

STATUS INCONSISTENCIES IN AN
EDUCATIONAL SETTING: AN APPLICATION OF
RANK BALANCE THEORY

by

SUSAN M. CLARK

B.A., Liverpool University, 1966
M.A., McMaster University, 1971

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department
of
Anthropology and Sociology

We accept this thesis as conforming to
the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

August, 1975

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study.

I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Anthropology & Sociology.

The University of British Columbia
2075 Wesbrook Place
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Date Sept. 5th 1975.

ABSTRACT

This research is concerned with a theory of rank balance as an approach to understanding stratified social systems. Despite a long history of interest in the problem, it was not until recently that an attempt was made to develop a theory which integrates rank balance within the field of social stratification. This project critically examines the theory developed by Zelditch and Anderson.

One hundred and ninety-two students in a university residence were interviewed in order to collect data directed to answering three problems. The first problem investigated is a precondition to the theory and is concerned with the way in which a social system is stratified. It is maintained that a person has an overall rank in a system which is determined by his/her ranks on relevant evaluative criteria weighted according to their relative importance. The data showed strong support for this part of the theory.

The second problem was to study the extent to which the students had balanced or imbalanced ranks under three different definitions of balance. The results show that the percentage of balanced and imbalanced persons varies according to the precise definition used, although under all three conditions a majority of the students were imbalanced. Such findings indicate that the usefulness of rank balance as an explanatory system may be limited if there is no agreement on which people are balanced or imbalanced.

The third problem studied was to investigate if people who have imbalanced ranks behave differently from those whose ranks are balanced. One response to imbalance was studied. This was the desire for rank mobility as expressed through preferences for changes in ranks on the evaluative criteria. Contrary to the predictions of the theory, students generally did not appear to be concerned with rank balance. Possible reasons for this lack of concern may be found in the peculiarities of the student residences as a social system, in the type of evaluative criteria important to the students, or in the nature of the comparison processes the members make between themselves. Evidence from this research indicates that the scope of the theory has to be limited since it is not likely to be applicable to all social systems.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
CHAPTER	
I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
II. THE RESEARCH DESIGN	37
III. THE DETERMINANTS OF STATUS	62
IV. THE PROCESSES OF BALANCE AND THE RESPONSE TO IMBALANCE	101
V. CONCLUSIONS	133
BIBLIOGRAPHY	163
APPENDIX A THE QUESTIONNAIRES	171
APPENDIX B THE QUESTIONNAIRE CODES	181

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Interviewer Reliability, Distribution of Choices Which Were the Same, Omitted or New Between the Original List of Evaluative Criteria and the List Given in the Reliability Test, by Interviewer	50
II. Distribution of Students, Number of Interviews, and Number of Useable Interviews, by Bay	58
III. Consensus on Rankings on General Status, Distribution of the Interquartile Range of Ranks and Kendall's W, by Bay	64
IV. Percentage Distribution of High Consensus Students on General Status by Status Position and Sex	69
V. Percentage Distribution of Friends in the Top Third of Ranks on General Status, by Sex	74
VI. Percentage Distribution of Friends Ranked in the Top Three Positions on General Status, by Sex	75
VII. The Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Evaluative Criteria, by Sex	77
VIII. Evaluative Criteria Seen to be Identical by at Least Ten Students in the Supplementary Survey	81
IX. Kendall's W for All Evaluative Criteria Used at Least Twice within a Bay, by Bay	92
X. Percentage Distribution of High Consensus Students on Academic and Athletic Abilities by Status Position and Sex	94
XI. Variation Accounted for by the General Status Equation, Males and Females	97

TABLE	PAGE
XII. Beta Weights for the Regression Equations for Men and Women	99
XIII. Percentage Distribution of Others' Rankings Under Three Conditions of Balance, by Sex . . .	111
XIV. Percentage Distribution of Others' Rankings Under Three Rank Definition of Balance, by Sex	112
XV. Percentage Distribution of Self-Rankings Under Three Conditions of Balance, by Sex	115
XVI. Percentage Distribution of Self-Rankings Under The Three Rank Definition of Balance, by Sex. .	115
XVII. First Question on Mobility; Percentage Distribution of Preferred Ranks Under the All-Rank Definition of Balance, by Sex	120
XVIII. First Question on Mobility; Percentage Distribution of Preferred Ranks Under the Three-Rank Definition of Balance, for Men . . .	122
XIX. First Question on Mobility; Percentage Distribution of Preferred Ranks under the Two-Rank Definition of Balance, for Men	123
XX. First Question on Mobility; Percentage Distribution of Preferred Ranks Under the Two-Rank Definition of Balance, for Wmen . . .	123
XXI. First Question on Mobility; Percentage Distribution of Preferred Ranks under the Three-Rank Definition of Balance, for Women . .	124
XXII. First Question on Mobility; Percentage Distribution of Preferred Ranks under the Two-Rank Definition of Balance, by Sex	124
XXIII. Second Question on Mobility; Percentage Distribution of Preferred Ranks under the All-Rank Definition of Balance, by Sex	126
XXIV. Second Question on Mobility; Percentage Distribution of Preferred Ranks under the Three-Rank Definition of Balance, for Men . . .	127

TABLE

PAGE

XXV. Second Question on Mobility: Percentage Distribution of Preferred Ranks under the Three-Rank Definition of Balance, for Women . .	127
XXVI. Second Question on Mobility: Percentage Distribution of Preferred Ranks under the Two-Rank Definition of Balance, for Men	128
XXVII. Second Question on Mobility: Percentage Distribution of Preferred Ranks under the Two-Rank Definition of Balance, for Women . . .	128

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. A Balanced Three Person Matrix	18

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to express my indebtedness to my research supervisor, Dr. Y. Chang, and to the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. B. Alfred, Dr. M. Foschi, Dr. Ratner and Dr. R. Wong, for the help and encouragement they gave to me throughout this project.

I am grateful to King's College University administration and students for their willingness to cooperate in the research, to Elizabeth Pacey and Guy Masland for their help with the interviewing, to Wita Schliewen and Barry De Ville for their assistance with the computer programming, and to (Mrs. N.) Florence Levy for the typing of the final manuscript.

I would like to thank the Canada Council for providing financial assistance in the form of Doctoral Fellowships for the period, 1970 to 1972.

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The research reported in the following chapters is concerned with an area of social stratification called rank balance.¹ Although one can trace the development of this approach from the work of early sociologists, it has not been until comparatively recently that considerable attention has been directed towards this field of research. Indeed, it is not until 1966 that one gets a systematic and more complete development of an actual theory of rank balance as opposed to a general approach to particular issues of stratification.² As a result of the developments in the approach being so recent, there has been no systematic testing of the theory in an attempt to establish its validity. This project was designed to test certain of the preconditions, assumptions and hypotheses of the theory suggested by Zelditch and Anderson in an attempt to begin the process of establishing its usefulness in explaining some aspects of social behaviour.

Recent interest in the rank balance approach dates from 1954 when Lenski published an article entitled "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status."³ In this article Lenski presents the ideas which are basic to the approach and which have been adopted, in whole or in part, by later researchers. Rank balance differs from other

approaches within the field of social stratification in that it is concerned with a "non-vertical status dimension."⁴ Instead of attention being directed to the consequences of people being ranked relative to one another on certain hierarchies of social characteristics, the rank balance approach seeks to explain behaviour by studying the extent to which a person's rank on one hierarchy is of the same order as his/her rank on different evaluative criteria. Thus the concern is with the relationship between the ranks each individual has on various hierarchies rather than the relationship between different individuals on the same criterion.

Using this approach, it is maintained that a person within a social system is evaluated on various status criteria relevant to that system. Such evaluations determine whether the ranks to which a person is assigned are of the same level. If they are, then a person is said to have balanced ranks, otherwise they are imbalanced. When a person has imbalanced ranks it is assumed that he or she is under some sort of stress or tension which a person with balanced ranks does not experience. For example, a person who has high occupational prestige and high educational attainment will not experience the stress which a person with low occupational prestige but high educational attainment would feel. Consequently, it is suggested that people with imbalanced ranks will strive to eliminate the stress associated with this state. The reasons why such

stress arises are not fully understood but one possibility is that people encounter difficulties in social interaction as others' expectations for their behaviour will depend on to which rank they respond. This may result in there being conflicting expectations about the behaviour which, in turn, may make it difficult for people with discrepant ranks to have satisfactory social relations.

Compensatory behaviour which arises from attempts to alleviate the stress connected with imbalanced ranks has been seen to take many different forms, judging by the reported research. Those with imbalanced ranks have been reported as being both more liberal in their political and economic views⁵ and more conservative⁶ than people whose ranks are balanced. Equally they are seen to be more predisposed to join social movements⁷ or retreat into isolation,⁸ to seek a redistribution of power within society⁹ or to have higher incidence of psychosomatic disorders.¹⁰

The possible forms which the compensatory behaviour can take are divergent and in some cases contradictory in nature. To this extent, the research using this approach has presented many perplexing problems. Indeed, one is led to question the viability of this particular field of social stratification. Some of the problems have undoubtedly arisen because researchers were using an approach which has not been

well systematized. Consequently, some of the basic theoretical problems and methodological issues were unresolved.¹¹

Many of these theoretical and methodological issues are not specific to Lenski and later researchers, but can be found to be problems since the beginning of the work in social stratification. Thus one continually finds a lack of a clearly defined relationship between the various status hierarchies, problems in measuring basic concepts such as social status, and disagreement on what are the important evaluative criteria in a particular society.

Researchers using multidimensional approaches to social stratification assume that significant evaluations of people are made on more than one evaluative criterion. In view of the complexity of industrial societies such an assumption seems warranted although it would be incorrect to assume that there are multiple bases of evaluation in all types of societies and all social systems. Within this general orientation to social stratification, rank balance is one approach and in common with this wider field has its foundations in the work of Weber.¹² Weber, however, raises, but does not give a satisfactory answer, to the very basic question of the relationship between the three evaluative dimensions he discusses--namely, a person's class or economic position, status and power. In his response to what he termed as Marx's 'untenable monocausal theory',¹³ Weber maintained that one would have a

better understanding of people's social actions if one considered various separate dimensions of evaluation. Marx assumes that one's economic position coincides with one's position on other relevant dimensions, for example, power, or prestige.¹⁴ Although Weber regards economic factors as important in determining a person's social rank, he maintains that the evaluations on the three status hierarchies will not necessarily be of the same order. Weber, nevertheless, incompletely specifies the relationship between the factors he discusses. At one instance, he writes that class and status are distinct in that "'status groups' hinder the strict carrying through of the sheer market principle,"¹⁵ and yet he also maintains that "property as such is not always recognized as a status qualification, but in the long run it is recognized as such with an extraordinary regularity."¹⁶ In relation to the concept of power, he gives no clear indication as to how this is related to the other concepts.

It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of Weber's work in the area of social stratification despite its obvious problems. Later researchers have not improved markedly on Weber's ideas, however, and the problems in Weber's work recur in more recent research. Thus in the community studies of the 1920s to 1940s in the U.S.A.,¹⁷ one finds that a major concern is with the inter-relationships of various status variables but that the theoretical understanding of the issue has progressed hardly at all beyond Weber's initial ideas.

However, it can be argued that whilst these studies did not further the theoretical development of the field, they did give considerable attention to the methodological problems encountered in measuring concepts such as social class, status or power. Weber pays little attention to these concerns; but in the work of Warner and his associates, for instance, one finds a detailed discussion of the measurement of the concepts.¹⁸ Although Warner's work can be seen to be an improvement over previous research in this regard, critics have commented that his measurement procedures are not fully explained and that the concept of social class used by Warner and his associates shows a fundamental ambiguity.¹⁹ It is even unclear in some instances whether social class is a multidimensional or unidimensional concept.²⁰ That such a question is raised again illustrates the fact that the status dimensions and their inter-relations have not been precisely specified. Warner himself argues that status, power and economic position are different and separate dimensions²¹ but his research lacks a systematic and more exhaustive discussion of their inter-relations and of the consequences of having various combinations of ranks on the hierarchies of evaluation. Indeed, one could maintain that his major concern is not with the effects of specific combinations of status variables but rather with developing a single measure of social status from the evaluations made on specific evaluative criteria.

If in the early 1940s, one had assessed the progress made by those who can now be seen as the forerunners of the rank balance approach, one could have concluded that the significant problems had been raised but that little agreement had been reached on the solutions to the issues. Thus, multiple dimensions of evaluation were widely accepted as characteristic of the stratified social systems being studied, but the nature of the dimensions, their measurement and their interrelations were still questions without adequate answers.

In 1944, however, two articles were published which dealt specifically with the interrelations of status dimensions and with the consequences of having unequal ranks on various evaluative criteria. The articles, by Hughes²² and Benoit Smullyan,²³ are quite dissimilar in orientation. Hughes is concerned with the problems some people encounter in social interaction as a result of having different ranks on evaluative hierarchies. Benoit-Smullyan's article is more theoretical in that he discusses the probability of people having statuses which are of like order and the consequences for both the individual and the society, which may arise when this equilibration of statuses does not occur. Demerath,²⁴ in his account of the development of the rank balance approach, traces a history in which Benoit-Smullyan's ideas are inconsequential but in which Hughes' ideas are important.

The different emphasis he places on the two articles may arise because he sees a clear distinction between theorists who have discussed these ideas in relation to societal concerns and those who are concerned with individuals' responses. Benoit-Smullyan's article is bypassed as being too clearly in the Weberian tradition and consequently, from Demerath's point of view, not as significant as Hughes' work. Whilst recognizing the initial contribution of Weber's ideas, Demerath maintains that it was Simmel who activated the interest in the concept of rank balance. For Demerath, the line of development moves from Weber to Simmel, with the latter's interest in "the instabilities of situations rather than their monolithic structures"²⁵ and his influence on the Chicago School and its concern with the marginal man.

It is this concept of marginal man which is of importance in Hughes' article and for Demerath, Hughes "resumes the development of status discrepancy per se."²⁶ Hughes describes the difficulties for a person and those with whom one interacts if certain status characteristics are not in line with the norm. His examples are those of the Negro doctor and the female scientist. Hughes discusses the possible conflict which may arise from such discrepant statuses as people may react to the doctor in terms of his race rather than in terms of his occupation. Such problems may affect both the doctor-patient relationship and relationships between colleagues and lead to situations where the

potential conflict is minimized by putting the doctor, for instance, in jobs where he will not meet the public. Hughes' article is an insightful discussion of particular status dilemmas but the theoretical side of his work is undeveloped. For instance, there is little discussion of the types of status discrepancies which would lead to the problems he suggests nor are the possible solutions for the individual with discrepant statuses discussed in a systematic manner.

In contrast, Benoit-Smullyan's article is theoretical in orientation. This article, in dealing with a person's ranks on different dimensions and their interrelationships, is essentially a reworking of Weber's ideas, although there are some additional important insights. For example, Benoit-Smullyan uses the same three dimensions as Weber did to develop the different hierarchies of status, but he proceeds to suggest the idea of status equilibration. Social status he defines as the status which would exist if a person had perfectly equilibrated statuses. He suggests there would be positive correlations between people's ranks on the three dimensions and that where such an equilibration process does not develop, for example, through the movement of ranks on the hierarchies, then the resulting social tensions could produce intense conflict--even to the point of revolution. Benoit-Smullyan also writes of possible ways to measure this equilibrating tendency either by taking a simple average of the separate political, economic and prestige statuses for

each individual or by weighting the dimensions according to their relative importance and then using a weighted ranking to define the overall social status. It is this latter procedure which Benoit-Smullyan maintains would give a better approximation of the social status of a person. Such an approach has not, however, been implemented within the field of social stratification.

Although both of these articles were published in 1944 there does not appear to have been any great interest in the ideas raised in the articles at the time they were written. Indeed, it is almost ten years later before one again finds reference to these issues in the empirical work of Homans²⁷ and Adams.²⁸ Homans does not explicitly refer to status discrepancy, or any such concept, but in his analysis of why one group of clerks is less contented with their job than another group he discusses the fact that high prestige in terms of job responsibility is not associated with correspondingly high economic rewards. Adams' research was concerned with aircraft crew behaviour. He studied the effects on group efficiency of individuals in the group all having the same status or of some having high status and others low status. Adams constructs an index of status congruence for the group by including such characteristics as age, rank, amount of flight time and length of service. His research is somewhat different from later research in that he is studying the effects of status congruence of a group rather than of each of the individuals.

Consequently, he does not discuss whether each individual has a congruent status but whether one group is more or less congruent than another group. Nevertheless, the concept of group congruence he uses bears a distinct relationship to the concept of rank balance used by other sociologists in work prior to and following Adam's report.

The problems which have been discussed as characteristic of the earlier research in social stratification do not cease to be problems with the publication of Lenski's research in 1954. Lenski argues that people with low status crystallization are more likely to hold liberal political views, measured by voting for the Democratic Party, than are people with high status crystallization. The major significance of his initial contribution lies in the fact that he deals explicitly with the concept of status crystallization, its theoretical justification, operationalization and application to a particular research problem; but it is apparent from the article and from the problems faced by subsequent researchers who used his approach, that the discussion of one particular problem, political preferences, does not provide an adequate theoretical base for the study of other status inconsistency related behaviour. The choice of the evaluative hierarchies, the actual nature of imbalance and whether all forms are equally disturbing, and the question of under what conditions people may exhibit particular forms of compensatory behaviour are all questions which are dealt with inadequately.

It is perhaps the inadequacy of the theory found in the research using rank balance which led some sociologists to suggest that the whole approach could be best subsumed under already existing theories and in particular the theory of cognitive dissonance.²⁹ Geschwender³⁰ and Sampson³¹ both take this approach but Sampson also suggests that it is the concept of expectancy congruence which is common to both theories. Consequently, he maintains that a tendency towards status equilibration will not occur with any and all status discrepancies but only when discrepancies in rank imply inconsistent expectations for the behaviour of the person who occupies those ranks. Under such circumstances both the person who occupies this inconsistent position and people with whom interaction takes place are in a situation where it is difficult to anticipate each other's behaviour. The incumbent of the position is likely to feel stress and tension and other people may exert pressure on a person in an inconsistent position to try to bring about an equilibrating process and render his/her behaviour more predictable.

In a study conducted by Brandon, she compares Sampson's model of rank imbalance with that of Lenski where it is assumed that all forms of imbalance will be equally disturbing.³² She presents data which indicates that Sampson's model is generally superior to that of Lenski, although neither of them was entirely satisfactory in explaining the observed behaviour. The major problem which

remains unanswered in Sampson's work is that of being able to state which combination of imbalanced ranks will lead to inconsistent expectations. Unless this can be answered beforehand, the explanatory and predictive ability of this approach is limited.

The absence of a satisfactory development of the theoretical bases of rank balance has been a severe hindrance in the research using this approach. Thus it is questionable as to what extent researchers have progressed beyond an intuitive understanding that specific combinations of ranks held by people do influence some vaguely specified forms of behaviour. Although some of these problems are due to a lack of concern with an actual theory of rank balance, it is also the case that there is a very fundamental problem in the development of such a theory which seems to have no adequate solution. This issue has been discussed by Mitchell,³³ Demerath,³⁴ Hyman³⁵ and in particular by Blalock.³⁶

The issue they raise is what Blalock labels the identification problem and whilst this is not peculiar just to this particular theory it is of crucial importance in this instance. The problem arises in maintaining the independence of status inconsistency and vertical social status since the former concept is defined in terms of the latter. Consequently, it is possible that the behavioural effects of status inconsistency may be reducible to simple differences in vertical social

status. Indeed, empirical studies indicate that behaviour characteristic of people with low status crystallization is also characteristic of those with low social status. In both instances people have been described as politically radical,³⁷ as having low rates of participation in voluntary organizations³⁸ and high levels of mental disorders.³⁹

Researchers, starting with Lenski in 1954, have attempted to develop procedures which would allow for a more rigorous control of the effects of vertical status in order that one might conclude that behaviour which is attributed to rank imbalance really is a consequence of that and not simply the effect of high or low status by itself. None of the procedures developed have been entirely satisfactory. In some cases vertical social status has not been effectively controlled whilst in others it cannot be determined that the effects attributed to rank imbalance are due to that phenomenon and not to some other interactive effect between the status hierarchies.⁴⁰ Blalock characterizes the problem as the general one of identifying coefficients in simultaneous equations and comments that there are no purely empirical means of identifying the coefficients.⁴¹ He, too, suggests alternative solutions to the problems but is still forced to conclude that none of them are likely to give completely satisfactory results. The issue is to be able to put restrictions on the model of status inconsistency which would allow one to differentiate the effects it predicts from those of alternative

explanations. Although indicating some of the alternative models of inconsistency which can be generated if certain assumptions are made, (for instance, status inconsistency will have an effect irrespective of the direction of inconsistency), Blalock maintains that inadequate theoretical conceptualization also hinders the job of determining the viability of the theory. In order to progress in this direction he suggests that:

It will, therefore, probably be necessary to apply two different strategies simultaneously. We shall have to explore the implications of alternative mathematical formulations, but it will also be necessary to formulate verbal theories that specify more clearly the conditions under which inconsistency effects can be expected to be more or less pronounced, or to be patterned in given ways.⁴²

It is to this latter question that Zelditch and Anderson address their article.⁴³ Theirs can be seen as the first attempt to develop an explicit theory of rank balance. In their work they deal systematically with the assumptions they see to be common to the research which has used this approach, the preconditions of the theory, the definitions of terms and concepts and with the behaviour which will be exhibited by people with imbalanced ranks. In the introduction to the presentation of their theory Zelditch and Anderson write:

Despite a long history of great interest in the problem the available evidence only weakly confirms the central assumption that imbalanced ranks generate strain and efforts to restore

balance. Contradictory results have been obtained, supposedly positive results are sometimes quite inconclusive and it is often necessary to invent ad hoc principles to explain peculiar results in particular cases. This is due less to the fact that the balance assumption is false than to the incomplete and very vague formulation of the theory. Its assumptions have not been made explicit, the scope of the theory has not been clearly defined, several distinct processes have used the same name, and many portions of the theory--such as the possible response processes--have not been thought out at all.⁴⁴

Unlike some of the researchers mentioned previously, Zelditch and Anderson treat the theory of rank balance in its own right and not as part of a more general theory of psychological dispositions. They place the theory within the field of social stratification and argue that multidimensional evaluations within a social system are clearly a precondition to their theory. It is maintained that the stratification of a social system can be understood in terms of each person in the system having a general or overall evaluation. Each person's overall evaluation is determined by the combination of a set of weighted ranks on status characteristics or evaluative criteria used by people within a given social system. The weights attached to the evaluative criteria indicate the relative importance of each criterion and thereby determine the relative contribution each rank makes to a person's overall status. On the assumption that the status equation is a linear function of the ranks on the weighted criteria, then the general standing a person has can be expressed in the following way:

$$w_1 r_{1i} + w_2 r_{2i} + \dots + w_k r_{ki} = R_i \quad 45$$

where R_i is the overall standing in the social system, r_{1i} , r_{2i} - - - r_{ki} are the ranks on specific evaluative criteria and w_1 , w_2 in w_k are the weights attached to the status criteria.

If a person's overall status is not determined in the manner they suggest then the theory Zelditch and Anderson subsequently develop obviously would not apply. The nature of the evaluative criteria used within a specific social system, the weights or relative importance of the criteria and people's ranks on the criteria are clearly empirical questions. Zelditch and Anderson suggest that in order to simplify the initial theory and research, it could be assumed that all people within the system agree on the relative importance of the evaluative criteria. They see such an assumption not being necessary once the theory has been more fully developed and, indeed, it may be the case that rank imbalance itself leads to an increase in the disagreement over which evaluative criteria are important.

If one follows Zelditch and Anderson's example of depicting a social system in terms of a matrix then rank balance can be defined with reference to the stratification matrix. The matrix below represents a three person social system in which people are evaluated on three status criteria.

<u>Evaluative Criteria</u>			
<u>Members</u>	<u>Academic ability</u>	<u>Athletic ability</u>	<u>Friendliness</u>
MacDonald	1	1	1
Boutilier	2	2	2
McPhee	3	3	3

FIGURE 1
A Balanced Three Person Matrix

Each person is represented by one row in the matrix and a person's rank on the criterion is entered in a cell of the matrix. A person can then be said to have balanced ranks 'if and only if every entry in the i th row is greater than, every entry is the same as, or every entry is less than each corresponding entry in any other row.'⁴⁶ In the above example it can be seen that the three people all have balanced ranks.

