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ABSTRACT

The problem of creating stable and healthy urban communities and efficient land use planning is related to the problem of reducing residential mobility. Residential mobility has been defined as "the mechanism by which a family's housing is brought into adjustment to its housing needs". However, it must also be seen as a method of coping with a variety of social, physical and economic problems which, furthermore, create additional problems.

Residential mobility is a reflection of the instability prevailing in our urban society and, at the same time, a contribution to it. There is some evidence that residential mobility promotes mental ill-health, undesirable social conditions, and appears to be the cause of certain urban planning problems.

The purpose of this Thesis is to analyse some of the motivational factors in residential mobility and to investigate the possibility of reducing mobility and instability by providing housing which may satisfy a family's changing housing needs and by creating neighborhoods which assist in the formation of integrated communities.

The contention of this Thesis is that apart from a family's desire to adjust housing to its functional needs, it also has to adjust residence to changing status and prestige needs. It is assumed for certain groups in society that their vertical occupational mobility is the cause of their social
mobility, and that members of these groups periodically adjust their residences primarily in order to satisfy their status and prestige needs. These persons become dissatisfied because of their changing socio-economic status, and although their need for segregation may be anticipated, the features which serve to satisfy their changing needs cannot be incorporated in one dwelling and one neighborhood; therefore, these persons have to move periodically.

The investigation of the relationship between changing status needs and residential adjustment was confined to thirty-nine Middle Management persons employed by a local utility corporation. Attitudes, descriptions, reasons and factual data were obtained by means of an interview schedule. Attitudes and factual data were correlated in order to establish the individual's perception of the relationship between occupational, social and residential mobility. On the basis of ratings provided by the respondents, a "Status Hierarchy of Residential Areas" was developed which served to measure each respondent's "status increase". Subsequently, each person's reasons for moving from a residence and selecting a new residence were analysed, with special focus on the individual's concern with status and prestige. Finally, the results of each separate investigation were correlated and the number of persons were identified who moved for reasons of status and prestige.

The results of the investigation indicate that a majority of the Middle Management group moved into their present or
previous residences in order to adjust residences to their status and prestige needs. Furthermore, a greater number of persons were concerned with the qualities of the residential district rather than the house, as a symbol of their social status.

In the final analysis, the author concludes that residential mobility which is generated by social mobility of certain occupational groups cannot be reduced unless the value structure of this society is altered.
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The purpose of this study is to investigate the extent to which the desire for satisfaction of status and prestige needs motivates people to adjust their residences periodically in accordance with increases in their occupational and social status position.

Part One of this study consists of a discussion of the problems created by residential mobility in promoting "stable and healthy urban communities". The value of the "planned neighborhood" as a means to produce stability are briefly discussed, and the reasons for mobility are summarized from the findings of several investigators. The function of residences as status symbols and as configurations of a system of social values are discussed in detail, and the question is posed whether residential mobility for reasons of status and prestige can be reduced at all. This Part concludes with the discussion of three studies which influenced the approach and methods used in this investigation. These are a study made by Peter H. Rossi, *Why Families Move*, which assesses in minute detail reasons for residential mobility; a study by V. H. Whitney and Ch. M. Grigg, *Mobility among Students' Families*, which is particularly concerned with residential mobility for reasons of status and prestige, and W. H. Whyte Jr., *The Organization Man*, which "is the first complete study of a way of life that many Americans are now leading, and that many more are likely to lead". *The Organization Man* is considered of
importance for this study because it analyses the behavior of a group of persons among whom this investigation was carried out.

Part Two describes the design of the investigation. Some of the basic considerations are discussed which led to the selection of a group of thirty-nine persons from among the Middle Management ranks of the British Columbia Electric Company, Ltd., a private utility company located in Vancouver, B. C. The design of the questionnaire and its use are described, while at the same time the general outline of the investigation and the methods of analysis are indicated.

Part Three describes in detail the methods used in analysing attitude and opinion answers and factual data regarding the relationship between occupational, social, and residential mobility. Apart from the description of statistical methods used to correlate various information about these relationships, the development and use of the "Status Hierarchy of Residential Areas" are discussed in detail. In order to evaluate and interpret the reasons given by the respondents for moving from a residence and for selecting a new residence, certain assumptions are made and explained which serve the analysis of the apparent motives for residential mobility.

Part Four of this investigation consists of the actual application of the methods to the available data. The relationship between occupational and social mobility, and between social status and the importance of residence as status symbol is
analysed on the basis of attitudes revealed by the respondents. Subsequently, several aspects of occupational, social, and residential mobility are investigated, and the moves to larger and more elaborate dwellings, and to better residential areas are analysed in order to establish the number of moves which were made for reasons of status and prestige. The actual proportion of members of the Middle Management group concerned with satisfying their status and prestige needs are established separately on the basis of analysis of attitudes, factual information, reasons for moving and selecting, and by evaluating each person’s residential mobility in terms of the "Status Hierarchy".

Part Five presents the conclusions of the study. Chapter I consists entirely of a correlations of results of the independent analyses. On the basis of six criteria the number of persons of the Middle Management group who have moved for reasons of status and prestige is identified. Chapter II discusses the sociological aspects of this investigation. The behavior of Middle Management persons regarding concern with status and prestige, and conformity to group standards is investigated in the light of W. H. Whyte's study of The Organization Man. Certain conclusions are made about the values held by this group and their potential influence upon the future development of residential areas. In Chapter III the implications of this study for Community Planning are discussed. The questions raised at the beginning of the study and throughout the
investigation are discussed in view of the findings, and new questions are posed. In particular, the value of the "neighborhood concept" in a socially and spatially mobile society is scrutinized, and a different concept of "urban stability" is outlined. The relationship between segregation of socio-economic groups and creation of "communities" is discussed, and it is hinted that certain basic values cherished by our society would have to be altered first before a manipulation of physical environments, e.g. planning residential neighborhoods, may effectively inaugurate "communities" and "community spirit". The study concludes with a few basic questions about the legitimate role of the Planner as a "social engineer".
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PART I

BACKGROUND FOR THIS INVESTIGATION
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM OF RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY

The Magnitude of Residential Mobility

Residential mobility is a phenomena which is directly related to increasing urbanization. It has increased in magnitude particularly during and after the last war. There seems to be no need for speculating on the psychological effects which the war may have had upon the "rootedness" of people, obviously, the economic recovery during, and particularly after the war, has produced this milling about of large masses of population. New industries have sprung up over the entire country attracting more and more people into urban centers while at the same time the individual was placed financially in the position to be able to afford a house, and build a new house if he so desired. The tremendous backlog in housing development which was created during the economic depression in the pre-war years suddenly began to be reduced and people moved from congested urban areas, from small towns and rural areas into the vast, newly opened residential suburbs.

Based on its monthly population sample survey, the U. S. Bureau of Census\(^1\) estimated that between April 1956 and April

1957, 10,268,000 persons one year and older, or altogether 6.2% of the entire U. S. population changed county of residence, and that 21,566,000 persons or 13.1% of the population moved to a different dwelling within the same county during this period. During the period 1940-47, 21% of the entire U. S. population changed county lines. This last figure does not include local, intra- and intercity moves within the county.

A survey conducted by Prof. M. C. Branch in cities of varying sizes, which investigated the residential mobility behaviour of some 9,000 respondents over a past period of five years showed that 53% of the respondents had moved at least once during this period. Of these 53%, 36% of the persons had moved only within their city or locale, 11% had made local and intercity moves, while 6% had only made intercity moves. This survey was conducted in 1942 and assesses the mobility prior to the war, nevertheless, it indicates the large proportion of people who periodically moved within the urban environment.

In order to give an example of the extent to which a small-scale, modern community is affected by this incessant turn-over, one may cite William H. Whyte's observation of residential mobility in Park Forest, Chicago.


In 1954 out of 3,000 rental apartments there were 1,059 move-outs, in 1955, 1100. During 1954-55, 18% of Park Foresters had moved to other communities.

Park Forest is a special type of community which has become particularly attractive to people who are transient on account of their profession or their affiliation with national-wide organizations. According to Whyte\(^4\)

In 1953, 44% of the move-outs were corporation couples being transferred away from the Chicago area; 12.5% were Army and Navy couples assigned to new stations.

This type of residential mobility, perhaps, is not all-typical but as a later discussion of Whyte's *The Organization Man* will show, it is on the way to almost becoming an institution of North American society. From these examples one may conclude with Peter H. Rossi\(^5\)

America's city dwellers change their housing it seems almost as often as their cars.

The Effects of Residential Mobility

"The incessant movement from one place to another," writes Catherine Bauer, "are both cause and result of our most serious planning problems."\(^6\) These problems are usually seen in relationship to the social welfare of the individual in urban society. It is assumed as A. Wallace states that "the problem

---

\(^4\) Whyte, *The Organization Man*, p. 335.


of creating stable and healthy urban societies cannot be solved without a recreation of the community as a healthy social unit."^7

However, "the desired residential stability is seriously affected by mobility."^8 There seems to be definite evidence that residential mobility and state of mental health are intimately related as may be gathered from the results of a study which tested the relationship between "Personality Disorder and Spatial Mobility."^9 It was found that the rates of psychotics, adult neurotics, psychopathic personalities, and children with behavior problems per 1,000 population

in the groups with the shortest residence in the house are always higher than in the group living in the same house for ten years or more.

The authors of the investigation conclude that

the population in the more mobile households furnish more than its share of psychotics, neurotics, psychopathic personalities, and other types of personality disorder among adults and children.

This observed fact may be interpreted in two ways. It is possible that the mobile families are on the move for reasons not associated with their mental make-up and that adjustment difficulties and personality disorders of every kind are the results of moving around. On the other hand, families with a tendency to mental deviation may not adjust well wherever they find themselves and therefore change their residences oftener than do more stable people. The truth, probably, lies somewhere in-between.

---

^7 A. F. C. Wallace, Housing and Social Structure, a preliminary survey with particular reference to multi-story, low-rent public housing projects; repro. by the Philadelphia Housing Authority, 1952, p. 15.

^8 Rossi, Why Families Move, p. 3.

There is no doubt that excessive residential mobility involves a great deal of social costs, apart from the economic costs arising from the sale of lots, houses and furniture, the loss of wage hours, and the expenditures for packing and transportation, which all create work but do not contribute to the net income of national economy. Social costs arise from the disruption of neighbourhood ties, work and business relationships; at the same time this must be balanced against the fact that new ties and perhaps more valuable relationships are created elsewhere by residential mobility. Although the move of the individual family may not account for a great deal of social costs, the sum of turnovers undoubtedly will. For example, a high turnover of pupils necessarily hampers teaching as well as the educational progress of the transient child and the class group which he enters. Therefore, the public funds spent on education which are administered by an institution experiencing a high turn-over of pupils and teachers will net lower educational standards among its pupils than they could produce among a stable population. These are but some of the type of social costs which are incurred by residential mobility.

The problems arising from residential mobility to community planning are manifold. The proverbial "flight to the suburbs" itself produces difficulties in the provision of services and administration which are generally well known and need not be described here. More intricate and directly related to the exodus to the suburbs, are the problems arising from population shifts among established residential areas. Areas which are
services with the facilities required by one population of a
certain composition in terms of household size, age of house-
hold members, purchasing power, education, recreational habits,
and others, are gradually invaded by other types of populations
which require different services or a greater or lesser variety
and amount of the available facilities. Planners are suddenly
faced with problems of overcrowded or inefficiently used schools,
misplaced parks and playgrounds, blighted commercial sections or
pressures for more shopping facilities, unused churches or
inadequate libraries, overcrowded streets, lack of bridges, empty
subway trains, and great deficits arising in areas which are
fully serviced but sparsely populated. Efforts have been made to
reduce the occurrence of these problems.

The Planned Neighborhood Unit - an answer to
residential mobility?

One of the solutions to the problems arising from the
assumed "anonymity of urban life" and the "incessant movement
from place to place" was thought to be the "planned residential
neighborhood unit". The planned neighborhood unit, it was hoped,
would reintroduce the neighborhood controls and "rootedness" in
the community which characterise the rural community and would
help to prevent the family disorganization, mental ill-health,
and social problems generally which are associated with a highly
mobile urban life.

The idea of reconstructing city neighborhoods is not
new. J. F. Steiner in "An Appraisal of the Community
Movement'\textsuperscript{10} wrote as long ago as 1928 that:

Many years before Cooley pointed out the important role of neighborhood groups in the process of socialization, the social settlements had set for themselves the task of reconstructing city neighborhoods as the best means of approach to social problems.

On the basis of similar considerations and in order to overcome such social and physical planning problems as were indicated before, planners like Clarence Perry\textsuperscript{11} developed the principle of the "neighborhood unit". However, in recent years various persons pointed out that because of its disconcern for sociological principles the concept of the planned neighborhood unit has produced its own social problems.\textsuperscript{12}

Two basic questions may be raised with regard to the benefits of the "planned neighborhood unit". First, does this neighborhood unit actually solve worse problems than it may create, and second, does it and can it reduce residential mobility?

If it is true that unstable communities contribute to a general feeling of insecurity which promotes mental ill-health


\textsuperscript{11} C. A. Perry, \textit{Housing for the Machine Age}, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1939.

and gives rise to a variety of behavior considered self-destructive and detrimental to the welfare of the society, than stable communities must produce emotionally adjusted personalities. However, stable communities are characteristic of a high degree of interpersonal relationships and while such relationships may be reassuring they may also contribute to mental strain. For example, in our society economic instability is one of the principal sources of anxiety. However, the neighborhood community is not only unable to reassure the individual but increases his anxiety because economic failure is considered a personal failure.13 The neighborhood community with its closely knit inter-personal relationships will often times create anxieties in the individual because it controls and supervises the individual and constantly forces him to judge his behavior in terms of the group's standards. Since the group is small, its member's attitudes, experiences and values represent only an arbitrary fraction of the sum-total norms of the society. Therefore, the individual has to relate his behavior to a fraction of the entire variation of behaviors acceptable in society. His chance of considering his own behavior as deviating from the restricted number of behaviors permissible in the small neighborhood unit is much greater than if he were merely an anonymous member of the large society. The small neighborhood community can offer the individual "assured belonging" if he accepts its norms, otherwise he has to move and

find a community which has segregated personality and behavior
types similar to his own. Again one may quote J. F. Steiner who wrote in 1928:

The back-to-the neighborhood philosophy no longer can be given serious consideration, although many of the earlier group of the community leaders are still clinging to this illusive hope. . . . We are not willing to obtain the old neighborhood values at the price of isolation. From the modern point of view, the most satisfactory neighborhood is the one that has many inter-relationships with the outside world.

The natural areas, in so far as they can be accurately defined and given general recognition, seem to give promise of greater usefulness than local neighborhoods. . . .

In effect, the so-called "anonymous", "unstable" urban social environment in contrast to the proto-type neighborhood community -- the stable and narrow rural community -- permits the individual a choice of congenial communities in which the residents do not have to live in face-to-face relationships.

In the urban environment the individual is able to select a community of other individuals who share his attitudes, values and experiences, and who are least apt to produce oppressive situations because they cannot escape each other.

One example of a residential community where this integration of individuals and families into one community has been achieved, perhaps, is Park Forest.

Park Forest, as has been indicated above, is a particular

---

14 Steiner, American Sociological Society Publications, XXIII, 1928, p. 23.
kind of community because it caters to a transient and socially very mobile group of society. But this fact really serves to reinforce the argument against the social values of this type of neighborhood community. In spite of the limited time period available to the tenant to impress his behavior upon the community, the collective behavior of these transients and members of large-scale organizations persists and becomes the inherent norm of the community. In spite of the high turnover of residents, a certain type of behavior is constantly reinforced, becomes stereotyped and is transmitted to the newcomer by the residual group of tenants living in certain "courts". The physical arrangement of homes around courts predetermines the size of groups and their focus, the newcomer has little choice between groups and no choice, other than by accepting the group norms and behavior, to become part of the group. He has to conform and is conditioned to conform further during his stay in the "court community". Non-conformists or people slow in adjusting are ostracized or leave voluntary.

The question may be raised whether it is this type of segregated primary community which is supposed to create the "stable and healthy urban society" and which is to prevent neurotic residential mobility by giving individuals a feeling of "belonging"? Or is it this type of community which will generate neurotic behavior? According to Whyte\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{16} Whyte, \textit{The Organization Man}, p. 385.
Planners can argue that if they can find what it is that creates cohesiveness it would follow that by deliberately building these features into the new housing they could at once eliminate the loneliness of modern life.

In view of the planner's notion "to see in the tight-knit group of suburbia a development of great promise", Whyte counters, "on such developments as the integrated group it is necessary to ask not only how it can be planned but if?" And he adds the pertinent question:

How good is 'happiness'? The socially cohesive block has its advantages, but there is a stiff price to be paid.

Nevertheless, for the advocates of "integrated community life" this type of neighborhood, probably, is a very stable community in spite of the terrific rate of tenant turn-over taking place in Park Forest. Because of the physical arrangement of houses, tenant groups are formed which maintain the "spirit" of the community and all newcomers are made to feel at home.

However, if one considers other neighborhood units which by their physical design do not create the same degree of cohesion as found in Park Forest and where it depends upon each individual to find congenial groups and associations in the community, residential mobility may disrupt communal relationships and cause hardships.

In this respect, H. P. Rossi concluded the following
from his study Why Families Move:

Some writers have made the claim that mobility is lessened when households within an area have developed strong interpersonal ties. The data of this study does not lend any support to this generalization.

...households do not cling to a neighborhood because their friends or relatives live there. Friendships and their locations are independent of mobility inclinations. But they are related to the mobility of an area in the sense that the more stable the area the more likely a household is to establish ties in a neighborhood, but the absence of such ties does not affect a households desire to remain or move.

In other words, regardless of whether people have established strong ties in the neighborhood, they move when they have to or want to. Although they may realize and deplore the fact that they are disrupting their own and their children's relationships, that they cause a certain amount of hardship to their former neighbors, that they help to break up associations valued in the neighborhood, and that they themselves will have difficulties in assimilating to a new social and physical environment, they nevertheless move. What forces, one may ask, compels these people to move and what kind of incentives attracts them to other residential areas?

Compelling Reasons for Residential Mobility

From the studies of reasons for residential mobility which have been investigated, five principal reasons for moving

17 Rossi, Why Families Move, p. 90.
may be isolated. These will be summarized below, although not in order of importance.

First, "forced" moves accounted for 39% of moves made by 444 respondents in Rossi's investigation.\textsuperscript{18} Forced moves include evictions, dwelling destruction, severe income loss, temporary occupation of a dwelling, marriage and divorce, and other forms of dissolution of households. Second, "economic" moves accounted for 90% of 443 intercity moves in a study conducted by V. H. Whitney and Ch. M. Grigg.\textsuperscript{19} As has been indicated above, Whyte's study of \textit{The Organization Man} supports the conclusions that a majority of intercity moves are economic moves in the sense that people move to better job opportunities or are transferred to other branches and stations by large organizations. Economic moves of this nature produce little mobility within a city. This was found by Whitney and Grigg who noted only 3% of 604 local moves as economic moves,\textsuperscript{20} by Branch who concluded that about 80% of the people he investigated were "not bothered by time and money involved in getting to work",\textsuperscript{21} and by Rossi, who found that "the journey to work was considered largely irrelevant for moving".\textsuperscript{22}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} Rossi, \textit{Why Families Move}, p. 135.
\item \textsuperscript{19} V. H. Whitney and Ch. M. Grigg, "Mobility among Students' Families", \textit{American Sociological Review}, XXIII (Dec. 1958), No. 6, this study, as well as Rossi's study \textit{Why Families Move}, and Whyte's investigation of \textit{The Organization Man} will be discussed separately later on.
\item \textsuperscript{20} \textit{Loc. cit.}
\item \textsuperscript{21} Branch, \textit{Urban Planning and Public Opinion}, p. 17.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Rossi, \textit{The Organization Man}, p. 90.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Third, moves made on account of the changing requirements of the growing family with regard to the size of dwellings, facilities in the dwellings, and design of dwellings. These moves probably account for the greatest percentage of residential mobility during the early part of each couple's married life.23

Fourth, moves made on account of the changing requirements of the family with regard to the facilities in the neighborhood, e.g. playgrounds, schools, shops, other recreational facilities, etc. which are demanded as families with children go through different stages of the life cycle.

Fifth, status moves which are made on account of dissatisfaction with the social environment and the need for adjusting residence to changing status and prestige needs.

In the light of these reasons for moving one may briefly discuss what the planner can do to eliminate or reduce residential mobility, if that is desirable. Planners can do little to eliminate those conditions which force people to move for reasons of eviction, dissolution of households, or occupation. If it should be possible to resolve the economic problem which besets young couples when they become married and have children, and which forces them to adjust their dwellings according to their needs and their financial ability, then it might be possible to have them establish themselves in dwellings and neighborhoods.

23 Conclusions regarding this and the remaining "principal reasons for moving" will be summarized later on on the basis of studies made by H. P. Rossi, and V. H. Whitney and Ch. M. Grigg.
which will suit their needs regardless of change in size and families and age structure. These problems may be partly resolved by planning neighborhoods with different types of accommodations which permit families to rotate within the neighborhood from small to large and back to small dwellings as they go through the different life stages. The problem of being able to afford a large dwelling when all other expenses are high and income still low remains unresolved, unless payments for the house are made in proportion to the income and become higher with length of residence until the initial debt is obliterated. Another possible solution may be seen in mass-manufactured houses which can be enlarged or readjusted as the need arises. Similarly, problems arising from irregular dwelling changes stemming from architectural design, lot sizes, building and zoning regulations, or arising from too uniform dwelling changes with respect to capacity or utilities, utilization of schools, shops, parks, and other services should not be too difficult to solve.

However, residential mobility generated by the desire to satisfy status and prestige needs poses entirely different questions and problems. From the point of view of the person seeking prestige, residences and residential areas become symbols of status over and above their functions as dwellings and as places to live, yet they have to satisfy the needs both for prestige and for functional living quarters.

In order to decide whether community planners in planning
residential areas and urban environment can or should apply their methods and influence to produce physical environments which apart from satisfying functional housing needs also satisfy needs of status and prestige, the community planner has to investigate (a) the importance of residence and residential areas as a status symbol, (b) the qualities and features of such residences and areas which attract persons seeking prestige, (c) which sections of the population are particularly prone to seek residence in residential status areas and what causes them to become prestige conscious, (d) which are the residential status areas in an urban area, (e) what is the proportion of people moving for reasons of status and prestige, and (f) if it is possible or necessary from a planning point of view, that is from the point of view of social welfare, to adjust future residential developments to status and prestige requirements.
CHAPTER II

STATUS AND PRESTIGE IN RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY

The Hypothesis

The specific hypothesis to be tested in this investigation was defined as follows:

A significant increase in occupational status motivates persons to move into larger and more elaborate dwellings and to better residential areas in order to bring their residences in adjustment with their newly acquired social status position and obtain the prestige associated with each residential area.

