, and among those previously married, a significantly larger proportion of mobile women continued working during marriage.
Twenty percent of the mobile women had an at least partial recognition of the role of family or community rejection in inspiring upward mobility. No one in the non-mobile group attached importance to such factors.

Only one significant difference was found regarding conscious motivations for entering present occupation. A larger proportion of non-mobile women said they were inspired by a desire to be of service to others.

A significantly larger proportion of mobile women reported having had a conscious desire to excel in high school and college grades. No significant differences were found with respect to career aspirations during childhood and adolescence or present aspirations.
X. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation is an exploratory study of the correlates of upward social mobility among a sample of successful unmarried career women in a Southern metropolitan city. The study was intended partially to test a number of largely unverified hypotheses in current social scientific literature.

The basic plan was to compare a selected group of mobile persons with a selected group of non-mobile persons with respect to a number of factors thought to be associated with upward mobility. The groups were kept as homogeneous as possible with respect to such major variables as marital status, sex and occupational status, so that statistically significant differences between the two groups could be assumed to be associated with upward social mobility. The sample included sixty outstanding unmarried career women now living in one city. Respondents were divided into mobile and non-mobile sub-samples on basis of comparison of respondent's occupational status with the occupational status of her father. The research was done through intensive personal interviews.

Factors studied were based largely upon hypotheses found in current social scientific literature. The variables fell into three major categories: (1) presumed causes of upward social mobility, (2) presumed effects of upward social mobility, and (3) means and methods of achieving high status.
The basic underlying hypothesis, suggested particularly by Karen Horney and Pitirim Sorokin, was that upward social mobility frequently is at least partially inspired by emotional drives generated by unsatisfactory early primary group relations, and that mobility leads to further deterioration of primary group relations with accompanying neurotic symptoms. The early primary group relations would have been characterized by a lack of genuine affection from others and by a series of humiliating experiences which wounded the child's self-esteem.

Accordingly, in attempting to isolate presumed causes of upward social mobility, the major emphasis was upon early primary group relations. Three possible alternatives to the explanation of upward social mobility in terms of deep-rooted personality factors also were studied as thoroughly as possible. They were that mobility can be attributed largely to (1) superior intelligence, (2) high vitality, or (3) chance.

Among the possible conditioning factors, statistically significant differences between the mobile and non-mobile groups were found only with respect to certain types of early primary group relations. A significantly larger proportion of mobile women had had a series of humiliating experiences which apparently had wounded self-esteem and led to an intense desire to prove personal worth both to self and to others. Larger

proportions of mobile women had experienced both rejection by the general community and an at least partial rejection by parents who had showed favoritism toward a sibling or siblings. One further specific indication of the lack of the affection apparently necessary for emotional security in our society was found among mobile women. A significantly larger proportion of mobile respondents rated their attachment to parents during childhood and adolescence as "less than average."

In attempting to determine the effects of upward social mobility, attention again was focused upon primary group relations. It was assumed that relative social isolation would result from the already existing incapacity to achieve satisfactory primary group relations, and that that incapacity would be further encouraged by movement through different class sub-cultures with divergent standards and customs. Two hypotheses regarding attempts to alleviate socio-psychological loneliness were that unduly large proportions of mobile women turn to a frantic hunt for pleasure or acquire pets as outlets for affection.

In general, findings indicated that mobile women are more socially isolated than non-mobile. Mobile women had smaller numbers of intimate friends, smaller numbers of long-lasting friendships, and a greater amount of conflict.
with parents during adulthood. All three group differences were statistically significant. Significantly greater numbers of mobile women also had turned to a hunt for pleasure or to pets in an apparent attempt to alleviate the loneliness resulting from superficial, impermanent primary group relations. A further indication of the relative emotional maladjustment of mobile women was the significantly greater incidence of psychosomatic and similar ailments.

Replies to several questions hinted that successful careers are more likely to be major ends rather than second-choice substitutes for marriage among mobile than non-mobile women. A significantly larger proportion of mobile respondents indicated a desire to continue careers in event of marriage, and among those previously married, a significantly larger proportion of mobile women actually did continue working during marriage.

No significant group differences were found regarding means and methods of achieving high-status position, or conscious aspirations either during childhood and adolescence or at present.