All research using rank balance as an explanatory approach predicts that people with imbalanced ranks will behave differently from those whose ranks are balanced. The difference in behaviour arises because of the instability of the ranks which are not balanced and through the tension people experience as a result of this situation. Zelditch and Anderson formulate these ideas into three assumptions which are basic to their theory. They state that:

1. Balanced ranks are stable;
2. Imbalanced ranks tend to change until they become balanced;
3. Imbalanced ranks produce a state of tension.⁴⁷

It is not necessarily the case that all imbalanced rank systems will achieve a state of balance. However, it is postulated that whilst ever the ranks are imbalanced a person will experience some form of tension. In an attempt to create balance and to alleviate the tension associated with imbalance, one can predict that a person with imbalanced ranks will act in different ways from those whose ranks are balanced. Such a statement is obviously very vague and has limited predictive value unless the exact forms of behaviour can be specified.

In order for a person to be aware that his or her ranks are imbalanced it is necessary for some comparison process to take place between different people or groups. As Zelditch and Anderson suggest, this process is poorly understood insofar as it is unclear which comparisons will cause people to feel relatively deprived. Not all comparisons between ego and others will result in ego defining him/herself as having imbalanced ranks and thereby activating mechanisms to create balance. If, in fact, no comparisons are made, Zelditch and Anderson define the ranks as being "vacuously" balanced and stable. In addition, "insulation" occurs when a person makes a comparison between himself/herself and others who are imbalanced in the same way and thus does not realize that his/her ranks could be defined as imbalanced from a different perspective. It can be noted that Zelditch and Anderson indicate that an individual makes comparisons and thus is aware of his/her own balance or imbalance. This self

realization is in contrast to Lenski's approach where balance or imbalance is not necessarily a subjectively felt condition although people may still engage in behaviour to counteract imbalance without any awareness that equilibrating ranks was the underlying impetus. In terms of Zelditch and Anderson theory, however, compensatory behaviour arises because a person has made a comparison between him/herself and significant others⁴⁸ and has realized that his/her rank system differs from that of other people.

If a person defines him/herself as having imbalanced ranks, what then are the processes which could be followed in order to counteract this undesirable state? Published research has indicated that people may respond in differing ways.⁴⁹ Zelditch and Anderson maintain that despite the varied forms of compensatory behaviour which have been reported such behaviour can be classified into only a few response categories. Five categories of response to imbalance are considered: isolation, insulation, role-differentiation, mobility and a series of responses which could lead to social conflict and revolution as suggested by Benoit-Smullyan.

The first three responses are classified as withdrawal responses as these are forms of behaviour such that a person does not deal with the problems of having imbalanced ranks but instead withdraws from those situations in which the comparison process is disturbing and which defines him/her

as being imbalanced. Thus, "isolation" is a response in which a person does not compare him/herself with any other person in the social system; "insulation" occurs when comparisons are made only between individuals who are imbalanced in the same manner and who, therefore, would not see themselves as having imbalanced ranks; "role-differentiation" may occur when there are two or more roles in a social system and people make comparisons not between the actors in the system but between the roles which people perform.⁵⁰ It is then likely that comparisons between attributes which are not part of the role will not be disturbing to people, and people will not feel to have imbalanced ranks. For example, Zelditch and Anderson discuss the fact that a surgeon who has higher ranks on skill, prestige and income than an anaesthesiologist will not feel imbalanced because he is less competent than the anaesthesiologist at giving anaesthetics as this is not regarded as part of the surgeon's role. This response is connected to a problem Zelditch and Anderson discuss earlier in their paper which they label 'system reference problems.'⁵¹ Here the issue is to counteract the possibility that people who belong to different systems are evaluated on criteria from each of these systems when in fact they should be evaluated on criteria relevant only to the specific situation being considered. In this instance and in the role-differentiation response to imbalance, the concern is with making comparisons between criteria which pertain to the position a person holds in a particular social

system and not, for instance, comparing ranks on job criteria, marital status and skiing ability when one is only concerned with the work situation.

At the present time there has been insufficient research to allow conclusions to be drawn about why, or in precisely what manner people with imbalanced ranks may withdraw. From the published research, however, it would appear that many of the responses people make are not withdrawal responses. From studying this research, Zelditch and Anderson maintain that it is most likely that some of the observable reactions to rank imbalance are procedures by which people seek to alter their ranks in such a way as to decrease their imbalance rather than withdraw. The processes they discuss, which can be labelled as mobility and revolution, are interconnected and the latter response is only likely to occur when attempts at mobility have proven unsuccessful.

Mobility is defined as the increase or decrease of some rank by any person in a given social system.⁵² This alteration of rank may, however, be achieved in various ways. If one assumes that people wish others to have as positive evaluation of them as possible, then it would seem most likely that people would wish to achieve rank balance by raising their lower ranks to the level of their higher ones; but not all ranks are independent of each other. Consequently, altering a rank on one criterion may have repercussions for a

person's other ranks. Zelditch and Anderson suggest that if two ranks are causally related (this they refer to as contingent ranks) then one rank will be the independent rank and one the dependent rank.⁵³ Taking this factor into account they make two assumptions about the way in which the mobility response may work. These are:

- (a) if there are 'noncontingent imbalanced ranks, whichever rank is lower is raised;'
- (b) if there are 'contingent imbalanced ranks, whichever rank is dependent is changed in the direction of balance.'⁵⁴

For example, if one defines a person's life style as dependent on that person's income, and the ranks on these two criteria are imbalanced, then Zelditch and Anderson predict that a person would attempt to achieve balance by altering the life style rank rather than the income.

The predictions about the way in which people will seek to alter their ranks rest on two further assumptions. The first, in connection with non-contingent imbalanced ranks, states that people wish to maintain as positive a self-evaluation as possible. They would, therefore, prefer to raise their lower ranks to the level of the higher ones rather than vice versa. In the second assumption, Zelditch and Anderson state that a person must have "an overall evaluation of himself that is no less positive than the evaluations significant others have of him."⁵⁵ This assumption is part of the theory in order to counteract the possibility that a person may not feel disturbed if one rank is lower than another

because he or she has a low self-evaluation. If this were the case then such a person may try to achieve balance by having all the ranks low or may not think that rank equality is justified. Such an assumption is seen to be a simplifying procedure which is necessary in the present development of the theory. This restriction could be relaxed in a more developed theory since such a theory would then take into account the possibility that all types of imbalance are not equally disturbing.

The mobility response to imbalance discussed above implies that the situation is an individual problem but, as Zelditch and Anderson argue, imbalance may be a pervasive problem in a particular social system. Whether or not the problem is an individual or a group one is likely to lead to differing responses. Individual mobility occurs when only a few people move rank, whereas stratum mobility is characterized by the movement of a large number of people. It is also possible in the latter case, however, that it is not just people who are mobile but that the status itself may move up or down some evaluative hierarchy. Such may occur, for instance, with an occupational status whose importance has changed through time. This mobility of a status Zelditch and Anderson label "re-evaluation."⁵⁶

Although a person may wish to overcome the problem of having imbalanced ranks by raising some of his/her ranks it is likely that this possibility will not always be available to a

person. For example, ascribed characteristics are not amenable to change except through a process of re-evaluation. Further, a person may lack the requisite skills or knowledge to raise the appropriate ranks or others may act in such a way as to prevent mobility on the part of people with imbalanced ranks. Consideration, therefore, has to be given to alternative responses to imbalance when mobility is blocked.

Zelditch and Anderston state that "mobility of an element of S (a social system) is blocked if either actors do not want or expect to be mobile or others can and do act to prevent them from being mobile."⁵⁷ The expectation of being mobile is important since people are unlikely to react to imbalance if they fully expect to move out of the discrepant ranks within a short time. If this expectation does not exist then other forms of compensatory behaviour are likely to be realized. Organized movements generally presuppose that many people share a common grievance. Because of this, Zelditch and Anderson's assertion that "a blocked stratum has greater tendencies to organize as a movement than blocked individuals"⁵⁸ seems reasonable, again assuming that members of the imbalanced stratum do not expect to be mobile.

Benoit-Smullyan maintained that societies would experience revolution if people's mobility was blocked. As Zelditch and Anderson indicate though, the combination of factors which cause revolutions are very complex and involve

many issues outside the scope of their theory. Their discussion of the consequences of mobility being blocked indicates that they do not see revolution as a necessary outcome. Rather it can be viewed as an extreme response under certain conditions. If a blocked stratum organizes, it is likely to do so in order to effect change in the rank structure of the social system by altering the weight, (i.e., the importance) attached to each of the evaluative criteria. This Zelditch and Anderson label "redefinition."⁵⁸ Conflict may result from this redefinition because although it will decrease the rank imbalance for one group it will simultaneously increase other people's imbalance. Such conflict could be avoided if people can withdraw into insulated social systems and do not have to accept the redefinition of another group. At the present time, however, sociologists are not able to explain when this latter alternative may be adopted rather than conflict.

Zelditch and Anderson's theory of rank balance is extremely broad in scope; for instance, no restrictions are placed on the type of social system considered or the nature of the evaluative process; moreover, their theory touches on many diverse forms of behaviour some of which are not well understood. Nevertheless, its advantages over other formulations of the approach are very clear. In the first place, the theory is systematically formulated and all assumptions, definitions and deductions from the basic premises are clearly laid down. Following from this, one is then able to subject

the theory to systematic testing. Only by being able to do this is it possible to begin to assess the validity of a theory. In view of the inconsistent and contradictory results which researchers have reported, it is obviously necessary to try to deal with the issues of this approach in order to see whether the theory is useful in explaining differences in behaviour.

The information necessary to test parts of Zelditch and Anderson's theory is, in some cases, very difficult to obtain. Studying the causes of revolutions, for instance, is both difficult and complex, and one may justify choosing to investigate other responses to imbalance on the grounds that they are more frequent occurrences than are revolutions. One can also argue that it is more essential to establish first the validity of the basic assumptions rather than the responses to imbalance. Such a procedure, however, does not mean that if the basic premises were to receive support then the hypothesized response patterns would likewise be validated. Rather, it would indicate that there were established assumptions which could be taken as the foundation of the theory and from which hypotheses could be derived.

The research reported in subsequent chapters is concerned with the validity of rank balance theory as formulated by Zelditch and Anderson. In view of the broad scope of this theory only certain aspects have been tested, but

attention has been focused primarily on those issues which are basic to the theory and, indeed, any rank balance approach. To the extent that these parts of the theory receive support then there are grounds for proceeding to a more detailed analysis of possible responses to imbalance than is reported here.

Three major issues are dealt with in this study. The first concern is with what has been labelled a precondition to the entire theory--namely, the nature of the stratification system. If a person's overall status is not determined in the way Zelditch and Anderson suggest then their theory would have to be extensively revised. All their developments of the theory rest on the assumption that their status equation is correct. In order to test the equation, four sets of information are necessary. These are:

- 1) a person's overall rank;
- 2) the evaluative criteria on which a person is assessed;
- 3) the relative importance of the criteria;
- 4) a person's rank on each of the evaluative criteria.

Once these data have been obtained it is then possible to test Zelditch and Anderson's status equation. This allows one to assess whether or not the precondition to their theory has been met. If, in fact, the social system does not have multiple bases of evaluation and the evaluations are not combined in the way Zelditch and Anderson specify, then the remainder of

their theory would have no foundation. Support for the status equation, however, does not mean that subsequent parts of the theory will necessarily also be supported. Although rank balance theory does rest on the assumption that social systems are multidimensional in terms of stratification, alternative explanations can be derived from this which do not take the form of rank balance theory. As one theory within this field of stratification it has to be demonstrated that rank balance theory does indeed allow one to explain predicted forms of behaviour. If it does not, then the theory has to be revised or abandoned, but this would not mean that the multidimensional nature of a social system was in question.

If the precondition to Zelditch and Anderson's theory is supported it is then possible to investigate the second issue which is crucial to any theory of rank balance. This is the determination of the extent to which people in a particular social system have balanced or imbalanced ranks. This problem is linked to the first not only because the status equation is a precondition to this part of the theory but also because the rank orderings used in that equation will provide the information necessary for deciding whether people are imbalanced or not. From the analysis of the extent to which people in one social system do or do not have balanced ranks it will be possible to move on to a third issue of concern. This is an examination of how individuals respond to rank imbalance.

One response to imbalance is investigated and that is individual rank mobility. This response was chosen because it seemed likely that this would be a response which could be readily adopted. Ranks may be moved more easily to the extent that evaluations are not made on ascribed characteristics or on behaviour dependent on some innate ability, and to the extent that the status system is not rigid such that people do not have the possibility of altering their ranks. It appeared that both of these conditions would be found in the social system studied since the interpersonal evaluations made were not based on ascribed characteristics and the status hierarchies were continually modified as new people entered the system each year. Consequently, it seemed possible that people would be able to alter their ranks if they so wished. Mobility is also the response category into which much of the behaviour reported in previous research would fit. This would indicate that it is a form of compensatory behaviour which may be readily undertaken by those with imbalanced ranks. Certainly Zelditch and Anderson assume that people would attempt to alleviate the stress of imbalance through mobility before they would engage in responses which would require greater organization and which would have severe consequences for the society as a whole. Consequently, it is appropriate to investigate what appears to be a frequent response to imbalance before turning to other less usual occurrences. In this research, attention is directed to whether such a response is exhibited and whether people are mobile in the manner predicted by Zelditch and Anderson.

These three issues have been chosen for study because they are central to any further development of rank balance theory. If the research indicates support for the theory in these areas then it will be appropriate to go on and consider some of the related issues encompassed within the approach. Without this systematic testing of rank balance theory its validity will remain in question and its usefulness in research severely limited.

FOOTNOTES

¹The researchers using this theoretical approach have not been consistent in their terminology. "Status crystallization," "status discrepancy," "status congruency," "status consistency," and "rank balance" are terms used to describe the same empirical phenomenon. In the order given above the following references indicate the different uses of the terms: G. Lenski, "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status," American Sociological Review, 19 (1954), pp. 405-413; N.J. Demerath III, Social Class in American Protestantism, Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965, pp. 127-173; Ralph V. Exline and R.C. Ziller, "Status Congruency and Interpersonal Conflict in Decision-Making Groups," Human Relations, 12 (1959), pp. 147-162; E. Jackson, "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress," American Sociological Review, 27 (1962), pp. 469-480; Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, "On the Balance of a Set of Ranks," in Sociological Theories in Progress, vol. I, edited by Joseph Berger, Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966, pp. 244-268.

²Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, op. cit., pp. 244-268.

³G. Lenski, op. cit., pp. 405-413.

⁴Ibid., p. 405.

⁵Ibid., pp. 405-413.

⁶Gary B. Rush, "Status Consistency and Right Wing Extremism," American Sociological Review, 32 (1967), pp. 86-92.

⁷James A. Geschwender, "Status Inconsistency, Social Isolation and Individual Unrest," Social Forces, 46 (1968), pp. 477-483.

⁸G. Lenski, "Social Participation and Status Crystallization," American Sociological Review, 21 (1956), pp. 458-464.

⁹Irwin Goffman, "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution," American Sociological Review, 22 (1957), pp. 275-281.

¹⁰Elton Jackson, op. cit., pp. 469-480.

¹¹These problems have been most consistently presented by Blalock: Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., "Comment: Status Inconsistency and the Identification Problem," Public Opinion Quarterly, 30 (1966)a, pp. 130-132; "The Identification Problem and Theory Building: The Case of Status Inconsistency," American Sociological Review, 31 (1966)b, pp. 52-61; "Status Inconsistency, Social Mobility, Status Integration and Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, 32 (1967)a, pp. 790-801; "Status Inconsistency and Interaction: Some Alternative Models," American

Journal of Sociology, 73 (1967) b, pp. 305-315; "Tests of Status Inconsistency Theory: A Note of Caution," Pacific Sociological Review, 10 (1967) c, pp. 69-74.

¹²H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, (eds.), from Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, translated by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

¹³Ibid., pp. 46-47.

¹⁴Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset, "Karl Marx's Theory of Social Classes," in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset, editors, Class, Status, and Power, New York: Free Press, 1966, pp. 6-11.

¹⁵Max Weber, "Class, Status, and Power," in H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, op. cit., p. 185.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 187.

¹⁷John Dollard, Caste and Class in a Southern Town, New York: Harper, 1949.

St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, Black Metropolis, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1945.

Burleigh B. Gardner and Mary R. Gardner, Deep South, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd, Middletown, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1929.

Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd, Middletown in Transition, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1937.

W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, The Social Life of a Modern Community, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941, Yankee City Series, Vol. I.

W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, The Status System of a Modern Community, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942, Yankee City Series, Vol. II.

W. Lloyd Warner and Leo Srole, The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups, New York: Yale University Press, 1945, Yankee City Series, Vol. III.

W. Lloyd Warner and J.O. Low, The Social System of a Modern Factory, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947, Yankee City Series, Vol. IV.

¹⁸W. Lloyd Warner, Marchia Meeker, Kenneth Ells, Social Class in America, New York: Harper and Row, 1960, pp. 47-98 and 121-130.

- ¹⁹C. Wright Mills, "Review of the Social Life of a Modern Community," American Sociological Review, 7 (1942), pp. 263-271; Harold W. Pfautz and Otis Dudley Duncan, "A Critical Evaluation of Warner's Work in Community Stratification," American Sociological Review, 15 (1950), pp. 205-215.
- ²⁰C. Wright Mills, op. cit., pp. 264-266.
- ²¹W. Lloyd Warner, Marcia Meeker and Kenneth Ells, Social Class in America, p. 21.
- ²²Everett C. Hughes, "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status," American Journal of Sociology, 50 (1944), pp. 353-359.
- ²³Emile Benoit-Smullyan, "Status, Status Types, and Status Interrelationships," American Sociological Review, 9 (1944), pp. 151-161.
- ²⁴N.J. Demerath, III, op. cit., pp. 129-142.
- ²⁵Ibid., p. 131.
- ²⁶Ibid., p. 131.
- ²⁷George C. Homans, "Status Among Clerical Workers," Human Organization, 12 (1953), pp. 5-10.
- ²⁸Stuart N. Adams, "Status Congruency as a Variable in Small Group Performance," Social Forces, 32 (1953-54), pp. 16-22.
- ²⁹Leon Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Co., 1957.
- ³⁰James A. Geschwender, "Continuities in Theories of Status Consistency and Cognitive Dissonance," Social Forces, 46 (1967), pp. 160-171.
- ³¹Edward E. Sampson, "Status Congruence and Cognitive Consistency," Sociometry, 26 (1963), pp. 146-162.
- ³²Arlene Brandon, "Status Congruence and Expectations," Sociometry, 28 (1965), pp. 272-288.
- ³³Robert E. Mitchell, "Methodological Notes on a Theory of Status Crystallization," Public Opinion Quarterly, 28 (1964), pp. 315-330.
- ³⁴N.J. Demerath, III, op. cit., pp. 149-173.
- ³⁵Martin D. Hyman, "Determining the Effects of Status Inconsistency," Public Opinion Quarterly, 30 (1966), pp. 120-129.

³⁶Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., op.cit., 1966(a), pp. 130-132; 1966(b), pp. 52-61; 1967(a), pp. 790-801; 1967(b), pp. 305-315; 1967(c), pp. 69-74.

³⁷Seymour Martin Lipset, Political Man, Garden City: Doubleday, 1963, pp. 230-278.

³⁸John N. Foskett, "Social Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, 20 (1955), pp. 431-438.

³⁹August B. Hollingshead and F.C. Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness: A Community Study, New York: John Wiley, 1958.

⁴⁰Robert E. Mitchell, op. cit., pp. 320-323; Marvin E. Olsen and Judy Corder Tully, "Socio-Economic-Ethnic Status Inconsistency and Preference for Political Change," American Sociological Review, 37 (1972), pp. 560-574.

⁴¹Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., op. cit., 1966(a), p. 130.

⁴²Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., op. cit., 1967(b), p. 314.

⁴³Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, op. cit., pp. 244-268.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 245.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 246.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 248.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 249.

⁴⁸J.A. Davis, "A Formal Interpretation of the Theory of Relative Deprivation," Sociometry, 22 (1959), pp. 280-296; M. Patchen, "A Conceptual Framework and Some Empirical Data Regarding Comparisons of Social Rewards," Sociometry, 22 (1961), pp. 136-156.

⁴⁹See for example, J. Geschwender, op. cit., pp. 477-483; E. Jackson, op. cit., pp. 469-480; G. Lenski, op. cit., 1954, pp. 405-413, and Gary Rush, op. cit., pp. 86-92.

⁵⁰Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, op. cit., p. 259.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 252-255.

⁵²Ibid., p. 261.

⁵³Ibid., p. 260.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 260.

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 249-250.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 261.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 262. Blocking is used in this context to mean that ranks are immobile for whatever reason and not necessarily because someone else acts to prevent another from moving his/her ranks. In this statement Zelditch and Anderson introduce the idea of people wanting to be mobile. This is a new area of concern which is not dealt with in the theory as it is presently stated but which would be an issue if the theory were to be completely developed. It indicates that under some circumstances people may prefer to have imbalanced ranks rather than to balance them.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 264.

CHAPTER II

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

The data used to test parts of Zelditch and Anderson's theory of rank balance was collected through interviews with students in university residence. This information was collected in a five-week period from the last week in February through March 1972. Although these data are the basis for the analysis reported in subsequent chapters a second group of students answered a questionnaire several months later. This second set of data provided information necessary to resolve a problem encountered during the analysis of the student interviews and focused specifically on one issue. As the present chapter is concerned with the sources and methods of the data collection both of them will be discussed in the following pages.

Zelditch and Anderson do not place any restrictions on the type of social system to which their theory applies. Consequently, the criteria for choosing a particular social system arose more from considering the kind of information necessary to test their theory than from any specific guidelines stated by them.

Since the theory rests on assumptions about social stratification, it was essential to conduct the research in a situation where the stratification system could be described

as completely as possible. Given this condition it appeared likely that the social system would have to be relatively small and be one where people interacted frequently with each other. If this was the case, then people would probably have sufficient information to evaluate the other members and be familiar with the status system. It was also evident that it would be necessary for membership in the social system to be clearly defined. This would be essential to ensure that the same people are always under consideration and that they were being evaluated in reference to their membership in that system.

From informal conversations with students and faculty at King's University, it seemed likely that their residences would be the sort of institution where people would interact frequently, would be of a suitable size for people to know each other and where there would be a clear distinction between members and non-members. These impressions were, in fact, borne out during the interviews. However, there were also other advantages to conducting the research in the university which do not relate specifically to the needs of the theory.

Firstly, the university residences could be seen as social systems which were relatively simple. This arises from the fact that they are single sex institutions which are relatively homogeneous with regard to such characteristics as age, educational attainment and social background. It was felt

that it would be preferable to conduct the study in such a situation as it was likely to reduce the number of factors which could complicate the stratification system.

Secondly, on logistical grounds the King's residences also seemed appropriate. It was apparent, for instance, that permission to carry out the study in the residences would be easily obtained from the university authorities. Also, as the people to be interviewed were students, it was thought that they would be familiar with the idea of research and, therefore, be willing to cooperate. This, in turn, would reduce the likelihood of non-respondents. Having considered all these issues, it was evident that the residences were a highly suitable social system for the purposes of this study.

King's is not a typical Canadian university in terms of its size or its academic programme. It has, for instance, somewhat less than 300 students. Originally founded in 1789 as an Anglican college, it has since 1930 been in a partnership with Dalhousie. This agreement has meant that King's and Dalhousie maintain a joint arts and science faculty and King's a separate theology faculty. At the present time, King's degree granting powers are in abeyance except for degrees in theology and honorary degrees. King's students can register only for a B.A. or a B.Sc. degree apart from theology degrees, and they take all their courses with the exception of theology at Dalhousie. Consequently, it is not

surprising to find that most students in residence are registered for B.A. or B.Sc. degrees and, indeed, this characterizes 86 per cent of the women and 70 per cent of the men. The students who are not in these programmes live in King's residences either because there is no place for them in the Dalhousie residences or because of previously existing ties with King's. For instance, some of the students had fathers who were educated at King's and some of the male students had attended a private school in Windsor which had close connections with the university.