The concepts included in this hypothesis are defined as follows:

a. "Significant increase in occupational status" means a promotion to a more responsible position and/or a considerable raise in salary.

b. "Larger and more elaborate dwelling" means a dwelling containing a certain number of rooms which in relationship to the number of household members are not all essential to the normal functioning of the household. Furthermore, such a dwelling contains features which are also not essential to the normal functioning of the household, and which are primarily meant to impress others.

c. "Better residential areas" means a district which the individual or the occupational group to which he belongs considers more desirable from the point of view of social and physical environment
and which has more prestige in the eyes of the status group.¹

d. "Social status position" means "the social prestige or honor attached to a position" of a person within his class and his particular status group.²

The assumption is made that each person investigated in the cause of this study has a record of occupational mobility, and derives his social status position from his occupational status or rank position in the rank hierarchy of the organization by which he is employed, and from his level of income. Both assumptions are tested in this investigation as far as this is possible, but will continue to be upheld regardless of the results of these additional investigations.

Actually it was also hypothesized that persons move to larger and more elaborate dwellings and to better residential areas because they are expected to conform to the standards set by the organizations with which they are employed and by their occupational status group. Although these aspects of residential mobility for reasons of status and prestige were investigated, lack of time prevented the analysis of the obtained data. In final analysis, these relationships will be briefly discussed,

¹ K. B. Mayer, Class and Society, New York, Random House, 1953, p. 54; states that 'Prestige refers to a social-psychological system of attitudes in which superiority and inferiority are reciprocally ascribed, while status groups are functioning collectives of persons of similar prestige in one another's eyes who interact with one another in intimate social associations'.

although this discussion cannot be substantiated by quantitative evidence.

In this part of the investigation the "Meaning of Status Symbols" and "Houses and Residential Areas as Status Symbols" will be discussed first in order to explain the significance which houses and residential areas have as symbols apart from their functional importance. Subsequently, those studies will be discussed which are considered pertinent to the subject matter of this study and the methods used in this investigation.

The Meaning of Status Symbol

In the process of adjusting to various physical environments, humans are not content to accept a minimum standard of living which would suffice to maintain their physical existence. "Man is a cultural animal and is able, therefore, to modify his natural environment and to create, within limitations, his own habitat." His ability and, primarily, his desire entice him to improve his habitat. Unequal opportunity and various degrees of ambition to exploit his ability as well as difference in ability and various cultural goals determine the extent to which Man improves his environment. Within each society these forces have grouped people into broad classes. Depending upon the type of society, these classifications tend to reinforce the notion that traditionally unequal opportunity implies unequal abilities.

---

and ambitions. In a society which professes equality of the individual before the law and as a political being, equal ability and equal opportunity on the part of all members is accepted as a norm. To insinuate that differences may exist is considered blasphemy and all actions which serve to emphasize differences produce guilt feelings and have to be rationalized. Since no community or society can persist without leadership or can do without criteria for determining leadership -- be it conspicuous self-assurance or conspicuous modesty -- equality of members may be a philosophical basis which governs the formal interactions of members, but the desire to exploit the philosophy of equal opportunity in order to rise above the norm cannot be denied and is necessary. Perhaps, one can say that the effort applied to overcome equality stands in direct relationship to the strength of the prevailing attitude. A society which places little emphasis upon birth, inherited wealth, title and intellectual ability which is not applied to achieve some practical purpose, in order to determine a person's status position, permits its members to achieve distinction via the avenue of equal opportunity and on the basis of economic success. Because economic success is obtained by exploiting various abilities, the ability of exploiting one's own and others' capacities, rather than having a superior ability per se becomes important and acceptable. Therefore, birth, title, inherited wealth, artistic ability and similar characteristics are permitted through the backdoor to serve as explanation for achieving economic success and status. Therefore, the emphasis upon economic success
generally rather upon any inherent ability or characteristics fits well into the entire philosophical basis of this society. While it is not immoral to become an economic success, to conclude from this that individuals may have different worths, abilities and rights is immoral. Therefore, persons with ambitions and aspirations feel compelled to rationalize their behavior, preferably in economic terms, and to reassure themselves and others, that their natural desire for economic improvement does not make them different persons, untrue friends or social climbers, generally.

The ability to make an economic success of oneself theoretically is not restricted to any member of any class, although class already implies "the type of chance and power one has in a market situation". However, the way in which money is spent and should be spent in order to afford the individual a maximum of recognition and status position within his class varies considerably. If one can determine the status symbols each class has adopted, one can determine each individual's class and group affiliation, his social progress and aspiration.

Status symbols are determined by several factors which vary with each society and with each group within society. In this society, generally speaking, status symbols are directly and indirectly related to one's financial ability and confidence in one's potential financial ability. However, based upon the

---

4 Hatt and Reiss, Cities and Society, p. 393.
prevailing philosophy of equal opportunity and equal human worth for all, for any "unit value" to become a status symbol, be it a commodity, an education or club membership, it has to have three basic characteristics. First, it has to belong to a broad category of symbols which vary in value. The value at each level determines the position of the class which can afford this value. Houses are such a broad category -- or have been. The value of houses determines who can afford them; this in turn determines the class affiliation of the individual. Within each class the individual's status position may be determined according to the degree by which the value of his house, its style or other features approaches the "median symbol" of the next higher class.

Second, the value of each symbol within its category must be easily understood by the majority of people in order to serve its purpose as a symbol of discrimination. A symbol which has a complicated value cannot be appreciated by the entire society but operates to afford distinction to members of exclusive ingroups. Within the symbol category "house", interior design, quality of materials or name of architect affords this distinction of status position within one group which can appreciate these devices.

Third, each more valuable symbol must be attainable by other members of the society including the successively lower classes if they are willing to make the effort and sacrifice. An exclusive or unattainable class symbol or group symbol has
little meaning in a society which encourages and permits social mobility via economic success in spite of its disapproval of people who change their attitudes towards others. Therefore, material values such as cars, houses, boats, appliances and lots become significant class status symbols because there are wide and rarely questioned avenues for attaining them as long as one has made sufficient money. Education, knowledge, interests, behavior, manners and speech are much less pronounced status symbols because they are less "democratic" as the Dollar.

Houses and Residential Areas as Status Symbols

In a society where the possession of economic wealth means the possession of the greatest power, money and whatever can be obtained through money has a symbolic meaning. Because residence stands in direct relationship to what a person can afford, residence becomes a symbol of a person's position in the socio-economic power structure. Although houses show their value, they are difficult to describe and tend to disappear among other houses; districts, however, acquire meaning and are easily identified. Partly for this reason, partly in order to protect their investment people of similar income tend to segregate themselves and create residential areas which have fairly uniform land and improvement values. Further segregation takes place in terms of occupational groups. It has been found that

5 Mayer, Class and Society, p. 46. "Outstanding among the highly visible status symbols is residence. Most American towns have a right or wrong 'side of the track' -- their 'best',
"segregation is greater for those occupational groups with clearly defined status than for those groups whose status is ambiguous." However, segregation does not stop there but further subdivides residential areas in occupation by racial and ethnic groups, age groups, and groups with similar family structure, religious groups and professional groups. Other groups congregate around certain institutions, clubs, particularly renown schools, downtown sections and industries. In each case group affiliation of people of similar prestige tends to impart the group status upon the residential section they occupy. This status, in turn, identifies them as a group in the eyes of the community and attracts them to the area. Consequently, the reciprocacy of status identification reinforces the individual's consciousness of his status while his residence in a particular section reinforces the general notion that this section has an exclusive status. This type of reciprocal reinforcement is discernable to all members of the community in terms of broad socio-economic groups but less so in terms of particular ingroups. Segregation of people of similar prestige tends to impart the group status upon the residential section they occupy. This status, in turn, identifies them as a group in the eyes of the community and attracts them to the area. Consequently, the reciprocacy of status identification reinforces the individual's consciousness of his status while his residence in a particular section reinforces the general notion that this section has an exclusive status. This type of reciprocal reinforcement is discernable to all members of the community in terms of broad socio-economic groups but less so in terms of particular ingroups.

'good' and 'poor' residential sections. This geographical division is largely the product of the financial position and occupational activity of the various segments of the population, to be sure, but the area of residence and the type of dwelling also reflects the tendency of higher status groups to translate social distance into physical distance....Moving into a better residential section is an important way of expressing status aspirations, not only because it represents an outward sign of success but also because residential location helps to determine informal associations."


7 Mayer, Class and Society, p. 54.
of the latter usually is known only to other ingroups within the same socio-economic class, and it is probably found less often in the lower economic classes than in the upper classes. Therefore, the lower and middle economic classes are less discriminating in selecting residential areas apart from the greater variety of areas which is at their disposal. These groups are less oriented as a whole although those members with clearly defined socio-occupational goals are much more conscious of the status structure of residential areas and more definite in explaining their choice of a potential future residence.

It is generally understood that "each residential area, then, has a status value in the eyes of the community", But H. A. Gibbard argues further that residential areas cannot be ranked on a continuum from highest to lowest because such factors as rent level, ethnic and racial characteristics, tradition, and prominent families living in an area affect the status value of each area differently. In other words, judging areas on the basis of their land and improvement values would produce a different scale than ranking them according to the proportion of native to foreign groups found in each district. It is questionable whether people use widely differing criteria for evaluating the status of areas, although this criteria may vary considerably for members of different socio-economic classes,

---


9 Ibid., p. 837.
and particularly for members of various in- and minority groups.\textsuperscript{10}

For the purpose of this study it was assumed that it is possible to rank areas in a continuum based upon the opinion of one socio-occupational group.\textsuperscript{11}

**Discussion of Related Studies**

Of the variety of studies in residential mobility which were investigated only a few were found to have some reference to this investigation. The more significant points of these studies will be briefly discussed in the following paragraphs:

1. Peter H. Rossi's investigation of the reasons *Why Families Move* is a "study in the social psychology of urban residential mobility".\textsuperscript{12} The study was conducted in Philadelphia,

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Socio-economic strata of respondents & Upper & Middle & Lower & Total \\
& \% of 32 pers. & \% of 51 pers. & \% of 42 pers. & \% of 125 pers. \\
\hline
House & 81.2 & 74.5 & 78.6 & 77.6 \\
Neighb. & 53.1 & 43.1 & 57.1 & 50.4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Status Indexes Judged Unimportant or Irrelevant for the Appraisal of Status}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{10} H. W. Form, and G. P. Stone, "Urbanism, Anonymity and Status Symbols", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 62, 1957, pp. 504-514. The authors investigated 125 adults residing in three widely different socio-economic areas of Lansing, Mich., (Pop. 100,000). Equivalent groups of adults in each area were asked to state in terms of which factors they appraise the status of a person. With respect to 'Type of House' and 'Type of Neighborhood' the following results were obtained:

\textsuperscript{11} For a discussion of methods of determining a status hierarchy of residential areas see Appendix II. The "Status Hierarchy" actually adopted is discussed in Part III, Chapter II, Section B, 1a of this study.

\textsuperscript{12} Rossi, *Why Families Move*. 
involving 924 households selected at random from four different residential areas. Almost equal-sized groups of households were interviewed in two areas with high socio-economic status and characterized by high and low mobility respectively and in two areas with low socio-economic status and the same difference in amount of mobility. Rossi investigated three aspects of residential mobility, namely, Area Mobility, Household Mobility, and The Decision to Move. The results of this investigation may be briefly summarized as follows.\textsuperscript{13}

Mobility is the mechanism by which a family's housing is brought into adjustment to its housing needs. These needs are determined by the composition of the household.

During the early part of a family's life cycle the family is most likely to be out of adjustment with its requirements. Moving during this early stage takes families from mobile, family-less areas to areas where family living is the typical pattern of household existence.

This life cycle stage is followed by a period of residential stability. Although families may shrink considerably during later stages of the life cycle, mobility is less often resorted to as it is easier to adjust to a surplus rather than a shortage of space.

Parallel with this functional adjustment to changing family size, another cycle must be seen in the changing need for adjusting the environment to such requirements of the pre-school child, the pupil and the adolescent in terms of playgrounds, schools and families serving the recreational needs of the older children.

Furthermore, residential mobility plays a part in vertical social mobility. Families moving up the occupational ladder use residential mobility to bring their residences into line with their prestige needs. (my italics)

\textsuperscript{13} Rossi, \textit{Why Families Move}, pp. 5-10, 177-181.
Generally it was found that space contained by a dwelling is probably the most important dwelling quality. Small units are congenial only to the earliest and final stages in the family life cycle.

Apart from design - space, layout of rooms and utilities are other important aspects of the dwelling. If a family has control over its dwelling and can adjust it to its needs, mobility is reduced. Families owning large houses are least mobile, while large families renting relatively small dwelling units are the most mobile households.

Rossi's conclusions regarding the relationship between life cycle and changing housing and neighborhood needs of the family have been verified by V. H. Whitney and Ch. M. Grigg in their investigation of "Mobility among Students' Families".14 Rossi's statement regarding the relationship between upward occupational mobility and the desire to adjust housing to the changing status needs unfortunately is not based upon statistical evidence but upon observation. However, because this hypothesized relationship is the result of a very thorough and penetrating analysis of motives in residential mobility, it has significance. Rossi does not suggest which method should be applied to test this relationship.

2. V. H. Whitney and Ch. M. Grigg's joint investigation of "Mobility among Students' Families" is of considerable interest for the purpose of this study because of (a) the method which has been used to obtain reasons for moving, (b) the manner in which these reasons were interpreted and classified, and

(c) the results of the study.

a) One of the intentions of this study was to determine whether it is possible to study the behavior of a group over a long period by assessing specific aspects of each individual's behavior during the past rather than trying to maintain contact with each member of a group over an equally long future period. As such the authors prepared a questionnaire which was intended to elicit reasons for moving for each change of address during the past 20 years. The questionnaire was explained to 500 freshmen who in turn explained it to their families. 492 acceptable questionnaires were returned. The authors felt that people were remarkably sure and specific in stating reasons for past moves and that the method was considered adequate for their purpose.

b) The reasons given for a total of 1,047 moves were grouped into the following categories: Economic, Status, Non-status and Dislike. The first two categories were considered "positive" and the last two "negative incentives to change place of residence".

Examples of answers fitting into the category Economic were "better paying job" and "job transfer". Answers which indicated awareness that the subsequent moves involves status improvements, such as "neighborhood with nicer people", "best part of town" or "house we would be proud to entertain friends in", were placed into the category Status.
In an attempt to differentiate between status and non-status moves, all answers indicating a compelling force or a concrete dislike of some aspects of a specific house or neighborhood were placed into the respective categories. For example, such answers as "moved for reasons of poor health", "to join relatives or friends" or "because property was condemned" were grouped as Non-status moves. Under the category Dislike the following type of answers were included: "noisy neighbors", "leaky plumbing", "outgrown house", "excessive taxes" and "poor schools".

Two criticisms may be levelled against the method used for analysing and categorizing answers. First, the question may be raised as to what extent Non-status and Dislike answers serve as rationalizations and can be disproved as such. For example, "joining relatives or friends" may mean that these people lived in a better residential area and induced their friends or relatives to join them there or otherwise both parties' prestige and relationships would suffer. "Noisy neighbors" may mean "people with whom we didn't want to be associated", while "excessive taxes" can mean admission of a previous prestige move into an area which cannot be afforded, or the person may be saying: "I dislike the people or the non-residential land uses that invade the neighborhood, they raise the assessment and make the area undesirable from the point of view of my status". "Poor schools" usually refers to the quality of educational standards which in turn are a reflection of what the particular neighborhood
can afford. Presumably, an unpleasant area with unpleasant school buildings will attract fewer highclass teachers than a pleasant area. Furthermore, a poor area produces less revenue and probably has less power on the School Board to demand better buildings and teaching personnel. Moving for reason of "Poor School" probably always means leaving an undesirable neighborhood for reasons of affording one's children an education which one feels they should have. Possibly, therefore aspirations regarding the children's future status are the motives for these moves.

The second criticism may be directed against the grouping of answers into 'positive' and 'negative' incentives for moving. For example, a "better paying job" is an incentive to move and is classified in the category Economic. When it comes to selecting a new residence, the individual will actually indicate whether his move was merely an Economic move or a Status-Economic move because he can select a residence which is worse, equal or better than his past residence. If he moved to a better residence in terms of "nicer neighborhood" or "more respectable house", the move should be classified as a Status move.

This study also fails to distinguish between the reasons for moving and the reasons for selecting. The former may be entirely unrelated to status or prestige considerations; the second may always be made in terms of what is considered appropriate, in terms of aspirations, and in terms of dissatisfactions about the status aspects of the previous residence.
c) The statistical results of the study are summarized in Table I.

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF TYPES OF MOVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Moving</th>
<th>Local Number</th>
<th>Local Percentage</th>
<th>Distance Number</th>
<th>Distance Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1 - 1.0</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Status</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All types</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strong emphasis upon Economic and Status moves seems to indicate that the authors were very careful in analysing Non-Status and Dislike reasons. Furthermore, the authors state that most of the Distance moves (of which 90% were Economic moves) were followed by one or two local moves, of which at least one was a Status move. This phenomena might be explained by the fact that non-residents lacked knowledge of the status of various residential areas and selected their first residence in terms of other needs. Once they had become familiar with the residential status structure, they adjusted their residence in terms of their perception of their own status.
In their summary, Whitney and Grigg state that in the Middle class group, in terms of average American family income and job status, almost all families were upwardly mobile, and that this group could be expected to do a maximum of status moves. Decision to move was not motivated by the desire to obtain additional income gain but on the prior existence of such gains.

3. The third study which is considered significant for this part of the investigation is *The Organization Man* by William H. Whyte Jr. Whyte's analysis of "The Organization Man" has significance for this discussion because his investigation of motives in residential mobility was carried out among members of a large organization. Although no attempt has been made to analyse this particular group in the light of Whyte's conclusions about "The Organization Man", certain aspects of this personality type as they relate to the hypothesis of this investigation should be discussed.

According to Whyte "The Organization Man", generally, is a member of the young business generation and usually a post-war college graduate who has been sucked up by the rapidly expanding post-war economy and first becomes a trainee, then a member of the Middle Management group and, possibly, at last a member of the Advanced Management group of a large organization. Once a member of the "Organization", "The Organization Man" is trained

---

according to the principles of the new "Social Ethics" of business life.

"By social ethic", Whyte explains, 16

I mean that contemporary body of thought which makes morally legitimate the pressures of society against the individual. Its major propositions are three: a belief in the group as the source of creativity; a belief in 'belongingness' as the ultimate need of the individual; and a belief in the application of science to achieve the belongingness.

"The Organization Man's" personality is molded by these beliefs. He is trained to adjust easily to various groups and situations; he is encouraged to appear as a well-rounded person who has no introverted inclinations and just enough ambition to reassure his superiors of his loyalty to the organization system without becoming suspect by his group; he believes in the organization's good will and scientific skill to place him into a position that will suit his capacities. Although he may feel disturbed if his progress in the organization is not commensurate with that of others in his group, his ideal of a good life limits his ambition to raise himself to more than, possibly, a top position in the Middle Management group. Above that, the "good life" is eaten away by overwork, frustration, ambition and a feeling of insecurity. In order to attain this rank, however, he conforms further to the organization's system and criteria for promotion. In order to have the necessary broad knowledge of all the facets of the organization, he surpresses

16 Whyte, The Organization Man, p. 7.
all special interests and specialist training he may have had, and accepts a long period of interdepartmental and intercity transiency. To him it becomes more important to be able to lead a group and mold it into a functional instrument than to assert his individuality and become noted for independent decisions.

Outside the organization, "The Organization Man" remains true to his principles of smooth co-operation and beneficient conformity. He takes his cues as to where and how he should live from the group and because he is not overly ambitious to appear conspicuous among his own group, he advances as a group in the community as he advances in the organization, namely, steadily upwards.

However, once "The Organization Man" has been selected for the Advanced Management group, his attitudes and behavior change drastically. Although he remains "The Organization Man", he has to conform to the standards of a different category of this personality type. If it is not he himself who deliberately changes his style of life, it is his former group which reminds him of his new position and forces him in a benevolent way to assume the standards of that "higher" group.

The success in the organization places new social demands upon the individual which almost automatically require of him to assume the status symbols of his new group. With respect to residence, Whyte notes the following:17

17 Whyte, The Organization Man, p. 175.
...to interpolate from Fortune's circulation records, promotion for the man and change of address for his family correlate rather highly - and rather quickly. In the case of the wives I interviewed for the articles I have gone back from time to time in connection with follow up studies and have found that some of the most insistent about staying put and happy have been the first to move out to Brinton Hills and its equivalents. Chrestmere Heights, it now appears, was just a phase. And not the last one either, by a long shot.

It appears from Whyte's analysis that "The Organization Man" is associated with two distinctive groups, namely, the broad Middle Management group, and the much more exclusive Advanced or Top Management group. Of these groups, the latter is the more conspicuous in the community; the former is respectable Middle Class. In the Middle Management group conspicuous consumption and conspicuous behavior is frowned upon, although, as a group, they are the Joneses of the community. To be above or below the group standards is a show of ambition or disconcern which annoys the group. However, because "The Organization Man" has been trained to conform, such individualism rarely rears itself. For the Advanced Management group similar standards exist. In terms of consumption and social behavior, these standards are definitely above those of the Middle Management group. Change of address, change of associations and different social responsibilities indicate most clearly when the break has occurred.

Whyte's analysis raises questions which cannot be discussed here at great length. First of all, is "The Organization
Man" as uniform in his personality as Whyte describes him or has Whyte abstracted numerous individual traits and formed a personality type, a caricature, which is rarely found as complete as is given to understand? Second, does "The Organization Man" pervade all large-scale organizations or is he more typically associated with national-wide organizations rather than with local companies? Third, is "The Organization Man" the product of an institution per se and therefore can be found in all societies or is he primarily the product of the American way of life? And fourth, are those persons who have ten and twenty years of service in the lowest ranks of the organization before they advance into the Middle Management group also "Organization Men" in Whyte's sense, and how would they react to their change of Status? And finally, when are we justified in separating the ideas and behavior of a person from his past experiences and construct a type personality? Is Whyte himself not guilty to some extent of placing a large group of persons on one personality trait card? These questions aside, one must admit that Whyte's study provides considerable insight regarding the behavior of one group of society which seems to become larger rather than smaller. Furthermore, Whyte's analysis permits other investigators to apply his personality abstract and find the deviations from the type. This has been done in the present investigation with regard to some aspects of "The Organization Man".
PART II

DESIGN OF THE INVESTIGATION
CHAPTER II

SELECTION OF THE GROUP TO BE STUDIED

In order to test the hypothesized relationships, a group of persons had to be selected which were similar in some important aspects and of which it could be assumed that conformity and prestige if at all had a like influence upon their behavior.