In summary, the evidence indicated that upward social mobility is likely to be an outgrowth of basically neurotic drives resulting from unsatisfactory early primary group relations that have wounded the self-esteem, and that mobility
leads to continuation of superficial, impermanent primary group relations and other overt manifestations of emotional maladjustment.
THE SCHEDULE

1. When were you born?
2. Where were you born?
3. Did you live anywhere else during childhood and adolescence? If so, where? At what age did you move there? How many years did you live there?
4. Did you graduate from high school?
5. Did you go to college? If so, what college or colleges? How many years of college work did you complete? What years did you go to college? What degrees did you receive? What were your major subjects?
6. What jobs have you held other than your present position? Where and when did you hold the other jobs, and for how many months or years? What was your motivation for taking each job?
7. What was your motivation for entering your present field?
8. How did you obtain your first job in your present field?
9. Do you think being a woman has been a handicap to you in your present occupation? If so, how?
10. What are your aspirations for the future?
11. (For persons with aspirations beyond present status.) Why do you want to be or do ______ (the stated aspiration)?
12. Is one of your major aspirations to have more money? Why or why not?
13. Would you want to continue working if you were married? Why or why not?

14. How many hours do you spend working in an average week?

15. How has your general outlook on life and people changed since you started working?

16. Have you had any serious illnesses in the last five years?

17. Do you have any recurring or chronic illnesses or health problems? If so, what?

18. In regard to nervousness, would you rate yourself as more nervous than the average woman, about average, or less than average?

19. Do you have any specific symptoms of nervousness? If so, what?

20. Do you ever have insomnia? If so, how often?

21. Would you rate your vitality as more than that of the average woman, about average, or less than average?

22. Where do you live now—in a house, apartment or otherwise?

23. Do you own a house or furnishings?

24. Do you live alone or with someone else? If with someone else, who?

25. Do you have any pets?

26. What are your major leisure time activities?

27. What organizations are you a member of?

28. How regularly do you attend the meetings or other activities of those organizations?
29. Do you hold an office in any organization?
30. Are you a member of a church?
31. About how many church services do you attend each month?
32. How many church services have you attended in the last month?
33. Why do you or don't you attend church regularly?
34. How many intimate friends do you have in Montgomery?
35. How many intimate friends do you have elsewhere?
36. How many of your intimate friends are women, and how many are men?
37. How long have you known each of your intimate friends?
38. Were your high school grades above average, about average, or below average for your school?
39. Were your college grades above average, about average, or below average for your school?
40. Were you particularly interested in having good grades in high school and college? Why or why not?
41. What academic or social honors did you receive in high school and college?
42. Were you valedictorian or salutatorian in your high school class?
43. Were you a member of Phi Beta Kappa or an honor graduate in college?
44. What extra-curricular activities did you participate in in high school and college?
45. Have you ever been married? If so, are you widowed or divorced? Did you work while you were married? Do you have any children?

46. What was your father's major occupation? Did your mother ever work? If so, how many years? What was her occupation?

47. What were your aspirations during childhood and adolescence?

48. How many sisters and brothers do you have?

49. What was your birth order?

50. What are the present occupations of your sisters and brothers?

51. During childhood and adolescence did your parents show favoritism toward either you or a sister or brother? If so, how did they show their favoritism? What was your attitude about it?

52. Were you ever jealous of a sister or brother? If so, why?

53. When you were born, did your parents have a preference for either a boy or a girl?

54. How harmonious were your relations with your parents during childhood and adolescence?

55. Would you say your degree of attachment to your parents during childhood and adolescence was more than average, about average or less than average?

56. Was there any difference in the degree of attachment to your father and to your mother?

57. Were your parents ever separated, either informally or by divorce or death? If so, how old were you at the time?
58. During childhood and adolescence how satisfactory were your relations with other people in your community?

59. How harmonious are your relations with your family now?

60. How often do you write your parents?

61. How often do you visit your parents?

62. Do you consult your parents about your important personal and occupational problems?

63. During adulthood have you ever had any conflict with your parents about: religion, politics, your career, your personal conduct?

64. Would you rate your general happiness during adulthood as very happy, happy, average, unhappy, or very unhappy?

65. Have you ever had any dependents or partial dependents? If so, who and for how long?
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