Although King's has had a long history as a college, it is probable that it is not very well known outside the province since it is very small and its affiliation with Dalhousie has meant that its own academic programmes have been curtailed. The local nature of the university can be seen by the fact that of the students in residence 87 per cent of the women and 79 per cent of the men are from Nova Scotia and only 15 students come from outside the Maritimes. Because of the partnership with Dalhousie it is apparent that students do not register at King's for the academic programmes. The family ties mentioned previously are one reason why students may choose to attend King's and a further reason can be found in the religious tradition of the college. Although not in a majority, students of Anglican background do form the largest single religious group being 43 per cent of the women and 41 per cent of the men in residence.

King's has made a conscious attempt to emulate the Oxford and Cambridge pattern of residential colleges. It stresses the "inestimable benefits of life in a small residential college"¹ and the social and moral responsibilities that students who are to be leaders in society have to accept. Students are encouraged to live in residence and to participate in the university's extracurricular activities as these are important in the educational philosophy of the university. Apart from the residences, King's has its own dining room, library, chapel, gym and common rooms. King's students have a student union and student societies including debating, drama, and literary clubs and athletic associations.

As the enrolment at King's is small and as students are encouraged to live in residence at some time during their years at university, many of the students are quite well known to each other. Nevertheless, it was not to be expected that students would be sufficiently familiar with all the students or even the ones in their own residence to be able to answer the questions in the interview. This would particularly be the case for the 47 per cent of the students who were in their first year at university and the 57 per cent of the students who were in their first year in residence. However, the residences are organized in terms of twelve units or bays which are determined by the physical layout of the buildings.² The number of students in each bay varied between twelve and twenty-three and it seemed reasonable to assume that students

would be familiar with those students in the same bay as themselves. Apart from the general encouragement to participate in the life of the university, the bays were designed in such a way that contact with other bay members was virtually unavoidable.

For the men, their part of the residence was divided into six units each of which had a separate entrance. Five of the units were identical in terms of physical layout, whilst the sixth was somewhat different. The five which were the same were set up such that there was a common stairwell with a small landing on each of the four floors from which leads the bathroom and four student rooms. In this way, it was necessary for a person wishing to reach the fourth floor to pass through the three lower ones. In most of the cases, the rooms are double rooms and arranged in such a way that one person in every pair has to pass through the room of his roommate in order to reach his own room. The exception to this pattern is the fourth floor where there are four single rooms. The sixth bay was one floor at the top of the administration building and contained twelve single room.

The women in the residence all live in one common building. Here there was a central staircase connecting the three floors. The residence was again divided into six bays, two per floor. Each bay had its own bathroom but there was also a kitchen on each floor, shared by both of the bays,

which was used for ironing, incidental cooking, or as an extra study or talking place. The first floor bays were the smallest having seven rooms on one side and eight on the other, whereas all the other bays had eleven rooms. Theoretically, the rooms were designed for double occupancy, but in practise this varied from a bay in which only one out of eleven rooms was shared to a bay where five out of seven rooms had two people in them. Unlike the men's residence where each person essentially had his own room, the women who did not have single rooms had to share a single space in which there were two of all the essential articles of furniture, for example, beds, desks, closets, chairs. Given this physical layout of the buildings and the fact that the residence was "home" to the students for several months of the year, it seemed highly probable that the students would be quite familiar with their fellow bay members. Such familiarity, in fact, seemed to be expected and encouraged insofar as the bays were called upon to organize floats for the winter carnival and to take part in inter-bay sports. Meetings were held to organize these events and bay members were expected to participate in these activities in some way. Members of the same bay were also seen to be familiar with one another in that they frequently visited each other's rooms. These visits were often simply social in nature and arose out of the wish to have someone to talk to or with whom to drink coffee. Students were also observed to lend a wide range of items to each other, including not only

articles such as clothing, records, cups and kettles, but also books and notes relating to course work. It was not uncommon to find students helping one another either by lending material related to a course or by explaining work which another student did not understand. In this regard, the junior members of the bay would sometimes seek the help of the students who were more advanced in their studies than they themselves were.

Although students were seen to visit each other's rooms in all the bays, the men's bays were more informal than the women's. Characteristically, the men's bays were noisier than the women's, doors to rooms were usually left open and the students would go in and out of others' rooms without feeling obliged to ask permission. As a result of this type of interaction, the men had considerable information on where other students were, what time they would be back in the bay or the best times to find particular individuals. The women's bays did not show the same degree of informality. There was some variation between the women's bays; for instance, Bay F4 was most like the men's, but on the whole they were quieter, the doors to rooms were shut and people did not enter without knocking.

Once permission was obtained from the university administration to conduct interviews with willing students, the students themselves were contacted by letter. The letter explained that research on student relationships was being

conducted in the residence and requested that they agree to an interview which would take about an hour of their time. The exact nature of the research was not explained to the students at this time. It was thought that students might be less cooperative if reference was made to the fact that the study was concerned with people's relative positions on various status hierarchies. Students would perhaps be reluctant to discuss what they might see as the undesirable characteristics of their residences. Also, it was desirable to minimize as far as possible the likelihood of students getting together and agreeing or collaborating on their answers. Such considerations led to describing the research as dealing with "student relationships" as this was a term which did not specify the exact problem being studied but was sufficiently ambiguous to cover a range of problems including rank balance theory.

Following this letter, one of the interviewers contacted the students and either interviewed them at that time or arranged a later appointment. Some students proved difficult to contact and towards the end of the interviewing period those who had not been reached were sent a second letter asking them to contact one of the interviewers and arrange for the interview. Of all the students, only one male student was never able to be contacted by any of the interviewers.

The data were collected through interviews using a questionnaire which was predominantly open-ended. The interview was designed to obtain information in four major areas: (a) the evaluative criteria students used and the relative importance of them; (b) the students' ranks on these criteria and the overall status dimension; (c) a student's preferred ranks, and (d) general background information on the students. The complete interview schedule is in Appendix A.

The interviews were conducted by four interviewers, three of whom made the majority of contacts and did most of the interviewing. All interviewers were university graduates and had had previous experience interviewing in social surveys. After the questionnaire had been pretested by conducting five interviews outside the student residence and the procedure appeared acceptable as a method of collecting the necessary data, I conducted the first ten interviews in the student residences. These ten interviews were used as a basis for training the other interviewers.

Interviewers were instructed on how to present the research so that the students would be willing to take part in the study. Attention was also directed to how each question was to be asked. For instance, in the questions on preferred ranks interviewers had to avoid the implication that moving any of the ranks was preferable to keeping them

in their original position. Thus they had to be sure that they included all of the three alternatives open to the students--to keep the rank the same, to increase it or to decrease it--when they asked about students' preferred positions. Most of the interview was not difficult to conduct once a respondent had agreed to cooperate. The most problematic part was in deciding what evaluative criteria students used to assess each other. This was a difficult procedure and the issue is discussed in detail below.

In order to test Zelditch and Anderson's status equation it was necessary to know the evaluative criteria relevant within the social system, their relative importance, the ranks individuals have on these criteria and the same individuals' overall status ranks. Published research on university students has given little attention to the qualities they see as desirable in their fellow students. Consequently, the selection of the relevant evaluative criteria could not be made by reference to previous research. It was decided to use an indirect approach to elicit this information. Students were handed a list of members of their bay and asked to give a description of each person. No direction was given as to what sort of information should be included. Interviewers were instructed to respond to any requests for clarification by giving non-committal answers. The descriptions, however, would only be useful insofar as

they made reference to specific behaviour or personality characteristics. Consequently, interviewers were to ask for clarification if students gave descriptions which were too general; for instance, if a student simply said, "He's a typical Cape Bretoner" or "She's O.K."

Students who asked why the process was necessary at all were told that it was to allow the interviewers to have some idea of what the people in the bay were like in order to be able to understand the student relationships. Generally, students gave descriptions which were four or five sentences long. Typical descriptions would be:

She's easy to talk to. Willing to listen to you but doesn't say much herself. Very helpful and will do almost anything you ask her to do.

He's a nice guy. Good to talk to and well liked in the bay. He doesn't study much but gets along well with the others in the bay.

From these descriptions, the interviewer determined the evaluative criteria the respondent was using. It was assumed that the forms of behaviour and characteristics which a student thought important would be reflected in the descriptions given of the other bay members. In order to select the evaluative criteria the interviewer had essentially to do a content analysis of these descriptions. The interviewers chose as evaluative criteria those qualifying words which occurred most frequently in a student's descriptions. In

some instances, this part of the interview did not pose any problems as certain words were repeated many times. In other cases, however, no significant word might be used more than once. When this occurred the students were asked directly sorts of behaviour or aspects of personality they thought were important for students in residence to have. The criteria they listed were then used as the relevant evaluative criteria. In all cases, including those where the choice of evaluative criteria by the interviewer was comparatively simple, students were asked at the end of the ranking process whether they thought there were any other criteria they would like to add. It was necessary to add this question in order to counteract the possibility of underestimating the importance of a criterion which may have been mentioned only once. Otherwise the procedure followed may have biased the choice of evaluative criteria in the direction of those most frequently used without giving enough attention to the importance of some other criteria. Zelditch and Anderson raise one problem in their development of rank balance theory which the present research design can be said to eliminate. This is the issue which they label "system reference problems."³ Such problems refer to the possibility that evaluations will be made on criteria which are nonsensical within a particular social system. As the students themselves generated the evaluative criteria used here, one can say that by definition they are all relevant to the system and that meaningless comparisons of ranks are impossible from the point

of view of the student who generated the criteria. Although solving the system reference issue the specificity of the criteria generated by this method could be a problem when trying to establish generalizations of any kind.

Even though the choice of evaluative criteria was seen to be the most difficult part of the interview, the procedures followed were successful. After the interviews had been conducted interviewer reliability was checked. Two bays, one male and one female, were chosen at random. The three interviewers who had conducted most of the interviews then read the bay descriptions and indicated which evaluative criteria they would choose from these descriptions. The lists of criteria obtained were then compared to the original list and to each other. The three interviewers chose an average of 69 (78 per cent) of the same criteria, from the initial 88 criteria. An average of nineteen criteria which were in the original list was omitted by the interviewers in the reliability test and an average of ten new criteria was suggested. As some of the evaluative criteria used by the students came from a direct question, and hence were not available from the bay descriptions, it was felt that an average of 78 per cent was a high percentage for this replication. In comparisons between the interviewers it was found that there were no significant differences between their choices (χ^2 between .30 and .50). This result indicates that interviewer reliability was high. See Table I.

TABLE I

INTERVIEWER RELIABILITY: DISTRIBUTION OF CHOICES WHICH WERE THE SAME, OMITTED OR NEW BETWEEN THE ORIGINAL LIST OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA AND THE LIST GIVEN IN THE RELIABILITY TEST, BY INTERVIEWER

Interviewer	CRITERIA CHOICE		
	Same	Omitted	New
A	71 (71.57)	17 (19.71)	14 (10.72)
B	67 (70.17)	21 (19.32)	12 (10.51)
C	69 (65.26)	19 (17.97)	5 (9.77)
Total	207	57	31

$\chi^2 = 4.3$ df = 4
Significant at between
.50 and .30 levels.

Once the students had described all the others in their bay they were then asked to rank all the bay members in terms of those who were most well thought of to those who were least well thought of and then on the evaluative criteria taken from the bay descriptions. The first ranking procedure was designed to ascertain students' general status ranks. In order to study this aspect of the status system it was assumed that people did indeed have an overall status and that people within the social system would be conscious of where other members ranked relative to one another. Consequently,

students were simply asked to rank the bay members "from those who were most to those who were least well thought of." The use of the word "status" was avoided in order to reduce ambiguity, since it was thought that students might give different interpretations to the word. Also, it seemed possible that students might be somewhat reluctant to talk about the stratification system in the residence and, therefore, it was desirable to avoid words which might carry negative connotations. To this end the idea was stressed that it was normal and usual for distinctions to be made between people in social organizations. Students were also assured that their answers would be completely confidential and that results would be written in such a way that specific respondents or bay members could not be identified. In fact, students did not appear to be sensitive to the question on status rankings and no one refused to answer the questions because they felt it was inappropriate.

Having obtained the general status ranking, each student then proceeded to rank his/her bay members on the evaluative criteria which he/she had indicated were important. If academic and athletic abilities had not been suggested by the students themselves as important criteria then they were asked to rank the students on these criteria as well. These two criteria were included because it was an advantage to have some evaluative criteria which were used by everyone as this would allow for comparisons in ranking between different

individuals. These particular criteria were chosen because it was thought that they were criteria which were relevant to the residence in its context of being part of a university. They were also criteria about which students would be likely to have some information to enable them to rank each other.

Once a respondent had ranked his/her bay members on overall status and on the relevant evaluative criteria the respondent was then asked to indicate where he/she ranked on all the criteria used. Including this question meant that a complete view of the stratification system was obtained from each individual's perspective. The following question on the interview schedule dealt with the relative importance of the evaluative criteria themselves. Here the students were asked to rank order the criteria they had used from being most important to least important. Although the determination of the weights to be attached to the criteria is necessary for the status equation, Zelditch and Anderson give no indication how this is to be achieved.⁴ Further, it appears that other researchers have not been concerned with assessing the relative importance of evaluations. There is, therefore, no available information on any scale which might be used to measure the weights and, consequently, the determination of them could have been very problematic. The rank ordering of the criteria used here is a very suitable procedure in that it was simple and easily managed in terms of data collection and was seen to

be an important step in furthering the research in this unstudied area.

Subsequent questions in the interview dealt with the mobility response to rank imbalance. Using the rank orderings the students gave, a person's rank balance or imbalance could be determined using Zelditch and Anderson's definition of balance. The extent to which students have balanced ranks is discussed in Chapter IV but here the concern is with how the rank mobility response was measured. In order to study this issue students were asked what their preferred ranks would be on the individual evaluative criteria. From the theory, one would expect that students with balanced ranks would not wish to alter their positions on the criteria. Students with imbalanced ranks, however, should indicate preferred ranks which would create rank balance.

Two separate questions were asked in relation to the mobility response. The first question placed more constraints than the second on the possibility for mobility in that the respondent was asked to assume that he/she could alter their rank on one particular criterion whilst ranks on the others stayed as they were. The question was repeated so that all the criteria a student used were put in the situation of being the one where the rank could be altered. Using information from this question it was possible to see which ranks a student would prefer to move and to measure the

degree to which a rank was moved up or down a particular hierarchy in relation to the ranks on the other criteria. The second question dealt with mobility under the assumption that there were no constraints on a person but that one could state a completely ideal configuration of ranks.

It is clear that in both of these questions one is dealing with an expressed desire to have particular ranks and that this does not indicate that people can, or will, necessarily strive in such a way as to achieve the preferred status. However, if the assumptions made by Zelditch and Anderson are correct in that imbalanced ranks create tension and are unstable, then students will express a wish for preferred ranks which would reduce the tension.

Data gained from the last part of the interview and from records kept on the students by the university authorities were used as background information. It was collected in order to see whether factors such as friendship patterns or year at university would affect people's perception of the stratification system. The occupations of the students' fathers were also recorded to determine whether the family's socio-economic status would influence the students' evaluations. Such a consideration is important in that it would show whether or not conditions outside the residence were relevant to the students. This could indicate a linkage between the social system studied here and a social system or systems outside the

residence in that at least one of the evaluative criteria would be common to more than one system.

Coding of the interviews did not present any significant difficulties. The rank orderings given by the students had simply to be transferred from the interview schedule to the coding sheets in order to be ready to be keypunched. Answers to other questions, for example, religion and the evaluative criteria were also coded as given by the students. The two questions which involved decisions about the grouping of answers were father's occupation and home town. In the latter case, it was decided to follow recognized geographical areas within the province of Nova Scotia, e.g., eastern shore, the Valley, Cape Breton, and then to code other responses in terms of Atlantic provinces other than Nova Scotia, any other Canadian provinces and finally any residence outside of Canada. Father's occupation was coded on a six-point scale. The categories, professional, managerial and executive, other non-manual occupations, skilled manual, unskilled, and farmer or fisherman, were fairly broad because information about the occupation was not sufficiently detailed to allow for finer distinctions. It later became apparent that some of the occupational categories had very few entries in them and, therefore, the occupations were regrouped into four classes. Professional, managerial and executive were Class 1; other non-manual Class 2; skilled manual Class 3, and unskilled manual, farmer and fisherman Class 4. A complete listing

of all the codes used in the study can be found in Appendix B.

From the 194 students in residence, 162 interviews were obtained and it is from these data that the analyses in the following chapters have been made. Of the 162 students, 90 were men and 72 women. This number of interviews was arrived at as the result of several factors.

Six people were not interviewed at all as one male student could never be contacted and five women refused to take part in the study. Of these five women, only one could be considered a typical student in terms of the students in residence as she was a white Nova Scotian between the ages of 20 and 24 years. The other four were not typical in that three were of a different race from the majority, and the fourth was over 40 years old, so that their exclusion actually left the sample even more homogeneous than it would otherwise have been.

Other students have been excluded from the study even though they were interviewed. Only one rule was made with reference to whether an interview was to be included for analysis or not. The rule stated that a respondent had to be able to describe at least half of the total number of people in his or her bay and to be able to rank the same number on the general or overall status dimension. This fifty per cent rule can be seen as restricting the definition of who is a

member of the social system. Although membership can be broadly defined by reference to who lives in the residence, this information does not give any indication of whether or not a student knows or interacts with other people in the bay and in a more subjective sense can be considered a member. The rule requires people to show some familiarity with the other students and allows for a better appreciation of the stratification system in the bay. When students could describe the majority of their bay members they could also rank them on the general status dimension. In only two cases did students describe the other students and then claim that they were not familiar with the status hierarchy in their bay. Generally the respondents fell clearly into one of two categories: they could either describe and rank all the bay or they could not describe and rank more than three or four people. Thus by applying this rule it was possible to get very complete rankings on the overall status dimension. In terms of the individual evaluative criteria no further difficulty was encountered since all students were able to rank at least as many students as they ranked on general status. By this definition of a useable interview, twenty respondents were excluded--sixteen men and four women. Of the men, six came from one bay and represented half the membership of that bay. As a consequence it was decided to take that entire bay out of the study as so much information was missing. This bay was unlike the other five in terms of

physical layout and in the fact that eight of the students were graduate students who interacted very little with each other or the other members of the residence. Table II summarizes the distribution of interviews by bay.

TABLE II
DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS, NUMBER OF
INTERVIEWS, AND NUMBER OF USEABLE INTERVIEWS,
BY BAY

	<u>BAYS</u>											
	<u>M1</u>	<u>M2</u>	<u>M3</u>	<u>M4</u>	<u>M5</u>	<u>M6</u>	<u>F1</u>	<u>F2</u>	<u>F3</u>	<u>F4</u>	<u>F5</u>	<u>F6</u>
No. of Students	17	17	23	21	23	12	12	12	16	12	14	15
No. of Interviews	17	17	22	21	23	12	12	12	14	11	12	15
No. of Useable Interviews	15	16	19	20	20	6	12	12	12	10	11	15

A problem which had to be encountered during the analysis of the student interviews was whether or not students were using different names for the same behaviour in their descriptions of the bay members. This would, of course, affect the evaluative criteria which were chosen from these descriptions. In order to test this possibility a small supplementary survey was conducted. Seventy-one students from four different university courses took part in the project. These students were asked to study the list of 59

evaluative criteria taken from the interviews in the initial survey and indicate the words which they thought described identical forms of behaviour. In order to ensure that the students in this second study were likely to assign the same meanings to the words as did the King's students it was desirable that the two samples be very similar in terms of social characteristics. Therefore, in addition to the main question on the evaluative criteria the students were asked to indicate their age, sex, degree they were studying for, hometown and whether or not they had ever lived in a university residence. (The complete questionnaire is in Appendix A.) These questions were used to estimate the similarities of the two groups of students. The students were approached during their regular class time and filled in the questionnaire during the first 15 to 20 minutes of the class. The courses in which the students were enrolled were chosen in order to increase the likelihood of the students being similar to the King's students on certain characteristics. Thus it was desirable that the courses should not be predominantly of one sex and as the majority of students in the residences were in B.A. or B.Sc. programmes the courses chosen were also in these areas rather than in the professional schools. The courses involved were a first year Chemistry and a first year English course, a second year Economics and a third year Sociology course. Each of these courses were small and this allowed for close supervision of the survey.

Of the 71 students who took part, 36 were women and 35 were men. Generally these students were very similar to the students in residence. The area in which they showed the greatest difference was that in comparison to 100 per cent of the students in the initial survey, only 25 per cent of the men and 47 per cent of the women in the supplementary study had ever lived in a university residence. On other characteristics, 89 per cent of this latter group came from the Maritimes, 53 per cent were in their first year at university, 81 per cent were studying for a B.A. or B.Sc. degree and 79 per cent of them were 24 years or younger. For the residence students, the corresponding figures are 91, 47, 77 and 80 per cent. In view of these figures it can be seen that the students in the supplementary survey were very similar to the King's students and this increases the likelihood that they would assign the same meaning to the evaluative criteria as the students in the initial survey. This problem is discussed further in the following chapter.

Having considered the source of the data to be used and the data collection procedures, the following two chapters are concerned with the substantive findings. Chapter III deals with the general status equation and Chapter IV the process of rank balance and the response to imbalance.

FOOTNOTES

¹King's College University Calendar, 1972-73.

²In the succeeding pages, the men's bays are designated by the letter M and the female bays by the letter F.

³Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, "On the Balance of a Set of Ranks," in Sociological Theories in Progress, Vol. I, edited by J. Berger et al., New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966, pp. 252-255.

⁴Ibid., pp. 246-248.

CHAPTER III

THE DETERMINANTS OF STATUS

As stated in Chapter I, one of the major areas of this research is to test Zelditch and Anderson's status equation. The testing of this equation is fundamental to establishing the validity of rank balance theory as developed by them. Not only is the equation a precondition to their theory but it is also essential in assessing whether or not people have balanced or imbalanced ranks. This follows from the fact that the ranks a person has on specific evaluative criteria are used to determine whether a person's ranks are balanced or not. In this chapter, attention is directed at the status equation per se and the issue of rank balance is addressed in the following chapter.

It was indicated previously that testing the status equation involved obtaining information about four different areas. These are:

- 1) the rank orderings of individuals on the overall status dimension;
- 2) the evaluative criteria relevant to the social system studied;
- 3) the relative importance of the criteria;
- 4) the rank orderings of individuals on the evaluative criteria.

These four issues are dealt with in the succeeding pages of this chapter.

1. Rank Orderings on the Overall Status Dimension

As reported in Chapter II, the interviewing procedure assumed that, in fact, students did have a general or overall status and that this status was known to the students. If this assumption had been incorrect, (for instance, if students could not rank each other on the general status dimension), then a major revision of Zelditch and Anderson's theory would have been necessary. From the results of the interviews, however, one can conclude that students do indeed see themselves and other bay members as having a general status within their bay and that they can describe this status system. When students did not rank others on this dimension it was because they were unfamiliar with the bay rather than because they did not believe that such a dimension existed.

When one compares the rank orderings students give in each of the bays the overall conclusion is that there is great variation between the students' evaluations. Each student had a different rank ordering of individuals for his/her bay and agreement on where particular individuals ranked was very low. Table III presents a summary of the students' rankings in their bay and measures the degree of consensus about rankings by the interquartile range of ranks and Kendall's W. It can be seen from an examination of the Kendall's W that most of the women's bays show somewhat greater consensus than do the men's. However, as the largest

TABLE III

CONSENSUS ON RANKINGS ON GENERAL STATUS:
DISTRIBUTION OF THE INTERQUARTILE RANGE OF
RANKS AND KENDALL'S W, BY BAY

INTERQUARTILE RANGE	GENERAL STATUS BAYS											TOTALS	
	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	M	F
1.50 or below	3	2	2	3	1	7	10	4	11	7	4	11	43
1.51 - 3.00	10	12	12	9	8	5	2	7	1	7	9	51	31
3.01 - 4.50	4	3	8	8	9	0	0	5	0	0	2	32	7
4.51 or above	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
KENDALL'S W	.059	.066	.008	.025	.003	.140	.123	.062	.175	.035	.065		
No. of students ranked	17	17	22	21	23	12	12	16	12	14	15		
No. of students ranking	15	16	19	20	20	12	12	12	10	11	15		

22

12

W is 0.175 it is apparent that consensus on rankings in all of the bays is very low whether these be women's or men's bays.