In view of Whyte's analysis of "The Organization Man" it was felt that the Middle Management group of a business organization would be suited for the purpose of this investigation. It was decided to study one such group associated with one organization rather than select people from several organizations. This restriction would further permit a better control of the following variables:

a) The policies of the organization would apply to all members of the group, e.g. regarding promotion, interdepartmental and inter-personnel relationships, superior-subordinate relationships, public relationships, and regarding the individual's conduct as a function of the organization's public relation policy.¹

¹ It is understood that policies and relationships in an organization vary over a period of time and in divisions of an organization depending upon leading personalities, the economic situation and "scientific" revelations regarding the potential capacities of personalities and inter-personnel relationships. Seasoned employees may be different personalities than recent employees; this was one of the findings of the investigation.
b) The salary structure and ranking system would be consistent and permit the investigator to judge a person's rank in the organization.

c) The method of training and the policy of instructing others would be consistent.

d) A greater similarity of attitudes, values and behaviors among members of the group might be expected because:

1) These persons were selected as supervisors according to one organization's personnel policy and with the assistance of a standardized Personality Assessment Card System.

2) They may be expected to have similar experiences in the organization with regard to conformity and prestige which might influence their attitudes, values and behaviors similarly.

3) The entire group gathers periodically at formal meetings and presumably, members of the group meet frequently during business hours. Friendship groups will be formed within the company. The resulting exchange of ideas and experiences will contribute to a greater similarity in terms of attitudes, values, and behaviors among the members of the group.
In the light of the above it was decided to study the behavior of a group of people employed as members of the Middle Management group with the British Columbia Power Corporation Ltd. (which is popularly referred to as the B. C. Electric). In the Middle Management group were included all Technical Specialists and Junior Line Supervisors as defined by W. E. Moore. In terms of the B. C. Electric rank structure the

---

2 The British Columbia Power Corporation Ltd. is the holding company of the British Columbia Electric Company Ltd., B. C. Engineering Company Ltd., British Columbia Electric Railway Company Ltd., and Western Development and Power Ltd. Of these companies the B. C. Electric Co. Ltd. employs the majority of the 5,000 employees of the Corporation. The B. C. Engineering Co. Ltd. employs about 300 specialists depending, however, upon seasonal engineering and consulting projects. The Western Development and Power Ltd. employs a very small staff of people.

The B. C. Electric Co. Ltd. is a private utility company which serves the southern portion of the Province of British Columbia with electricity, gas, and trolley coach and motor bus service. B. C. Electric Railway Co. Ltd. has a limited railway operation. For all purposes, and excluding B. C. Engineering Co. Ltd., the Corporation is a provincial organization, although one which has considerable influence upon the development of Western Canada. Because most of the Corporation's staff and employees are concentrated in Vancouver, its Middle Management group consisting of 400 supervisors (approx.) probably is one of the largest in this city.

3 W. E. Moore, citing F. H. Roethlisberger, Management and Moral, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1941, pp. 35-36, distinguishes six categories of occupational functions in a corporation or corporation-type organization. These are: (a) Executives, (b) Technical Specialists, (c) Junior Line Supervisors, (d) Secretarial or Clerical Workers, (e) First Line Supervisors (foremen), and (f) Shop and Bench Workers -- in that order.

The Technical Specialists have the following functions:
1. The primary group (largest) concerned with effective organization (internal):
Middle Management group included Traffic Supervisors and Department Heads who had professional backgrounds that varied from bus operation to post-graduate training in engineering. The salaries of this group range from $5,500 to $11,000 per annum, depending upon position, training, experience and performance.

Lack of time prevented an investigation of all persons in this group hence a sample was selected. Lack of time also prevented the stratification of the sample. However, an attempt was made to select from about 400 supervisors a number of persons from each Division proportional to the number of supervisors and proportional to the number of supervisor income groups. The selection of the group had to be left to the discretion of

- arrangement and maintenance of production, e.g. engineers.
- statistical and financial aspects, e.g. statistican, accountant, etc.
- maintenance of personnel, health, recreation, etc.

2. The secondary group concerned with the external relations:
   - market analysis, design and wrapping of product, etc.
   - soliciting, public relation, etc.

3. The tertiary group concerned with research.

Each of these Technical Specialists has (a) the position and authority as supervisor, (b) a considerable amount of training of a high technical quality, and (c) a basic training which was not acquired "on the job" but outside the organization at an institution, and usually Specialists were hired from these institutions or some other organization for a specific purpose.

The Junior Line Supervisor has the following function:
1. He is a manager in the direct line of authority and an important part in the channel of communication between top management and the lower echelons of the organization.
2. He makes orders more explicit and sees to it that they are carried out.

the Personnel Department. Separated in terms of Division and Annual Salary, the group appears in Table II:

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Dept.</th>
<th>Number of Persons</th>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
<th>Number of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Dept.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4500-5499</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Directory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5500-6499</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6500-7499</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Division</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7500-8499</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Division</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8500-9499</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9500-10499</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industial Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Division</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10500-11499</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Division</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Div.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Division</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 After the investigation was concluded it was learned that the Personal Department actually selected the respondents in terms of "who was likely to be most cooperative in granting an interview". However, it was felt, that the sample was still quite representative in proportion to the actual distribution.
CHAPTER II

DESIGN AND METHOD OF THE INVESTIGATION

The Original Design of the Investigation

In order to test the hypothesized relationship between rising occupational status, improving residential status and an increasing tendency of the individual to follow the residential pattern of his occupational group, the original design of the investigation was as follows.

1. The residential mobility pattern of the Advanced Management group was to be established first. This pattern was to be established over a period of 15 years in order to find "residential plateaus" for certain rank levels, the movement from one to the next "plateau" as the person's rank increased and areas changed, and the present "focus plateaus" for certain ranks and Divisions which may be the goals for certain Middle Management groups within the organization.¹

¹ This investigation has been carried out. A list of 104 Advanced Management persons including the President and Top Middle Management persons was obtained from the "1957 - British Columbia Power Corporation, Ltd., ANNUAL REPORT". Their residential mobility pattern has been established based on the City Directory returning to 1943 in five-year intervals. In-between moves and lack of income and rank data prevented the establishment of "residential plateaus", although this limitation could have been overcome in spite of the organization's refusal to reveal any data about this group, referred to by the company as "Group 16". "Residential plateaus" are meant to be residential areas to which company officials move after they have acquired a
2. Next the residential mobility pattern of 200 Middle Management persons was to be established beginning with the last residence before they had been appointed supervisor.

3. The occupational mobility pattern in terms of income and rank was intended to be established next for the Middle Management persons also beginning with their last job-grouping before becoming supervisor.

4. Lastly the "family increase" pattern was to be established for each member of the group, i.e. date of marriage, dates of birth of children and when they left the household, dates about other members of the household not belonging to the family.

Once these patterns were established, the following certain rank position and can afford to live in certain areas. Providing that the character of areas does not change rapidly over time, all officials may at one time reside in these areas as they move up in the rank hierarchy of the company. It may be assumed that certain areas figure prominently in this occupational-residential upward mobility because officials may obtain their cues for "appropriate residential areas" from other officials in the company. Furthermore, persons following a certain pattern of mobility from "plateau" to "plateau" may be expected to reside finally in definite "focus plateaus". These are determined by certain groups of the Top Management group. It may be assumed that persons intending to reside finally in a "traditional high-class area" rather than in a "modern high-class area", will follow a different pattern of "plateaus". While gradually moving closer to a certain "high-class area" these persons are able to observe the behavior of the "high-class socio-economic groups" and become accustomed to the particular pattern of living prevailing in these "high-class areas". It becomes "natural" for them to move into these areas if they are financially able to do so, rather than to move to a different social and physical environment with which they are not familiar.
investigation and correlations were intended to test the hypothesized relationships:

1. First a pattern of "residential status plateaus" was to be established based on the movements of the majority of Middle Management persons as they advance through the organizations rank hierarchy. These patterns would indicate
a) that certain residential areas are attractive to a certain rank-income group of one organization.
b) that persons of each rank-income group either have to conform or do conform voluntary to a pattern in order to maintain their prestige with the group or to express their status position by means of residence.
If in the majority of cases these tendencies could have been proven, tentative conclusions about occupational group conformity and individual prestige needs could have been drawn.

2. Comparison of occupational and residential mobility data would have shown the degree of correlation between promotion and mobility. If a high correlation was found and if a trend towards the next "occupational-residential status plateau" in terms of "focus plateaus", average value of houses and lots, and socio-economic grouping could have been proven, then W. H. Whyte's observation that increase in rank and change of address correlate quickly could be verified to some degree.²

² Whyte, The Organization Man, p. 175.
3. In order to eliminate those moves which might have been related to a change in the size of the household, mobility dates and family increase dates were to be compared from this point of view.

Once these correlations were made, approximately 40 supervisors representing proportionally as many different type cases as may have been found in the preliminary investigation of 200 supervisors, would have been selected for interviews. These interviews would have been designed to investigate (a) reasons for moving, (b) reasons for selecting the new residence, (c) importance of prestige considerations in moving and selecting, and (d) degree of conformity.

If a high correlation between attitudes and motives of respondents representing each type case could have been found, tentative generalizations about these groups within the Middle Management group could have been presented.

This original design of the investigation had to be discarded largely because the Personnel Department of the B. C. Electric considered it impossible to extract this mass of data within a short time.

The Adopted Design of the Investigation

The new design had to rely upon the interview schedule itself for obtaining both factual and attitude information. Furthermore, the sample had to be restricted to a total of
40 supervisors.  

The interview schedule (see Appendix I) was designed with the following considerations in mind:

1. In order to keep the respondent as long as possible in the dark about the specific purpose of the interview e.g. reveal the hypothesis of the study too soon thereby influencing the results, information about the person, his family, his employment and salary, and about the sequence and character of his residences, his reasons for moving and selecting, and his intention to move from his present residence was obtained during the beginning of the interview. (Questions 1 - 26) The investigator avoided "reminding" the respondent of possible motives for moving or selection, also respondents were not asked to evaluate such motives in terms of their own behavior. While a considerable number of motives might have been lost in this fashion, the danger of suggesting motives and obtaining stereotyped responses could thereby be avoided.  

3 Of the 40 persons selected for interviewing, 39 persons were visited. One person worked in New Westminster, approximately 12 miles from the center of Vancouver and the area in which the remaining 39 persons worked. Since this person was not Vancouver-oriented and lived near New Westminster he was considered a special case and hence excluded from the sample.

4 Peter H. Rossi in his study Why Families Move among other methods, presented a list of aspects "commonly thought to be sources of dissatisfaction" in order that the respondent might indicate which of these items had much or no significance in triggering a subsequent move. Op. cit., p. 81.
indicated concern with status and prestige, further probing questions were posed and assessed accordingly.

2. Questions regarding social status, prestige, group pressure and use of residence as a status symbol were asked next. (Questions 27 - 53) The questions were arranged in such a fashion that the respondent could state his opinion about the general public, the people in the organization and the Middle Management group first before he had to reveal his own position. It was hoped that people would be less reluctant to answer freely for themselves if given the opportunity to identify themselves with larger groups. Although this approach helped considerably in introducing the subject in a neutral way, most respondents jumped to conclusions about their own behavior after the first or second question. Some questions and particularly such concepts as "higher social position", "substantial raise in salary", and "appropriateness of the house and neighborhood in view of ones social status position", created confusion of meanings and usually precipitated a lengthy discussion. These questions and concepts were given uniform meaning by relating stereotyped examples, which, however, may not have assured similar understanding. Throughout the discussion of questions in this general category, the investigator made reference to the respondent's actual mobility in order to clear up apparent inconsistencies and suspicions held by the investigator regarding the
respondent's objectivity. However, the latter were rarely cleared up to both parties' satisfaction.

3. The ranking of residential areas by each respondent (Question 54) was introduced by explaining that an attempt was made to establish a status hierarchy of residential areas on the basis of demographic data.\(^5\) The hierarchy obtained by this method was to be compared with the hierarchy perceived by the respondents. The respondent was not asked to determine the status of areas in terms of a specific criteria but in terms of the criteria which he would ordinarily apply. It should be noted that most respondents determined status of residential areas primarily in terms of appearance, condition, size, and value of houses and lots, socio-economic groupings, residence of top management personnel, and residence of people well-known in the community. Most people were careful in making their selections and justified their choice in terms of specific aspects with which they were familiar; however, people who had never lived East of Main St. often exhibited prejudices about these areas.

4. The general questions about neighborhood relations (Questions 55 - 63) were introduced after emphasizing the fact that they had no relationship to the rest of the interview but were meant to test an assumption which had been made in

\(^5\) This hierarchy of residential areas in terms of status was based upon demographic data contained in Canada Census, Population Characteristics, Metropolitan Vancouver by Census Tracts, Bulletin CT-11, published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa. For a discussion of methods of establishing status hierarchies of residential areas refer to Appendix II.
another study. The nature of this assumption was revealed only after the questions were asked.

5. The summary questions about reasons in the past and the future for selecting a residence was read by each respondent. In cases where people could not honestly arrange all five items into a sequence of importance it was agreed that these items should remain open.

Of the 39 supervisors interviewed, 13 were visited at home while 26 were met in their office. Although the home interviews on the average lasted longer than the office interviews (2 - 2-1/2 hours as compared to 2-1/2 - 3 hours), it is felt that the business atmosphere and interruptions did not influence the course of the interview and the response of the individual to any noticeable degree.

---

6 Robert Williams, "The Social Effects of Subdivision Design: A Study in Micro-Ecology", unpublished Master's thesis, graduate course in Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia, May 1958. Mr. Williams made the assumption that members of the lower socio-economic groups are much more dependent upon neighborhood friendship relations than, by inference, members of the middle socio-economic groups.
PART III

METHODS OF ANALYSIS

Analysis of the relationship between increase in occupational status and moving to a larger and more elaborate dwelling and to a better residential area in order to bring residence in adjustment with the acquired social status position and in order to obtain the prestige associated with each residential area.

This hypothesis was separated for the purpose of analysis into its four component parts which were grouped into Analysis of Attitudes and Analysis of Factual Information.

Analysis of Attitudes

1. The relationship between increase in occupational status and increase in social status.

2. The relationship between social position and residence as an expression of social position.

Analysis of Factual Information

1. The relationship between moving to a larger and more elaborate dwelling and status and prestige considerations.

2. The relationship between moving to a better residential area and status and prestige considerations.

The methods applied to test each relationship will be outlined under the respective headings.
CHAPTER I

METHODS FOR ANALYSING ATTITUDES

Methods used to test the Relationship between Increase in Occupational Status and Increase in Social Status

The assumption was made that each respondent has a record of vertical occupational mobility. This assumption was based upon the understanding that persons (a) rarely obtain a Middle Management position without having been employed with the Organization as rank and file employees or as trainees for some time, and (b) do not remain in the same rank position or job-grouping\(^1\) once they have entered the Middle Management range but advance further. The investigation actually showed that 36 of 39 respondents were "first-line supervisors", "rank and file employees", or "trainees" for at least three years prior to their appointment as Supervisors or "Junior Executives". Three respondents were hired as Supervisors but have since increased their rank and job-grouping. Most of the 36 respondents had also increased their rank or job-grouping, although a few had not, or to a very limited degree, progressed in Middle Management. These persons, however, had made the significant step into Middle Management and, presumably, with the expansion

---

\(^{1}\) Job-grouping determines salary, not rank position.
of the organization had also experienced an expansion of their responsibility and authority. The assumption that each respondent has a record of vertical occupational mobility may be accepted as proven.

For the purpose of this investigation only a limited amount of data indicating vertical occupational mobility could be obtained. This material is confined to (a) beginning of employment with the Organization, (b) year of appointment to a supervisory position, and (c) present annual salary. Except in the case of being appointed Supervisor there is no other way of relating vertical occupational mobility directly to both social mobility and residential mobility. Therefore, a gradual vertical occupational mobility is assumed for each respondent, and beginning with the date of employment with the Organization.

The assumption was made that people derive their social status position from their occupational position (position in the rank hierarchy of the organization). It was assumed that social mobility would parallel vertical occupational mobility. This assumption is being upheld. However, in order to test it on members of the Middle Management group, Questions 27, 28, and 30 were designed. Each respondent was asked to answer with regard to the behavior of (a) the general public, (b) B. C. Electric employees, and (c) himself, the following question:

Do you think, that when people achieve a substantial increase in salary and a more responsible position in their profession, that they feel that they have achieved a higher social status position?
The results of these answers are compared with the results obtained from answers to Questions 29, 29a and 31. Question 29a investigates whether B. C. Electric employees think that the relationship between vertical occupational mobility and social mobility depends upon the previous position or income a person had, while Question 31 investigates when the respondent felt a change in his social status had occurred, if at all.

Upon the conclusion of the investigation it was felt that the design of this part of the investigation was inadequate to yield very definite results. However, a considerable amount of discussion with each respondent was generated around this topic of social and occupational mobility. These discussions may not have helped the respondent to clarify the issue but certainly gave the investigator a better understanding of the respondent's attitudes and of the complexity of the entire relationship. In addition to the formal responses, the informal knowledge gained during these discussions are utilized later to explain the relationship between occupational and social mobility as it is perceived by members of the Middle Management group. This knowledge is used to make generalizations about the behavior of this group.

Method used to Test the Relationship between Social Position and Residence as an Expression of Social Position

This relationship actually constitutes the core of the entire investigation and is intended to be tested on the basis
of "de facto" conditions as outlined under Relationships 1 and 2 which follow. However, an attempt was made to obtain the respondents' attitudes to the relationship between residence and social position independently of his behavior which was assessed prior to these attitude questions. The behavior itself, of course, is only partly an objective indication of a respondent's attitudes because the investigator interprets the behavior on the basis of certain assumptions.

In order to test the respondent's attitudes, Questions 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, and 42 were designed. Each respondent was asked to answer with regard to the behavior of (a) the general public, (b) B. C. Electric employees, (c) members of the Middle Management group, generally, (d) B. C. Electric Middle Management people, and (e) himself, the following question:

Do you think, that when people select houses one of the factors which influences their choice is the appropriateness of the house and the neighborhood for their particular social status position?

This general question contains certain ambiguities which should be pointed out. First, the word "house" was mentioned twice and leaves the respondent with the impression that house rather than house and neighborhood was emphasized in the question. The investigator cannot ascertain whether all respondents addressed themselves to the entire question or to the "house part" only. The question assessing the respondent's perception of his own behavior was separated into a "house" and "neighborhood".

---

2 "Neighbourhood" was always meant to be "residential area or district" and understood as such, and not as the concept "Neighborhood" is used in Community Planning.
question, and is clear in this respect.

Second, the word "position" was used throughout the interview schedule as "occupational position" (meaning rank in the Organization's rank hierarchy) and as "social status position" (meaning rank in the status hierarchy of society) but was most clearly understood as "occupational position" depending upon the sophistication of the respondent regarding these concepts. Although "position" was never used by itself, its frequent interchangeable use may have produced some confusion, and those people who rejected a relationship between occupational and social mobility may have also rejected the relationship between social status position and choice of residence. Those persons who do not derive their status from their occupational rank or who do not realize or admit this relationship, nevertheless, are conscious of certain social standards.

Third, Questions 41 and 42 were worded in such a way that the respondent may not be entirely certain whether he was supposed to answer in terms of his past behavior, or his past and future behavior. Although the question was intended to assess past behavior, the investigator did not always remember the ambiguity of the questions. An added difficulty was, of course, that a few of the respondents' past moves were "practical" and one or two were "status" moves. Not all of them generalized in favour of the latter types of moves, particularly if they did not recognize those moves for their prestige considerations. In many cases the investigator discussed the answers with regard to certain
moves which the respondent had made in the past, and therefore, obtained more affirmative answers than some respondents were willing to give.

In order to clear some of the ambiguities contained in Questions 41 and 42 which are the important attitude questions, the answers to these questions are correlated with (a) the answer which the investigator feels should have been given on the basis of the discussion with each respondent at this point, (b) the reasons for selecting a new residence which each respondent gave prior to the attitude questions, and (c) with regard to the "neighborhood" question with the respondent's absolute improvement on the "Status hierarchy" scale. Although these correlations are no substitute for the original attitude question, they help to clarify whether the majority of respondents recognize a relationship between their social status position and their choice of residence.
CHAPTER II

METHODS FOR ANALYSING FACTUAL INFORMATION

Methods used to test the Relationship between Moving to a Larger and More Elaborate Dwelling and Prestige Considerations

In order to simplify analysis, the above relationship is separated into (1) moving to a larger dwelling, and (2) moving to a more elaborate dwelling for reasons of status and prestige.

Moving to a larger dwelling

The method used to test this part of the relationship first utilizes objective or factual data, and second, the respondents' reasons for moving from a residence and selecting a new residence.

The general hypothesis that Middle Management persons move to larger dwellings can easily be tested by (a) the number of moves which were made to larger dwellings, and (b) a comparison of the size of the first dwelling occupied with the size of the dwelling occupied at present.

By definition the "first dwelling occupied" is that dwelling into which the respondent moved upon becoming married, regardless of whether he had been employed with the B. C. Electric or whether he married in the Vancouver Metropolitan area. A "move"
is a move from a residence, and "reasons for moving" are incentives for moving "from a residence". The "size of a dwelling" is determined on the basis of the number of rooms, not the size of rooms, it contains. The number of rooms include all rooms except bathrooms and those rooms which have a function usually fulfilled by the basement, i.e. utility room and furnace room.

Once it is established that a majority of moves are made to larger dwellings, it is tested whether the respondents continue to move to larger dwellings after they have passed the stage when most young couples reside in apartments or suites. It may be assumed that single-detached houses are selected on the basis of the actual and anticipated size of the household. In order to test this assumption density, in terms of Persons per Room, is compared for maximum occupance of first residence with maximum occupance of first single-detached house (rented or owned). If it is found that the density has not decreased or is high, it must also be assumed that subsequent moves to larger dwellings are made in order to adjust residence to space needs. Once this "adjustment move" has been made, and after no addition to the size of the household has occurred, the Person per Room density can be expected to be low. The resultant average density index is compared with Person per Room indices established for Vancouver Metropolitan census tracts on the basis of the 1951 Canada Census. The assumption is made that the 1951 density indices represent a fair average for determining
whether a dwelling is comparatively large, medium or small in relationship to the size of the household, and, possibly, whether a dwelling can be considered high, middle or low class.

Subsequently, it is established whether respondents continue to move to larger dwellings without being forced to by an addition in number of household members. The resultant average Person per Room density for this particular group is compared with the density index of the high-class areas of the Vancouver Metropolitan area. If on the basis of "reasons for moving" it is established that these respondents move to a larger house for reasons of prestige, and if the Person per Room density index for these dwellings is lower than the indices for 1951 high-class areas, these moves would indicate the persons' concern with prestige and the resulting density is used to check those dwellings of other respondents who have not made "additional moves". It must be assumed that persons move to larger dwellings because they experienced or expect an addition to their household, but they may select dwellings which are considerably larger than would actually be required by the size of the household.

Upon the conclusion of the analysis of factual data, the principal reason for a move which resulted in a move to a larger dwelling is investigated. All those moves to a larger dwelling are defined as "prestige moves", where respondents indicated that their previous residence lacks in "representative aspects", e.g. lacks room for entertainment, guest rooms or lacks sufficient auxiliary or bathroom facilities. Furthermore, if the Person per
Room density is found to be below the density which has previously been defined as the dividing line between dwelling sizes based on function as against dwelling sizes based on status then such move to a larger dwelling is considered to be a "prestige move".

Subsequently, reasons for selecting a new dwelling are analysed and those cases where "larger house" is mentioned as a reason for deciding upon a particular dwelling are scrutinized in the same manner as outlined above.

The "status cases" found on the basis of the analysis of factual data are compared with those cases found on the basis of the analysis of reasons in order to ascertain in how many cases a "relationship between moving to a larger dwelling and prestige considerations" can be found.

Moving to a more elaborate dwelling

For the purpose of this investigation a "more elaborate dwelling" is defined as a dwelling which contains features not available to the majority of persons, not essential to the normal functioning of a household, and which are primarily meant to impress others. Originally it was intended to present a list of such items as driveway, carport, swimming pool, picture window, sun porch, library, recreation room, den, types of fire places, stone walls, etc., to each respondent and have him check for each dwelling whether any of these features were available. In order to reduce the length of the interview, this list was eliminated. To establish whether a respondent purposely moved
to a "more elaborate dwelling" the following criteria is used.

a. It is assumed that "elaborateness" occurs together with dwelling sizes which are above the functional requirements. Based upon the previous analysis of Person per Room densities, the density index indicating concern with prestige in selecting a certain-sized house is used as one criterion of "elaborateness".

b. Any mention of the reason "large living or recreation room for entertainment" for selecting a house is used as criterion for "elaborateness". Any special mention that a house or design was attractive because it had a large living or recreation room usually was followed up by the explanation that for the purpose of entertainment these facilities are considered "representative". In such case a concern with prestige can be assumed with certainty.

c. Any special mention of housing styles, which are fashionable, e.g. Post and Beam, Split-level, or Ranch home with carport and breezeway, or which have traditional prestige, e.g. Colonial or Cape Cod mansion, indicate the respondent's concern with the particular value of having a fashionable or stately home. These persons seem to be particularly impressed by house styles and expect to impress others with what they often describe as "individuality". These reasons also are included as a criterion for "elaborateness".

d. If, in selecting the residence, "view" is especially mentioned, it is assumed that this factor has prestige appeal to these
people. Although a large variety of views may be had from several large residential areas in the Vancouver Metropolitan area, certain views and, in particular, certain ways of "seeing the view", are restricted to high-class residential areas. Reference to "view" usually implies that the location of the house affords its residents a "high-class view" possibly in a "high-class fashion".

These four items are compared for each residence occupied by each respondent. If two or more items apply to a residence, this residence is considered as being selected for reasons of prestige.

Those cases which are identified as "prestige moves to larger houses" and those cases considered "prestige moves to more elaborate houses" are compared for drawing final conclusions.

Methods used to test the Relationship between Moving to a Better Residential Area and Status and Prestige Considerations

Two methods were used to test this relationship.

1. The residential mobility of each respondent and groups of respondents was measured on the basis of "residential area status values" which were assigned to each area in accordance with the "Status Hierarchy of Residential Areas in the Metropolitan Vancouver Area".

2. The meanings of reasons which each respondent presented as explanations for (a) moving from a residence, and
(b) selecting a new residence were analysed in terms of their significance for testing the above relationship.

Method of Analysis based upon the "Status Hierarchy of Residential Areas in the Metropolitan Vancouver Area"

In order to be able to measure whether the respondents consistently moved to residential areas of increasing residential status in terms of their own and the community's perception, several attempts were made to develop a method for establishing a hierarchy of residential areas based upon the status and prestige of each area. Three methods were discarded because certain basic limitations could not be overcome.

The "inspection method", the "assessment value method", and the method which utilized data from the 1951 Canada Census regarding demographic and housing characteristics for census tracts were all based upon limited, subjectively selected criteria.¹

Although it was not expected to develop a method which could be used to rank residential areas in such a manner that all groups and classes within the local society could agree with it, it was nevertheless hoped to establish a ranking which would be consistent in the perception of one group, namely the Middle Management group investigated here. It was, therefore, decided to leave it to the respondents themselves to indicate such a hierarchy of residential status areas, by asking each respondent

¹ These methods are discussed in Appendix II "Methods for deriving a Status Hierarchy of Residential Areas", based upon a term paper for Geography 304, "Geography of Human Settlement", March, 1959.
to select five high-class, five middle-class, and five low-class residential areas on the basis of each individual's own criteria. The selection was made from a map outlining the 1951 census tracts of the Metropolitan Vancouver area. Some of these tracts were further subdivided; therefore, a total of seventy-four areas were available for making fifteen choices.

This method had the following advantages:

(a) The status of each area was not determined on the basis of an arbitrarily selected criteria but on the basis of the perception of thirty-nine respondents, whose mobility subsequently was to be judged according to their group-opinion.

(b) Some of the respondents had either lived in each area or were more intimately familiar with certain areas, therefore, a more or less considered judgment was obtained for all areas.

(c) The respondents also reflected a certain amount of prejudices regarding the status of certain areas which would not come out on the basis of an objective analysis of demographic data, but which actually continues to determine the status of areas regardless of the change in socio-economic grouping.

This method also contains certain limitations:
(a) The group interviewed was found not to be too homogeneous in terms of length of residence in Vancouver, length of employment, rate of occupational mobility and present salary, upbringing and education, and attitudes, experiences, and factors affecting the potential upward mobility, i.e. number and age of children, occupational background, length of period before becoming Middle Management, etc. Altogether, 25 of 74 residential areas were considered high and middle class areas, or middle and low class areas, consequently these areas have no singular status in the opinion of the entire group. However, five areas were unanimously identified as having high-class status, 17 areas were unanimously identified as having middle-class status, and 17 areas were unanimously identified as having low-class status. No area was identified at the same time as having high, middle, and low class status or high and low class status. Therefore, 39 areas were clearly identified in terms of one unanimously selected status, while the status of 25 additional areas could be determined on the basis of a majority of selections for high, middle or low status choices respectively.
(b) The status of a few areas was solely determined by one or two persons who had lived in these areas or were familiar with them.

(c) Certain areas were too large in size to permit distinct classification. People either abstained from classifying such areas or classified them according to the predominant characteristics or the perceived future development of such an area. Area 14 (Kitsilano Beach), in particular caused problems in the analysis because it contains modern apartment dwellings situated next to one of the worst single-family developments in the metropolitan area.

In spite of these limitations, the resulting "Status Hierarchy"\(^2\) was found valuable in the analysis of residential mobility and was accepted as the criterion for measuring the improvements in residential status achieved by each respondent in the course of his residential mobility.

The rank of each residential area and the total "Status Hierarchy" was determined in the following manner:

The number of high-, middle-, and low-class choices given to each area were multiplied by 3, 2, and 1, respectively, and the sum was divided by the total number of choices each area had received.

\(^2\) The Map showing the "status value" of each area is included in Appendix III.
For example:

Area A was selected 10 times as a high-class area \((10 \times 3) = 30\)

2 times as a middle-class " \((2 \times 2) = \frac{4}{12} = \frac{34}{34}\)

The sum of 34 is divided by 12 = 2.83

The total range of rank indices reached from 3.00 (top high-class area) to 1.00 (bottom low-class area). All areas were arranged in terms of their rank index from 3.00 down to 1.00. Because 39 areas were given only one type of status and consequently had even indices of 3.00, 2.00 and 1.00, these were also ranked in terms of the number of choices each area had received. For the high- and middle-class areas, the areas with the greater number of choices were ranked above the area with the lesser number of choices and the same index. However, for the low-class areas, this method was reversed, because those areas which received the most low-class choices must be considered the more conspicuous low-class areas.

Areas which were not selected at all, were ranked according to the rank indices of the surrounding areas if these correlated closely with the ranks determined on the basis of demographic and housing characteristics.

Once all areas were ranked, the "residential status value" of each area was determined by the rank position of the area in the hierarchy. The top area being one, the bottom area being 74.

For purpose of description the entire "Status Hierarchy" was divided into ten residential status classes ranking from
Upper Upper to Lower Lower residential classes. These class intervals were determined on the basis of 0.20 rank index differences, number of choices per area, and in relationship to the "Status Hierarchy" determined on the basis of demographic and housing characteristics.

The resulting "Status Hierarchy" has no residential areas of equal values which, perhaps, is an arbitrary arrangement, as all moves outside one area are either increases or decreases in residential status. However, it was not considered less arbitrary to establish "plateaus of residential areas of equal value" than to arrange them on a continuum of status values.

The analysis of the relationship between moving to a better residential area and status and prestige considered on the basis of the "Status Hierarchy" is divided into three parts.

Method of Analysing Moves to "Better Residential Areas"

First, it is investigated whether the group and members of the group moved and are now residing in "better residential areas".

"Better residential areas" are defined as areas which have a "residential status value" between 1 - 27 (Upper Upper residential class to upper Middle Middle residential class). These areas are above the midpoint of the descriptive classifications.

The average status value of the group for the first and
present residence is determined by adding the respective "status values" of each area in which a respondent resided and dividing the sum by the total number of respondents. The group's average and each respondent's "status value" may be compared with the "status value" of each successive residence including the present one. On the basis of these "values" it is determined whether the group as a whole improved its residential status, whether it is at present residing in "better residential areas", and how many respondents resided and are now residing in "better residential areas". This analysis also investigated the circumstances which caused the respective respondents to move to "better residential areas". For this purpose other information about the respondent is utilized. This information is partly contained in the material gathered during the interview session and available in the form of answers to attitude and background questions, while some of it is gathered during informal discussions. However, the principal objective of this analysis is to establish that the majority of the group actually moved to better residential areas.

Method of Analysing Efforts of Improving Residential Status by Moving

Second, the efforts of increasing residential status made by the respondents and groups of respondents are investigated on the basis of the "Status Hierarchy".

The entire group is subdivided into groups which showed similar "moving behavior" on the basis of the "Status Hierarchy".
The residential status improvement of each of these groups is investigated. Subsequently, the relative residential status improvement of each group member is analysed and evaluated in view of additional information obtained from each respondent during the interview session. Although this meant introducing a certain amount of subjective evaluation, it is felt that the classifications produced by the "Status Hierarchy" should not be accepted without scrutinizing the particular circumstances and conditions affecting the "moving behavior" of each respondent within each group. In order to control the influence of subjective interpretation of additional information, the "moving behavior" established on the basis of the "Status Hierarchy" remains the basic criterion while judging whether respondents moved and improved their residential status in order to satisfy social status and prestige needs.

**Methods of Analysing the Relationship between Occupational and Residential Mobility**

Third, the relationship between vertical occupational mobility and residential mobility resulting in improvements of residential status is investigated on the basis of the "Status Hierarchy".

In order to investigate this potential relationship it is necessary to find when the group made its major improvement of residential status, and which factors and circumstances other than occupational mobility determines this major improvement move. Once these factors are established and, as far as possible,
kept constant, the potential relationship between occupational mobility and residential mobility resulting in improved residential status is investigated.

Subsequently, the direct relationship between promotion to supervisor and improved residential status is investigated in terms of groups of respondents whose residential mobility relative to their promotion shows a similar behavior. Again the particular circumstances affecting these time relationships are evaluated on the basis of additional information in order to establish whether a respondent improved his residential status because of the promotion, in anticipation of the promotion, or whether the overt relationship is accidental.

The relationship between rate of occupational mobility and improvement of residential status is investigated in three ways. First, relative improvement is measured against length of period employed with the Organization. Second, length of period before promotion to supervisor beginning with year of employment is measured against relative improvement of residential status. Third, relative improvement of residential status is measured against present annual salary. Although in each case the respective length of period of married life, of employment, and of the time before becoming supervisor is averaged and compared for the respective groups, these averages are highly arbitrary. Since all additional factors which definitely have influenced the behavior of each respondent, could not be assessed or controlled, the investigation of the relationship between rate
of occupational mobility and improvement of residential status probably is not too valuable.

Method of Analysis based upon the Reasons for Moving from a Residence and for Selecting a New Residence

For each change of residence the reasons for moving and the reasons for selecting the new residence were obtained and investigated. It was assumed that for each change of residence positive and negative incentives existed. In order to investigate whether people move in order to adjust their residential and social status and in order to obtain the prestige of the areas to which they intended to move, both types of reasons had to be obtained. In the first place people are reluctant to admit that they moved from a neighborhood in order to obtain the prestige of another area or because they became dissatisfied with the status of their last neighborhood. Also, it is entirely possible that people move for practical reasons, e.g. increase in number of household members, without being particularly dissatisfied with the status of the neighborhood, but in making their selection of a future home consider their status position and their potential increase in position and select a residence from these points of view as well. Although a mentioning of status and prestige considerations among reasons for moving must be considered more important as an indication of a person's concern with his status, it will occur less frequently because it is felt to be a more obvious admission of prestige concern. In mentioning these same items among reasons for selecting people
merely feel that they confess to a standard of residences and neighborhoods which they may claim because of their financial ability, occupational position, training and education, and upbringing. The investigation of these two types of reasons is carried out separately.

Method of Analysis based on Reasons for Moving from a Residence

Reasons for Moving are summarized in eighteen categories and according to their "face values", in other words, no attempt is made to analyse the motives behind each single reason presented by a respondent and group all reasons according to similar motives. Although this kind of investigation would be considerably more valuable, a great deal more information about the individual would be required. Furthermore, a study of this kind would have to restrict itself to particular reasons whose motivational structure could be thoroughly investigated. Because this study is concerned with status and prestige as motivational factors for changing residence, certain categories of reasons which are being interpreted as rationalizations of status and prestige motives are grouped together. These categories are discussed during the analysis. On the basis of these reason categories, the number of respondents are found who improved their residential status in order to satisfy their social status and prestige needs. Each of the moves for which status reasons are mentioned is analysed on the basis of the "Status Hierarchy" in order to ascertain whether such moves actually increased the respondents' residential status.
Method of Analysis Based on Reason for Selecting a New Residence

Reasons for Selecting are summarized in fifty categories and where possible reasons are grouped according to their relevance for the hypothesized relationship. In other words, those reasons which indicated a concern with the appropriateness of the neighborhood for the respondent's social status and prestige are grouped in different categories. The following categories of reasons for selecting a new residence are interpreted as an indication of a respondent's concern with the status and prestige of his residence. The categories are numbered as they appear in the "Summary of Reasons for Selecting".

1. Socially desirable neighborhood
   Respondents who mention the desirability of a neighborhood regarding its socio-economic composition or who prefer to be among a certain "kind of people" with similar behavior, attitudes and values as they have themselves, are aware of the implications regarding their own status and prestige.

2. Good investment
   It is assumed that concern with the "value of house" in a certain neighborhood for the purpose of investment indicates a concern for a stable, attractive area which in the respondent's view will not depreciate but retain and possibly increase its value over and above the trend towards higher property and house values. Because depreciation, stability and improvement of values are also a function of the
inhabitants' attitudes to the maintenance of houses and the neighborhood, of the relationship between residential and non-residential uses, and of the status held by the socio-economic group in the neighborhood, the respondents' estimate of a residential area's "investment qualities" is necessarily also an estimate of the quality of the inhabitants. An area which has the prestige of a good "investment area" also has the prestige of being a "desirable social environment" for people who are concerned with protecting their investment. Areas which are invaded by non-residential uses or by multiple family dwellings experience a considerable inflation of land values, and, therefore, are good "speculation areas"; however, in order to reap such benefits, the owner-resident has to endure a long period of "residential status degradation". Persons who are interested in protecting their investment rather than in speculating with it are not interested in these areas. Consequently, the very mentioning of "good investment" seems to indicate a person's concern with his status and prestige.

15. Returned to or moved within socially desirable neighborhood

18. Good schools, desirable for raising children

It is assumed that "good schools" means (a) better educational standards which eventually may afford the child certain advantages on the socio-occupational market, and (b) a type of social environment which furthers rather than depresses
the notion in the child that a higher education is desirable *per se* and for the above advantages. When "good schools" was presented as a reason for selecting residence in a certain area, these assumptions were discussed with the respondent and agreed upon by him in all cases. Furthermore, it may be assumed that people forward these reasons indicating their aspiration for the child's future in order to rationalize their own desire for a better residential status. It is felt that children look primarily to their parents for leadership regarding educational goals and occupational aspirations, and that the parents, if they so desired, can exert their personal influence in order to make education a worthwhile goal for the children regardless of the average aspirations of children and parents in the neighborhood. Therefore, moving closer to "good schools" and to the University must be considered rationalizations of the respondent's personal prestige motives. Moving closer to the University, as a category of reasons, has not been included in this group for reasons better explained in the analysis.

29. **Same economic group**

It is assumed that these reasons express the respondents concern for being associated with the "right kind of people". The dislike which has usually been expressed for "being better off than the neighbor" and therefore making him feel embarrassed or making ones own children appear as the Joneses
of the neighborhood, probably means that the respondent feels under censure to suppress his ambitions, and that he may express them in a less conspicuous manner among his own economic group.

The number of persons mentioning these reasons for selecting a new residence are summarized. These persons are considered as being concerned with the appropriateness of the neighborhood and with increasing their residential status in order to satisfy their social status and prestige needs.

Subsequently, the persons and moves appearing in the above reason categories are compared with the persons and moves appearing in the reason categories summarized below.

9. Lowest rent in good district
12. Built in high lot cost area
38. Low down-payment in good district
41. Lowest rent in best district
17. Friends, colleagues and relatives attracted me to the area
32. Prestige
42. Back to town

It is assumed that those respondents who mentioned the reasons indicated above, are largely the same persons who mentioned their concern with "desirable social environment", "good investment", "good schools" and "same economic group". If this is found to apply, the argument that they improved their residential status
because they were concerned with status and prestige is strengthened.

Finally, those reasons which indicate a concern with the appropriateness of the dwelling itself (larger and more elaborate dwelling) are computed with the above categories, in order to find whether the same group of persons is concerned with both the appropriateness of the house and the residential area for their social status position.
PART IV

RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION
CHAPTER I

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUP OF MIDDLE MANAGEMENT PEOPLE

The analysis of behavior aspects exhibited by this group of Middle Management people regarding the relationships between occupational, social and residential mobility should be preceded by a discussion of those factors which overtly make them a Group.

It is believed here that the concept "group" refers to an abstraction of behavior traits exhibited by a group of individuals rather than to a "group of individuals" who happen to have certain factors in common, e.g., income, position and organization affiliation. Furthermore, it is believed here that a "group" of similar behavior traits does not presuppose similar behavior patterns nor identical or even similar personalities. It is entirely possible on the basis of certain identical traits to identify a groups of individuals as a "group," although they themselves do not recognize the identity or, in view of a host of other dissimilar traits, would not consider themselves as a "group." Each individual can consider himself a member of many groups according to aspects of his personality, behavior, values and attitudes. All members of one "group" may consider themselves extreme opposites regarding those factors which do not give the group its identity.
These observations are commonplace, yet, when one refers to groups, e.g., the Middle Management group, one tends to assume that each member of the group is very similar to each other member, and that the purpose of the group and its place in the structure of society has led to the selection of similar personalities and, furthermore, that the process of selection has subjected these personalities to a variety of similar conditions which have tended to emphasize certain characteristics and to reinforce the notion of a "group." This may be true to some extent, but unless one accepts the point of view that similar mental and physical environments condition similar behavior and permit the individual little in the way of independent comprehension, evaluation, choice and decision, one has to assume that often a labeled group is nothing more than an accidental agglomeration of individuals.

The Middle Management group investigated here is perhaps not as loose an agglomeration of individuals as might have been implied in the remarks above—they are members of one organization, they are supervisors, they have similar responsibilities, rights and duties, and so forth. In other words, they have been segregated upon satisfying certain conditions which the Organization has set for certain jobs and ranks. However, the members of this group are also individuals with widely differing personalities and behaviors. For the purpose of this investigation they are not considered a "group" unless their behavior in terms of the aspects
investigated proves them to be a group. Where the term Middle Management group is used it means "the group of people investigated," and nothing else.

In order to show the potential variety of personalities, behaviors, values and attitudes which may be expected in this Middle Management group, certain basic patterns will be compared and certain basic influences will be illuminated which may produce a variety of behavior patterns. Table III gives the Arithmetic Mean and Range of Deviation for the number of years of married life, of affiliation with the Organization, and the number of years prior to becoming supervisor and a member of the Middle Management group.

**TABLE III**
MEANS AND DEVIATIONS FOR BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MIDDLE MANAGEMENT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Characteristic</th>
<th>Arithmetic Mean (X)</th>
<th>Range of Deviation</th>
<th>Number of Persons Above X</th>
<th>Number of Persons Below X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of years:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4 - 35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed with B.C.E.</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>3 - 37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before app. supervisor</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0 - 28*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Persons which were appointed supervisor upon being employed by the Company appear as zero in the deviation.
In each case, and particularly with regard to employment, the deviation is considerable. As a "group" they bear little resemblance to Whyte's post-war, college-trained "Organization Man" in his early Thirties with one child and another one on the way. The "least" deviation is found for "years of employment before becoming Supervisor." The majority of the group became a member of the Middle Management group in less than ten years. This, however, does not mean that these twenty-five persons advanced rapidly through the Middle Management ranks and are now drawing high salaries. Although, on the average, they are now employed with the Organization for 16.8 years, their average annual income is $7,260 which is not inconsiderably below the average income of $7,620 for the entire Middle Management group investigated. Furthermore, this group includes five of the six persons earning more than $10,000 a year as well as six of the nine persons earning less than $6,500 a year. The pattern spreads very broad, indeed. Looking at those six persons who are earning more than $10,000 a year, one finds that they are now with the Organization for 30, 22, 19, 18, 13 and 12 years, and became supervisors after 9, 11, 6, 5, 0, and 3 years respectively.