Within the general statement that there is low consensus on where people rank there are clearly noticeable variations. Bay F4, for instance, stands out because it appears to have a relatively high degree of agreement, particularly if one looks at the interquartile range of ranks. This bay was unusual in comparison to the others because six students maintained that all the students in the bay had the same overall status and that no distinctions could be made between them on this dimension. One could question whether such a response should be interpreted as a refusal to answer the question. However, from the remarks the students made during the interview it appeared that they did not think that there were significant differences between the bay members. Students made such remarks as "Some people are better in some ways than others but everything more or less evens out" or "When you get to know them (the bay members) they're all equally nice." Given such comments it seems that the students had evaluated each other and then concluded that there were no status distinctions.

For students to conclude that there are no significant differences between the bay members on general status implies that they have considerable information about each

other. However, having a great deal of information may also inhibit a person in recognizing status differentials or may allow for different interpretations. The amount of knowledge people have about each other may be related to the size of the bay since smaller bays may allow more opportunities for people to know each other well. Consequently, the relationship between the size of the bay and the degree of consensus on general status rankings was investigated. Correlating the number of students in the bay and Kendall's W as a measure of consensus, one finds a correlation coefficient of $r = -.86$ and an r^2 of .74. Such a high correlation indicates a strong relationship between the size of the bay and the level of consensus such that as the bay becomes larger consensus over rankings decreases.

The issue of the relationship between the size of the bay and the information available is in need of further investigation. It is unclear, for instance, whether in the smaller bays the students are more familiar with each other and, therefore, have more information on which to judge one another or if there is a better alternative explanation for the findings. It may be the case that such a relationship is not simply a question of the amount of information available but that higher levels of interaction are characteristic of smaller bays and that such interaction leads to a greater degree of agreement on particular issues.¹ However,

even though the correlation between bay size and consensus on rankings is high it has to be noted that the variation in the Kendall's W (from .003 to .175) is not very great. Therefore, although consensus is related to size, size certainly does not appear to cause very significant variation in the level of agreement on rankings. Further, even in the larger bays the majority of students were able to give descriptions of the other bay members and did not claim any difficulty in rank ordering them on this hierarchy. Thus, it could be concluded that most students had sufficient information as a result of their contacts with other students in the bay to be able to rank them on general status and that the low consensus reflects different perceptions of the status system.

Although the overall finding is that there is very low agreement on where individuals rank on general status, nevertheless one does find some instances of high consensus. For the purposes of this research, high consensus was said to exist if a student was ranked such that the interquartile range of all the ranks assigned to him/her on this hierarchy was 1.5 or less. Further, a person was classified as being in a high status position if apart from this high degree of consensus, he/she was also ranked such that the median of the assigned ranks was either 1, 2, or 3, i.e., one of the top three positions in the bay. For example, a student over whom there was high consensus as to his ranks and who also was

of high status could have an interquartile range of ranks of 1.00 and a median rank of 2. Low status people were those over whom there was high consensus but whose median rank was one of the three lowest positions in the bay. Other people who were ranked consistently but whose median rank was not one of the six already mentioned were said to have medium status.

Using the above definition of high consensus, there were fifty-four students (33 per cent) whose ranks gave an interquartile range of 1.5 or less. Of these fifty-four, forty-three were women and eleven were men. See Table IV. Categorizing these people into high, medium or low status positions one finds that for both men and women there are relatively few people in the high and low status categories. The small number of men over whom there is high consensus, however, means that the variation between the status categories reflects a difference of only one or two people. The medium status category of women is very large because of the characteristics of Bay F4 where few distinctions were made between people on this status dimension. This meant that in several cases the students were assigned a rank of 6.5 and this placed them in the category of high consensus medium status. If one excludes this bay from consideration then the medium status category contains twenty-two women.

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH CONSENSUS STUDENTS ON
GENERAL STATUS BY STATUS POSITION AND SEX

STATUS POSITION	MEN	WOMEN
	HIGH CONSENSUS STUDENTS ON	GENERAL STATUS
High	18%	14%
Medium	46%	77%
Low	36%	9%
Total	100% (11)	100% (43)

From these data it can be concluded that there is very little agreement even over which students could be considered to be the leaders in the bays. Students in Bays M2 and M4, for instance, show no agreement over who could be considered to be in such positions in their bays since there is no one over whom there is high consensus and who has high status. Given such lack of consensus on who could be considered to be the prominent people it is not surprising, perhaps, that there is little consensus on where people rank in the other positions. As the students maintained that there was a general status dimension in the bays and that in the majority of cases the students were familiar with this status system, one would have to conclude that this lack of consensus arises because of different perceptions of the bay and its members. Such differences in perception may arise, as already discussed, because of different levels of information available to the

students but may also reflect the fact that students differ over the aspects of behaviour they see as relevant and important within the residence as this would lead them to have different evaluations of people.

Although the student residences have so far been viewed as self-contained social systems, it is obvious that they are embedded in a wider societal context. When students described their bay members they did not use as evaluative criteria those dimensions of behaviour most frequently reported in other studies, for example, educational attainment, socio-economic standing, racial or ethnic background.² The choice of different criteria is a reflection of the type of social system being studied and may be seen as an indication of its relative isolation from the rest of society insofar as the students do not consider important the evaluations made in the society outside the residences.

Even though the students did not explicitly mention factors such as the other students' socio-economic status, it was possible that such evaluations were influencing the rank orderings the respondents gave. As the occupations of the students' fathers had been obtained it was decided to use this as a measure of the families' socio-economic status and determine whether or not the rank orderings of students on the general status criterion were related to the students' family backgrounds. Father's occupation is only one aspect

of a student's family background but it is still an important indicator of relative social status.³ Therefore, this measure can be used to determine whether or not there is any relationship between the students' status system and the status system operative in the society at large.

The occupations of one hundred and fifty-five students' fathers were put into one of the four classes of occupations discussed in Chapter II. Students whose fathers were retired, deceased, or on whom there was insufficient information were excluded from the analysis. Thus correlations were calculated between the students' rankings and the occupations of the students' fathers for 86 men and 69 women. Using these correlations, one can conclude that there is very little relationship between a student's rank on general status and his family status. Only 17 men and 21 women ranked their bay members such that the correlations yielded a level of significance of 0.05 or above. There were 9 women for whom there was a perfect correlation between the two status systems but these were the only instances in which this occurred. Of further interest is the fact that among men, 13 of the correlations which were significant were negative correlations as was also the case for 7 of the women. In fact, if one considers all the correlations from the men's status rankings, whether or not they were significant, one finds that 72 per cent of them were negative.

The corresponding figure for women was 45 per cent. One can conclude from this that the relationship between the two status systems for many of the men is one of reversal. This pattern is also found among the women but not so consistently. Thus, the relationship between the status system in the residences and the status system in the larger society is not strong and insofar as it does exist it is frequently a negative one. Such findings suggest that the residences are indeed isolated from the status systems of the society in which they exist and that the men may, in fact, be rejecting the outside status system altogether.

The findings on the general status dimension are not simple and consistent. Thus whilst nearly all the students indicated that such a dimension did exist and that they could place each of their bay members on the rank hierarchy, each student had a different perception of the status system. This resulted in there being very low consensus on where students ranked. The reasons for the differing perceptions of the status system are not clear although they may be related to the size of the bay and friendship patterns as these factors may affect the information available to each of the students.

From the data obtained in the interviews, it was possible to make some assessment of the influence of friendship on the rank orderings on general status. It was thought that students would assign high ranks to friends. This was

likely because it was assumed that students would have more information about their friends than about the other people in their bay. One hundred and nineteen students out of 162 had friends in the same bay as themselves. Most students had one, two or three friends in the bay and only thirteen students claimed more than three friends in their unit.

The relationship between friendship patterns and ranking on general status is not a very consistent one. If one considers the extent to which students place their friends in the top third of the ranks of the bay, significant variations between the men and women can be seen. See Table V. For the 62 men who had friends in the bay all but seven (12 per cent) ranked at least some of their friends in the top third of the ranks and 38 (61 per cent) of them put all their friends within these positions. Among the women, 25 (44 per cent) ranked all their friends in the top third of the bay and a further 11 (19 per cent) put some of them in these positions. Twenty-one (37 per cent) of the women, however, put none of them in the top positions. These findings suggest that men are more likely than women to rank their friends in high positions.

The comparison between men and women on the influence of friendship patterns on the general status rankings is difficult, however, because of the different sizes of the bays. Considering the top third of rankings

in a bay means that the men have a greater number of ranks on which to assign their friends. Consequently, it was decided to re-examine the issue by considering just those people who had three or less friends within the bay and determining whether these friends were given higher status on the general dimension. High status was defined as having one of the top three ranks in the bay. This procedure allows for a comparison between men and women without the size of the bay being an intruding factor.

TABLE V

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FRIENDS IN THE
TOP THIRD OF RANKS ON GENERAL STATUS, BY SEX

	MEN FRIENDS IN THE TOP THIRD OF RANKS ON GENERAL STATUS	WOMEN FRIENDS IN THE TOP THIRD OF RANKS ON GENERAL STATUS
All of them	61% (33.35)	44% (30.17)
Some of them	27% (14.06)	19% (13.42)
None of them	12% (14.59)	37% (13.42)
Total	100% (62)	100% (57)
$\chi^2 = 11.51$		
df = 2		
Significant at between .01 and .001 levels		

When one makes the analysis of where friends are ranked in this manner, one finds that there are no significant differences between the sexes on where friends are ranked. In

both instances, a majority of students ranked some or all of their friends in the top three ranks. See Table VI. The number of people who put all their friends in these ranks, however, did not differ very greatly from the number who put none of them in these high positions and this is particularly the case for the men. These results suggest that friendship patterns are not very important in explaining the general status rankings. Nevertheless, the inconsistency in the results such that some students do rank their friends highly, whilst others do not, suggests that this is an issue which should be more fully investigated in the future.

TABLE VI

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FRIENDS RANKED IN THE
TOP THREE POSITIONS ON GENERAL STATUS, BY SEX

	MEN	WOMEN
	FRIENDS RANKED IN THE TOP THREE POSITIONS ON GENERAL STATUS	
All of them	35% (18.32)	36% (18.68)
Some of them	27% (11.39)	9% (11.61)
None of them	38% (22.29)	25% (22.71)
Total	100% (52)	100% (53)

$$\chi^2 = 1.67$$

$$df = 2$$

Significant at between .50 and .30 levels

2. The Evaluative Criteria

Having established that students could rank others and themselves on the dimension of general status, the major question was then to determine at how a particular rank was arrived. In order to test Zelditch and Anderson's ideas, one must be able to describe the evaluative criteria operative within the social system. Past researchers appear to have settled this issue by deciding themselves that particular criteria are important in the context they are studying.⁴ Zelditch and Anderson suggest that observation of the social system will be necessary before one can say what evaluative criteria are relevant.⁵ Although none of the published research indicates that the researchers did make systematic observations prior to conducting their studies, one could assume that general familiarity with the society was sufficient to justify their choice of criteria. In this research the students were asked both directly and indirectly what evaluative criteria they thought were important in the residences.

Excluding academic and athletic abilities which were criteria chosen by this author, the students used a total of 57 different evaluative criteria. See Table VII. Of these, 25 were used only once.

TABLE VII
THE FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF
THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA, BY SEX

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA	EVALUATIVE CRITERIA USED BY THE STUDENTS			
	FREQ.	MEN PERCENT.	WOMEN FREQ.	PERCENT.
Academic Ability	86	95	71	98
Athletic Ability	89	98	68	94
Friendly	25	27	40	55
Considerate	16	17	23	40
Helpful	13	14	21	29
Easy to talk to	4	4	20	27
Bay spirit	38	42	4	5
Sense of humour	2	2	12	16
Not moody			2	2
Sympathetic			2	2
Lots of fun			6	8
Easy to get along with	20	22	10	13
Easy going			2	2
Mature			4	5
Patient			1	1
Trustworthy	2	2	2	2
Not two-faced			12	16
General temperament			1	1
Outgoing	3	3	10	13
Creative			1	1
Tolerant of other's ideas	3	3	2	2
Conscientious student	2	2	3	4
Good listener			3	4
Has own opinions			2	2
Empathetic			1	1
Active Empathy			1	1
Activist			1	1

TABLE VII (cont'd.)

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA	EVALUATIVE CRITERIA USED BY THE STUDENTS			
	MEN		WOMEN	
	FREQ.	PERCENT.	FREQ.	PERCENT.
Understanding			16	22
Kind			1	1
Reliable	8	8	3	4
Interested in people			1	1
Same interests			1	1
Appearance			4	5
Nice	3	3	1	1
Well organized			1	1
Quiet	1	1	1	1
Well adjusted	1	1	1	1
Perceptive			1	1
General attitude	3	3		
Sociable	6	6		
Generous	5	5		
Self-awareness	2	2		
Easy to get to know	1	1		
Communicative ability	3	3		
Non-aggressive	1	1		
Sense of community	1	1		
Responsible	1	1	1	1
Respectful	1	1		
Ability to combine academic matters and a good time	1	1		
Willing to try	1	1		
Ability to be a good friend	1	1		
College pride	1	1		
Good to talk to	1	1	5	7
Political awareness	1	1		
Spirituality	1	1		

TABLE VII (cont'd.)

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA	EVALUATIVE CRITERIA USED BY THE STUDENTS			
	MEN		WOMEN	
	FREQ.	PERCENT.	FREQ.	PERCENT.
Musical			1	1
Not shy			1	1
Warm and fun-loving			1	1
No. of criteria	347		366	
No. of students	90		72	

The women used 42 different evaluative criteria and the men 32, with 17 of these criteria common to both sexes.

The criteria listed in Table VII are the words the students used in their interviews. It is assumed that when students are using the same word they are referring to the same form of behaviour; for instance, students are referring to the same behaviour when they describe someone as being helpful. The fact that the students were relatively homogeneous in terms of many of their social characteristics increases the probability that the same behaviour is being described when particular words are used; but one also needs to assess whether or not students describe the same behaviour under two different labels.

It was this problem which led to the small supplementary survey being conducted as described in Chapter II. The purpose was to determine whether or not any of the 59 criteria could be eliminated because they were describing

identical behaviour. When the seventy-one students who participated in this second survey had indicated which words they thought described identical forms of behaviour, a total of 684 different pairs of words were listed. This large list was, in fact, generated by 64 students as 7 of those who participated in the survey maintained that in their opinion none of the words were describing exactly the same behaviour. From this list of identical behaviour, only 29 pairs of words were seen as identical by at least 14 per cent of the students. See Table VIII. None of the words were seen as identical by more than 30 per cent of the students and this percentage occurred only twice. In analyzing the evaluative criteria which students claimed were identical it was also found that their opinion differed from the students in residence. Thus, criteria deemed identical by the students in the supplementary survey were treated as different criteria by the residence students and they also ranked others on these criteria in a different order. These cases are marked with an * on Table VIII. In these instances, it was decided that the residence students' views of the criteria as describing different forms of behaviour would be accepted and, consequently, the 29 pairs of words used most frequently by the students in the supplementary survey were reduced to 23.

In view of the low level of agreement on which words could be considered to be describing identical forms of behaviour, it was decided that all 59 of the evaluative

criteria would be retained. This means that it is assumed that students in residence were referring to different and unique forms of behaviour when using different descriptive words.

TABLE VIII

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA SEEN TO BE IDENTICAL BY
AT LEAST TEN STUDENTS IN THE SUPPLEMENTARY SURVEY

IDENTICAL EVALUATIVE CRITERIA	NO. OF TIMES CHOSEN
1. Friendly and sociable	15
2. Friendly and easy to get to know	18
3. Friendly and warm and fun-loving	11
4. Friendly and easy to talk to	17*
5. Friendly and easy to get along with	17*
6. Friendly and nice	12*
7. Considerate and helpful	21*
8. Considerate and understanding	10*
9. Considerate and kind	15
10. Helpful and kind	13
11. Easy to talk to and easy to get along with	14*
12. Easy to talk to and good listener	11
13. Easy to talk to and communicative ability	10
14. Easy to talk to and good to talk to	10
15. Bay spirit and college pride	12
16. Sense of humour and lots of fun	16
17. Sense of humour and warm and fun-loving	11
18. Lots of fun and warm and fun-loving	16
19. Easy to get along with and easy-going	10
20. Trustworthy and not two-faced	21
21. Trustworthy and reliable	19
22. Outgoing and not shy	17
23. Tolerant of others' ideas and good listener	10
24. Good listener and good to talk to	10
25. Good listener and understanding	10

TABLE VIII (cont'd.)

IDENTICAL EVALUATIVE CRITERIA	NO. OF TIMES CHOSEN
26. Understanding and kind	10
27. Kind and nice	10
28. Reliable and responsible	11
29. No desire for power and non-aggressive	14

It can be seen that the great majority of the evaluative criteria reflect a concern with aspects of interpersonal behaviour. Students are concerned with whether a fellow bay member is friendly, easy to get along with, has a sense of humour or is dependable. Given that students have to live at close quarters with a variety of people it is, perhaps, not surprising that such emphasis should be placed on qualities which are likely to make for easy social intercourse and which may influence whether a residence is an enjoyable place in which to live.

In comparing the evaluative criteria used by the men and women, one finds that the bay descriptions given by the women yield a larger number of different criteria and that the women also rank each other on a greater number of criteria than do the men. For the men the average number of criteria used, including athletic and academic abilities, is 3.9. The corresponding figure for the women is 5.1. The reasons for this difference are speculative. It could be argued, for instance, that women are particularly perceptive about such aspects of

behaviour and see more different forms of behaviour as being significant. Alternatively, it may be the case that stratification in the women's bays is more complex than in the men's.

There are 40 criteria which are used by only one sex. Some of these criteria may appear somewhat idiosyncratic in that they are used only once as in the case of 25 of them. However, the use of criteria by only one sex and the frequency of use of some of the criteria seem to point to some interesting differences between the men and women in the area of expected behaviour. Such a conclusion is quite speculative but there does appear to be some support for the view that the women are more concerned with emotive aspects of behaviour in comparison to the men who are more achievement oriented.⁶ The women, for instance, use such criteria as being understanding, not being two-faced or being lots of fun, and stress more than the men such aspects as being friendly, outgoing, helpful, and considerate.

The difference between the men and women can perhaps be most closely seen in relation to the criterion bay spirit. Bay spirit refers to the notion of "being for the bay," and emphasizes the need for cooperation among bay members to uphold the prestige of the bay through inter-bay sports, for example. For the men this is the most frequently mentioned criterion since 42 per cent of them rank on this dimension in comparison to only 5 per cent of the women. Bay spirit is closely linked

to inter-bay sports as this is the occasion for most of the rivalry, but it may refer in a more general sense to a spirit of camaraderie expressed through bay parties and common social events. That this cooperative aspect of bay life is not of importance to women can be clearly seen from the data. The lack of importance attributed to such common activities may be in part a reflection of the different organization of bay life between men and women. This can be seen in relation not only to inter-bay sports but also initiation ceremonies.

Women's inter-bay sports are spasmodic and poorly organized affairs in comparison to the hockey games organized by the men's bays. Whilst some of the women students referred to the fact that their inter-bay sports, e.g., volleyball, were cancelled because of the lack of interest and the consequent lack of teams, this did not occur in the men's bays. Indeed, it seemed to be a point of honour that each bay had a team and students were pressured to play if they had not volunteered and even if they were not particularly athletic. The feeling seemed to be that any team was better than no team. The desire to create this commitment to the bay was certainly part of the initiation ceremonies for freshmen.⁷ Here again, these were more organized and considered more important in the men's bays than in the women's residence. It is doubtful, in fact, whether the women's bays could be considered to have initiation rites since the events were primarily social in nature and used as a means for students to get to know each other. In the men's

bays the initiation took on the more characteristic nature of ridiculing the new students, making them perform ridiculous acts and stating their allegiance to their bay. Within the men's bays, therefore, there were deliberate efforts to encourage the students to identify with their bay and to look upon some activities as important cooperative ventures. These sentiments may also be reflected in the use of criteria such as college pride, being reliable and in the greater importance given to athletic ability by some students.

The conclusion that the choice of evaluative criteria do reflect different bases of evaluation between men and women is tentative at this time. Nevertheless, previous research has indicated the differences in orientation between men and women in academic settings and this may be further evidence for such findings. It is apparent that whilst there is noticeable variation between men and women in terms of the evaluative criteria they use, there is also considerable variation between people of the same sex. The fact that 59 different criteria were used is indicative of the complexity of the stratification system.

Once the criteria the students used in their evaluations were obtained it was then necessary to establish the relative importance of the evaluative hierarchies. It is this issue which is dealt with in the following section of this chapter.

3. Relative Importance of the Evaluative Criteria

Zelditch and Anderson suggest that in order to simplify the theory at this stage in its development, one could impose a condition such that the evaluative criteria are all seen to be equally important. They state, "Members of S (the social system) agree on the weights to be given criteria by which they evaluate themselves and others."⁸ Such a restriction is seen as being temporary and would be removed when the theory was fully formulated. In the context of this research it was decided that this condition was too restrictive. As the students showed considerable variation in the evaluative criteria they considered significant, it was not possible to make any assumptions about the agreement on the relative importance of them. On the other hand, it was possible to get some measure of the importance of the criteria for each student during the interview and it was felt to be desirable to include this information and to begin a consideration of this issue in the interests of developing the theory.

As there was little agreement between students on the relevant evaluative criteria there could be little agreement on their relative importance. Nevertheless, it is possible to investigate to what extent there is agreement on the importance of the criteria which students do use in common. In their interviews the students rank ordered the

criteria they used and it is this ordering which is used to discuss the importance of the criteria. However, because students evaluated their bay members on a different number of criteria it is possible to consider only such questions as which criteria are seen as most or least important. To make such comparisons meaningful, only those cases where at least four evaluative criteria were used have been included in the following analysis.

Athletic ability is seen as the least important criterion by a majority of both men (52 per cent) and women (69 per cent). A further 25 per cent of the women and 35 per cent of the men would maintain that this criterion is second to last in importance, thus 94 per cent of the women and 87 per cent of the men consider this criterion as the most unimportant dimension or next to the most unimportant. Both of the criteria imposed by the researcher were, in fact, seen as being rather unimportant in many instances. The criterion which received the second largest number of choices for being least important was academic ability. Twenty-four per cent of both men and women considered this aspect of behaviour least significant.

Academic and athletic abilities are the only two criteria on which there is relatively large agreement that they are the least important. Ninety-three per cent of the women rank one or other of these two criteria last and 76

per cent of the men follow the same pattern. Apart from these criteria there is little consensus over which can be considered least important. Bay spirit is least important for eleven men but with the exception of these three criteria no other was chosen as least important by more than five persons.

The agreement on which criteria are most important is less pronounced than agreement in the above instances. Twenty-four per cent of the men chose academic ability as the most important criterion. This is interesting in that an equal number of men regarded this as the least important criterion and this would indicate that there is considerable variation of opinion between the men over its relative significance. In comparison, only one woman ranked this criterion first.

Other criteria which the men ranked as most important were: easy to get along with 14 per cent; friendly 11 per cent; considerate 10 per cent, and helpful 6 per cent. Apart from these, no other criterion was regarded as most important by at least five men. For women the corresponding criteria were friendly 21 per cent; understanding 12 per cent; helpful, easy to talk to and not two-faced each 9 per cent, and easy to get along with and a sense of humour both 8 per cent. Friendly, easy to get along with and helpful are the only criteria regarded as the most important by at least five men and five women.

If one considers the criteria ranked second in importance there is again relatively little agreement over which criteria are ranked in that position. Considering those criteria chosen by at least five men, one finds the following pattern of choices: academic ability 22 per cent; bay spirit 20 per cent; friendly 8 per cent; athletic ability and considerate, each 7 per cent, helpful 6 per cent. For women the corresponding choices are: considerate 13 per cent; academic ability and helpful, each 11 per cent; friendly 9 per cent, and understanding 8 per cent.

These figures show that there is more variation over which criteria are important than over which ones are unimportant. The differences in the rank ordering of the criteria appear to indicate the different areas of concern to men and women as did the initial choice of the criteria. This is seen particularly in reference to academic ability where 46 per cent of the men consider it to be first or second in importance in comparison to only 11 per cent of the women. Women, on the other hand, place more importance on those characteristics which allow for easy and supportive social relationships. For both men and women, however, there is considerable variation in the choice of which criteria are most important.

From the data collected in this project it was possible to investigate one possible explanation of why the students ordered the criteria in the way they did. If one

assumes that people wish to maintain as positive a self-evaluation of themselves as is possible,⁹ then one could argue that the students will consider the criterion on which they have the highest rank the most important. Likewise, the least important criterion will be the one they rank the lowest. Consequently, the relationship between a student's ranking of himself/herself and the relative importance he/she assigned to the evaluative criteria was investigated.

In fact, there does not appear to be much support for the assertion that the rank ordering of the criteria is related to a person's own ranks on the criteria. If one looks at whether a student regards the most important criterion as the one of which he/she ranks highest then one finds that this is the case for only 36 per cent of the female students and 42 per cent of the male students. Similarly, only 34 per cent of the men and 43 per cent of the women regarded the least important criterion as the one on which they had the lowest rank. The fact that the relative importance of the evaluative criteria does not appear to be related to the student's own ranks on these criteria would indicate that the students gave an unbiased assessment in their rank orderings of the criteria.

4. Rank Orderings on the Evaluative Criteria

Having established the evaluative criteria the students use and their relative importance, the final factor

necessary for the status equation was to determine people's ranks on these individual criteria and this issue is discussed below.

When comparisons are made on how students in the same bay are ranked on common criteria by different people, one finds similar results to the rankings on general status; that is, that there is very little agreement over people's ranks. Students did not appear to experience any difficulty in ranking others on the evaluative criteria they chose. Consensus on rankings, however, was low. In order to make comparisons between rank orderings, at least two people in the same bay had to use the same criteria. There were ninety-seven instances where this occurred involving twenty-four different criteria. Using Kendall's W as a measure of agreement on rankings, the figures in Table IX indicate the generally low levels of consensus. The only instances where there is comparatively high agreement, (for instance W is .4 or above), are four cases all in the women's bays. In each of these instances the agreement is between only two rankers. There is, however, no consistent relationship between the degree of consensus and the number of rankers using a particular criterion.

As academic and athletic abilities were two criteria which all students were asked to use as the bases for evaluations, it is possible to make more detailed comparisons with

TABLE IX

KENDALL'S W FOR ALL EVALUATIVE CRITERIA USED AT LEAST TWICE WITHIN A BAY, BY BAY

BAY	EVALUATIVE CRITERIA CODES KENDALL'S W													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
M1	.053	.044	.174	.009	.000		.069			.252				
M2	.034	.028	.095	.031	.122		.136			.087				.280
M3	.005	.009	.019	.002			.016			.002				
M4	.016	.018	.007	.116	.001		.022			.016				
M5	.003	.007	.004			.017	.002			.008				
F1	.068	.032	.166	.013	.196	.603		.029	.068	.225			.425	
F2	.100	.050	.094	.028	.187									
F3	.007	.073	.142	.074	.141	.008						.036		
F4	.154	.084	.090	.279	.261	.300						.111	.694	
F5	.126	.045	.054	.034	.199	.075		.027	.049		.184	.082		
F6	.018	.043	.138	.049	.093	.111							.218	

Key to Evaluative Criteria Codes -

1 Academy Ability	9 Lots of Fun	17 Understanding
2 Athletic Ability	10 Easy to get along with	18 Reliable
3 Friendly	11 Mature	19 Appearance
4 Considerate	12 Not two-faced	20 Nice
5 Helpful	13 Outgoing	21 Sociable
6 Easy to talk to	14 Tolerant of other's ideas	22 Generous
7 Bay Spirit	15 Conscientious student	23 Communicative ability
8 Sense of Humour	16 Good listener	24 Good to talk to

15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
			.002				.117	.098	
			.019		.047	.019	.032		
.028		.068		.444					
		.121							
	.028	.028							
		.015							
		.124							.371

these than with any of the other evaluative criteria used. Consensus on where people rank on each of these criteria is again very low as measured by Kendall's W. See Table IX. In seven instances, the consensus on rankings for academic and athletic abilities is even lower than for general status. (See Tables III and X). If, however, one considers the number of persons over whom there is agreement as to their ranks, one finds that there are 91 persons in this category for athletic ability and 39 for academic ability in comparison to 54 on the overall dimension. High consensus is again being defined as an interquartile range of ranks of 1.5 or less. Analyzing these students into high, medium or low status positions as defined previously on page 13, one again finds that most of the students are in the medium status category. (See Table X.). Thus, there is little consensus over who can be considered the athletes or the best students in the bays. The fact that there are more high consensus individuals on athletic ability than on either academic ability or general status may be related to the fact that athletic ability is more visible than the other two. It is interesting, however, that the women have more high consensus individuals than do the men when athletics were unimportant to them.

The lack of consensus among the rankings on the evaluative criteria again supports the contention that students have different views of the stratification system of which

they are part. In summarizing the evidence presented so far in this chapter, one has to conclude that the stratification system in any bay is not as simple as one may have thought. This complexity is the result of their evaluating each other on many different criteria, assigning different levels of importance to those criteria they do hold in common and assigning different ranks to people if common criteria are used. In view of these factors, it is not surprising that there is such a low degree of agreement on the rank orderings on general status since Zelditch and Anderson's theory states that a person's overall rank is the result of the combination of evaluations on the individual evaluative criteria. It is this status equation which will be discussed in the following pages.

TABLE X

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH CONSENSUS
STUDENTS ON ACADEMIC AND ATHLETIC ABILITIES
BY STATUS POSITION AND SEX

	MEN		WOMEN	
	HIGH CONSENSUS STUDENTS ON ACADEMIC AND ATHLETIC ABILITIES			
Status Position	Academic Ability	Athletic Ability	Academic Ability	Athletic Ability
High	22%	20%	13%	20%
Medium	56%	77%	80%	74%
Low	22%	3%	7%	6%
Total	100% (9)	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (61)

5. The General Status Equation

Zelditch and Anderson incorporate the following equation into their theory as a description of the relationship between a person's overall status position and their ranks on the individual evaluative criteria:

$$w_1 r_{1i} + w_2 r_{2i} + \dots + w_k r_{ki} = R_i$$

Thus, a person's general standing (denoted R_i) "is determined by some set of criteria (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k). Since the criteria may vary in importance, a set of weights (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k) determines how much each criterion contributes to the value of R_i . Just how the weighted values are added up is difficult to say, but certainly R_i is a monotonically increasing function of them."¹⁰

If the general status equation Zelditch and Anderson present is an accurate reflection of how a person's overall status is determined, then one should be able to predict that status if a person's ranks on the individual criteria and the relative significance of the criteria are known.

The rank orderings each individual gave to his/her bay members on the evaluative criteria, the rank ordering of the criteria themselves and the number of criteria used were put into regression equations to determine the extent to which this information predicted a person's general status rank. As the students had used many different criteria, the

regression equations were calculated simply by taking into account the number of criteria used and not the specific content of the evaluative criteria upon which each student ranked.

The regression equations for each sex were calculated separately. The women used between two and eight criteria and the men between one and seven, although there were only 17 cases among the men where 7 criteria were used and in these instances no greater predictability of overall rank was achieved than when 6 criteria were used. It can be seen that the relationship between the number of variables used and the amount of variation explained in overall rank is not a perfect one since the variation fluctuates until at least three criteria are used by the men and four by the women. See Table XI. However, the regression equations for the women, unlike those of the men, continue to explain more of the variation in overall rank as the number of criteria continues to increase and do not reach a point beyond which no further variation is accounted for. With the use of eight criteria the greatest predictability for either men or women is achieved.

These data show considerable support for Zelditch and Anderson's status equation since the amount of variation explained is relatively large and the results show a high level of significance. Thus, it can be seen that by knowing

people's ranks on the evaluative criteria and the relative importance of the criteria a considerable amount of the variation in people's overall status ranks can be accounted for. This is seen to be the case particularly as the number of evaluative criteria in the equation increases.

TABLE XI
VARIATION ACCOUNTED FOR BY THE GENERAL
STATUS EQUATION, MALES AND FEMALES

No. of Variables	Total Variance Explained R^2	Level of Significance	Sets of Rankings
<u>Males</u>			
1	.034	.241	42
2	.501	.000	92
3	.415	.000	295
4	.508	.000	1192
5	.609	.000	62
6	.635	.000	76
<u>Females</u>			
2	.323	.007	28
3	.057	.254	73
4	.431	.000	280
5	.435	.000	182
6	.449	.000	220
7	.528	.000	109
8	.773	.003	22

It has already been suggested that the fact that the men and women perceive the status system in the residences differently is reflected in their use of different evaluative criteria. The evidence from this equation further supports the idea of dissimilar perceptions. The maximum number of

evaluative criteria which are useful in predicting men's overall status ranks is six, whilst the upper limit for women, beyond which additional criteria do not increase the predictability, is at least eight. This suggests that the reason women generally used more evaluative criteria than the men is because of differences in the status systems. For the women, the status system is more complex than for the men insofar as a greater number of evaluative criteria are relevant to the determination of a person's general status. Further evidence that the men and women do have different views of their status systems can also be seen by an examination of the beta weights used in the regression analysis. The beta weights are the equivalent of the W's or weights Zelditch and Anderson include in their status equation. An examination of Table XII indicates that the weights the men and women use are quite different and thus they do not share a common perspective about the stratification of the residences.

As a precondition to their theory of rank balance, Zelditch and Anderson's view of the status system does receive support from this data. Thus, one is able to explain a considerable amount of the variation in ranks on general status by using Zelditch and Anderson's status equation. The evidence here suggests that further efforts to increase the predictability of status ranks by this equation would be profitable. For instance, attention could be directed to

considering the specific combinations of criteria in the equation and not simply the number of criteria used. Seeing that the basis for Zelditch and Anderson's approach to rank balance theory does receive support, however, one can proceed to consider the major concern of the theory, namely, the issue of rank balance and the response to imbalance.

TABLE XII
BETA WEIGHTS FOR THE REGRESSION EQUATIONS
FOR MEN AND WOMEN

MEN							
No. of Variables							
1	2	3	4	5	6		
.185							
.613	.197						
.304	.357	.183					
.355	.238	.224	.216				
.133	.475	.012	.380	.026			
.155	.188	.040	.366	.257	.096		
WOMEN							
No. of Variables							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
.482	.164						
.160	.104	.091					
.443	.117	.182	.155				
.161	.124	.443	.090	.067			
.172	.232	.223	.070	.046	.206		
.210	.122	.002	.386	.156	.084	-.008	
.691	.567	.382	.046	.082	.037	.073	-.325

FOOTNOTES

¹George C. Homans, The Human Group, New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1950, pp. 131-136.

²See for example, G. Lenski, "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status," American Sociological Review, 19 (1954), pp. 405-413, and E. Jackson, "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress," American Sociological Review, 27 (1962), pp. 469-480.

³Richard H. Hall, Occupations and the Social Structure, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969, pp. 258-260.

⁴G. Lenski, op. cit.

⁵Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, "On the Balance of a Set of Ranks," in Sociological Theories in Progress, Vol. I, edited by J. Berger, et al., New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966, p. 246.

⁶The differences between men and women in this regard have been noted in a variety of contexts. See for instance: Talcott Parsons, "The American Family: Its Relations to Personality and to the Social Structures," in Family, Socialization and Interaction Process, edited by Talcott Parsons and R.F. Bales, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955, pp. 3-33; Fred L. Strodbeck and Richard D. Mann, "Sex Role Differentiation in Jury Deliberations," Sociometry, 19 (1956), pp. 3-11; Matina Horner, "The Motive to Avoid Success and Changing Aspirations of College Women," in Readings on Psychology of Women, edited by Judith M. Bardwick, New York: Harper and Row, 1972, pp. 62-67, and Esther Greenglass, "The Psychology of Women; or, the High Cost of Achievement," in Women in Canada, edited by Marylee Stephenson, Toronto: New Press, 1973, pp. 108-118.

⁷The influence of initiation ceremonies on commitment to the group has been previously noted; for example, E. Aronson and J. Mills, "The Effect of Severity of Initiation on Liking for a Group," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59 (1959), pp. 177-181.

⁸Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, op. cit., p. 249.

⁹Ibid., pp. 249-250.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 246.

CHAPTER IV

THE PROCESSES OF BALANCE AND
THE RESPONSE TO IMBALANCE

At the very crux of rank balance theory is the issue of whether people whose ranks are imbalanced will exhibit behaviour different from those who have balanced ranks. It is assumed that if there are differences they are attributable to the fact that people with imbalanced ranks are attempting to alleviate the tension associated with that condition. The exact forms of behaviour which people with imbalanced ranks may exhibit is not well understood and the published research has indicated a variety of possibilities.¹ Nevertheless, that there will be behavioural differences between those whose ranks are balanced and those who are imbalanced is clearly expected.

Because of this central issue, the decision as to whether or not someone has balanced or imbalanced ranks becomes very important and the procedures by which this decision is reached are crucial. Consequently, this chapter will look first at the definition of rank balance and the extent to which the students do or do not have balanced ranks, and secondly, at the response to imbalance through individual rank mobility.

One aspect of this study which is different from other published research is that it is possible to look at two different aspects of rank balance. One issue is to see whether

or not students rank other students such that their ranks can be said to be balanced; a second factor is the possibility of investigating whether the students see themselves as having balanced ranks.² (These two different aspects of balance will be referred to as the 'rankings of others' and 'others' balance' in the former case and 'self-rankings' and 'self-balance' in the latter.) In previous research, the respondents have been assigned to various ranks by the researchers themselves. This has meant that in some cases the respondents were clearly aware of their imbalance whilst in others this awareness was less definitely established.³ Here the extent to which people have balanced ranks under both self-rankings and the rankings of others can be investigated. However, as Zelditch and Anderson maintain that people are aware of their own balance or imbalance, only self-rankings are considered in the response to imbalance; but under either condition the decision on whether someone has balanced or imbalanced ranks depends on how rank balance is defined.

Zelditch and Anderson maintain that a person has balanced ranks if the ranks assigned to him/her are greater than, the same as, or less than every rank assigned to any other people in the same social system.⁴ This is a very general definition of balance which places no restrictions on how the researcher conceptualizes the ranks, nor on how many ranks are to be found in any particular social system. Consequently, one could use Zelditch and Anderson's definition and have only two

ranks, or the number of ranks could be as large as the number of people in the social system being considered. Both of these extremes would still enable one to define balance in accordance with Zelditch and Anderson's specifications. Some of the definitions of balance used in previous research would fit within Zelditch and Anderson's definition.⁵ Others, insofar as they reduce the rankings to one overall score, present a somewhat different approach.⁶ Under all definitions, however, the determination of the ranks is of major importance.

Most researchers have themselves created the number of ranks they wished to consider by dividing the educational spectrum into three categories,⁷ for instance, or income into ten.⁸ Having developed these ranks the respondents were accordingly assigned to them. In this study the number of ranks were created by the students who assigned a unique rank to every student in the bay in virtually all cases. This means that the number of ranks in each bay is equal to the number of students in that bay. Such a procedure has given a more detailed ranking system than has generally been used before.

If one considers a set of rankings to be all the ranks one person assigns to another on the evaluative criteria that person uses, then there are a total of 2,468 sets of rankings to be considered--842 among the women and 1,626 among the men--in the analysis of others' balance. Out of this number there are only 32 instances where the rankings are in

balance in accordance with Zelditch and Anderson's definition. Six of these instances are among the women (0.71 per cent) and 26 (1.59 per cent) among the men. In only two cases, both in Bay M3, is a person seen as being balanced by more than one person, and here two people are each considered balanced by two different students.

The factor which stands out most among the men is that if they saw someone as having balanced ranks, then they frequently only ranked on two evaluative criteria. This was the case in all but four of the twenty-six instances of balance. Of the four who did not conform to this pattern, two were ranked on three criteria and two on four. The very few instances of balance among the women make it more difficult to draw any conclusions. However, four women are ranked on more than two criteria and are seen to be balanced. In these cases the women with balanced ranks are ranked on four criteria once, five twice and six once. It is also apparent among the men that particular students assign balanced ranks more frequently than others. Seventeen instances of balance are attributable to three men who in all of these cases rank others on only two criteria.

One factor which does characterize even this small number of balanced cases, however, is that the students who are assigned balanced ranks are frequently ones who have high or low status. Fifteen students are seen to have high status

in that all their ranks are in one of the top three positions within a bay, and further seven students have ranks which are among the three lowest status positions. For the women, there is more diversity in the number of evaluative criteria used but they repeat the pattern of assigning balance to only high or low status people since all the women who are balanced are given either high or low status ranks. Such results imply that it is only at the extremes of the evaluative hierarchies that one finds people who are recognized as having balanced ranks. These findings clearly indicate, however, that rank balance is a very infrequent phenomenon and one which characterizes an extremely small percentage of the sets of rankings.

Neither Zelditch and Anderson, nor other researchers who have used the rank balance approach, have discussed whether a particular percentage of balanced people should be expected in a given social system. Thus, one has no reason to assume that rank balance will be characteristic of a majority or a minority of people. Certainly, if one compares the results reported here to those of Lenski⁹ or Jackson¹⁰ one finds a considerably smaller percentage of people are balanced than in their studies. Lenski, for instance, reports that 72 per cent of his respondents were balanced and Jackson 23 per cent. Clearly, there is a large variation in the findings between Lenski and Jackson and an even greater variation between Lenski and the results given here.

Perhaps the reasons for such a large variation in the number of balanced people can be found in either the different samples involved or in the way in which balance is defined and measured. In the former case, one would have to maintain that different groups in society experience differing degrees of rank balance. One can find groups of individuals with combinations of status variables which could lead to very high rates of imbalance. Hughes,¹¹ for instance, writes about such a possibility when he examines the consequences of doctors having low racial status. However, it is difficult to use this argument in explaining the different percentages of balanced subjects in Lenski's and Jackson's reports since they both use random samples of adults and it is unlikely that such variations in balanced people would be caused by this factor. The differences between the students' responses and these others may lie in the fact that different evaluative criteria are used; for example, the students evaluate on interpersonal characteristics as opposed to such criteria as income or education, or be attributable to the fact that the students are at a stage in the life cycle where their ranks have not had time to become stabilized and balanced. Such arguments, however, would not explain why Lenski and Jackson have such different results and, therefore, it seems most likely that the differences in balance are a reflection of the way in which rank balance is measured.

The rank balance process will be increasingly complex as the number of ranks on the evaluative criteria increases

and as the number of criteria used also increases. In this latter case, the students do not differ very greatly from other research. Although the number of criteria the students rank on varies between individuals, the average of 3.9 for men and 5.1 for women is close to the 3 or 4 criteria which are the numbers frequently used by other researchers. In the small number of cases of balance found in this study, however, it did appear that the number of criteria might be an influencing factor, at least for the men. Since there are such a few cases such a conclusion is very tentative. Further, in comparing Lenski and Jackson one does not find a relationship between the number of evaluative criteria and the percentage of respondents balanced such that as the former increases the latter decreases. In fact, the opposite is the case. On the basis of such evidence it seems unlikely that the number of evaluative criteria used is a very significant factor in the issue of balance in this case.

This indicates that the most important issue is the question of how many ranks are used in the evaluation of people. Whilst other researchers have used various procedures different from the ones adopted here in order to define balance, one factor they all have in common is that fewer ranks are considered. In many instances, there are only three possible ranks and although Lenski creates ten he eventually reduces all the ranks on four different hierarchies to one common score.¹² Consequently, it was decided to reduce the number

of ranks available and to investigate the extent to which the number of balanced people would vary as the number of possible ranks was altered. Even though the number of ranks is reduced, the same definition of balance given by Zelditch and Anderson can be used here as previously.

The ranks were reduced from the maximum number possible to three and then to two, which is the minimum number possible. In the case of the three rank condition a procedure similar to Jackson's was adopted.¹³ He does not write simply of balance and imbalance but rather of balance and degrees of imbalance. He ranks people on three criteria--occupation, education and racial-ethnic background. These criteria were each divided into three ranks and every respondent was assigned a rank on each of the three criteria. Respondents could then be divided into several categories according to the pattern of their ranks. People's ranks were defined as balanced if they had the same rank on all three dimensions. Moderately imbalanced persons had two ranks the same and a third one one rank-step away, e.g., 223, 112. Two categories of sharply imbalanced statuses were also devised. These consisted of persons with no ranks alike and those who had two ranks alike but a two-rank step separating the third dimension from the other two, e.g., 123, 331.

In order to create three ranks from the total number of ranks the students used, the ranks in each bay were divided into thirds. When it was impossible to do this so that the

thirds had identical numbers of ranks within them, the ranks were divided so that the first and third categories always had the same number. The rankings the students had assigned to others were then reassigned to one of these three new ranks in the following way. If a student had an original rank which placed him/her within the top third of ranks in a bay, then he/she was reassigned a rank of one; if the original rank placed them in the second third they were given a rank of two; and if in the bottom third a rank of three.

A similar procedure was followed in creating only two possible ranks within a bay. Here the ranks in the bay were divided into two and the original ranks reassigned. Students whose original ranks placed them in the top half of the ranks were given a rank of 1, otherwise they ~~were~~ reassigned a rank of 2. When the ranks would not divide evenly, the extra rank was added to the top half of ranks.

Although the number of ranks has been reduced, Zelditch and Anderson's definition of balance is still applicable. Thus, with only two ranks to consider, a person is balanced if all his/her reassigned ranks are the same, i.e., all one or all two; otherwise, a person is imbalanced. In the case of three ranks, the procedure was varied to the extent that degrees of imbalance were distinguished and not just imbalance per se. Students were again defined as balanced if they had the same rank on all dimensions. They were

considered moderately imbalanced if they had ranks which were only one rank step away from each other, e.g., 1122, 2223, and sharply imbalanced if their ranks were two rank steps away. This could mean that a student's ranks were, for example, 1133, or that the student was assigned all possible ranks, for example, 1123.

When one analyzes the percentage of students balanced under these reworked definitions it is clear that the percentage of balanced cases is, however, still small and reaches a maximum of 34 per cent for men under the two rank condition. As the two rank condition presents the minimum number of ranks which could be considered under Zelditch and Anderson's definition of balance, it is apparent that the percentage of balance fluctuates between 1.59 per cent and 34 per cent for men and 0.71 per cent and 27 per cent for women, depending on the precise definition used. See Table XIII. The percentage difference between men and women who are balanced under the two-rank definition are not very large although they are significant at the .001 level ($X^2 = 12.75$, $df = 1$). Whilst it is possible that the difference arises because men are more likely than women to see each other as having balanced ranks, it is most likely that differences are due to the different size of the bays. All the men's bays were larger than the women's and this results in there being a greater range of ranks under which the men can still be defined as balanced.

When comparisons are made between the two men's bays and the two women's bays which are closest in size (Bays M1 and M2 and F3 and F6), one finds that there are no significant differences between the men and women in the distribution of the ranks into balanced and imbalanced categories. It would seem, therefore, that the differences which are observed between men and women when all the bays are considered are likely to be a result of the differences in the sizes of the bays and the effect this has on the definition of balance.

TABLE XIII

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OTHERS' RANKINGS
UNDER THREE CONDITIONS OF BALANCE, BY SEX

	RANKINGS OF OTHERS			
	MEN		WOMEN	
	Balanced	Imbalanced	Balanced	Imbalanced
All ranks	1.59%	98.41%	0.71%	99.29%
3 ranks	20%	80%	13%	87%
2 ranks	34%	66%	27%	73%
N		1626		842

Under the three-rank condition the men and women have very similar distributions of ranks. See Table XIV. For both sexes, the number of students with balanced ranks is the smallest of the three categories and the moderately imbalanced category is the largest. The fact that for both men and women nearly 40 per cent of others' rankings are sharply imbalanced

is an indication that the ranks vary quite considerably and are not even relatively close to one another.