The eleven persons who are now employed with the Organization for less than thirteen years (post-war) earn salaries ranging from $6,000 to $10,000, the average being $8,240. Among these eleven persons are nine university graduates who make an average income of $8,460 per year,
which is already considerably above the average for the entire group. These people seem to approximate Whyte's description of "The Organization Man" more closely—in terms of overt characteristics. On the average, these nine persons with, perhaps, the exception of one advanced most quickly to above-average incomes and, probably, have the best prospects for further advancement. However, one should recognize that similar rank positions are differently paid, that advancement in one Division may be quicker than in another, and that specialization prevents certain persons from stepping on to a faster-moving promotion belt.

On the basis of statistics, it is difficult to identify certain groups which are made up of individuals who are similar in most respects, for example, have similar lengths of employment, were promoted at equal rate, earn similar salaries and are married for a similar length of time. A group of 39 people is too small a sample to permit such segregation. Therefore, it is difficult to assume similar behavior pattern for groups of people which do not display a considerable similarity in most of the basic factors of their career.

To these basic variations must be added other influences which have meaning in forming the behaviors of persons. Such basic influences are the Depression in the 1930's, the Second World War, and the Post-War economic expansion. Each of these periods had an entirely different
character, and it must be assumed that those persons who tried to get started in their career and family life during the depression times have a different perception of life, values and the future, than those persons who made their start during the post-war years and were carried along on the boom wave. To become supervisor during the depression years probably meant more than it did during the post-war years, and the effect on the person in the former case probably has been more modest than the effect created after the war. One may expect that the behavior of these two groups is different, for example, in terms of residential mobility.

A still additional basic factor should be introduced, namely, socio-economic affiliation. First of all, people come from different levels. For some, the Middle Management position and a certain residential area is the norm—they were raised in this environment and feel comfortable in it. Others come from the lower ranks and their aspiration is Middle Management, no more. Still others come from a similar level and aspire to be higher than Middle Management but they feel they lack the kind of self-confidence which would enable them to feel comfortable in the traditional well-to-do areas. And a few come from higher socio-economic groups and their style of living expresses their aspiration. Second, some of the pre-war employees probably did not experience the Depression as severely as some of the post-war
employees, simply because they have lived in different environments.

Consequently, in light of the above one can conclude that attitudes, values and behaviors cannot be expected to be very similar for the entire group, but if they are in some respects, as this investigation intends to show, then one may tentatively conclude that Middle Management attracts and forms personalities with certain similar traits.
CHAPTER II

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INCREASE IN OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AND INCREASE IN SOCIAL STATUS

In answer to the question:

Do you think that when people achieve a substantial increase in salary and a more responsible position in their profession, that they feel they have achieved a higher social status position?

the following summary was obtained from 38 persons, each one answering with regard to (a) all people, generally, (b) B.C. Electric employees, generally, and (c) for themselves.

TABLE IV

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INCREASE IN OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AND INCREASE IN SOCIAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents answering for:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes, but other*</th>
<th>Some/depends</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People in general</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.E. employees</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themselves</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other, includes one person who related the change in status to becoming officer in the Armed Forces, while three persons related it to graduation from University.

+ One of 39 persons interviewed declined to answer the questions.
Of the seventeen persons who felt that they experienced an increase in their social status position, thirteen indicated that becoming Supervisor made them feel that they had achieved a higher social status, while of the remaining four persons two experienced the regrouping of their job as giving them higher status, one after becoming Assistant Superintendent and one after becoming Department Head. These three occasions also were mentioned by others as subsequent causes for status change.

Previous to the above questions, these seventeen persons indicated that "increase in salary and position" (seven persons), "increase in responsibility" (six persons) and "increase in salary" (four persons) are the factors upon which it depends whether B. C. Electric employees feel, if at all, that they have achieved a higher social status.

The result of this part of the investigation obviously does not bear out the assumptions that (a) persons derive their social status from their occupational rank, or (b) that they generally feel that a change in occupational status produces a change in social status. However, before one completely accepts these conclusions, certain matters should be illuminated. These were brought out during the discussions which accompanied this particular part of the investigation.
No matter in what manner the above questions were answered, two basic attitudes appeared which were shared by most of the respondents.

First, it was felt by most respondents that greater financial ability permits people to afford more in terms of goods, services, and amenities. Since an increase in responsibility is usually accompanied by an increase in salary, occupational upwards mobility places persons not automatically but certainly gradually into a different class of "spenders." In other words, it was generally felt that successive promotions tend to place persons into successively higher economic classes, allowing for individual circumstances, e.g., number of children, other dependents, and hospitalization.

Second, most of the respondents felt that their increased financial ability, their greater responsibility, their better knowledge of company affairs and of their specific fields, their position generally or the fact that they became "White Collar" workers and had to disassociate themselves from Unions, and their different interests, places them on a different level. However, the majority of the respondents denied that "the general public," or "B. C. Electric employees" or they themselves would purposely disassociate themselves from friends who had not changed their status and hence take a snobbish attitude. Although
some people felt that they find it embarrassing to be able to afford more than their former associates or to have "a better all-round knowledge" than former colleagues and therefore tend to see them less often, other people stated outright or implied, that the "average Canadian" is not a social climber and that B. C. Electric in particular, is "democratic from the top down" and much less social-conscious than some other corporations. However, thirty-two and twenty-one people, respectively, stated that "the general public" and "B. C. Electric employees" feel they have achieved a higher social status after a significant promotion. Either, there exists a confusion of terms coupled with reluctance to admit status change, or a career in Middle Management is not considered important enough to give supervisors a concrete feeling of social mobility.

The confusion which exists is not so much a confusion in terminology and concepts as a confusion of facts and values. People admit unhesitatingly their aspirations for a steadily improved economic position, and they usually realize that their economic position within the "White Collar" class places them also on a higher social level, but they hesitate to admit that this result satisfies part of their aspirations. They admit that they want to be "better off," but they do not wish to be suspected of wanting to be "better." Therefore, they point out that they tend
(or make the effort) to retain old friends in spite of certain changes which makes it more difficult for them to maintain these friendships. This is particularly true, if the distance in terms of financial ability, level of work, and between old and new associates, becomes too great to be easily overlooked.

The point is that people feel caught between two contradictory notions, namely, that "to better oneself economically is good" and that "to better oneself socially is bad" because the latter seems to imply that "one thinks more highly of oneself and worse of those one once belonged to." Apart from the notion that a person should think more highly of himself if he has proven his ability, for this reason alone he may have never "belonged to." Furthermore, personality changes. According to Stagner: "The individual human personality is the product of a learning sequence." People who have moved from one sub-culture to the next experience a change of personality which gradually makes them alien to the sub-culture or social class they have come from, and there are usually not enough non-conformists around who are able to create their own sub-culture which straddles the lesser extremes.

However, in the North American society recognition of "classes" is undesirable; therefore, such common sense

---

developments as change of associations are not acceptable and recognized for what they are, namely, changes of personality, but become moral issues and create guilt complexes because each person suspects the other of wanting to be "unequal." The concept of "equal rights" has become utterly confused with equality of personality, of ability, honesty, goodness and what have you. An uneducated person's integrity does not improve his chances of becoming a member of the Academy of Science, while the Academy's refusal to accept him is not a reflection upon the person's integrity nor should it lead to the conclusion that the Academy thinks little of him as a member of society. However, this is exactly what is implied if people state in one breath that they do not terminate former associations and thereby express a snobbish attitude. They do not have to and still will be in a different socio-economic strata of society if they make and spend their money as is customary in that strata.

A considerable number of respondents displayed prejudices and "snobbish attitudes" regarding people living in certain areas but to measure the magnitude of their "social climb" based on changing associations seems hardly possible. One person stated that he did not want to move "too far West" because his friends may suspect him of becoming a snob, yet, he admitted that he moved from the eastern residential area for reasons of prestige. It seems, then, that those persons who do not admit having experienced
a change in social status by pointing out that they have maintained their associations, nevertheless may in fact be conscious of their "social change" and may create that type of social pressure which makes others unhappy and uneasy about residing in certain areas and, possibly, forces them to move and break established relationships. Scrutinizing the comments and answers given in this part of the investigation more carefully on the basis of additional information obtained in response to the questionnaire and during the discussions, the following result is obtained:

TABLE V

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THEIR CHANGE IN SOCIAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Their answer on the basis of:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes, but other* had present status</th>
<th>No, always decreased</th>
<th>Total**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and other information</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other, includes one person who related the change in status to becoming officer in the Armed Forces, while three persons related it to graduation from University.

+ One of 39 persons interviewed declined to answer this question.

The other possibility, namely, that mobility in Middle Management ranks is not considered significant to
give persons a sense of changed social status position was checked in the following manner:

Question 29a:

Do you think that it depends upon the previous level of income and position whether a promotion will make B. C. Electric people feel that they have achieved a higher social status position?

was answered in the following way:

Does depend: 21 respondents
May depend: 4 "
Does not depend: 13 "

The twenty-one persons who related change in social position to occupational mobility, considered the following types of promotions significant for a change in social status position (based on answers to Question 29a):

Promotion from ranks to Supervisor: 11 persons
Promotion between supervisor and including promotion to Department Head: 2 persons
Promotion from Department Head up: 7 persons

However, if one combines the above answer with the statement each individual made regarding his reaction to a promotion (Question 31), the following results are obtained:

TABLE VI

RESPONDENTS' ACTUAL RECOGNITION AND EXPERIENCE OF CHANGE IN SOCIAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status increase depends on promotion</th>
<th>Number of Persons</th>
<th>Type of Promotion</th>
<th>Number of persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does depend</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rank to supervisor</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May depend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bet. S.V. &amp; Dept. Hd.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not depend</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>From Dept. Head up</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>38+</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One of 39 persons interviewed declined to answer these questions.
Thus, the tendency appears to be that 29 respondents of 38 (76.3 per cent) recognize the relationship between occupational and social mobility, while possibly as many as 24 respondents (63.2 per cent) have experienced a change in their social status on account of a promotion.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL POSITION AND RESIDENCE AS AN EXPRESSION OF SOCIAL POSITION

This part of the investigation, as was pointed out in the description of the method, suffered from certain ambiguities which may make the results less meaningful.

In answer to the question:

Do you think that when people select houses one of the factors which influence their choice is the appropriateness of the house and neighborhood for their particular status position?

the following results were obtained:

TABLE VII

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THE ATTITUDES OF CERTAIN GROUPS REGARDING THE USE OF RESIDENCE AS A STATUS SYMBOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents answering for:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Some/ Depends</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The General Public</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. E. Employees</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management, generally</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. E. Middle Management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One of 39 persons interviewed declined to answer these questions.
With regard to the relationship between occupational and social mobility one may again observe from the data in Table VII that people are more likely to attribute a certain behavior to a large group, i.e., the General public, and that they are more cautious about making general statements regarding successively smaller and better known groups. Increasing familiarity with the values and behaviors of members of these groups and, possibly, an increasing awareness of the fact that the person generalizes about his own behavior makes him more objective and careful.

However, something else seems to happen when people retreat from making "off the cuff" generalizations regarding the relationship between social status and residence. In judging the behavior of the "General Public" they realize or assume that the majority of people segregate themselves according to their affiliation with socio-economic groups. This type of segregation appears natural and acceptable to them. If asked about the behavior of B. C. Electric employees, however, the B. C. Electric itself becomes an in-group of which they themselves are members. The investigator who was an insider with regard to the first question now becomes an outsider, and in-group loyalty undoubtedly begins to colour the answers. Socio-economic segregation cannot be admitted further because it begins to reek of snobbishness. When asked about the behavior of
Middle Management itself, the respondents begin to think of cases where people have ostentatious residences and then use these examples to measure the behavior of the majority of group members. Furthermore, they usually know persons who recently have moved into a "better" neighborhood, and knowing these persons more or less intimately convinces them that status aspirations had no part in the decisions of these individuals.

This bending of the measuring stick is, perhaps, understandable, but it does not produce objective answers. Consequently, the answers to the above questions reflect the perception of the respondents but not the attitudes of the various groups to the relationship between social status and residence.

Question 41:

In your case, for example, when you are selecting a new place to live do you consider at all how appropriate the house is for a person in your social position?

was answered in such a fashion that 28 of 39 persons said Yes and fourteen said No. Quite a few of the respondents who answered in the affirmative meant the re-sale value of the house or some features of the house, therefore, this summary of results is not entirely representative. If one correlates (a) the answers to Question 41 (b) the answers which the investigator obtained from the discussion with
(c) the "status reasons" each respondent gave with regard to any one selection of a house during the past, the patterns are obtained which are summarized in Table VIII.

### TABLE VIII

**ASSESSMENT OF ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL STATUS POSITION AND HOUSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers given to Question 41</th>
<th>Answers obtained from the discussion</th>
<th>Behavior found on the basis of &quot;STATUS REASONS FOR SELECTION&quot;</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                       | 20|

On the basis of this correlation shown in Table VIII it was found that seventeen respondents recognize the relationship between social status position and choice of house as applicable for themselves, and that this self-appraisal can be confirmed. In the case of three persons this relationship is not admitted but strongly suspected on the basis of the other criteria. For the remaining nineteen respondents, the relationship is neither 2

2 "Status reasons" for selection of neighborhoods are those summarized and explained in the outline given in Part III, Chapter II, Section A, 2.
convincingly admitted nor confirmed.

Question 42:

What about the neighborhood—do you consider whether it is appropriate for a person in your social position?

showed that twenty-eight respondents admitted the relationship and eleven respondents denied it. For reasons outlined in the description of the Method of Analysis, these answers cannot be entirely accepted. Consequently, similar correlations as in the case of Question 41 are made with regard to Question 42. These are summarized in Table IX. The answer provided to Question 42 (a) was compared with (b) the answer which the investigator obtained from the discussion, with (c) the "status reasons" each respondent gave with regard to any one selection of a neighborhood during the past, and with (d) the absolute improvement each respondent experienced while moving from the first to the present residence as measured on the "Status hierarchy of residential areas."

On the basis of these correlations it was found that a maximum of twenty-six persons recognized the relationship between social status position and their choice of neighborhood. Thirteen respondents either did not admit this relationship or sufficient evidence was lacking to

---

2 "Status reasons" for selection of neighborhoods are those summarized and explained in the outline given in Part III, Chapter II, Section B, 2b.
### TABLE IX

ASSESSMENT OF ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR REGARDING THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL STATUS POSITION
AND SELECTION OF THE RESIDENTIAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer given to Question</th>
<th>Answer obtained from the discussion</th>
<th>Behavior established on the basis of &quot;STATUS REASONS&quot;</th>
<th>Residential Improvement According to &quot;STATUS HIERARCHY&quot;</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents who stayed in the same or returned to the original residential area did not improve their residential status according to the "STATUS HIERARCHY."
confirm or suspect recognition of this relationship.

The result of this investigation shows that more than half of this Middle Management group recognizes the relationship between "the appropriateness of the house and neighborhood" and a person's social status position. Furthermore, more people consider the "neighborhood" of greater importance than the "house" as a means of expressing status and obtaining prestige.


CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOVING TO A LARGER
AND MORE ELABORATE DWELLING AND PRESTIGE CONSIDERATIONS

Moving to a Larger Dwelling

The analysis is concerned first with the objective or factual data, and then with the reasons for moving and reasons for selecting a new dwelling. Analysis of the objective data regarding increase of dwelling size clearly shows that the majority of moves made after the respondents occupied their first dwelling upon becoming married was to larger dwellings. In total 100 moves were made by 34 respondents after they had occupied their first dwelling—five respondents have not moved at all since becoming married. Excluding those residences where the respective respondent shared the dwelling with friends or relatives or where other circumstances makes proper assessment of rooms used exclusively by the respondent's family difficult, a total of 92 moves involving 33 respondents are considered. Table X shows that the greater number of moves were made to larger dwellings.

Comparing the number of rooms contained in the first residence which each respondent selected upon becoming married with the number of rooms contained in their present
### TABLE X
TOTAL NUMBER OF MOVES AFTER THE FIRST RESIDENCE
UPON BEING MARRIED TO A LARGER, SAME SIZED,
OR SMALLER DWELLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Move</th>
<th>Number of Moves</th>
<th>Percentage of 92 Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move to a larger dwelling</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to a same-sized dwelling</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to a smaller dwelling</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XI
SIZE OF PRESENT DWELLING AS COMPARED TO SIZE
OF FIRST DWELLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Move</th>
<th>Number of persons</th>
<th>Percentage of Group of 39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved to a larger dwelling</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to a same-sized dwelling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in the first dwelling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to a smaller dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dwelling, the results shown in Table XI are obtained. Almost 80 per cent of the 39 respondents moved to a larger residence since they occupied their first residence upon becoming married. The respondents who remained in their first residence on the average had six rooms per dwelling. Considering the entire group, it was found that the average number of rooms in the first dwelling occupied by each respondent upon becoming married was 3.8 Rooms per Dwelling. At the present time, each respondent occupies a dwelling which on the average contains 7.0 Rooms per Dwelling, an average increase of 3.2 Rooms per Dwelling.

Consequently, the majority of the group has moved on the average to a considerably larger dwelling since they first became married. However, it must be assumed that most young married couples seek at first "a suitable accommodation according to financial ability," where financial ability dictates the spaciousness of the first one or two residences. In fact, on the basis of "Reasons for Selecting a certain Residence in a particular Neighborhood" 31 respondents gave these reasons for selecting a total of 73 of 132 (55.3 per cent) residences which includes the first residence. In the majority, the first and second residence was chosen from this point of view, and usually was a

---

1 A complete summary of reasons will be found in Part IV, Chapter V, Section B, 1.
suite or apartment (Table XII).

**TABLE XII**

CHANGE FROM APARTMENT/SUITE ACCOMMODATION

TO DUPLEX/HOUSE ACCOMMODATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Accommodation</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Seventh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House owned</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House rented</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex rented</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apt. rented</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite rented</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The density in the first residence was high, namely, 0.70 Persons per Room at maximum household size, which according to the definition of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics\(^2\) is near-crowding. One may assume that the first single-detached house rented or owned by each respondent was chosen in order to relieve the space need created by the initial accommodation and in order to accommodate anticipated additions to the household, e.g., children, parents and relatives. Subsequent moves to considerably

---

\(^2\) According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Canada Census 1951, Population and Housing Characteristics, a density of above 0.8 persons per room is considered "crowding."
larger dwellings, one may suspect, may indicate prestige considerations. In Table XIII, all moves are summarized which took place after the respondent rented or owned his first single-detached dwelling. Of the 39 respondents, two are now living in apartments and were excluded from this summary.

**TABLE XIII**

NUMBER OF MOVES FROM THE FIRST SINGLE-DETACHED HOUSE RENTED OR OWNED TO THE HOUSE OWNED AT PRESENT IN TERMS OF MOVES TO LARGER, SAME-SIZED, OR SMALLER DWELLINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Move</th>
<th>Number of Moves</th>
<th>Percentage of 48 Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move to a larger dwelling</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to a same-sized dwelling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to a smaller dwelling</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority (62.6 per cent) of moves from the first house owned or rented were made to still larger dwellings.

Comparing the size of the first rented or owned single-detached dwelling with the size of the present single-detached dwelling occupied by 37 respondents, the
following differences are noted (Table XIV).

**TABLE XIV**

SIZE OF FIRST RENTED OR OWNED SINGLE-DETACHED DWELLING
RELATIVE TO SIZE OF PRESENT SINGLE-DETACHED DWELLING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Move</th>
<th>Number of Moves</th>
<th>Percentage of Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved to a larger dwelling</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to a same-sized dwelling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to a smaller dwelling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in the first dwelling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two persons now residing in apartments were excluded from this summary.

More than half of the group has continued to move to larger dwellings after the apartment/suite accommodation stage was passed, and presumably, the initial need for larger dwellings was satisfied. However, it must be assumed, that further additions to the number of household members enforced additional moves.

In order to find the maximum density each household reached, and either continued to tolerate or reduced by moving to a larger dwelling, number of rooms were compared with number of household members. Those density indices were selected which were not changed again on account of
an increase in household size and represented the maximum density for each household. It was found that the maximum density tolerated on the average by each of the 39 households was 0.72 persons per room which gave each dwelling on the average 5.7 rooms per dwelling. Consequently, population density actually increased slightly above the density created by maximum household size during the first residence which were largely suites and apartments. Although the majority of the respondents were living in single-detached houses, increasing household sizes on the average did not reduce but increased density and space need. Subsequently sixteen households moved into a larger dwelling in order to reduce population density. These sixteen moves reduced overall density to 0.63 persons per room and increased the average number of rooms per dwelling to 6.7 rooms per dwelling.

According to the figures summarized in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics' Bulletin "Population and Housing Characteristics, Vancouver Metropolitan Area by Census Tracts," the following Census Tracts had indices of 0.6 - 0.7 persons per room in 1951: 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 14, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 44, 47, 48, 49, 40, 41, 42, 43, North Vancouver City, and North Vancouver District. Although an index of 0.63 persons per room is closer to the indices found for areas West of Granville Street and in West Vancouver, this density is still an average one and cannot be taken as

3 Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Canada Census 1951, see also Map 3 in Appendix II.
evidence for proving that the majority of respondents chose larger dwellings than required by them.

However, after all respondents adjusted the size of dwelling to the maximum size of their household, five respondents continued to move into a still larger dwelling without being compelled by an increase in household size. In four of these cases, the respondents indicated that they required a large dwelling primarily for the purpose of having guests, entertainment and representativeness. In these four cases moving to a larger house can definitely be attributed to prestige considerations.

In these four cases the density indices vary between 0.33 - 0.50 persons per room. According to the 1951 Census, only Census Tract 22, Shaughnessy west of Granville Street, had a person-per-room density of 0.5 or less. It appears then that a density of 0.5 persons per room or less indicates that a large dwelling is perceived as a status symbol.