TABLE XIV
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OTHERS' RANKINGS
UNDER THE THREE RANK DEFINITION OF BALANCE, BY SEX

	RANKINGS OF OTHERS	
	MEN	WOMEN
Balanced	20% (286.59)	13% (148.41)
Moderately imbalanced	43% (726.69)	48% (376.31)
Sharply imbalanced	37% (612.72)	39% (317.28)
N	100% (1626) 100%	100% (842) 100%
$\chi^2 = 18.73$ $df = 2$ Significant at .001 level		

When balance was defined using all the possible ranks it was indicated that the cases of balance were attributable to the rankings of just one or two individuals, particularly among the men. In contrast to this it is found that, when balance is defined under the three-rank or two-rank condition, the incidences of balance are not due to the rankings of just a few people. Under both of these definitions the majority of students see at least one person as having balanced ranks. Conversely, the majority of individuals are also seen to be balanced by at least one person in their bay. When three ranks

are used, 75 per cent of the women and 90 per cent of the men are assigned balanced ranks by at least one individual. These percentages increase to 93 per cent and 96 per cent respectively when only 2 ranks are considered. Since there is a great variation in who is seen to have balanced ranks, there are very few instances where a majority of students rank the same person as balanced. Under the 3 rank condition this only occurs 4 times (3 times amongst the men and once amongst the women). Such instances of agreement are increased considerably when the ranks are reduced to two such that 22 per cent of the men and 19 per cent of the women are assigned balanced ranks by at least half of the bay members.

From these figures it is evident that as the number of balanced cases increases the number of different individuals who assign such ranks also increases as does the number of different students who are considered balanced by at least one person. Despite such increases, however, it is rank imbalance which is still characteristic of most people's rank structure.

The findings which are reported here in relation to others' balance can be seen to apply also when one looks at self-rankings and self-balance. Using Zelditch and Anderson's definition with the maximum number of ranks, one finds that no student assigns him/herself the same rank on all the criteria he/she uses. Consequently, under this definition, no one has balanced ranks.

The discrepancy in the ranks the students assign themselves can be seen by the fact that only 25 students had a range of ranks which was three or less. Consequently, it cannot be maintained that students, although not having ranks which were completely balanced, did have ranks which were fairly closely aligned. The discrepancy in ranks is demonstrated again when the definition of balance is reworked as previously. Under both the three-rank and the two-rank conditions of balance a majority of individuals were imbalanced. See Table XV. In the three-rank definition the men and women show the same pattern of ranks as was reported in the discussion on others' balance in that the moderately imbalanced category has the greatest number of persons in it, followed by the sharply imbalanced and then the balanced categories. See Table XVI. Referring again to Table XV, one can see that there is a considerable difference between the percentage of men and women balanced under the two-rank condition. The distribution of ranks between the balanced and imbalanced categories does not show such a wide variation for men as it does for women, a variation which may, in part, arise from the different sized bays and the influence this has on the definition of balance as discussed when considering others' balance. The differences between men's and women's self-rankings under the two-rank definition are significant at between the .01 and .001 levels ($\chi^2 = 8.2$, $df = 1$) when all the bays are included, but comparisons between the men's and women's bays closest in size reveal no significant differences in this regard.

TABLE XV
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELF-RANKINGS UNDER
THREE CONDITIONS OF BALANCE, BY SEX

	SELF-RANKINGS			
	MEN		WOMEN	
	Balanced	Imbalanced	Balanced	Imbalanced
All ranks	0% ^{0/}	100%	0%	100%
3 ranks	15%	85%	14%	86%
2 ranks	40%	60%	19%	81%
N	89		72	

TABLE XVI
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELF-RANKINGS UNDER
THE THREE RANK DEFINITION OF BALANCE, BY SEX

	SELF-RANKINGS	
	MEN	WOMEN
Balanced	15% ^{0/}	14%
Moderately imbalanced	53%	47%
Sharply imbalanced	32%	39%
N	100% (89)	100% (72)

From the preceding analysis of the students' ranks it can be seen that rank imbalance is more characteristic of the members of this social system than is rank balance. Even under the least restrictive definition of balance possible the balanced students are a minority of the cases. The fact that

the percentage of people with balanced ranks varies according to the definition of balance which is used is, however, the most significant factor of these findings and one which has important implications for the expected responses to imbalance. If there is no agreement on who has balanced ranks and who does not, then it is not possible to explain differential behaviour by reference to that concept. Nevertheless, as a large percentage of the students do have imbalanced ranks no matter which definition of balance is used, it is important to look at the students' responses to this condition. As the theory states that imbalanced ranks are unstable and produce stress, it is predicted that people will attempt to create rank balance. In view of their imbalance, one would expect the students to try to do this and it is this reaction to their situation which is considered in the following pages. The analysis is based on the students' self-rankings and the preferred ranks which were stated in the questions dealing with this issue.

Response to Imbalance

The students' responses to imbalance are examined in relation to their desire for rank mobility.¹⁴ In order for this response to be possible, it is assumed that a person's mobility is not blocked and that the person does indeed wish to be mobile.¹⁵ The manner in which a person may move his/her ranks is dependent on whether the ranks are contingent or non-contingent. An examination of the evaluative hierarchies

used by the students indicates that they do not appear to be interdependent; for example, a student's rank on the criterion, athletic ability, does not depend on his rank on being helpful. In the following analysis, therefore, all the ranks are considered to be non-contingent. Because of this it is expected that students will seek to raise their lower ranks to the level of their higher ones.¹⁶ This prediction rests on two further assumptions which were discussed on page 23. These assumptions state, firstly, that a person would wish to have a positive self-evaluation,¹⁷ and secondly, that that evaluation is no less positive than the evaluation significant others have of him/her.¹⁸

Using some of the data collected in this study, it is possible to test the second of these assumptions. In order to do this the rank a student assigned him/herself on the general status hierarchy was compared to the median rank on that evaluation calculated from the rankings all the other students gave him/her. If the self-assigned rank was higher than or equal to the median rank, then a student was considered to have self-evaluation which was at least as positive as the evaluations others held of him/her. The majority of the students do, in fact, hold such evaluations of themselves. Sixty per cent of the men (N=89) and 59 per cent of the women (N=72) conform to the restriction assumed by Zelditch and Anderson. However, there is still a large number of individuals for whom this is not the case. Consequently, when studying the response to

imbalance, the group with the lower self-evaluation will be compared to the group for whom self-evaluation and evaluation of others more nearly coincides. As the theory has been established on the assumption that people do have a self-evaluation at least as positive as that held of them by significant others, one would expect that students with low self-evaluation may not react to imbalance in the predicted way. For instance, they may not raise their lowest rank since they do not think that their evaluations should be any higher.

Two questions relating to rank mobility were asked and the results from each of these questions will be discussed separately. In the first question, students indicated preferred ranks on the criteria but each time assuming that only one rank could be altered and that all the other ranks would stay as they were. The second question allowed the students to move their ranks on all the evaluative criteria at the same time. In most of the instances the students' ranks are so varied that they could not achieve balance in one move. This is the case no matter which of the three definitions of rank balance is used. In view of this, the students' responses were analyzed by determining the extent to which rank mobility reduced the range of ranks. A reduction in the range is defined as an increase in balance. Other moves may either decrease the balance--by increasing the range of ranks--or cause no change in the extent to which a person can be said to be balanced.

The results obtained from both of the mobility questions show that 78 per cent of both the men (N=89) and the women (N=72) wished for some change in their ranks. On the first mobility question these 127 students who stated preferred ranks did so for an average of 3.1 ranks among the women and an average of 2.4 ranks among the men. This resulted in 175 ranks being altered by the women and 170 by the men. Seven women and eight men altered their ranks on all the criteria used but the rank which was altered by most people was the one on which they ranked themselves lowest. Sixty-seven per cent of the women and 71 per cent of the men would move this rank. The next most frequently altered rank, however, was that on which a student ranked highest. This characterized 34 per cent of the male students and 39 per cent of the female students who stated preferred ranks and showed a desire by these students to have an even higher evaluation on this hierarchy.

Under the definition of balance which used all the ranks every student was imbalanced and, therefore, it could be expected that all of them would wish to alter their ranks. The fact that 34 of them do not choose to do so indicates that imbalance is not felt to be disturbing by all of the students. It is also apparent in studying the responses the students do make that the preferred ranks most frequently do not lessen a person's imbalance. Of the 175 changes the women make only 19 per cent result in an increase in rank balance. The

corresponding figure for men was 29 per cent out of 170 changes. All the other changes meant that the extent of rank balance either remained unchanged or actually decreased. See Table XVII. These results are found because many students state preferred ranks which are higher on the evaluative hierarchies but show no concern with the extent to which their ranks may be of like order. This can be seen by the fact that although a majority of the students do wish to raise their lowest rank in accordance with Zelditch and Anderson's prediction, even this does not mean that rank imbalance is reduced. Twenty-seven per cent of the female students and 18 per cent of the males who do raise their lowest rank do so in such a way that their rank balance is decreased. This occurred if a person had ranks in the middle range of possible ranks and then raised the lowest rank above the level of the highest one. For instance, if a person had ranks 8,9,14,16 on four evaluative criteria and raised the rank 16 to rank 5, then the degree of imbalance was increased.

TABLE XVII

FIRST QUESTION ON MOBILITY: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF PREFERRED RANKS UNDER THE ALL-RANK DEFINITION
OF BALANCE, BY SEX

	MEN	WOMEN
Increase Balance	29% (41.39)	19% (42.61)
Decrease Balance	52% (98.55)	65% (101.45)
No Change	19% (30.05)	16% (30.94)
Total	100% (170)	100% (175)

If one considers the students who were defined as balanced or imbalanced under the three-rank and the two-rank definitions of balance, one is able to compare the responses of each of these groups to each other. If imbalanced ranks produce stress and are unstable, one would expect that students who are imbalanced will show a greater tendency to increase their rank balance in order to alleviate the situation in which they find themselves. For the men, there are no significant differences between the responses made by the balanced as opposed to the imbalanced group under either the three-rank or the two-rank condition. See Tables XVIII and XIX. The same result is found for women under the two-rank definition of balance but when balance is defined using three ranks, one finds a significant difference between the balanced and the imbalanced categories. See Tables XX and XXI. Although only 18 changes are made by women who are balanced under the three-rank condition, all but one of the changes resulted in a decrease in balance as opposed to the results from the other groups where more of the changes increased or did not alter their balance. This result runs counter to the expected behaviour in that the women who were balanced alter their ranks such that they become less balanced. It can also be seen that the imbalanced groups make more changes which result in a decrease in balance rather than an increase. This result is found for both men and women. The women generally show a greater tendency than do the men to state ranks that decrease their balance. It was seen that

this was the case when all the ranks were considered and is found also under the redefinitions of balance. Under the two-rank condition, the difference between men and women are quite significant in this regard. See Table XXII.

TABLE XVIII

FIRST QUESTION ON MOBILITY: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF
PREFERRED RANKS UNDER THE THREE-RANK DEFINITION OF
BALANCE, FOR MEN

	BALANCED	MEN: MODERATELY IMBALANCED	SHARPLY IMBALANCED
Increase Balance	17% (3.82)	28% (26.47)	34% (19.71)
Decrease Balance	68% (6.65)	50% (46.06)	49% (34.29)
No Change	17% (2.52)	33% (17.47)	17% (13.00)
Total	100% (13)	100% (90)	100% (67)

$$X^2 = 3.82$$

$$df = 4$$

Significant at between .50 and .30 levels.

TABLE XIX

FIRST QUESTION ON MOBILITY: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF
PREFERRED RANKS UNDER THE TWO-RANK DEFINITION OF
BALANCE, FOR MEN

	MEN	
	BALANCED	IMBALANCED
Increase Balance	34% (16.83)	31% (36.16)
Decrease Balance	42% (25.73)	50% (55.28)
No Change	24% (11.44)	19% (24.56)
Total	100% (54)	100% (116)
$\chi^2 = 0.86$		
df = 2		
Significant at between .70 and .50 levels		

TABLE XX

FIRST MOBILITY QUESTION: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF
PREFERRED RANKS UNDER THE TWO-RANK DEFINITION
OF BALANCE, FOR WOMEN

	WOMEN	
	BALANCED	IMBALANCED
Increase Balance	15% (7.82)	22% (28.18)
Decrease Balance	66% (24.54)	64% (88.46)
No Change	19% (5.65)	14% (20.35)
Total	100% (38)	100% (137)
$\chi^2 = 0.95$		
df = 2		
Significant at between .70 and .50 levels		

TABLE XXI

FIRST QUESTION ON MOBILITY: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF
PREFERRED RANKS UNDER THE TREE-RANK DEFINITION OF
BALANCE, FOR WOMEN

	BALANCED	WOMEN MODERATELY IMBALANCED	SHARPLY IMBALANCED
Increase Balance	7% (3.50)	16% (18.46)	29% (12.05)
Decrease Balance	93% (11.62)	69% (61.34)	48% (40.03)
No Change	0% (2.88)	15% (15.20)	23% (9.92)
Total	100% (18)	100% (95)	100% (62)

$\chi^2 = 15.38$ df = 4
Significant between .01 and .001 levels

TABLE XXII

FIRST QUESTION ON MOBILITY: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF
PREFERRED RANKS UNDER THE TWO-RANK DEFINITION OF
BALANCE, BY SEX

	BALANCED		IMBALANCED	
	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
Increase Balance	33% (14.09)	16% (9.91)	30% (29.80)	22% (35.20)
Decrease Balance	43% (28.17)	66% (19.83)	50% (66.94)	64% (79.06)
No Change	24% (11.74)	18% (8.26)	20% (19.26)	14% (22.74)
Total	100% (54)	100% (38)	100% (116)	100% (137)

Balanced Men and Women
 $\chi^2 = 5.26$ df = 2
Significant at between
.10 and .05 levels

Imbalanced Men and Women
 $\chi^2 = 5.24$ df = 2
Significant at between
.10 and .05 levels

The results presented show clearly that for both men and women the expected behaviour patterns are not found, since most changes result in a decrease rather than an increase in balance. This is the case whether the people were defined as balanced or imbalanced and thus it cannot be shown that the students with imbalanced ranks were reacting differently from those with balanced ranks in an attempt to alleviate the stress attributed to their situation. For all groups the desire is to have higher evaluations on the criteria and there does not appear to be a significant concern with balancing ranks.

The results from the second question on mobility are somewhat different from those discussed above. There are no significant differences between the men and women in the way in which they move their ranks but in contrast to the previous findings, more of the changes result in an increase in balance rather than a decrease. See Tables XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI and XXVII. Also under the three-rank definition of balance, the differences between the balanced and the imbalanced groups are significant for both men and women. The sharply imbalanced groups show a greater tendency to make changes which increase their balance than do the balanced groups. For men the greater the degree of imbalance the more they are likely to state changes which would increase their balance. This pattern is slightly different for the women because more of the moderately imbalanced group state preferences which would neither increase or decrease their balance than occurs among the men. See Tables

XXIV and XXV. Under the two-rank definition of balance, differences between the balanced and the imbalanced groups with respect to changes in rank are not significant but generally the groups show a greater tendency to increase rather than decrease balance. Only among the women who are balanced under this definition does one not find a majority of people increasing their balance. See Tables XXVI and XXVII.

TABLE XXIII

SECOND QUESTION ON MOBILITY: PERCENTAGE
DISTRIBUTION OF PREFERRED RANKS UNDER THE
ALL-RANK DEFINITION OF BALANCE, BY SEX

	MEN	WOMEN
Increase Balance	64% (43.05)	57% (33.95)
Decrease Balance	25% (19.01)	29% (14.99)
No Change	11% (8.94)	14% (7.06)
Total	100% (71)	100% (56)

$$x^2 = .56$$

$$df = 2$$

Significant at between .80 and .70 levels

TABLE XXIV

SECOND QUESTION ON MOBILITY: PERCENTAGE
DISTRIBUTION OF PREFERRED RANKS UNDER THE
THREE-RANK DEFINITION OF BALANCE, FOR MEN

	BALANCED	MEN MODERATELY IMBALANCED	SHARPLY IMBALANCED
Increase Balance	43% (4.44)	59% (25.35)	74% (15.22)
Decrease Balance	43% (1.77)	33% (10.14)	9% (6.08)
No Change	14% (0.79)	8% (4.51)	17% (2.70)
Total	100% (7)	100% (40)	100% (24)

$$x^2 = 6.65 \quad df = 4$$

Significant at between .20 and .10 levels

TABLE XXV

SECOND QUESTION ON MOBILITY: PERCENTAGE
DISTRIBUTION OF PREFERRED RANKS UNDER THE
THREE-RANK DEFINITION OF BALANCE, FOR WOMEN

	BALANCED	WOMEN MODERATELY IMBALANCED	SHARPLY IMBALANCED
Increase Balance	50% (4.57)	46% (16.00)	75% (11.43)
Decrease Balance	50% (2.29)	36% (8.00)	10% (5.71)
No Change	0% (1.14)	18% (4.00)	15% (2.86)
Total	100% (8)	100% (28)	100% (20)

$$x^2 = 7.33 \quad df = 4$$

Significant at between .20 and .10 levels.

TABLE XXVI

SECOND QUESTION ON MOBILITY: PERCENTAGE
DISTRIBUTION OF PREFERRED RANKS UNDER THE
TWO-RANK DEFINITION OF BALANCE, FOR MEN

	MEN	
	BALANCED	IMBALANCED
Increase Balance	61% (14.44)	57% (26.56)
Decrease Balance	31% (6.69)	23% (12.31)
No Change	8% (3.87)	20% (7.13)
Total	100% (25)	100% (46)

$\chi^2 = 1.83$ df = 2
Significant at between .50 and .30 levels

TABLE XXVII

SECOND QUESTION ON MOBILITY: PERCENTAGE
DISTRIBUTION OF PREFERRED RANKS UNDER THE
TWO-RANK DEFINITION OF BALANCE, FOR WOMEN

	WOMEN	
	BALANCED	IMBALANCED
Increase Balance	42% (7.07)	63% (25.94)
Decrease Balance	42% (3.21)	23% (11.78)
No Change	16% (1.71)	14% (6.28)
Total	100% (12)	100% (44)

$\chi^2 = 2.13$ df = 2
Significant at between .50 and .30 levels

When one compares the responses to mobility which the students with a positive self-evaluation gave as opposed to those with a low self-evaluation, one finds no significant differences between the two groups. Students with a high self-evaluation are no more balanced than those with a low self-evaluation when the original ranks are considered and do not show any greater tendency to wish to increase their balance. Consequently, the student's self-evaluation does not appear to be an important factor either in the original assignment of ranks or in the response to imbalance.

From the data presented in this chapter it would appear that the central issues of rank balance theory have to be questioned. Although the students give unique ranks to each other and themselves it is apparent that they do not have ranks of the same order on the different evaluative criteria. The extent of rank balance, however, varies with the precise definition of balance which is used. This has consequences for the students' responses to the questions dealing with imbalance since it is only under the three-rank condition in the second mobility question where all ranks can be moved simultaneously that there are significant differences between the balanced and the imbalanced groups such that the imbalanced groups show a greater preference for changes which would increase their balance and thus act in a manner predicted in the theory. In the first mobility question,

where students could only state a preferred rank for each of the evaluative criteria in turn, the changes made seem to reflect a wish for higher evaluations regardless of whether this decreases or increases rank balance. Preferred ranks stated in answer to the second mobility question are more likely to result in an increase in balance. The students again show a wish for higher ranks on the evaluative criteria, but the result of stating their preferences is an increase in balance in many cases. Under these conditions, therefore, some students do want to have ranks which are more closely alike but there are only six students who state preferred ranks which would make them balanced under the all-rank definition. The results from these questions suggest that students are generally more concerned with having higher evaluations on particular hierarchies than with rank balance per se. The possible exception to this statement may occur when the three-rank definition of balance is used and people are able to alter all their ranks. As it is the sharply imbalanced group which shows the greatest tendency to increase balance this may imply that people do experience dissatisfaction when some of their ranks are in the top third of possible positions and some are in the lowest third. This suggests that a definition of balance based on three ranks may be the one which will allow differences in behaviour due to discrepant ranks to be observed.

FOOTNOTES

¹See for example, Karl E. Bauman, "Status Inconsistency, Satisfactory Social Interaction, and Community Satisfaction in an Area of Rapid Growth," Social Forces, 47 (1968), pp. 45-52; Irwin Goffman, "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution," American Sociological Review, 22 (1957), pp. 275-281; Elton Jackson, "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress," American Sociological Review, 27 (1962), pp. 469-480; G. Lenski, "A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status," American Sociological Review, 19 (1954), pp. 405-413; Gary B. Rush, "Status Consistency and Right Wing Extremism," American Sociological Review, 32 (1967), pp. 86-92.

²K. Dennis Kelly and William J. Chambliss, "Status Consistency and Political Attitudes," American Sociological Review, 31 (1966), pp. 375-382. This is probably the only report of the many dealing with rank imbalance and using survey data which refers specifically to the respondents' perception of imbalance. Here the authors are concerned with the respondents' perception of their rank on income, occupation and education.

³In the experimental research, the researcher is more certain that the subjects are aware of their relative ranks on the hierarchies of evaluation. See for example, Arlene Brandon, "Status Congruence and Expectations," Sociometry, 28 (1965), pp. 272-284, and E. Burnstein and Robert B. Zajonc, "The Effect of Group Success in the Reduction of Status Incongruence in Task-Oriented Groups," Sociometry, 28 (1965), pp. 349-362. In the research based on survey data it is not necessarily the case that respondents are aware of their rank balance or imbalance. See for example, Karl E. Bauman, op. cit.; G. Lenski, op. cit.; and Elton Jackson, op. cit. This implies that there have been two different approaches to the question of rank balance. In one approach it is assumed that people are aware of their own rank balance or imbalance, whilst in the other the concept of rank balance is used to interpret "compensatory" behaviour using data that does not include information about specific comparison processes.

⁴Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, "On the Balance of a Set of Ranks," in Sociological Theories in Progress, Vol. I, edited by Joseph Berger, Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966, p. 248.

⁵For example, Arlene Brandon, op. cit.; Elton Jackson, op. cit.; E. Burnstein and Robert B. Zajonc, op. cit.

⁶Karl E. Bauman, op. cit.; and G. Lenski, op. cit.

⁷Elton Jackson, op. cit.

⁸David R. Segal, Mady W. Segal and David Knoke, "Status Inconsistency and Self-Evaluation," Sociometry, 33 (1970), pp. 347-357.

⁹G. Lenski, op. cit.

¹⁰Elton Jackson, op. cit.

¹¹Everett C. Hughes, "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status," American Journal of Sociology, 50 (1944), pp. 353-359.

¹²G. Lenski, op. cit., pp. 407-408.

¹³Elton Jackson, op. cit., pp. 471-472.

¹⁴Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, op. cit., pp. 260-261.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 262.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 260.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 260.

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 249-250.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

From the data presented in the preceding chapters, it is possible to reassess Zelditch and Anderson's theory of rank balance. Although it is not feasible to decide to accept or reject the theory on the basis of research conducted in one special system, it is possible to suggest where the theory has received support and where, on the other hand, it may need to be modified. The following discussion, therefore, will focus on two interrelated issues. One will be to look at the theoretical implications of this research insofar as generalizations can be made from the residences to other social systems. Such generalizations may in some instances be limited by the special characteristics of the social system which was studied. Nevertheless, conclusions drawn from the data obtained in the residences will allow one to make observations about the usefulness of rank balance theory as an explanatory approach in that context and some of the conclusions will have a more general importance and relevance. From the discussion of these conclusions the second issue of concern will be developed which will be to suggest directions for future research. Such research would need to be undertaken in order to further the attempts to establish the validity of this theory and to answer some of the problems which have been raised by the research reported here.

The precondition Zelditch and Anderson place on their theory, namely that social status is a multidimensional characteristic, does receive support from these data. As was mentioned previously, these assumptions were tested in order to see whether the bases from which Zelditch and Anderson proceed to develop their theory could be supported. The fact that they were indicates that rank balance theory has a logical and established foundation. Thus, the students assigned unique ranks to themselves and others on the general status hierarchy. They also indicated the evaluative criteria which were important to them and ranked the students on those hierarchies which were seen to be contributing factors to a person's overall rank. Lastly, they were also able to rank the evaluative criteria as a measure of the relative importance of each of the hierarchies to a student's general status. Once all these factors were entered into Zelditch and Anderson's status equation, it was seen that a considerable amount of the variation in students' rankings was explained as Zelditch and Anderson had assumed.

It appears reasonable to assert that support for the status equation is not peculiar to just the student residences. In this regard, it is expected that members of other social systems would be able to indicate the bases of evaluation relevant to their situations and the relative importance of the evaluations, as well as rank order the members on the overall status hierarchy and on the separate

criteria. This is not to imply that all social systems are necessarily multidimensional, (for instance, members of some religious communities may evaluate only on a criterion such as spirituality), but in such systems there could, of course, be no concern with rank balance. Given the complexity of industrial societies, however, it seems probable that several hierarchies of evaluation are used in most social systems in these societies and there is no reason to assume that students would be any more aware of these evaluative processes than people in other social situations. Therefore, the support obtained here for the assumption Zelditch and Anderson make about the stratification of social systems can be taken as an indication of the validity of the status equation.

Despite the general support for the equation which is given by the data from the students, there are some factors which are not consistent with the expected results. Such issues may be idiosyncratic to the system studied but are worthy of investigation in that they point to problems which may be encountered in research in other settings. The first problem is that the relationship between the number of evaluative criteria used and the total amount of variation explained is not completely uniform. When only a few criteria are used the variation explained fluctuates. This may mean that a minimum number of criteria have to be used in the equation in order to get reasonable predictability, or that this

problem is related to the second issue raised by the results presented. This second issue is that in predicting the overall rank for men the equation does not become increasingly accurate as more than six criteria are used. Of the three factors which are important in the status equation--the evaluative criteria, their relative importance and the rank orderings on the criteria--it is probable that the first factor raises the most difficulties and will account for the problems encountered. The choice of the evaluative criteria is also the most important issue because it is the factor which has to be determined before it is possible to consider either the relative importance of the criteria or the rank orderings of students on them. Although only a rank ordering of the evaluative criteria was obtained from the students as an indication of the criteria's relative importance, the regression analysis preserved this ordering but weighted the criteria such that the greatest total variation could be explained. Unless one doubts the validity of the rank orderings of the evaluative criteria which were given by the students, this element in the status equation does not seem problematic. Also, unless the students attempted to disguise what they thought to be the actual rankings on either the general status hierarchy or the evaluative criteria, one has no reason to assume that the given ranks are not an accurate reflection of the status system as each student saw it. It therefore appears most likely that it is the evaluative criteria which need to be further investigated.

Although the interview procedures were designed to ascertain all the relevant criteria from the students, there was no independent check that this had, in fact, been accomplished. The procedures depended on the students being able to describe the important aspects of behaviour, and it may be the case that some were inadvertently omitted and that others, less important, were included. The determination of the evaluative criteria was the most difficult aspect of the interview and, although the procedures did reveal many of the relevant criteria, future research should seek to improve on the methods used here. It would certainly be desirable if all the relevant criteria could be determined prior to any of the other aspects of the research being conducted. It seems unlikely that one could establish an exhaustive list of criteria but if it were relatively complete it could be used as a reference to ensure that at least all those criteria were considered and rankings given on them if the respondents thought them to be significant. The determination of the evaluative criteria is a crucial aspect of any research on rank balance and is likely to be complex. In the residences, which are comparatively simple social systems in relation to such variables as age and social background, it is apparent that many diverse forms of behaviour are considered important.

The criteria chosen by the students are specific to their situation in the residence and do not give any indication of those criteria likely to be important in other systems.

Consequently, it remains to be seen what criteria different systems may have in common with each other and whether the diversity of criteria found here will be duplicated in other settings. From this study, it appears that there will be little overlap between the evaluative criteria used in the residences and those used in other areas of society. It was apparent that the student status hierarchy was not congruent with that found in the society external to the residences insofar as this was measured by occupational status. Thus, prestige from one's family does not correspond to the prestige a person has in the bay.

Occupational status is, of course, only one criterion which may be seen as relevant in the social system outside the residences. Although in this case there does not appear to be agreement on the evaluative criteria between the two systems, this does not preclude the possibility that there are evaluative criteria in common. The criteria the students use, however, do reflect quite different bases of evaluation from those most frequently used in other studies of rank balance¹ and is again a reflection of the specific nature of the evaluative criteria chosen by the students. Indeed, it can be argued that the students make a deliberate attempt to produce a counter-system to the rest of the society and, therefore, reject the societal bases of evaluation. That this may happen has been seen by some other researchers as an expected pattern of behaviour in

the North American context. It has been argued that this may occur because the structural arrangements of the society are such that young people in formal education are largely segregated from the rest of the society and, therefore, the possibility of producing separate youth cultures, which may be in opposition to the society, is enhanced.² It has also been suggested that such a counter-system is to be expected as part of the process of psychological development. Erikson suggests that in the development of a psychosocial identity, young people experience a "normative crisis in individual development."³ He indicates that young people are at a stage in their development where important decisions are made which will significantly influence their future, for example, choice of occupation. As part of this process Erikson maintains that young people are likely to reject the definitions and expectations held about them by older persons in an attempt to create their own definition of themselves.⁴

The extent to which different social systems do have evaluative criteria in common is an issue which has to be investigated further. If one could determine which criteria two or more systems use, then it would be possible to indicate how the relevant criteria change from one system to the next and the consequences for a person having membership in different social systems. Whilst socio-economic status is unimportant in the residences it does not seem likely that it

will continue to be so when the students move from the university into the employment situation. One could consider the longitudinal changes in the evaluative criteria relevant to people throughout their lifetime or the analysis of different social systems at any given time as a means of studying this problem.

The evaluative criteria in common to different social systems are important to rank balance theory since Zelditch and Anderson use this factor in their definition of subsystems. They maintain that one social system is a subsystem of another if there is at least one evaluative criterion common to both. In view of the criteria the students use and the fact that the comparison between the residences and the outside social system reveal that the status hierarchies are quite different, it is not clear that these social systems are related as Zelditch and Anderson suggest. Consequently, alternative definitions of subsystems could be considered. Although there may be no overlap of evaluative criteria between the residences and the external society, there is certainly an overlap of personnel between the system studied here and the families of which the students are members. Therefore, an alternative way of defining subsystems would be to consider the extent to which they have membership in common.

It seems likely that if one were to consider defining subsystems in terms of common membership it would be necessary

to specify that a certain number of people would have to belong to both or all the systems in question. Without such a limit, one would have to consider two systems to be subsystems of each other even though they might only have one person in common. Such an approach does not seem to be very fruitful as it would create the possibility of having to consider a great variety of small subsystems about which it would not be possible to make any generalizations.

One further possibility in studying subsystems would be to consider both common membership and, as Zelditch and Anderson suggest, common bases of evaluation. If, in fact, there are common members and only one or very few evaluative criteria are relevant to both subsystems, then this would raise questions about the consequences of being evaluated on different criteria in different systems. One could assume that people will give up membership in one system if the bases of evaluation are in conflict with those of another system of which they are also a member, or at least there will be some attempt to counteract what could be a stressful situation. In order to do this, people may try to keep their memberships in the two systems compartmentalized and thereby avoid conflict and tension. It is doubtful, however, if this would be possible under all circumstances since the behaviour and evaluations made of a person in one system may well affect the behaviour that person shows in another situation. It can also be suggested that hostility between various systems will be related to the

extent to which they share common bases of evaluation and each is intent on its evaluations being accepted. Certainly a history of student protest has been documented which occurs over the conflict about the desirability of a particular type of university or society and which is attributable to disagreement over basic values.⁵

In studying the stratification system of the residences, there are other issues of general significance. Perhaps the one issue which appears most clearly is the complexity of the stratification system. This complexity is reflected in the choice of the many different evaluative criteria as significant and relevant to this social system and in the lack of agreement about where people rank. It was previously suggested that the choices of evaluative criteria which the students make reflect somewhat different bases of evaluation between men and women. Such a conclusion would indicate that systematic research on the nature of evaluations made by different people is needed. One might consider that variations in the behaviour and characteristics evaluated would occur not only between men and women but also with respect to other social characteristics and the type of social system analyzed. Many theories of social stratification have been concerned with evaluations made on criteria assumed to be important for the total society. This has resulted in less attention being directed to the nature of interpersonal evaluations and the way in which these may be identical with

or vary from those made at a societal level. The identification of the evaluative criteria are obviously a central problem both in understanding the stratification system in general and in increasing the usefulness of Zelditch and Anderson's status equation.

What is very evident from these data is the fact that members of the same social system, whether men or women, have very different assessments of where people rank in the status hierarchies. Other researchers have reported a similar finding in that they suggest that people will have different perceptions of a status hierarchy depending on where they themselves rank on it.⁶ It has generally been concluded, however, that there is considerable consensus over the rank orderings of individuals or items on particular hierarchies.⁷ Here, one has to conclude that people differ considerably in the rankings of students to the extent that there is very little agreement on who could be seen to occupy even the most or the least prestigious positions in a bay although these could be considered to be the most visible positions. Some of the variation in overall rank can be attributed to the fact that the students see different aspects of behaviour as important and relevant to life in residence. That such a factor does not explain all the observed variation can be seen when one considers that even when students do evaluate on the same criterion, the ranks assigned to others still show very considerable variation.

Although there are some differences between men and women in the level of agreement on the rankings of others which should be investigated further, some of this variation may be explained by the fact that the men were ranked by a greater number of people than the women. This assumes that consensus is related to the number of people involved in the evaluation, an occurrence which may not be found in all situations and for all types of evaluations. In order to more fully understand the stratification system, however, it is necessary that the reasons for the lack of consensus on where people rank be investigated. The study of this issue could not be systematically undertaken in this project, but it would appear that a useful approach would be to study the relationship between the patterns of interaction of members. An associated problem is the degree of information people have about each other and the effect this has on the placement of people on general status ranks and on the ranks of the specific evaluative criteria.

One further issue which relates to the question of consensus on rankings is whether or not the perception of the status hierarchies changes through time. The nature of this study was not such that one could assess how stable the students' rankings were since the residences were studied at only one point in time. It may be the case that the rankings vary through time such that the people a student once thought had high status would be of lower status later. Although such

a concern would not affect the status equation it may be of considerable importance in explaining the lack of consensus about people's rankings. Perhaps agreement on the status hierarchies takes time to be established and the six or seven months the students had lived together were not sufficient for a consensus to be created. Certainly, in any attempt to understand the stratification system it would be advantageous to study if the rankings change with time. The assigned ranks are not the only factor within a social system which may be affected in this way. It is also possible that the actual bases of evaluation may also alter. Just as consensus over the status hierarchies could be a result of relatively prolonged involvement in the system, so may the forms of behaviour seen to be important. Whether or not this occur and if it is characteristic of all, or only some types of social systems, remains to be studied.

The extent to which rank balance can be considered an issue of concern to the students is a central question from these data. Overwhelmingly, the students rank themselves and others such that they are imbalanced. There is no indication in the literature on rank balance of the extent to which different social systems will vary with respect to the proportion of their members who have balanced ranks. Insofar as the students are all imbalanced on their self-rankings and assign imbalanced ranks to virtually everyone else when balance is defined in reference to all possible ranks, it would appear

that this system is at one extreme of a continuum which could range from the case where everyone was imbalanced to the situation in which all members of a system were balanced. The fact that the students appear to represent an extreme case means that ~~any~~ conclusions based on their responses to imbalance must take this into account.

One issue which is of relevance no matter what social system is studied, however, is the definition of rank balance. It was demonstrated that the percentage of students who could be considered to have balanced ranks varied with the precise operationalization of the concept. Such a finding suggests that rank balance is an artifact of the measurement process and raises considerable doubts about the utility of the concept since different researchers would not reach the same conclusions about which people they would consider to be balanced or imbalanced and, therefore, would see different behaviour arising from these states. Zelditch and Anderson do not raise the possibility of there being degrees of imbalance but write only of two possibilities--rank balance and rank imbalance. In view of the fact that the percentage balanced varies with the number of ranks taken into consideration on each of the evaluative criteria, it would seem that the best strategy for future research would be to consider more than these two possibilities. If one considered rank balance as a state with varying degrees it would then be possible to determine what level of rank imbalance has to exist in order for people to react in the

predicted ways. Perhaps only gross rank discrepancies will produce strain. The analysis of the students' responses indicate that the three-rank definition of balance is the most significant of the three definitions used here in that it is the only one which differentiates at all between the balanced and the imbalanced groups in the manner predicted by the theory. Consequently, it would be appropriate to consider using this definition rather than any other. There is, however, no necessary reason why the degree of imbalance which causes a response in one social system would be the same as in other systems. The relevance of this as a factor has to be established.

Although the majority of students were defined as imbalanced on their self-rankings no matter which of the three operationalizations of the concept used, the part of Zelditch and Anderson's theory which presents most problems in the light of these data is the response to imbalance. Students generally did not respond in the expected way in terms of their rank mobility. Many students indicated preferred ranks which would result in higher ranks on particular evaluative hierarchies but which would not create rank balance or lessen the imbalance characteristic of most students. Indeed, some students did not wish to alter any of their ranks at all even though they were not balanced. Consideration, therefore, has to be given to why the students did not seem to be concerned with rank balance.

Several reasons can be put forward as possible explanations. One would be to consider that the students' mobility was blocked.⁸ It was assumed in Chapter IV that the students' mobility was not, in fact, blocked and this assumption still appears most reasonable in view of the evaluation processes. The behavioural characteristics on which the students evaluated each other are not the types of behaviour which are generally subject to outside control. For instance, it would not be possible for someone to block a student from becoming more considerate or being easier to get along with. Particularly as the mobility response was measured in terms of stated preference for another rank, rather than the actual achievement of a different rank, it could not be assumed that a student's mobility was blocked by others.

Part of Zelditch and Anderson's definition of blocked mobility, however, states that blocking could occur if people "do not want or expect to be mobile."⁹ Although students were asked to state whether alternative ranks were preferred, it is possible that students indicated ranks which they thought they could realistically attain. Consequently, some of them may have seen their mobility as blocked because they did not see themselves as acquiring any more of an ability or exhibiting more of a particular form of behaviour. Most of the evaluative criteria are such that a student could increase his/her ranks on the criteria if wishing to do so. For most students, even their rank on a criterion such as athletic ability which may

be seen to depend on innate capacities more than some of the other criteria do, could be increased since the level of ability shown in inter-bay sports, for example, was not particularly high. In view of this it does not seem reasonable to ascribe the lack of mobility to the students' expectations that some ranks could be mobile and that others could not. The idea that blocking is responsible for the way in which students alter their ranks does not, therefore, seem likely and the assumption, that mobility was not blocked by others or because the students could not be mobile, still seems warranted.

One other aspect of blocking has to be considered, however. Zelditch and Anderson state that "the less permanent an imbalance is seen to be, the less mobility is blocked."¹⁰ Only if imbalance is thought to be relatively permanent will an individual respond to imbalance as an undesirable situation. Students cannot be in residence for more than three years and, in many instances, students will be members for only one or two years. Knowing this, students may not be concerned with their imbalance because they see it as being of a short duration and expect it to be resolved when they move out of the system. Zelditch and Anderson do not discuss the possibility of resolving imbalance by moving out of the system. Clearly, however, such a possibility does exist in some cases and is an additional response to imbalance which has to be considered. In doing so, it would be necessary to

investigate under what circumstances it is possible to move from one system to another and when people would choose to do this rather than adopt an alternative solution to imbalance. Whilst Zelditch and Anderson write of imbalance being impermanent or not, no indication is given of how long people will accept imbalance in the expectation of eventually altering that state. Indeed, since Zelditch and Anderson are concerned with someone's expectation about mobility it may be the case that some people will not be concerned with their imbalance because they continue to expect to be mobile even though such expectations are unrealistic from another's viewpoint. If it is assumed that the evaluations made in the residences do not differ very much with time, then it would appear that some students will have been imbalanced for nearly three years, that is, all the time they have been in residence. In this context, imbalance over a three-year period cannot be disturbing. This is undoubtedly related to the fact that students are aware that their movement out of the system will occur within this specified time and that if rank balance is a concern to them it will then be resolved at least in relation to this setting.

If students did not respond to rank imbalance because it was seen to be a problem which was impermanent, then the assumption that students' mobility was not blocked would have to be revised. Although Zelditch and Anderson state that blocking may occur for different reasons they do not imply that this could have consequences for people's behaviour. It

is possible, however, that this would be the case. In this study the students perhaps were not concerned with their imbalance because they saw it as a consequence of their being members of this social system that was of a relatively short duration. If, however, mobility had been blocked by others, then this might have caused them to react differently; for example, they may have questioned the relevance of the evaluations made.

A second explanation of the observed rank alterations may be found in the nature of the comparisons a student makes between him/herself and others. Zelditch and Anderson argue that the response to imbalance relies in part on comparison processes. In order for a person to recognize his/her own imbalance a comparison must have taken place between him/herself and at least one other person. If no comparisons are made, Zelditch and Anderson define the ranks as vacuously balanced and state that such ranks are stable.¹¹ The conditions under which a person may or may not compare him/herself to others are not known but it is unlikely that this could occur in the residences for students must have compared themselves to others in order to establish the rank orderings on general status and on the evaluative criteria. Therefore, it does not seem possible to argue that they would not have compared their own configuration of ranks with that of others in the bay. This would only be a possibility if a person considered each evaluative hierarchy separately and did not

look at a person's total evaluation. As the students ranked all the bay members on overall status, which is a combination of these separate evaluations, this again does not appear possible.

A more feasible explanation for the response the students made can be found in arguing that the comparison processes are insulated.¹² This means that comparisons are made between people who are similarly imbalanced. When this occurs individuals would either not recognize that they have imbalanced ranks or they would recognize the condition but see that nearly everyone else is in the same situation. Consequently, they would not wish to alter their ranks in the direction of balance because balance was not seen to be a usual state and, therefore, the students who were imbalanced would not experience relative deprivation in terms of their rank structure. As a majority of the students were imbalanced whether one considers self-rankings or the rankings which others gave, balance certainly would not be seen as the norm in this situation.

The fact that students chose to alter some of their ranks may simply mean that they do recognize the hierarchical nature of the evaluations and in some cases would prefer to have more of a particular attribute. That this is not always the case could be a reflection of the type of criteria on which they evaluate. The possession of some personal characteristics may not be seen to be that important and consequently,

the students do not put a premium on having high ranks on these criteria. Zelditch and Anderson's theory places no restrictions on the type of evaluations which take place. Thus, they imply that any and all evaluations are equally significant and any imbalance resulting from them equally disturbing. Among the students, the status hierarchies involve behaviour which is not easily identified by people other than those with whom a student is familiar. One cannot, for instance, simply look at another student and determine his/her rank on the criteria used. There has been some discussion in the literature on rank balance that only certain types of imbalance will create tension. In particular, attention has been directed to imbalance between achieved and ascribed statuses; for example, between educational attainment and ethno-racial status.¹³ The evidence is by no means conclusive on this issue, but it has been assumed that a low racial status in conjunction with high achieved status would predispose people to seek a redefinition of the status system through political action. One direction of research which could be explored would be the issue of the visibility of the criteria on which people are evaluated. Insofar as researchers have used race or ethnicity as an ascribed characteristic it may not be the question of race per se which causes people to react in a particular way but that that status is easily assessed by any other person. If it is a question of the visibility of the criteria being important, then one may also find people responding to imbalance when there is imbalance between achieved characteristics which are readily

evaluated by others. In that the criteria used here are not such that a person's rank is easily assessed by others then the students may not be disturbed by their imbalance which is known to relatively few other people some of whom the students may not regard as significant. Only when imbalance is generally acknowledged may it become a source of tension with which a person has to deal.

An additional concern which complicates the balancing process is the lack of agreement over the evaluative criteria and their weightings. Zelditch and Anderson put a condition on their theory in which they state that agreement on the relevant criteria and on the relative importance of the status hierarchies is assumed.¹⁴ They see this condition as a simplifying procedure at this stage in the development of the theory. Such a condition was not assumed in this research because it was clearly untenable. It may be, however, that such assumptions are not simply expeditious at this time but are, in fact, essential to the theory. Perhaps only when there is agreement on the criteria and their weightings will comparisons between people indicate where imbalance exists and produce the stress which would lead to predicted compensatory behaviour patterns. When there is agreement on these basic issues people may feel concerned when they find that their configuration of ranks is different from others. Without such agreement the situation found in the residences may be repeated where unique evaluations do not cause the

students to be concerned with their imbalance insofar as they do not state preferred ranks which necessarily increase their balance in many instances.

One further characteristic of the residences which should be discussed in relation to the students' responses to imbalance is the fact that the residences as a social system can also be defined as imbalanced. Zelditch and Anderson maintain that balance is an attribute not only of individuals' ranks but also of social systems. They write that a social system is balanced if every member has balanced ranks and is imbalanced if one or more members is imbalanced.¹⁵ This definition of an imbalanced system is very extreme in that a balanced social system is likely to be very rare since it only needs one individual to have imbalanced ranks to create system imbalance. Yet, it would seem likely that there will be different consequences for an individual who is the only one who is imbalanced as opposed to being one of a majority in the same situation. It has been suggested that it would be desirable to consider the possibility of individuals having different degrees of imbalance and a similar procedure could be adopted with reference to the balance of a system. A system which is balanced or which has very few imbalanced members may be one in which the bases of evaluation do not change over long periods of time and individuals' ranks are either stable or people move up or down the evaluative hierarchies in the same relation to one another. Such social

systems may be more characteristic of non-industrial societies or occur only where deliberate attempts are made to counteract the effects of a modern industrial state as happens in some utopian communities. It is, perhaps, the case in industrial societies that people are very likely to have imbalanced ranks since there are diverse bases of evaluation and the probability of individuals changing their ranks is high. In this situation, people may accept that imbalanced ranks are normal and thus do not seek to balance them. Having imbalanced ranks may still be stressful but the response to this may not be to try to eliminate the causes of the stress but to seek escape from the consequences.

The present development of the theory does not deal adequately with the consequences for individuals of being in a social system which is highly imbalanced as opposed to a more balanced system. Indeed, one could question whether rank balance would be seen to be a desirable characteristic in all social systems. Industrial societies may be the type of setting where it is more feasible to develop patterns of interaction which make rank imbalance an unimportant issue. For instance, the fact that different spheres of peoples' lives can be compartmentalized may mean that rank imbalance is an insignificant issue in such societies as a person may not be in situations where all the ranks on evaluations are relevant regardless of whether they are balanced or imbalanced. Zelditch and Anderson do not directly consider this possibility

but suggest that the number of imbalanced people in a system may be related to certain responses to imbalance. Thus, stratum mobility depends on their being many people who are imbalanced and the solution to imbalance is dependent on the united efforts of all the imbalanced members rather than on individual attempts. The more extreme responses to imbalance such as conflict and revolution also imply that many individuals in a particular social system are responding to the stress of an undesirable state. Even these predictions are at the present time relatively imprecise since it is not known whether a majority of people in the system have to experience imbalance or whether "many" refers to a smaller but significant number.

In order to determine whether people will react differently in a social system where only very few are imbalanced, as opposed to where everyone is imbalanced, comparisons need to be made between two such different systems. The student residences are an example of a system where imbalance is prevalent and a comparison needs to be made between this system and one where people with balanced ranks constitute a larger proportion of the membership. From this study, one would conclude that rank balance is not a significant issue when the entire social system is very imbalanced, but it is impossible to determine whether this is due to the system being imbalanced or to some other factors such as the

type of evaluations held to be important. At this time the influence of each of these variables is not known.

The issue of whether or not people will respond differently to imbalance depending on whether the system is only slightly imbalanced as opposed to being severely imbalanced is related to the question of the comparisons made between people. As suggested previously, the comparison processes are crucial to a person in recognizing their own balance or imbalance. This aspect of behaviour is not well understood but in order for rank balance theory to be developed further, this is a problem which has to be dealt with. The issue of the significant other¹⁶ is one which is important in other areas of sociological research and in the case of rank balance theory is central to the behaviour being explained. Research has to be directed to the question of with whom people compare themselves and under what circumstances particular comparisons take place. This information is necessary not only in order to be able to assess whether or not people will consider themselves imbalanced but also in order to more fully understand the responses to that state. The expectation a person has about being mobile, for instance, will probably be created through the comparisons a person makes between him/herself and some significant other. Without a better understanding of these comparisons rank balance theory will not be able to provide as satisfactory explanations of people's behaviour.