Analysing the person-per-room ratios of the dwellings occupied at present by the members of this Middle Management group, one finds that a total of fifteen respondents have 0.5 and better indices. Excluding those cases where the size of the household was reduced on account of death of members, 10 respondents live in dwellings which afford each household member the use of at least two rooms on the average. These respondents furthermore reside in residential
areas which on the basis of the "Status Hierarchy" have a value of 20.6 on the average. In other words, they own houses in the Upper Middle class areas and in areas where land and improvement values are comparatively high. These respondents, on the average, have an annual income of $7,480. The mean annual income of the entire group is $7,620, and the mean value of status areas for the entire group is 31.7.)

On the basis of factual data it can be concluded that 10 of 39 respondents (25.6 per cent of the group) moved into a larger dwelling, presumably in order to obtain the prestige associated with a large dwelling, that is, to be able to show that they can afford more space than would functionally be required.

The subsequent analysis of principal reasons given for moving from each residence is based upon the entire 100 moves made by 34 respondents. Certain assumptions were made about the relative size of those dwellings which were shared with others and for which numbers of rooms used exclusively by the respondents were not available. Analysis of these 100 moves shows that

66 moves were made to larger dwellings
13 moves were made to same-sized dwellings
21 moves were made to smaller dwellings
The principal reasons offered for each move away from a residence for the 66 moves made to larger dwellings are given in Table XV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More space required because:</th>
<th>Number of Moves</th>
<th>Percentage of Total to a larger Dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child expected</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative expected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of family changed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced move, or temporary</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement expired</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area became undesirable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House not representative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for the four respondents who indicated that their dwellings were not desirable from the point of view of entertainment and representation, among other reasons, no further indication can be found that a small dwelling is considered to have less prestige than a larger one. To interpret certain reasons and moves does not appear sensible because one would have to resort to the same method used beforehand, namely, densities.
Among the "reasons for selecting a new residence" the item "large house" was mentioned fourteen times by twelve respondents as one of the factors which determined the choice of a particular residence. In seven cases this factor affected present residences, however, in four cases the size of the family itself demanded a "large house" although in one case the density was better than 0.5 persons per room. This case and the remaining three which mentioned representative aspects were already included in the ten cases which were singled out on the basis of the previous method. Consequently, no additional cases were found in which a relationship between "large house" and prestige was admitted or confirmed through analysis. In view of the ten cases which were identified, one may say that size of the house itself seems to have limited value as status symbol for the Middle Management group. However, before any final conclusions can be drawn, the "elaborateness of the house" as an indication of concern with prestige has to be investigated.

**Moving to a More Elaborate Dwelling**

The elaborateness of a dwelling was judged on the basis of four criteria:

1. Person per Room density index of 0.5 and less.
2. Mention of the reason "large living or recreation room for entertainment" for the selection of a dwelling.
3. Mention of the reason "attractive style of house" for the selection of a dwelling.
Mention of the reason "view" for the selection of a dwelling.

Three residences of a total of 132 residences were identified as "more elaborate" because three of the above criteria applied to these residences. All three residences were dwellings occupied at present by respondents. An additional twelve residences were identified for which two items each classified them as "more elaborate dwellings." However, only six of these dwellings were present residences. The other six dwellings were occupied during earlier stages of residential mobility. One of the persons who once moved to a "more elaborate dwelling" for reasons of prestige now occupies a "larger dwelling" for similar reasons.

Comparison of the ten present residences which were identified as "large dwellings selected for reasons of prestige" with the nine present residences which were identified as "more elaborate dwellings chosen for reasons of prestige" yields five identical residences.

Consequently, on the basis of these two investigations it may be concluded that 14 respondents of a group of 39 are at present residing in "larger or more elaborate dwellings" in order to obtain the prestige associated with these dwellings. It may also be concluded that houses are not considered significant status symbols by the members of this Middle Management group.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOVING TO A BETTER RESIDENTIAL AREA AND STATUS AND PRESTIGE CONSIDERATIONS

This relationship was analysed on the basis of moves from the first residence to the present residence in terms of "status values" computed from the "Status Hierarchy of Residential Areas" as described in the method of analysis. Subsequently, the relationship was analysed on the basis of the reasons given by the respondents for moving from residences and for selecting new residences.

Analysis of the Relationship on the Basis of the "Status Hierarchy" of Residential Areas

The relationship as was pointed out in the description of the method has two connotations. First, it will be established whether this Middle Management group moved to a "better" residential area in terms of an area's position in the "Status Hierarchy." Next, it will be investigated whether and to what degree the respondents "bettered" their residential status according to the "Status Hierarchy." Whether the respondents "bettered" themselves according to their own perception will be investigated later on and on the basis of reasons for moving
and selecting. In this part of the investigation it will also be attempted to analyse the potential correlation between vertical occupational mobility and residential mobility in terms of "status values."

Moving to "Better Residential Areas"

"Better" residential areas were defined as those areas which have a "status value" of 1 - 27 on the "Status Hierarchy." These areas are Upper Upper (1 - 8), Middle Upper (9 - 14), Lower Upper (15 - 17), Upper Middle (18 - 21), and upper Middle Middle residential areas (19 - 27).

In Table XVI following, "Summary of Residential Mobility according to Status Values," the average "status value" obtained by the entire group is shown for the first residence upon becoming married, for each successive residence, and for the present residence. Because one respondent moved seven times, eight residences are listed. All residences except "temporary" and "out-of-town" residences are included in this summary. For each "status value" the "percentage point" value has been computed where the lowest "status value" (74) equals 100 per cent of points. The number of persons who resided in "better residential areas" at each stage of the group's residential mobility

1 See Appendix III.
are enumerated in the lowest row of this summary.

TABLE XVI

SUMMARY OF RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY ACCORDING TO STATUS VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Average Status Value</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Points</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents in &quot;better areas&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above "summary," the group on the average is residing in an area with a "status value" of 31.7 and therefore is not residing in areas which have been defined as "better residential areas" (Status Value 27.0-1.0). However, twenty-one respondents of the group (53.8 per cent) are at present residing in such areas. Of these twenty-one respondents, seven have maintained their residence in these "better areas" since their first residence; one respondent retired from such an area because he did not feel "at ease" there, while fourteen persons moved into these areas after a period of residence in "lower residential areas."

These fourteen respondents came on the average from a residential area with the "status value" of 50.9. They
increased their residential status on the average by a "status value" of 34.1 (46.1 percentage points), and are now residing in an area with the equivalent status value of 16.8. In other words, these fourteen respondents on the average have made considerable efforts to raise their residential status from a very low position in the Upper Lower residential class to a position in the Lower Upper residential class.

The seven respondents who maintained their position in the "better residential areas" increased their residential status on the average by a value of only 2.5 (3.4 percentage points). On the average these persons first resided in an area with the equivalent value of 19.6 and at present are residing in an area with the equivalent status value of 17.1. In other words, on the average, these respondents have remained in the Upper Middle residential areas. Both groups reside on the average in a residential status area with a "status value" equivalent to the residential status value averaged for 92 members of the Organization's Advanced Management group which includes the president and prominent top Middle Management personnel. The average "status value" of this group's residences was calculated at 17.5 (Upper Middle residential class). However, 53 persons of this group (57.6 per cent) reside in Middle Upper residential areas with an equivalent "status value" of 8.6. Seven persons of this group reside in residential areas with the
equivalent "status value" of 49.1 (Upper Lower residential class) and therefore tend to depress the average for the entire Advanced Management group.

The following conclusions may be drawn from the above analysis. First, this Middle Management group contains a core of seven respondents (17.9 per cent) who were accustomed to live in "better residential areas" at least since they became married or joined B. C. Electric. Subsequent occupational mobility actually did not affect their original standard very much, although one person indicated that he intends to move to an Upper Upper residential area within the next few years. The other fourteen respondents having first resided in lower class residential areas made considerable strides to improve their residential status. Undoubtedly these persons have moved in accordance with their improving occupational status, and probably for reasons of prestige and status.

In order to explain the circumstances and the "drive" which enabled these twenty-one persons to achieve positions in "better residential areas" better knowledge of their personalities would have to be gained than this investigation

---

2 Five persons were accustomed to living in "better" areas by virtue of their family background or previous status increases; two persons stated that they moved into "better areas" for social reasons.
could provide. Although the investigator believes he has obtained some insight and a grasp of the individuals' personality traits and circumstances which provide hunches about each person's motives, these cannot be substantiated. Furthermore, the circumstances and traits producing such motives cannot be generalized. For example, one person stated that he moved into a "better residential area" in order to force himself to earn this residential status by increasing his occupational status. Another person married into a well-to-do family and subsequently achieved his status in the Armed Forces, both reasons obliged and encouraged him to seek residence in an "appropriate" residential area. A third respondent maintained that each society has its "social classes" and that he himself by virtue of his effort and ability had worked his way out of the "lower classes" and not only may lay claim upon a residence in "better residential areas" but for his taste and his children's future feels obliged to do so. And a fourth person considers himself a "cultured, individualistic" person who prefers to live in an environment where people are "house-conscious" but otherwise less materialistically inclined. Also, among this group is one who lost his "economic status" before he joined the Organization during the depression but who was compelled to uphold his "social status" because of his relatives' status, and one person who was an immigrant believes that "the average Canadian is not a social climber."
Perhaps, it is possible to tentatively generalize one observation, namely, that these fourteen persons who moved from lower into "better residential areas" had the drive to improve themselves as members of society, in their occupation and as residents, before they even became Middle Management personnel, and that Middle Management became their avenue for improvement and provided them with the opportunity and the financial means to express overtly their respective status position. These persons probably would have found different avenues and different Organizations to enable them to improve their status and satisfy their ambitions. It is not that they are Middle Management and least of all that they are B. C. Electric Middle Management which gives them status, but rather it is because of their personal achievement in their occupation, in the Army or because by virtue of their personality or achievements they were able to marry into "well-to-do" families. Middle Management positions merely classify their personal achievements. However, in order to express their personal achievement and in order to satisfy their original desire for gaining or re-gaining a certain social status, these persons moved into "better residential areas."

On the basis of the "Status Hierarchy" fourteen respondents have significantly increased their residential status while they were employed with the Organization, and
seven maintained the same level of residential status of whom two definitely came from lower class areas. All twenty-one persons it may be assumed were conscious of the particular prestige and status they would obtain from being in these "better residential areas."

Relative Efforts Made by the Respondents to Improve Their Respective Residential Status

The following table, "Summary of Residential Status Improvements by Groups of Middle Management Persons" (Table XVII), shows the efforts made by individuals to improve their residential status. As above, "status values" are based upon the "Status Hierarchy" and computed by adding the respective area status values together and dividing the sum by the number of persons that are at a certain residential mobility stage. In this table only the first and present stage of residential mobility are considered and compared. In the right-hand columns "Decrease/Increase" of "Status Values" and the number of persons who resided in "Better Residential Areas" during the first and present stage of residential mobility are compared.

Group A
This group of five persons has not moved at all since they settled upon being married (three respondents) or came or returned to Vancouver (two respondents). Their residence in below-average-residential areas seems to indicate that these respondents are not concerned with their residence
### TABLE XVII

**SUMMARY OF RESIDENTIAL STATUS IMPROVEMENTS BY GROUPS OF MIDDLE MANAGEMENT PERSONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Behavior</th>
<th>Number of Persons</th>
<th>First Residence Status Values Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Percentage Points</th>
<th>Present Residence Status Values Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Percentage Points</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease Percent Status Values Points</th>
<th>Better Resid. Area No. of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A No more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B No Inc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Decrease</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Big Inc.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>+43.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Med. Inc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>+22.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Low Inc.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>+6.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,766</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,236</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>+13.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


as a means of expressing status or obtaining prestige. However, analysis of the individual cases indicates the following.

Three respondents moved or stayed in houses which their parents occupied before or built for them. Two of these expect to move "to the West" soon because they are becoming dissatisfied with their present social and physical environment. Although they are of widely different financial means, both persons hesitate to burden themselves with mortgages but feel they should move—for the sake of their childrens' upbringing, because the areas are depreciating and because of their position (at least one case mentioned this reason). The third person felt that the neighborhood which built up around his home neither caused his property to depreciate nor affected his prestige. He intends to stay until retirement. The fourth person retired and selected a reasonably priced place before he joined the B. C. Electric. He does not consider himself a "social lion" and realizes that his residence is perhaps not "appropriate" but he is satisfied and intends to stay. The fifth person came to Vancouver after the war and during the period of housing shortage. The place he selected was adjacent to an area which subsequently was rezoned for industrial uses. Although he would like to move "West" he could do so only after selling his property at a loss.
 Obviously, none of these persons chose his residence for reasons of prestige or in anticipation of the later promotion to a supervisory position. All of them are aware of the relationship between their residential and social status but only three are intending to adjust their residences to the social status which they have acquired on the basis of their position and their financial ability.

Group B

This group of respondents moved once or twice within the same general neighborhood or returned to it after one or two in-between moves to other areas. Since these four respondents are residing on the average in a lower Middle residential area one may suspect that they were accustomed to live in this type of environment and are not overly concerned with improving their residential status, or they may be at the verge of their next move.

Two respondents were actually raised in their respective neighborhoods. One person once moved to a "better residential area" but returned to his father's home because it suited him regarding to size and payments, furthermore the area promised to be rezoned for multiple dwelling use. This person expects to retire soon. He and the other person who was considerably handicapped by illness in the family almost certainly did not select their residences for reasons of prestige. The latter person,
however, is about to move to a fashionable sub-division outside Vancouver. Prestige may be a motive, particularly as this person intends to move with a group of company friends and expressed resentments about the social character and physical depreciation of his present neighborhood. Both of the other two persons were accustomed to living in "better residential areas;" one is residing in such an area, the other has realized his "potential financial ability on account of rapid promotion" and intends to move "up the hill" in the near future. Both persons, probably, did not crave for prestige, but both are conscious of their status in society and have definite standards of residence.

Of these four persons, two were concerned with maintaining a residential standard appropriate to their social position, one of them and a third person are about to make "status moves."

Group C

The six persons in this group actually lowered their residential status and appear to reside in the equivalent of a lower Middle Middle residential area. No concern with prestige and status may be expected among members of this group. However, only one person reduced his residential status considerably after he resided temporarily in a "better residential area" and did not feel "at ease" there. This person, presumably, would be concerned with prestige
were it not for the fact that prestige environments tend to
censure a person's way of living. Two persons retained their
position in a "better residential area;" one is concerned
with his prestige as a "cultural minded, home conscious"
person, and the other is concerned with "a good type of
people who maintain their property," and moved thrice
because they had not done so. Of the remaining three persons,
one, according to and presumably because of his wife, has
moved for reasons of prestige with other top Middle
Management officials, and two have moved in one of the least
pretentious residential areas. However, one of these persons
is recovering from a previous "status move" and expects to
move into an Upper residential area within the next year--
and to be closer to his friends and relatives.

Among this group there are actually five persons who
made "status moves" in the past of which one may be
discounted. Only one person expects to make a "status move"
within the foreseeable future, the others are satisfied
with their present house and neighborhood.

Group D
This group of nine persons on the average came from the
Middle Lower residential areas and now resides in the top
Upper Middle residential areas. This group has increased
its residential status almost by twice as much as the
Medium Increase group. All of these persons are now
residing in "better residential areas" and with the
exception of one, all came from Middle Lower and Lower Lower residential areas. Consequently, as a group these persons must be very concerned with status and prestige.

As a group they are also very unequal with regard to aspects of their background. Four of these persons joined B. C. Electric as streetcar operators or mechanics, three were clerks of whom two achieved status in the Armed Forces, and two are university graduates. These last four persons are earning more than $10,000 a year each, while the other five earn between $6,000 to $7,500 a year each. One person married into a well-to-do family, one has an independent income, one has a wife who discusses "Fruit" (Freud), and a fourth is a "Christian, not class-conscious but proud of his home." Two persons admitted that they moved for prestige into their present neighborhood, and both intend to move higher although one has qualms about moving "too far West" in view of his old colleagues. For one person selection of a residence in a "better residential area" indicated his aspiration ceiling; three persons moved in order to afford their children the right kind of social environment--near the university and up to "Canada's best residential area," and one moved to please his wife, her relatives and himself. The remaining two respondents moved to the rural atmosphere of West Vancouver. Of these nine persons, two hope to settle on waterfront lots in West
Vancouver, one in the University area, one intends to move deeper into Shaughnessey, and one closer to it. One person would like to be "further West," one "higher North," one expects to retire and convert his place into a multiple dwelling, and one respondent just moved to a $32,000 home.

In view of the fact that all of these nine respondents are residing in "better residential areas" and came from lower areas, that seven are planning status moves and most of them either admitted or indicated their concern with their status and the prestige of the house and neighborhood, one can conclude that at least eight respondents of this group were aware of the prestige they would obtain by moving into better residential areas.

Group E
This group of six respondents came on the average also from Middle and Lower Lower residential areas but increased its average residential status only by 22.4 status values. At present these persons are residing in areas that have an average status value slightly below the average value of the entire group of 39 respondents. In contrast to the former group, this group made much less effort to improve its residential status and possibly is not as prestige conscious as the previous group investigated.

Three persons of this group earn more than $9,000 a year each. Two of them built houses in outlying areas where
lots are relatively cheap, and one home was referred to by the owner as a "prestige home." Both realize that their neighborhoods have little prestige to impart, and one respondent wonders whether he should move in view of what is expected from a person in his position in the Organization, and the other respondent is going to move because of the functions he has to fulfill as a representative of the Organization. The third person in this income group has resided twice in top residential areas but always retreated to recover in the "outlying areas." In his case his wife "motions him back to town" and, presumably, into "better residential areas" where she is "less socially isolated." One person stated that he always wanted to live in "East Vancouver," and he does. Another one at one time followed his friends "to the West" and in owning a house with a "rich look," but now lives in a less pretentious home and neighborhood. The last respondent of this group who also lives in a "better residential area" has "little in common with laborers" and must prove it.

Of these six persons four indicated that they at one time were concerned with the prestige of a neighborhood, although for only two of them this concern is convincingly established. Two apparently were not concerned. Two are now definitely concerned with the appropriateness of their neighborhood, one may become concerned while three intend to stay indefinitely.
Group F
This last group came on the average from Middle class areas, and on the average has almost achieved residence in "better residential areas" with the least change in residential status. Eight persons of this group of nine are now residing in "better residential areas." Four of them had ever since they became married. This group of people appears to be accustomed to residing in better areas; they may have definite standards but are not overly concerned with improving their residential status continuously.

Actually, the average of the group was depressed by two respondents who came from low residential areas and did not improve their residential status to any noticeable degree. In one case, a person lives in a respectable area next to one of the worst residential areas which however, determined the place of the entire area in the "Status Hierarchy." This person actually moved to this area in order to escape a "socially undesirable environment" elsewhere, and made a "status move" before. The other person lives in a post-war NHA development "East of Main," and having been told this, he expects to move "West" where all supervisors move to--according to several respondents.

The remainder of the group, all told seven persons, selected their first residence on the average in "better residential areas," and all of them after a slight increase
are at present residing in "better residential areas."

Three selected their first residence with the expressed intention to overcome their formative past in the "East," and they continued selecting "better residential areas" in order to assure their children the appropriate social environments and "better schools." Two of them expect to improve their residential status further, one makes it dependent upon a substantial promotion. One person married into a well-to-do family and had difficulties maintaining the "appropriateness of the house and neighborhood" in direct view of the relatives. Three respondents followed the rising trend of property prices up the North Shore mountains. One intends to stay and "enjoy other things in life" while the other thinks he rather needs a bigger lot further West. The third person did not commit himself.

Of the seven persons who are now residing in "better residential areas," four admitted concern with prestige, two probably had prestige in mind when they moved, and one could not be evaluated properly. One of the remaining persons moved in the past for reasons of prestige, and one intends to. Four persons intend to improve their status, three may, and two intend to remain in their present residences.

On the basis of the relative improvement of each respondent's residential status compared with the circumstances which determined and resulted from each major "improvement"
move," it may be concluded that twenty-one respondents definitely improved their residential status with the intention to satisfy their social status and prestige needs.

An additional five respondents may be strongly suspected of having made "status moves" in the past, while thirteen respondents either have not improved their residential status at all or only to a slight degree, and sufficient evidence is lacking that they selected their past or present residence for reasons of status and prestige. However, seven of these thirteen respondents are now definitely intending to make "status moves" within the near future.

Therefore, at present, a total of thirty-three respondents either were, or will be in the future concerned with the appropriateness of the neighborhood in order to satisfy their social status and prestige needs.
The Relationship Between Vertical Occupational Mobility and Improving Residential Status

General observations. The Middle Management respondents made their most significant increase of residential status on the average with their first move. This may lead one to infer that the selection of the first residence upon being married has little meaning for measuring subsequent status increases, or that the majority of the group makes its residential status adjustment in anticipation of a subsequent promotion or irregardless of any promotion or occupational mobility, at all.

Selection of the first residence may have no meaning as a basis for inferring subsequent status increases because young couples will select residences in those areas which offer cheap accommodation and are generally accepted as "high mobility areas." In other words, young couples may have been raised in "better residential areas" but in order to be able to reside eventually in these areas, they have to accept a short residence in one of these transient areas. One may argue that this behavior of young couples would indicate the concern persons have for regaining a status which their families bestowed upon them. In order to achieve this status they may have to drive harder in their profession to be able to afford residence in a "better residential area."
Vertical occupational mobility may provide them with the financial means but may not raise their social status which encourages them to live in certain areas. Although these aspects were not investigated it is believed that no more then fourteen persons were raised in "better residential areas," and likely less than that.

Analysis of the principal reasons given for the selection of the first residence in each case yields the following categories:

Suitable accommodation at anywhere reasonable cost ) anywhere reasonable cost ) : 19 Respondents
Low down payment ) Low lot price )

Suitable accommodation at reasonable cost in socially desirable neighborhood : 10 Respondents
Raised in this neighborhood : 7 "
Others : 3 "

39 Respondents

Nineteen respondents apparently were not concerned with the "status" of their first residence, ten obviously were, and seven stayed in the neighborhood in which they were raised, all of which were lower residential areas. Consequently, seventeen respondents defined in terms of likes and dislikes where they wanted to make their first residence. The majority of respondents in the first category came from middle to low residential areas and it can be assumed that they did not "degrade" themselves
considerably by moving into residential areas with an equivalent status value of 45.5 (61.5 percentage points) for their first residence.

Thirty-four respondents who made more than one move after their first residence on the average stayed in their first residence for 2.9 years, while twenty-four respondents who made more than two moves on the average stayed 3.8 years in their second residence. The majority of respondents, it seems, must have stayed long enough in their first and their second residence to become identified with their neighborhood, and long enough to make them realize their position and aspiration against the background of their social environments. These considerations, probably, aroused in most of them the desire to seek residence in a better residential area, although the "choice adjustment" in terms of prestige and status probably is made less often with the first and second but with the third and fourth move. A considerable number of respondents are not settled yet and will not be until they have reached the ceiling of their occupational mobility. For the purpose of this investigation, therefore, the selection of the first residence is not meaningless but very revealing.