The conclusions drawn from one social system are not sufficient evidence on which to base a rejection or acceptance of the theory of rank balance. Nevertheless, some of the conclusions indicate that the theory may need to be modified and that future research should be conducted in a social system in which some of the issues raised here could be studied. From this research it appears that rank balance theory may only apply to certain types of social systems and, therefore, its scope has to be limited. Such a possibility could be determined if future research was done in a social system quite different from the student residences. Preferably such a system would be one where there was agreement on the evaluative criteria and their relative importance. At the same time, in order to counteract the likelihood that its members may not respond to imbalance because they can move easily from one system to another, it should be one to which the members have a commitment or at least cannot move without considerable costs to themselves. Comparisons between such a system and the one studied here could then be made in terms of the complexity of the stratification system, the extent to which people are balanced or imbalanced and their response to imbalance. Perhaps, a work situation would be sufficiently different from the student residences to provide important points of comparison. In such a situation, there may be more agreement on the evaluative hierarchies and the evaluations of a person may have more important consequences than they do for the students since they

could affect such factors as income, job security or job control. Research has also to be directed towards answering questions about the bases of evaluation in different social systems and to the role of the significant other in comparison processes. Without a concerted effort in these diverse areas of research the importance of rank balance theory as an explanatory approach cannot be satisfactorily answered.

FOOTNOTES

¹Researchers using the rank balance approach have generally used all or some of the following evaluative criteria: education, income, occupation, ethno-religious status. See for example, G. Lenski, "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status," American Sociological Review, 19 (1954), pp.405-413; Karl E. Bauman, "Status Inconsistency, Satisfactory Social Interaction and Community Satisfaction in an Area of Rapid Growth," Social Forces, 47 (1968), pp. 45-52; David R. Segal, Mady W. Segal and David Knoke, "Status Inconsistency and Self-Evaluation," Sociometry, 33 (1970), pp. 347-357.

²Talcott Parsons, "Youth in the Context of American Society," in Youth: Change and Challenge, ed. by Erik Erikson, Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1963, pp. 93-119.

³Erik H. Erikson, Identity, Youth and Crisis, W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., New York, 1968, p. 42.

⁴Ibid., pp. 15-43 and 232-260.

⁵Richard D. Lambert, editor, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 395 (1971).

⁶Allison Davis, Burleigh Gardner and Mary R. Gardner, Deep South, University of Chicago Press, 1941, p. 65; Norman C. Alexander, Jr., "Status Perceptions," American Sociological Review, 37 (1972), pp. 767-773.

⁷Norman C. Alexander, Jr., "Status Perceptions," American Sociological Review, 37 (1972), pp. 767-773.

⁸Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, "On the Balance of a Set of Ranks," in Sociological Theories in Progress, Vol. I, edited by J. Berger, Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966, pp. 261-263.

⁹Ibid., p. 262.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 262.

¹¹Ibid., p. 250.

¹²Ibid., pp. 259-260.

¹³Edward O. Laumann and David R. Segal, "Status Inconsistency and Ethno-Religious Group Membership as Determinants of Social Participation and Political Attitudes," American Journal of

Sociology, 77 (1971), pp. 36-60; Marvin E. Olsen and Judy Corder Tully, "Socioeconomic-ethnic Status Inconsistency and Preference for Political Change," American Sociological Review, 37 (1972), pp. 560-574.

¹⁴ Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, op. cit., p. 249.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 256-258.

¹⁶ J.A. Davis, "A Formal Interpretation of the Theory of Relative Deprivation," Sociometry, 22 (1959), pp. 280-296; M. Patchen, "A Conceptual Framework and Some Empirical Data Regarding Comparisons of Social Rewards," Sociometry, 24 (1961), pp. 136-156.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Stuart N. "Status, Congruency as a Variable in Small Group Performance." Social Forces, 32 (1953-54), pp. 16-22.
- Alexander, Norman C., Jr. "Status Perceptions." American Sociological Review, 37 (1972), pp. 767-773.
- Aronson, E., and J. Mills. "The Effect of Severity of Initiation on Liking for a Group." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 59 (1959), pp. 171-181.
- Bauman, Karl E. "Status Inconsistency, Satisfactory Social Interaction and Community Satisfaction in an Area of Rapid Growth." Social Forces, 47 (1968), pp. 45-52.
- Bendix, Reinhard, Seymour Martin Lipset. "Karl Marx's Theory of Social Classes." In Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset, editors, Class, Status, and Power. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- Benoit-Smullyan, Emile. "Status, Status Types and Status Interrelationships." American Sociological Review, 9 (1944), pp. 151-161.
- Berger, Joseph, Bernard P. Cohen and Morris Zelditch, Jr. "Status Characteristics and Social Interaction." American Sociological Review, 37 (1972), pp. 241-255.
- Berry, Kenneth J., and Thomas W. Martin. "Some Methodological Dilemmas in Status Inconsistency Analysis." Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal, 9 (1972), pp. 83-94.
- Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. "The Identification Problem and Theory Building: The Case of Status Inconsistency." American Sociological Review, 31 (1966), pp. 52-61.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. "Comment: Status Inconsistency and the Identification Problem." Public Opinion Quarterly, 30 (1966), pp. 130-132.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. "Status Inconsistency and Interaction: Some Alternative Models." American Journal of Sociology, 73 (1967), pp. 305-315.

- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. "Status Inconsistency, Social Mobility, Status Integration and Structural Effects." American Sociological Review, 32 (1967), pp. 790-801.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. "Tests of Status Inconsistency Theory: A Note of Caution." Pacific Sociological Review, 10 (1967), pp. 69-74.
- Bottomore, T.B., Maximilien Rubel (eds.). Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1961.
- Box, Steven and Julianne Ford. "Some Questionable Assumptions in the Theory of Status Inconsistency." Sociological Review, 17 (1969), pp. 187-201.
- Brandmeyer, Gerard. "Status Consistency and Political Behaviour: A Replication and Extension of Research." Sociological Quarterly, 6 (1965), pp. 241-246.
- Brandon, Arlene. "Status Congruence and Expectations." Sociometry, 28 (1965), pp. 272-288.
- Broom, Leonard and F. Lancaster Jones. "Status Consistency and Political Preference: The Australian Case." American Sociological Review, 35 (1970), pp. 989-1001.
- Burnstein, Eugene and Robert B. Zajonc. "The Effect of Group Success on the Reduction of Status Incongruence on Task-Oriented Groups." Sociometry, 28 (1965), pp. 349-362.
- Dahl, Robert A. "The Concept of Power." Behavioural Science, 2 (1957).
- Davis, J.A. "A Formal Interpretation of the Theory of Relative Deprivation." Sociometry, 22 (1959), pp. 280-296.
- Demerath, N.J., III. Social Class in American Protestantism. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965.
- Dollard, John. Caste and Class in a Southern Town. New York: Harper, 1949.
- Drake, St. Clair and Horace R. Cayton. Black Metropolis. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1945.
- Eitzen, Stanley D. "Status Inconsistency and the Cross-Pressures Hypothesis." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 16 (1972), pp. 287-294.

- Erikson, Erik H. Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1968.
- Exline, Ralph V. and R.C. Zillar. "Status Congruency and Interpersonal Conflict in Decision-Making Groups." Human Relations, 12 (1959), pp. 147-162.
- Fauman, Joseph. "Status Crystallization and Interracial Attitudes." Social Forces, 47 (1968), pp. 53-60.
- Festinger, Leon. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Co., 1957.
- Foskett, John N. "Social Structure and Social Participation." American Sociological Review, 20 (1955), pp. 431-438.
- Gardner, Burleigh B. and Mary R. Gardner. Deep South. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- Gerth, H.H. and C. Wright Mills (eds.). From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Translated by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Geschwender, James A. "Continuities in Theories of Status Consistency and Cognitive Dissonance." Social Forces, 46 (1967), pp. 160-171.
- Geschwender, James A. "Status Inconsistency, Social Isolation and Individual Unrest." Social Forces, 46 (1968), pp. 477-483.
- Goffman, Irwin. "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution." American Sociological Review, 22 (1957), pp. 275-281.
- Greenglass, Esther. "The Psychology of Women; or, The High Cost of Achievement." In Women in Canada, edited by Marylee Stephenson. Toronto: New Press, 1973, pp. 108-118.
- Gustafson, David P. and Jack E. Gaumnitz. "Consensus Rankings in Small Groups: Self-Rankings Included and Excluded." Sociometry, 35 (1972), pp. 610-618.
- Hall, Richard H. Occupations and The Social Structure. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Hamilton, V. and P. Freeman. "Academic Achievement and Student Personality Characteristics." British Journal of Sociology, 22 (1971), pp. 31-52.

- Hartman, Moshe. "On the Definition of Status Inconsistency." American Journal of Sociology, 80 (1974), pp. 706-721.
- Heller, Celia S. Structured Social Inequality. London: The Macmillan Co., 1969.
- Hempel, Carl G. Philosophy of Natural Science. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Himmelfarb, S. and D.J. Senn. "Forming Impressions of Social Class: Two Tests of an Averaging Model." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 12 (1969), pp. 38-51.
- Hoge, Dean R. "College Students' Value Patterns in the 1950s and 1960s." Sociology of Education, 44 (1971), pp. 170-197.
- Hollingshead, August B., F.C. Redlich. Social Class and Mental Illness: A Community Study. New York: John Wiley, 1958.
- Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1950.
- Homans, George C. "Status Among Clerical Workers." Human Organization, 12 (1953), pp. 5-10.
- Horner, Matina. "The Motive to Avoid Success and Changing Aspirations of College Women." In Readings on Psychology of Women, edited by Judith M. Bardwick. New York: Harper and Row, 1972, pp. 62-67.
- Hughes, Everett C. "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status." American Journal of Sociology, 50 (1944), pp. 353-359.
- Hyman, Martin D. "Determining the Effects of Status Inconsistency." Public Opinion Quarterly, 30 (1966), pp. 120-129.
- Jackson, E. "Status Consistency and Symptoms of Stress." American Sociological Review, 27 (1962), pp. 469-480.
- Jackson, Elton F. and Peter J. Burke. "Status and Symptoms of Stress: Additive and Interaction Effects." American Sociological Review, 30 (1965), pp. 556-564.
- Jackson, Elton F. and Richard F. Curtis. "Effects of Vertical Mobility and Status Inconsistency: A Body of Negative Evidence." American Sociological Review, 37 (1972), pp. 701-713.

- Kelly, K. Dennis and William J. Chambliss. "Status Consistency and Political Attitudes." American Sociological Review, 31 (1966), pp. 375-382.
- Kenkel, W.F. "The Relationship Between Status Consistency and Political--Economic Attitudes." American Sociological Review, 21 (1956), pp. 365-368.
- Kimberly, James C. "A Theory of Status Equilibration." In Joseph Berger, Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson, Sociological Theories in Progress. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1966, pp. 213-226.
- Knoke, David. "Community and Consistency: The Ethnic Factor in Status Inconsistency." Social Forces, 51 (1972), pp. 23-33.
- Landecker, Werner S. "Class Crystallization and Class Consciousness." American Sociological Review, 28 (1963), pp. 219-229.
- Laumann, Edward O. and David R. Segal. "Status Inconsistency and Ethnoreligious Group Membership as Determinants of Social Participation and Political Attitudes." American Journal of Sociology, 77 (1971), pp. 36-60.
- Lenski, G. "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status." American Sociological Review, 19 (1954), pp. 405-413.
- Lenski, G. "Social Participation and Status Crystallization." American Sociological Review, 21 (1956), pp. 458-464.
- Lenski, G. "Comment on 'Methodological Notes on a Theory of Status Crystallization'." Public Opinion Quarterly, 28 (1964), pp. 326-330.
- Lenski, G. Power and Privilege. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Lenski, G. "Status Inconsistency and the Vote: A Four Nations Test." American Sociological Review, 32 (1967), pp. 298-301.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. Political Man. Garden City: Doubleday, 1963.
- Lundy, Richard M. "Self Perceptions and Descriptions of Opposite Sex Sociometric Choices." Sociometry, 19 (1956), pp. 272-277.
- Lynd, Robert S. and Helen Merrell Lynd. Middletown. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1929.

- Lynd, Robert S. and Helen Merrell Lynd. Middletown in Transition. New York, N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1937.
- Malewski, Andrzej. "The Degree of Status Incongruence and Its Effects." In Reinhard Bendix and Seymour M. Lipset, editors, Class, Status, and Power, revised edition. New York: Free Press, 1966, pp. 303-308.
- Marsland, David. "Some Observations on Stratification." Sociological Analysis, 1 (1971), pp. 107-113.
- Martindale, Don A. The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960.
- Mills, C. Wright. "Review of The Social Life of a Modern Community." American Sociological Review, 7 (1942), pp. 263-271.
- Mitchell, Robert E. "Methodological Notes on a Theory of Status Crystallization." Public Opinion Quarterly, 28 (1964), pp. 315-330.
- Moore, James C., Jr., Eugenie B. Johnson and Martha S.C. Arnold. "Status Congruence and Equity in Restricted Communication Networks." Sociometry, 35 (1972), pp. 519-537.
- Nagi, Saad Z. "Status Profile and Reactions to Status Threats." American Sociological Review, 28 (1963), pp. 440-443.
- Olsen, Marvin E. and Judy Corder Tully. "Socio-economic-ethnic Status Inconsistency and Preference for Political Change." American Sociological Review, 37 (1972), pp. 560-574.
- Parker, Seymour. "Status Consistency and Stress." American Sociological Review, 28 (1963), pp. 131-132.
- Parsons, Talcott. "The American Family: Its Relations to Personality and to the Social Structure." In Family Socialization and Interaction Process, edited by Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955, pp. 3-33.
- Parsons, Talcott. "Youth in the Context of American Society." In Youth: Change and Challenge, edited by Erik H. Erikson, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1963, pp. 93-119.

- Patchen, M. "A Conceptual Framework and Some Empirical Data Regarding Comparisons of Social Rewards." Sociometry, 22 (1961), pp. 136-156.
- Pellegrin, Roland J. and Frederick L. Bates. "Congruity and Incongruity of Status Attributes within Occupations and Work Positions." Social Forces, 38 (1959), pp. 23-28.
- Pfautz, Harold W. and Otis Dudley Duncan. "A Critical Evaluation of Warner's Work in Community Stratification." American Sociological Review, 15 (1950), pp. 205-215.
- Rush, Gary B. "Status Consistency and Right-Wing Extremism." American Sociological Review, 32 (1967), pp. 86-92.
- Sampson, Edward E. "Status Congruence and Cognitive Consistency." Sociometry, 26 (1963), pp. 146-162.
- Segal, David R. "Status Inconsistency Cross-Pressures and American Political Behaviour." American Sociological Review, 34 (1969), pp. 352-359.
- Segal, David R. "Status Inconsistency and Party Choice in Canada: An Attempt to Replicate." Canadian Journal of Political Science, 3 (1970), pp. 471-474.
- Segal, David R. and David Knoke. "Social Mobility, Status Inconsistency and Partisan Realignment in the United States." Social Forces, 47 (1968), pp. 154-167.
- Segal, David R., Mady Segal and David Knoke. "Status Inconsistency and Self-Evaluation." Sociometry, 33 (1970), pp. 347-357.
- Sem, Tove T. "Sex Differences in Academic Behaviour." Acta Sociologica, 14 (1971), pp. 59-67.
- Siegel, S. Non-Parametric Statistics for The Behavioural Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1956.
- Smith, Thomas. "Structural Crystallization, Status Inconsistency and Political Partisanship." American Sociological Review, 34 (1969), pp. 907-921.
- Stehr, Nico. "Status Consistency: The Theoretical Concept and Its Empirical Referent." Pacific Sociological Review, 11 (1968), pp. 95-99.
- Strodtbeck, F.L. and R.D. Mann. "Sex Role Differentiation in Jury Deliberations." Sociometry, 19 (1956), pp. 3-11.

- Svalastoga, Karle. Social Differentiation. New York: David McKay Co., 1965.
- Treiman, Donald J. "Status Discrepancy and Prejudice." American Journal of Sociology, 72 (1966), pp. 651-664.
- Tucker, Robert C. (ed.). The Marx-Engels Reader. New York: W.W.Norton and Co., Inc., 1972.
- Warner, W. Lloyd et al. Democracy in Jonesville. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Warner, W. Lloyd and J.O. Low. The Social System of a Modern Factory. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947, Yankee City Series, Vol. IV.
- Warner, W. Lloyd and Paul S. Lunt. The Social Life of a Modern Community. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941, Yankee City Series, Vol. I.
- Warner, W. Lloyd and Paul S. Lunt. The Status System of a Modern Community. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942, Yankee City Series, Vol. II.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, Marchia Meeker and Kenneth Ells. Social Class in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.
- Warner, W. Lloyd and Leo Srole. The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups. New York: Yale University Press, 1945, Yankee City Series, Vol. III.
- Warren, Donald. "Status Inconsistency Theory and Flying Saucer Sightings." Science, 170 (1970), pp. 599-603.
- Wolff, Kurt H., editor. The Sociology of Georg Simmel. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1950.
- Zelditch, Morris, Jr., and Bo Anderson. "On the Balance of a Set of Ranks." In Sociological Theories in Progress, Vol. I, edited by Joseph Berger, Morris Zelditch, Jr., and Bo Anderson. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966, pp. 244-268.

APPENDIX A

INITIAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Study on Student Relationships

As you will remember from the letter you have received, this is a research project about student relationships. We're looking at certain aspect of students' life in residence.

I should like to thank you for agreeing to be interviewed. Everything you say will be kept confidential and nothing will be written in such a way that particular students can be identified.

Susan M. Clark

-
1. Here is a list of students in your bay. Could you give me a short description of each person on the list--excluding yourself.
 2. It seems to be the case in social organizations, whether hospitals, schools or offices, that some people are looked up to or admired more than others. Could you order the people in this bay from those who are most well thought of to those who are least well thought of. This does not necessarily mean those whom you like best but who is generally well thought of .
 3. Looking at the descriptions of people you have given me, it seems that certain aspects of people's behaviour are important. For instance, if we take the idea of (criteria 1) could you order people from those who are most _____ to those who are least _____.
 4. Are there any other aspects of behaviour which you think are important for people to have. Rank people on these, if any .
 5. Could you order people in terms of those who have the highest academic ability through to those who have least ability.
 6. Repeat for athletic ability.
 7. If we go back over these lists could you indicate where you would place yourself.

8. Taking these criteria that you have ranked others on, can you tell me which you consider most important, next most important, and so on.
9. Suppose that your standing on all the criteria except (criteria 1) were to remain the same, but you could change your position on that criterion, what would your preferred position be? For instance, would you prefer to remain where you are now, or would you prefer to move to a higher position, or prefer to move to a lower position?

Repeat for each criterion in turn.
10. If you could change your position on all the criteria at once, what would your preferred positions be?
11. What year are you in university?
12. What are you studying? What are your courses this year?
13. How long have you lived in this residence?
14. Do you participate in any clubs, organizations or any sort of activities outside your classes?
15. Are there any people in the bay whom you regard as being particular friends of yours? If yes, ask for their names.

BAY DESCRIPTIONS

Interviewee's Name

DIMENSIONAL RANKING

Interviewee's Name

Dimensions (go from high to low)

Insert self-rankings and preferred positions

RANK ORDERING OF THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

Interviewee's NameCriteria (go from high to low)

Interviewee's Name

Year at university:

Course of study:

This year's courses:

Year in residence:

Extracurricular activities:

Friends:

Interviewer's ReportInterviewer:Interviewee:

Sex Male
 Female

Race Negro
 White
 Other (specify)

Interest (high) 1 2 3 4 5(low)

Cooperativeness 1 2 3 4 5

Length of interview

Comments

Information from university recordsStudent's name:

Date of birth:

University enrolled in:

Home town:

Religion:

Occupation of father:

SUPPLEMENTARY SURVEY

MOUNT SAINT VINCENT UNIVERSITY

Below is a list of characteristics which male and female students used to describe people in their university residence. Please study the list and then write down on the attached sheet those characteristics which you think are identical to each other. (You can refer to the characteristics simply by the numbers assigned to them.)

Would you please also answer the following questions?

1. Sex: male
 female

2. Your age: _____

3. Home town: _____

4. What is your actual or intended major? _____

5. Year at university: _____

6. Have you ever lived in a university residence?

Yes _____ No _____

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 02 Academic ability | 31 Reliable |
| 03 Athletic ability | 32 Interested in people |
| 04 Friendly | 33 Same interests |
| 05 Considerate | 34 Appearance |
| 06 Helpful | 35 Nice |
| 07 Easy to talk to | 36 Well organized |
| 08 Bay spirit/being for the residence | 37 No desire for power |
| 09 Sense of humour | 38 Quiet |
| 10 Not moody | 39 Well adjusted |
| 11 Sympathetic | 40 Perceptive |
| 12 Lots of fun | 41 General attitude |
| 13 Easy to get along with | 42 Sociable |
| 14 Easy-going | 43 Generous |
| 15 Mature | 44 Self-awareness |
| 16 Patient | 45 Easy to get to know |
| 17 Trustworthy | 46 Communicative ability |
| 18 Not two-faced | 47 Non-aggressive |
| 19 General temperament | 48 Sense of community |
| 20 Outgoing | 49 Responsible |
| 21 Creative | 50 Respectful |
| 22 Tolerant of other's ideas | 51 Ability to combine
academic matters and
a good time |
| 23 Conscientious student | 52 Willing to try |
| 24 Good listener | 53 Ability to be a
a good friend |
| 25 Has own opinions | 54 College pride |
| 26 Empathetic | 55 Good to talk to |
| 27 Active empathy | 56 Political awareness |
| 28 Activist | 57 Spirituality |
| 29 Understanding | 58 Musical ability |
| 30 Kind | 59 Not shy |
| | 60 Warm and fun loving |

APPENDIX B
CODES FOR THE INITIAL SURVEY

Evaluative Criteria:

Academic ability	Reliable
Athletic ability	Interested in people
Friendly	Same interests
Considerate	Appearance
Helpful	Nice
Easy to talk to	Well organized
Bay spirit	Quiet
Sense of humour	Well-adjusted
Not moody	Perceptive
Sympathetic	General attitude
Lots of fun	Sociable
Easy to get along with	Generous
Easy-going	Self-awareness
Mature	Easy to get to know
Patient	Communicative ability
Trustworthy	Non-aggressive
Not two-faced	Sense of community
General temperament	Responsible
Outgoing	Respectful
Creative	Ability to combine academic matters and a good time
Tolerant of other's ideas	Willing to try
Conscientious student	Ability to be a good friend
Good listener	College pride
Has own opinions	Good to talk to
Empathetic	Political awareness
Active empathy	Spirituality
Activist	Musical
Understanding	Not shy
Kind	Warm and fun-loving

- Religion:
1. Roman Catholic
 2. United Church, Methodist, Presbyterian
 3. Baptist
 4. Anglican
 5. Other religion--Seventh Day Adventist, Pentecostal
 6. No religion
 7. No answer

Occupation of Father:

1. Retired
2. Deceased
3. Professional
4. Businessman--managerial, executive level
5. White-collar
6. Skilled manual
7. Unskilled manual
8. Farmer, fisherman
9. No answer

These occupational categories were reclassified:

- | | |
|-------|---|
| Class | I. Professional, businessman |
| | II. White-collar |
| | III. Skilled manual |
| | IV. Unskilled manual, farmer, fisherman |
| | V. Retired, deceased, no answer |

Home-town:

1. Halifax-Dartmouth
2. Cape Breton
3. South Shore
4. Eastern Shore, including New Glasgow and Antigonish
5. Truro and the Annapolis Valley

6. Outside Canada
7. Other Atlantic province
8. Other Canadian province
9. No answer

University or college registered at:

1. King's
2. Dalhousie
3. Nova Scotia College of Art and Design
4. Other

University programme:

1. 1st year B.A.
2. 2nd year B.A.
3. 3rd year B.A.
4. 1st year B.Sc.
5. 2nd year B.Sc.
6. 3rd year B.Sc.
7. 4th year B.Sc.
8. 1st year LL.B.
9. Pre-medicine
10. 1st year M.D.
11. 2nd year M.D.
12. 1st year D.D.S.
13. 1st year B.Pharm.
14. Nursing Diploma--public health
15. Nursing Diploma--public administration
16. 1st year Phys. Ed.
17. 2nd year Phys. Ed.
18. 3rd year Phys. Ed.
19. 1st year B. Ed.
20. 1st year B. Comm.
21. 2nd year B. Comm.
22. 1st year B. Sc. Eng.

University programme:

- 23. 3rd year B.Sc. Eng.
- 24. 1st year N.S.C.A. and D.
- 25. 2nd year N.S.C.A. and D.
- 26. 3rd year N.S.C.A. and D.
- 27. 1st year B. Litt. Theology
- 28. M.A. or M.Sc.
- 29. No degree

Codes for the Supplementary Survey:

The same codes as used in the initial survey were used for the questions on home-town, major course of study, and university or college registered at.