Because the first significant adjustment of residential status is made after the respondents on the average resided for 2.9 years in their first residence, it must be assumed that family increase rather than occupational mobility
enforces this adjustment. In other words, because children arrive the young couple has to move from the area where apartment living, transiency and families without children are the residential pattern to areas where families with children living in single-detached homes is the typical residential pattern. In fact the greatest intensity of moving occurs on the average between the first and fifth year after marriage. On the average each respondent makes 2.3 moves during the period of greatest moving intensity. The entire group, however, made 2.8 moves on the average during the entire period investigated here (excluding those five persons who did not move at all). Therefore, each respondent, theoretically makes only 0.5 moves after the first five years of marriage; theoretically, however, 3\frac{1}{4} respondents on the average did not become supervisor before 7.7 years of marriage, and five became supervisor on the average five years before marriage.

Consequently, on the basis of these statistics little correlation exists between occupational and residential mobility because on the average the group made their greatest status increase with the first move. This relationship will be investigated below.

The relationship between promotion to supervisor and moving to better residential areas. The only data about occupational mobility which could consistently be obtained from all respondents was the date of promotion to supervisor
which is assumed here to be synonymous with joining Middle Management. As was shown previously only fourteen respondents considered a promotion from ranks to supervisor as being of significance for a person's social status.

Of the 39 supervisors questioned, five achieved their promotion before becoming married. These five respondents selected their first residence in an area with the average status value of 33.4, and are residing at present in an area with the average value of 34.2. One person has remained in a "better residential area," two moved to such areas, one person left and one never approached "better residential areas." None of these persons admitted a relationship between rise in occupational status and social status. Three persons admitted selecting neighborhoods in terms of the appropriateness for their social position and all three are residing now in "better residential areas" but only one person lived there upon being married, and he was hired eleven years before as supervisor. The other two persons adjusted their residence within 3 to 5 years after marriage and became supervisor 1 to 2 years before marriage. One anticipated it, the other relates his status to his Army career. In these two cases marriage may have stood in direct relationship to becoming supervisor, residential status adjustment came after the usual period of, presumably, saving the downpayment. Then, however, they moved at once into "better residential areas."
Twelve persons did not move at all after becoming supervisor, and it may be suspected that they adjusted their residential status in anticipation of the promotion. Five persons stayed in the first residence which they selected upon becoming married or settled in Vancouver. This Group A has been described before; they reside in a status area with the average value of \(48.8\), and did not select residences for reasons of prestige, although three intend to move now.

Seven persons moved once or twice before becoming supervisor. On the average they moved from an area with a status value of \(42.4\) to an area with a status value of \(31.1\). One lived in a "better residential area," three more moved into these areas. However, one of these moved seventeen years before he became supervisor and two moved six years each before the promotion. All three recognize the relationship between increase in occupational status affecting increase in social status. They admit selecting the neighborhood in accordance with their social position, and, furthermore, admit that they experienced an increase in social position upon becoming supervisor. However, the direct relationship between becoming supervisor and residential mobility, even in anticipation, is missing. Two of the other persons moved eight and nine years before becoming supervisor within the same general neighborhood. The last person of this group improved his residential status slightly within the lower areas and seven
years before he became supervisor. No convincing relationship between promotion and residential mobility as such can be established for these twelve persons unless more factors are known, and particularly, until better understanding is gained about the potential range of anticipating a change of conditions which may then predetermine a person's behavior.

Ten persons moved prior to and after their promotion. Eight of these respondents lived in their second residence when being promoted and increased their residential status from an average of 49.0 to 26.0 with their last move before the promotion. As a group, these eight respondents on the average lived in "better residential areas" prior to their promotion. Their move after promotion increased their residential status on the average by 3.5 values. Therefore, on the average it appears that they made their "status moves" in anticipation of the promotion. Investigation of the individual cases shows that five persons made their "status move" before the promotion although one may suspect in only three cases that the persons moved in anticipation of the promotion. The other five respondents made their "status moves" after the promotion, four of these moves may be suspected of being related to the promotion.

Twelve persons actually moved during the same year in which they were promoted to a supervisory position. On the average they came from residential areas with a status
value of 51.5 and upon becoming supervisor moved to an area
with a status value of 32.2. On the average therefore, each
person increased his status considerably. However, one person
stayed in the same area, one decreased in status value, one
made a small increase and another person made a move within
the lower residential areas. On investigating each individual
case, three residential moves may be eliminated as having no
relationship to the promotion. In one case the person was
offered to take over his parents place, in another the
person temporarily moved into a duplex closer to his family
because his wife expected a child (he made his status move
afterwards), and one person returned after the war and was
made supervisor, but had to take an "unsatisfactory" dwelling
in an unpretentious neighborhood where he still resides.
In five cases the relationship between promotion and move
was admitted, and in four cases the relationship may be
suspected.

In summary it was found that five respondents
admitted the relationship between promotion and moving,
and in eleven cases this relationship may be suspected. Of
these eleven persons three persons moved in anticipation
of the promotion to supervisor; four during the same year,
and four after the promotion. Those persons who admitted
the relationship, either admitted it directly by saying they
moved for reasons of prestige or they insinuated that the
promotion promised them a future status, economic as well as social, of which they may take advantage at once. Of these sixteen persons eight recognized the relationship between increase in occupational status and social status, and all of these considered the step from the ranks to supervisory position the most important one. Two persons related their increase in social status to University graduation and a career in the army, while six persons saw no relationship between a promotion and a rise in social status for themselves. These six persons, however, made the following pertinent remarks. One thought that becoming a Professional Engineer may have given him a higher status; one felt that a promotion to supervisor forces a certain behavior on persons; one anticipated the promotion; one took out life policies guaranteeing his children's University education (and moved towards the University three years after the promotion); one had a feeling of achievement; and one always had a certain social standard and therefore, was not affected by a change in social status.

In conclusion, therefore, it may be said that this investigation has not satisfactorily proven or disproven whether there is a direct relationship between promotion and residential mobility. Although a few people definitely stated that a person should move upon becoming supervisor if he lived
in low-type dwellings and neighborhoods, and although a greater number of persons felt that becoming supervisor changes a person's social status, various special circumstances influence and determine whether people will change their residential status.

First, it depends on the condition and location of their dwelling at the time of their promotion. Usually, they are promoted after a certain length of employment during which they have been able to move to environments which do not give them the feeling of being "out of place" once they have become promoted. A certain amount of attachment to the neighborhood itself has to be worn down first before they may move because their status has changed.

Second, a promotion to a supervisory position usually is not accompanied by a vast increase in pay. A bus operator, for example, can make more money because he is paid overtime; upon being promoted to supervisor, the increase in pay may not balance the loss of overtime pay. Apart from this discrepancy, the person still has to build up his financial ability before he can move into a better dwelling and residential area, unless he is not concerned with going deeply into debt. It appeared that not too many respondents placed themselves into a difficult position by over-reaching themselves, although few people will admit this fact; this important factor was not analysed in this investigation.
Third, most people seemed to agree that the most rank positions in Middle Management are not conspicuous or important enough from their own and the Organization's point of view to warrant a particular emphasis upon the dwelling and the location of the dwelling. It was felt that from the top ranks on in Middle Management, residence does assume importance and some of the persons in this position verified this assumption by their behavior and their explanations.

It must be assumed then that the promotion itself does not precipitate a great number of significant status moves but that most persons, after the promotion, move less randomly and are more concerned with moving to the "right places" and in the "right directions." Further, these moves may not show up in the "Status Hierarchy" because all the areas West of Cambie Street and on the North Shore offer "conspicuous" residences and residential areas on a smaller scale within some of the Middle Class areas.

Furthermore, one must consider that forty-seven residential areas are below the midpoint of the descriptive "Status Hierarchy," and twenty-seven areas above the midpoint. These proportions indicate that the higher the status of an area becomes, the fewer of these areas are available and the more difficult it becomes to obtain and afford residence in these areas. On the basis of the "Status Hierarchy" a person may have made a large jump from
a low-class area into one of the middle-class areas without too much difficulty, however, in order to move into better areas from now on becomes increasingly more difficult. These moves will only appear as slight increases on the "Status Hierarchy" but they are the significant ones as regards status and prestige considerations. In order to evaluate them properly, the analysis and investigation would have to be carried out in much greater detail and be based on different methods.

The relationship between rate of occupational mobility and improvement of residential status. The previous investigation failed to prove that a direct relationship between occupational and social mobility exists in all cases, however, a relationship between rate of occupational mobility and improvement of residential status may exist. A person who raises his occupational status quickly may have a different sense of change in social status than a person who advances slowly. Although the latter person may have more time to accumulate resources which permit him to make a significant "status move," the rapidly advancing person not only is able to accumulate resources quicker but may have more confidence in his potential financial ability. Therefore, it may be hypothesized that rapid occupational mobility causes a relatively more rapid and more significant change of residential status.
The following discussion is based upon the attempt to investigate this potential relationship (Table XVII). The group of 39 respondents was divided into three groups on the basis of length of employment with the Organization. These three groups correspond to three concentrations of people on the distribution curve of length of employment. For each group the average increase of residential status value between first and present residence was estimated. The rate of increase was estimated by dividing average increase of status value by length of period between first and present residence. The fact that the respondents married at different intervals before and after their year of being employed with the B. C. Electric probably has a considerable influence upon the results and cannot be controlled.

The group which on the average joined B. C. Electric before and during the Depression increased its residential status the least and at the lowest rate. The fastest rate of increase was achieved by the group which joined the B. C. Electric during the post-war years. This group also became supervisor within the shortest period of employment.

Table XIX is based upon average length of time each individual was employed before he became supervisor. The same method was applied as above.

The data in Table XIX are of limited significance, because some persons were hired as supervisors or became
### TABLE XVIII
RELATIONSHIP OF LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT TO RESIDENTIAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employed since</th>
<th>Number of Employment</th>
<th>Before Becoming Supervisor</th>
<th>Status Value</th>
<th>Rate of Increase per Year of Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>First Resid.</td>
<td>Present Resid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933-45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XIX
RELATIONSHIP OF LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT BEFORE BECOMING SUPERVISOR TO RESIDENTIAL STATUS INCREASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period before becoming Sup. (in years)</th>
<th>Number of Employment</th>
<th>Before Becoming Supervisor</th>
<th>Status Value</th>
<th>Rate of Increase per Year of Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>First Resid.</td>
<td>Present Resid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supervisors immediately after their first employment but were not promoted very rapidly afterwards. The fact that those people who took the longest time to become supervisors have a rate of increase more closely related to those who became supervisors after the shortest period of employment than to the medium group may lead one to conclude that they have the greatest need for expressing their status position, presumably, because they were frustrated for a long period of time. The middle group which came from the relatively best areas has neither been frustrated nor are they very ambitious nor do they need to be overly concerned with improving their residential status. However, on investigating the individual cases one realizes that entirely different individuals with varying backgrounds were grouped together accidentally. If one attempts to isolate those who have the shortest employment, the shortest period before becoming supervisor, married shortly before becoming employed or supervisor, have the highest income, etc. and continues grouping them until one reaches the group with the longest employment, the longest period before becoming supervisor, and the lowest income, one ends up with a great variety of very small groups which may have a similar behavior, but most likely have not. The conclusion is that this sample is too small, that not enough qualitative and quantitative data is available to make meaningful correlations, and that one needs an IBM punch-card system to be able to control all influential factors.
Lastly, the entire group was separated according to groups of similar annual salaries, and increases and rates of increase were computed in the same manner as above. The data in Table XX do show that the group with the most rapid occupational mobility has the most significant residential status increase. However, all the other data lead one to hypothesize a great number of relationships which cannot be verified, and which makes one doubt the validity of the above casual relationship.

Consequently, on the basis of this investigation one may suspect but not prove relationship between rate of occupational and rate of residential status mobility.

Analysis of the Relationship between Moving to a Better Residential Area and Status and Prestige Consideration on the Basis of Reasons for Moving and Selecting

The relationship will be tested first on the basis of "Reasons for Moving," then on the basis of "Reasons for Selecting." The significance of the difference was explained in the description of the method of analysis.

Reasons for Moving

Two objectives promoted the investigation of reasons for moving. First, it was desirable to enumerate all principal reasons which persons may have for leaving a
TABLE XX

RELATIONSHIP OF SIZE OF ANNUAL SALARY TO
RESIDENTIAL STATUS INCREASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Employment Rate Before Becoming Supervisor</th>
<th>Status Value</th>
<th>Rate of Increase per Year of Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,500-5,499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,500-6,499</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,500-7,499</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,500-8,499</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,500-9,499</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,500-10,499</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,500-11,599</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
particular residence. The enumeration would provide a
distribution of reasons which might or might not be
representative of the motives for moving. Furthermore, it
would be possible to classify moves into popular reason
categories. Second, it was intended to probe certain reasons
and to find the motives which may lie behind them. This was
not possible in many cases for the simple reason that it was
difficult to develop schemes of reasoning which might
approximate the motive structure behind a particular reason
but which might also not embarrass the respondent. Since
it was necessary to retain the respondent's good will and not
give the purpose of the interview away too early, the probing
had to be restricted to certain reasons and certain respondents.

Table XXI "Summary of Reasons for Moving" presents
eighteen categories of reasons into which 163 reasons
advanced by 34 respondents for a total of 100 moves were
classified. Most of these reasons, probably, are true
reasons; whether they are all important reasons or all
touch on the motives a person may have had for moving, is
doubtful.

For example, "Increase in family" actually is not
a motive for leaving an apartment or suite, nor are the
auxiliary reasons which usually serve to explain an
"increase-in-family" move, such as lack of space, lack of
facilities, annoyance to the neighbors, or similar ones. Granted, the landlord's rule against permitting children is a motive for moving and one does not have to search far for other motives, but where this rule does not exist other motives operate. One such motive is the traditionally accepted norm that one does not raise children in apartments or suites. There are reasons for this norm, but these reasons are not lack of space, playgrounds, privacy or supervision because all persons who presented these reasons still would not consider raising their family in apartments even if apartment houses had indoor and outdoor playing facilities, if all apartments were soundproof and of distinctive design, and had most of the physical advantages offered by a single-family home and lot. It is "not the proper way of raising children." No doubt this habitually adopted norm has become a motivational factor in a society which in its various strata has scarce experience with living under confining conditions. People who were raised and taught to think in one way find it difficult to behave otherwise or encourage others to behave differently. Possibly the inherent connotation is that a person admits low economic status if he raises a family in an apartment or simply has a wrong sense of responsibility. However, the more obvious explanation must be that this cultural habit of raising families in single-detached homes is part of the society's value system to which everybody, consciously or unconsciously, voluntarily (or after having
seen too many raised eyebrows) conforms. The fact that in other societies children grow up normally in apartments seems to prove that values rather than reasons motivate people to exchange apartments for private homes as soon as a child has arrived.

The "desire to own" is another example of a reason which serves to explain a motive most people cannot even satisfactorily rationalize without admitting conformity to a socially cherished norm of behavior. People usually mention the independence ownership offers them, yet at the same time, and perhaps, without realizing it, they are extremely dependent upon the neighbors and their manner of maintaining property. Ownership affords them a kind of independence but to decide when to move in order to escape depreciation of property--and this seems to be the overwhelming concern of the persons investigated in this study--hardly glorifies independent ownership. Most of these persons appear to be slaves of their property because they have made their security dependent upon it. Because most of them move when they fear depreciation, and then tend to move to areas which they consider stable because they are "better residential areas with the right kind of people," they are really concerned with two things, namely psychological and physical security. Physical security comes with investing money in property which is believed to rise and fall with the
general economy; this belief plus "owning" also gives them psychological security. People seem to think that owning property is "the right thing to do" not merely because it is good economic horse sense, but as a social norm. The minority which does not own property and does not intend to indicates by their very disconcern doubts about the value of ownership and scorns a way of life which is valued. This is a disturbing thought to the others who then may unconsciously resent those who do not appreciate their way of life and their values. Resentments and feelings of insecurity usually breed an attitude of make-believe superiority which is reinforced and rationalized by the notion that property owners can afford owning property, and others who may value different ways of spending their money, cannot; they are therefore, also inferior in the economic sense. Thus the status of the property owner is established as the status of the solid Middle class which usually carries on the values of society, and the more property one owns in certain areas the more status one has.

Table XXI, then summarizes the kind of reasons people present for moving. In Table XXII "Distribution of Reasons for Moving according to Stages in Residential Mobility" the number of reasons given for the first and each successive move are summarized. "Increase in Family" caused fifteen moves from the first residence, while with the next move a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Categories</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Percentage of 163</th>
<th>Number of Persons</th>
<th>Percentage of 34</th>
<th>Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable neighborhood</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in family size</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary arrangements</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable condition of house</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interior space</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to own</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced to move because of expenses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better housing bargain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner returned or sold house</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of privacy—not because of children</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities lacking in neighborhood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden wanted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much gardening</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe neighborhood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too far from work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of closet space, lot too small</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural glamour wore off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXII

DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS FOR MOVING ACCORDING TO STAGES IN RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Categories</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Seventh</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Undesirable Neighborhood</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Increase in family size</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Temporary arrangements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Undes. condition of house</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lack of interior space</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Desire to own</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Prestige</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Forced out because of expenses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Better housing bargain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Owner returned or sold house</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Lack of privacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Facilities lacking in Neighborhood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Garden wanted</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Too much gardening</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Unsafe neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Too far from work</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 No closet space, small lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Rural glamour wore off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Reasons</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of People Moving</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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great number of "temporary arrangements" came to an end and people moved into their own homes. In Table XXIII "Combinations of Reasons for Moving" these combinations are self-explanatory. The items summarized under "prestige consideration" deserve some clarification.

"Undesirable neighborhood" usually refers to the depreciation an area experienced upon being invaded by an undesirable type of people which can afford buying houses which the previous undesirable type of people has not properly maintained. In the case of apartment dwellers, the other transients are the undesirable type of person. The respondents usually rationalized that the environment had a bad effect upon the behavior of their own children and the children were less likely to follow the parents' aspiration for their upbringing and education. The parents' concern with their own prestige and status is obvious. "Desire to own" as has been explained seems to indicate concern with status and prestige.

"Prestige" reasons were indicated when persons moved from areas and houses in order to maintain their prestige with friends, colleagues and relatives. Sometimes, the relationship between occupational mobility and moving shows up, and sometimes people do not want to be identified with a group of other people for which they have contempt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Reason</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Reasons</th>
<th>Percentage of 163 Persons</th>
<th>Percentage of 34 Persons</th>
<th>Moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Family Needs</strong></td>
<td>2 Increase in family size</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Undes. condition of house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Lack of interior space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Lack of closet space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Prestige and Status</strong></td>
<td>1 Undesirable neighborhood</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Desire to own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Forced Moves</strong></td>
<td>3 Temporary arrangements</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Financial Reasons</strong></td>
<td>8 Forced out because of exp.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Better housing bargain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Location of Dwell.</strong></td>
<td>12 Facilities lacking in Neigh.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Unsafe neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Too far from work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Other Reasons</strong></td>
<td>11 Lack of privacy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Garden desired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Too much gardening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Rural glamour wore off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty respondents of a group of thirty-nine considered with regard to thirty-four moves the effect which residence and neighborhood has upon their status and prestige. According to their own perception, these twenty respondents improved their residential status in order to satisfy their status needs.

On the basis of the "Status Hierarchy," twenty-three of these thirty-four moves increased the residential status of the twenty respondents by an average status value of 23.1, while two moves were changes of houses within the same general area, and nine moves lowered the residential status of the concerned persons by an average of 17.1. This decrease was largely due to one person who moved from an "undesirable neighborhood" into an apartment area, and two other respondents who left their previous residence for social reasons and moved into outlying areas. In both cases "undesirable social environment" meant really that they had made a "status move" before but found that they could not "keep up with the Joneses." However, these three respondents and the other six respondents who were responsible for very minor decreases also made positive status moves; therefore, the total of twenty respondents who moved for reasons of status and prestige remains unchanged.
Reasons for Selecting a New Residence

The emphasis in this investigation was upon "Reasons for Selecting" rather than "Reasons for Moving," because it was felt that people would find it easier to admit moving to a desirable environment rather than admit moving from an undesirable environment. Furthermore, they may have moved for "practical" reasons, e.g. increase in family size, facilities lacking in the dwelling and the neighborhood and others, but selected an environment according to their status and prestige needs. Lastly it was easier to confront them with potential choices of residential areas and infer from the reasons which they presented regarding the unsuitability or suitability of these areas which characteristics of residential areas attracted or repelled them.

Table XXIV "Summary of Reasons for Selecting Dwellings in Residential Areas" classifies a total of 427 reasons into 50 categories. Most of these reasons are not motives, and within each category of reasons several motives may be detected or assumed.

For example, "Moving Closer to University" contains three identifiable motives. One person moved closer to the University because he attended classes there, had no car, but wanted to be at a reasonable time distance from it. In his case comfort and efficiency were his motives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Reasons for Selecting</th>
<th>Number of Reasons</th>
<th>Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Socially desirable neighborhood</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. House appeared as good investment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Suitable accommodation at lowest rent in any district</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Close to work</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. View lot</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Large lot</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Large house</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Residence in outlying area (rural atmosphere)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Suitable accommodation at lowest rent in good district</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Attractive, distinctive style of house</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Close to recreational facilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wanted to build house in high lot cost district</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Close to public transportation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Advantageous buying terms</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Returned to/moved within socially desirable neighborhood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Raised in the neighborhood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Friends, colleagues or relatives attracted me to neighborhood</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Good schools, desirable for raising children</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Stayed temporarily with friends and relatives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Close to downtown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Wanted to build house in low lot cost area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Close to university</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Attractive, clean house or apartment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Close to school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Reasons for Selecting</td>
<td>Number of Reasons</td>
<td>Number of Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Close to friends or relatives (assistance)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Large lot and garden</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Large living or recreation room for entertainment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Close to shops</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Same economic group in the neighborhood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Low down-payment in any area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Returned/moved within the neighborhood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Moved into area for reasons of prestige</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Place required minimum of attention</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Selected place or built to have maximum privacy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Healthy location</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. House had attractive floor plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Rented house/apartment temporarily to recover financially</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Low down-payment for house in good district</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Option to buy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Safe and quiet neighborhood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Suitable accommodation at lowest rent in best district</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Back to town (socially isolated)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Always liked Hastings Townsite</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Inherited house</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Low density development--not outlying</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Well-built house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. House respectable in the eyes of relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Area with reasonable housing prices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. House wanted without garden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Small house wanted temporarily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another person moved closer to the University because he wanted to be associated with the "cultural environment" surrounding the University. In his case, perception of himself as a "cultured, non-materialistic" individual, the desire to associate with kindred persons, and a need for identification with these types of personalities and the University environment were his motive. Other persons moved closer to the University because they perceived a higher standard of education in the surrounding schools and a better social environment in the general area which they considered conducive to raising their children in such a way, that they "naturally" would aspire to a higher standard of education and social status. In these cases, status aspiration for their children and themselves were the underlying motives.

Although the investigator could analyse the majority of reasons summarized in the table and indicate motives which may lie behind these reasons, it does not seem justifiable to re-classify all reasons into categories of motives without being able at the same time to substantiate these hypothesized relationships by factual data. Consequently, the majority of reasons were accepted on their face value, while some were grouped into categories which have different meanings.

For example, "Suitable accommodation at lowest rent" consists of three categories. Category (3) summarizes all
reasons which stated that people looked everywhere in order to find a low-rent suite and apartment. Most of the times they selected one in lower residential areas. Category (9) includes all reasons which were stated in combination with such remarks as "looked only West of Main Street, and south of Broadway," or "never considered East Vancouver," or "only in decent neighborhood," and where it could be assumed that these persons were concerned with the type of social environment in which they intended to take residence even on a temporary basis. Category (41) summarized the few reasons which indicated that the persons had financial difficulties but for reasons of prestige, particularly with respect to relatives, had to move into high-class residential areas. Similar differences were made with regard to down-payments and house construction in low and high lot cost districts.

Reasons summarized under "Socially desirable neighborhood" include those when people actually stated that they wanted a certain type of social environment or when it could be inferred that they wanted to live among a certain socio-economic class, e.g. not in the laboring class districts, West of Main, among White Collar workers, young executive types, people which were not car but house conscious, people who would maintain their property, people of kindred
behavior, attitudes and values etc.

Subsequently, these categories of reasons are grouped together in terms of face values and, where possible, in terms of concern with prestige and status; finally all groups are drawn together for which a concern with prestige and status might be suspected as the underlying motive.

Table XXV "Distribution of Reasons for Selecting Dwellings and Residential Neighborhood according to Stages in Residential Mobility" shows that for selecting the first residence a majority of respondents were concerned with obtaining a suitable accommodation at the lowest rent (25 reasons); or which was located close to work, close to recreational facilities, close to public transportation, close to downtown, and close to shops (26 reasons). Although a concern with the character of the neighborhood as a social unit and for investment is obvious (Items 1, 2, 9, 12, 16, 17, 32, 41, and 47 = 32 reasons), this concern became much more important when selecting the second and third residence. With regard to the second residence into which 34 respondents moved, a total of 38 reasons are mentioned which indicate a concern with the social and physical qualities of the neighborhood, while 39 such reasons are mentioned by 26 respondents selecting their third residence.
From these general observations one may conclude that people in this Middle Management group selected their first residence (i.e. upon becoming married and before most of them became supervisor) primarily in terms of their restricted financial ability and in order to be close to certain facilities. However, a considerable number of them were concerned with the appropriateness of the neighborhood as a social unit. However, this concern and the concern with the investment became proportionally much greater when people selected their second and third residences. This increasing concern for the appropriateness of the district appears to be related to their concern with the proper up-bringing of their children, with protecting their investment, and with their increasing occupational status which arouses their social status needs while at the same time placing them financially in the position that they can satisfy these status and prestige needs. Furthermore, it may be assumed that their aspirations promote their concern with their childrens' upbringings and with their investment. The latter must be seen as the milestone of their occupational and social success because increasing investment in their property enables them to move up the residential status hierarchy thereby expressing their social and occupational achievement. Their property is the foundation of their position in the status hierarchy of society and therefore they have to protect it carefully.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Reasons for Selecting</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Fifth</th>
<th>Sixth</th>
<th>Seventh</th>
<th>Eighth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Socially desirable neighborhood</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Good investment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lowest rent in any district</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Close to work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. View lot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Large lot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Large house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Outlying area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lowest rent in good district</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Attractive style of house</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Close to recreation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Built in high lot cost area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Close to public transportation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Advantageous buying terms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Returned to soc. desir. neighborhood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Raised in neighborhood</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Friends, coll. &amp; relat. attract.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Good schools, desir. for rais. ch.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Stayed temporarily with frds/rel.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Close to downtown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Built in low lot cost area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Close to university</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Attractive, clean house/apt.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Close to schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Reasons for Selecting</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>Eighth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Close to friends &amp; rel. (assist.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Large lot and garden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Large living &amp; recreat. room</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Close to shops</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Same economic group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Low down-payment in any area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Moved in same neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Prestige reasons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. House requiring min. attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. House affording max. privacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Healthy location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. House with attractive floor plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Recover financially in outlying area</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Low down-payment in good district</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Option to buy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Safe and quiet neighborhood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Lowest rent in best district</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Back to town</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Hastings Townsite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Inherited house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Low density development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Well-built house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Respectable house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Reasonable house prices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. No garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Small house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Number of Reasons | 101 | 114 | 89 | 63 | 40 | 12 | 4 | 4 |
| Number of Persons who Moved | 39 | 34 | 26 | 18 | 14 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
In Table XXVI categories of reasons are grouped together in terms of their face value; however, groups (A), (E), and (K) already separate those categories which indicate a concern with the desirability of the neighborhood and the need for satisfying status and prestige aspirations.

The largest group of reasons was found to be the one which indicates the respondents' concern with the appropriateness of the neighborhood in terms of its social composition and its physical attractiveness. The latter being considered a criteria for good investment invariably depends upon the "kind of people" living in the neighborhood, which in the terminology of this Middle Management group means people of similar socio-economic standing, with similar attitudes and values. Twenty-nine respondents mentioned these reasons with respect to the selection of fifty-three residences.

It may be concluded, therefore, on the basis of this part of the investigation that these twenty-nine respondents according to their own perception have moved to better residential areas, and that these respondents are concerned with the appropriateness of the neighborhood regarding their
### TABLE XXVI

**COMBINATIONS OF CATEGORIES OF REASONS FOR SELECTION OF DWELLINGS AND RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS**

*(39 PERSONS, 132 RESIDENCES, 427 REASONS)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Percent of 427</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Percent of 39</th>
<th>Resids.</th>
<th>Percent of 132</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Socially &amp; physic.</td>
<td>(1),(2),(15)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18),(29).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Physical amenities</td>
<td>(5),(6),(8)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26),(35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Dwelling features</td>
<td>(7),(10),(21)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27),(32),(46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(47),(50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Cheap accommodation in any district</td>
<td>(3),(21),(30)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cheap accommodation in better district</td>
<td>(9),(12),(38)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D &amp; E) Cheap Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Close distance from:</td>
<td>(4),(13),(20)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Categories*</td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>Percent of 427</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Percent of 39</td>
<td>Resids</td>
<td>Percent of 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Close distance from:</td>
<td>(11), (22),</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24), (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F &amp; G) Close distance from facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Family &amp; Friendship relations</td>
<td>(16), (17), (19)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23), (31), (44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Financial considerations</td>
<td>(14), (37), (39)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Undisturbed residen.</td>
<td>(34), (40), (45)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Prestige</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Other</td>
<td>(33), (42), (43)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Table XXIV.
status and prestige needs. ³

However, the analysis of "reasons for selection" may be expanded to include those other categories which indicate the respondents' concern with the appropriateness of the neighborhood as a means of satisfying the respondents' needs for status and prestige.

In Table XXVII, the following categories have been added to Group A "Socially and physically attractive neighborhood":

Group E: "Cheap accommodation in better districts," summarizes reasons which indicate that certain respondents were concerned with maintaining a standard of accommodation and neighborhood, and made efforts to secure residences in good residential districts although their financial ability was limited. These persons, almost certainly, were concerned with their status and prestige while selecting residences in appropriate

³ Except for the move to the first residence, the "status increase" resulting from moves to all subsequent residences was calculated on the basis of the "Status Hierarchy." It was found that the majority of selections of new residences actually increased the "residential status" of the respective persons by a "status value" of between 100 - 150. Nine of 35 selections were made within the same general district or led to a slight decrease in "status value" which does not weaken the argument that these moves were not moves made to preserve a person's prestige by avoiding a socially undesirable environment or increasing it by moving into better section of a district.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Percent of 427</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Percent of 39</th>
<th>Resids.</th>
<th>Percent of 132</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Socially and phys.</td>
<td>(1),(2),(15)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attract. Neighbor.</td>
<td>(18),(29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cheap accommodation</td>
<td>(9),(12),(38)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in better district</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Family &amp; friendship</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Prestige</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Other</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
environments.

Category 17: "Friends, colleagues, and relatives attracted me to a residential area," summarizes reasons which indicated that relatives exerted pressure upon the respondent to move to a certain residential district, or his wife desired to be near relatives residing in high-class residential areas, or friends and colleagues set the example by moving into certain areas or types of areas which challenged the respondent to do likewise.

Group K: "Prestige," examples of clearly stated prestige reasons were cited before.

Category 42: "Back to town," summarizes reasons which indicated that respondents or their families felt socially isolated and out of place in urban areas and they moved back to town (usually "better residential areas") in order to be able to participate better in social affairs. It must also be suspected that their prestige suffered while residing in outlying areas.

Altogether twelve additional residences were selected for reasons of concerns with the neighborhood, however, only one more person was found in addition to the number of respondents included in Reason Group A.

Therefore, a total of thirty persons of the group of thirty-nine respondents was found to be concerned with the appropriateness of the neighborhood in view of their social position and their status needs.
Lastly, if one combines those reasons for selecting a dwelling which indicate a concern with the appropriateness of the house (larger and more elaborate dwelling) with the reasons which indicate concern with the appropriateness of the neighborhood, the summary given in Table XXVIII is obtained.

From this final analysis it may be seen that a maximum of twenty-five of the respondents who are concerned with the appropriateness of the neighborhood were also concerned with the appropriateness of the house in order to satisfy their status and prestige needs. Furthermore, only five additional dwellings were found which were selected only on the basis of "the appropriateness of the house."

On the basis of the analysis of "Reasons for Selection of Dwellings in Residential Areas" it may be concluded that a maximum of thirty-one of thirty-nine respondents were concerned at any one stage of their residential mobility with either the appropriateness of the house or the appropriateness of the neighborhood in order to satisfy their status and prestige needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Percent of 427</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Percent of 39 Resids.</th>
<th>Percent of 132</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Appropriateness</td>
<td>of the neighborhood</td>
<td>(1),(2),(15)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(18),(29),(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12),(38),(41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17),(32),(42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Appropriateness</td>
<td>of the house</td>
<td>(5),(10),(27)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(39 PERSONS, 132 RESIDENCES, 427 REASONS)
PART V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
CHAPTER I

THE PROPORTION OF PERSONS IN MIDDLE MANAGEMENT CONCERNED WITH STATUS AND PRESTIGE OF RESIDENCE

The Hypothesis

The following hypothesis was tested in this investigation:

A significant increase in occupational status motivates members of Middle Management group to move to larger and more elaborate dwellings and to better residential areas, because they intend to bring their residences in adjustment with their newly acquired social status position (or anticipated status position) and obtain the prestige associated with each residential area.

Two basic assumptions were made:

1. All members of the Middle Management group investigated here increased their occupational status since they became married and moved into their first residence. The investigation concerns itself with the relationship between socio-occupational mobility beginning with the first residence into which each respondent moved upon being married.

2. A significant increase in occupational status produces a change in the social status position of members of the Middle Management group. Promotion to a supervisory position and subsequent changes in rank position were considered significant increases in occupational status.

In the course of the investigation the validity of these assumptions was tested. Assumption (1) was tested on the basis of available data indicating occupational mobility, e.g. length of period of employment, length of period before and after promotion to supervisor, and present annual salary
in relationship to each salary earned by other members of this group. It was found that except for one person all members of this group increased their occupational status after their promotion to a supervisory position. The one exception, however, was nevertheless promoted to supervisor. The degree of increase in occupational status varied with each person. Assumption (2) was tested as part of the investigation, although it was intended to uphold the assumption regardless of the results of the investigation.

Assumption (2)

The relationship between increase in occupational status and increase in social status position was recognized by twenty-nine of thirty-eight respondents, while possibly as many as twenty-four respondents actually experienced a change in their social status position on account of a promotion.

Subsequently, the relationship between social status position and the house and residential neighborhood as a symbol of social status was tested.

1. The relationship between increase in social status position and selection of a house which is appropriate for the person's social position was admitted by seventeen respondents and strongly suspected in the case of three other respondents.

2. The relationship between increase in social position and selection of a neighborhood which is appropriate for the person's social status position was admitted by twenty-six respondents.

Correlations of the results obtained in testing Assumption (2), and relationships (1) and (2) yielded the following results:

Of the twenty respondents who were concerned with the appropriateness of the house, fifteen respon-
dents were also concerned with the appropriateness of the neighborhood, and sixteen respondents actually experienced a change of their social position on account of a promotion.

Of the twenty-six respondents who were concerned with the appropriateness of the neighborhood, fifteen respondents were also concerned with the appropriateness of the house, and eighteen respondents actually experienced a change of their social position on account of a promotion.

Altogether thirty of thirty-nine respondents were concerned with the appropriateness of the house and/or the neighborhood in view of each respondent's social status position. Of these thirty respondents, twenty-one respondents actually experienced a change of their social position on account of a promotion.

After the investigation of the "attitude, opinion, and self-appraisal answers" was completed and the above results obtained, six basic criteria were adopted in order to test on the basis of actual moving behavior and reasons for moving and selection whether and how many respondents "move to larger and more elaborate dwellings and to better residential areas" in order to satisfy their social status and prestige needs. The following results were obtained:

a) The analysis showed that fourteen respondents are at present residing in "larger and more elaborate dwellings" than are functionally required, and that they moved into these dwellings for reasons of status and prestige.

b) The analysis showed that twenty-one respondents are at present residing in "better residential areas" and that sixteen moved into these areas for reasons of status and prestige while the same reasons may be strongly suspected in case of the other five respondents.
c) The analysis showed that twenty-six respondents made considerable efforts in order to improve their residential status for reasons of social status and prestige.

d) The analysis showed that sixteen respondents moved in anticipation, upon or shortly after their promotion to supervisor, and that in five cases prestige considerations as reasons for moving were admitted while on the basis of other information it may be strongly suspected in case of eleven respondents, that they moved for reasons of status and prestige in relationship to their promotion.

e) The analysis showed that twenty respondents moved from residential areas for reasons of social status and prestige.

f) The analysis showed that thirty respondents moved to residential areas for reasons of status and prestige.

In Table XXIX, the results of the attitude, opinion, and self-appraisal answers are correlated with the results obtained on the basis of the analysis of each criterion.

On the basis of the six criteria, twenty-five of the thirty respondents concerned with both the appropriateness of the house and/or neighborhood were mentioned in the results of at least five criteria, while twenty-eight of the thirty respondents were mentioned in the results of at least three criteria. Excluding these five respondents for which on the basis of less than five criteria no definite proof can be established that these persons moved to "larger and more elaborate and/or better residential areas" for reasons of status and prestige, a total of twenty-five respondents remains for whom exists sufficient evidence that they have
### TABLE XXIX

Relative Number of Persons concerned with the Appropriateness of the House and Residential Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Number of Persons concerned with the House and neighborhood who are included in the groups established upon the analysis of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumption (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons (Note i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of the house</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of the neighborhood</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of house and/or neighborhood</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual number of persons found on the basis of each analysis

|                                      | 24       | 20       | 26       | 14  21  26  16  20  30 |

Notes:

i : Number of persons who experienced a change of social status on account of a promotion.

ii : Number of persons who consider the appropriateness of the house in view of their social status position

iii : Number of persons who consider the appropriateness of the neighborhood in view of their social status position
**Criteria**

(a) Number of persons who reside in "larger and more elaborate dwellings".
(b) Number of persons who reside in "better residential areas".
(c) Number of persons who made considerable efforts to improve their residential status.
(d) Number of persons improving their residential status in relationship to their promotion to supervisor.
(e) Number of persons moving from residential areas for reasons of status.
(f) Number of persons who moved to residential areas for reasons of status.

The data on the table should be read as follows:

Thirty persons are concerned with the appropriateness of the house and neighborhood. Of these, twenty-one experienced a change of their social status upon a promotion, twenty and twenty-six persons are concerned with the appropriateness of the house and the neighborhood, respectively. Of these thirty persons, fourteen are residing in "larger and more elaborate dwellings", twenty-one persons are residing in "better residential areas"; twenty-five made considerable efforts to improve their residential status, and so forth. The last row actually gives the number of persons for whom the particular relationship analyzed was found to apply. For example, twenty-six persons were found to have made considerable efforts to improve their residential status, however, one person of this group apparently was neither concerned with the appropriateness of the house or neighborhood.
moved for reasons of status and prestige. Among these
twenty-five persons are twenty-one persons who have ex-
perienced a change in social position on account of a pro-
motion, while of the remaining four persons, three have ex-
perienced a change of social position for other reasons than
promotion, while one person apparently always had a certain
social status.

Consequently, in the case of twenty-one respondents,
the hypothesis including Assumption (2) has been proven. In
the case of four respondents the hypothesis based upon Assump-
tions (1) and (2) has been proven. It may be concluded that
twenty-five of thirty-nine members of the Middle Management
group (61.5%) have moved to larger and more elaborate dwel-
lings and/or better residential areas in order to bring
their residences in adjustment with their social status posi-
tion and obtain the prestige associated with the particular
residential areas they moved to.
CHAPTER II

THE ORGANIZATION MAN AND CONFORMITY TO STANDARDS OF RESIDENCE

The Organization Man in Middle Management

The questions raised in an earlier chapter about the value of Whyte's description of the "Organization Man" for a comparative basis for evaluating the behavior of this group of supervisors were kept in mind during the investigation. Although the investigation does not lend itself to making definite statements about potentially uniform value and belief systems which these persons may have, it is nevertheless possible to indicate certain similarities between Whyte's "The Organization Man" and the members of this Middle Management group.

It will be recalled that in the description of the "General Characteristics of the Group" it was indicated to what extent these individuals differed in terms of certain basic factors which were considered to have a profound influence upon the mentality and outlook of these people. Judging on the basis of such variables as length of employment, education, training, background, and rate of promotion, a considerable number of persons of this Middle Management group are not typical examples of the "Organization Man". In particular those persons who became employed with the B.C. Electric before 1945 and, according to Whyte's description of
other Organizations, were still trained in terms of the "protestant ethics" of business, may not be "Organization Men" at all. Furthermore, the B.C. Electric Company was not an organization before the war in the sense it is to-day. This aside, it is the group of persons employed after the war which is being trained in the spirit of "social ethics", that is "group conformity" according to Whyte's use of the concept.

This investigation was concerned with a group of Middle Management persons of whom twenty-eight persons became employed with the Organization before 1945, and eleven after 1945; however, only nine persons became supervisor before 1945, while thirty persons became supervisor during the post-war period. Of the eleven persons who became employed with the Organization after the war, nine persons are university graduates. Of these nine persons at least eight were subjected to the type of training which Whyte describes as the socializing period of the "Organization Novice". Seven of these persons are already in the top ranks of Middle Management and most of them are confident that their career is still ahead of them. Only these seven persons have the typical prerequisites of the "Organization Man" but whether they think in similar veins cannot be ascertained. Three of the seven persons are already residing in Upper Class Residential areas, while two openly stated that they will have to adjust their residences soon in order to be able to fulfil the functions which their position has thrust upon them. These seven persons, perhaps,
are the Advanced Management type of "The Organization Man". Apart from this group, the members of two other groups resemble "The Organization Man" in certain aspects. One group consists largely of office people who became employed as clerks and received training in accounting or office management outside the Organization. These five persons were with the Organization for a considerable period (1939-1942) and took a much longer time before becoming supervisor than the graduate group. Excepting two persons, their salaries are relatively modest and their confidence in further promotion is slight. This small group of supervisors seems to resemble the type of "Organization Man" who is content with being a member of the Organization, who wants to belong to a group and to conform to standards which assure smooth cooperation and "the good life". Some of these persons live together in a very modern residential development which has also been described as "the young executive's area" and their attitudes about social class differences are very smug and ready-made. Perhaps, they are indeed the more typical "Organization Man", the one who conforms to the demands of the Organization and relies upon the Organization for guidance in his occupational career.

The third group consists of five persons who came from the "working man's" ranks rather than the "white collar" ranks. These persons are most conscious of their change of social status and most anxious to acquire the outward symbols of res-
pectable Middle Class. They are not the typical "Organization Man" because they struggled for their present positions in Middle Management rather than stepped "into the same boat". While some of them have acquired a suave self-assured behavior and denounce their form associations, most of them have retained attitudes and values which are more akin to those of their former associates than to those expressed by the majority of this Middle Management group. This gives them a certain individuality, yet their mutual desire seems to be to assimilate as far as possible to the residential and behavior standards of the Middle Management group. This obvious desire to conform to the standards of the Middle Management group is perhaps their most striking characteristic. According to one observer "these persons make it a point of appearing regularly on every supervisory meeting, presumably because they wish to re-assert each time their affiliation with Middle Management".

Altogether then seventeen persons in this Middle Management group seem to resemble "The Organization Man" in certain aspects but not very many of these persons may be likened to Whyte's "model man" of the modern subdivision. However, residential development in the Vancouver area is still relatively young and large districts of respectable housing close to the center of the Metropolitan Area absorb a great proportion of the Middle Class exodus to the outskirt suburbs which is experienced by older cities. Furthermore, the B.C. Electric is, perhaps, not the typical Organization which pro-
duces "The Organization Man" because it is a local utility corporation which has a monopoly in its field. Its Organization therefore is restricted and, possibly, not developed to the degree which is necessary to meet rigorous competition faced by other Organizations. Nevertheless, one may assume that while the proportion of persons in this Metropolitan Area which resemble the "Organization Man" is not large, it will become larger rather than smaller, and eventually constitute a force in residential mobility and residential development which should not be under-estimated.

Conformity to Group Standards

The matter of conformity on the part of the individual with regard to standards of residence set by the Organization and socio-occupational groups was investigated but not analyzed in statistical terms. Although no quantitative evidence may be presented for the following discussion, it is nevertheless based upon answers obtained to the "conformity questions" contained in the questionnaire. Furthermore, in the course of the interviews certain aspects were discussed which were not covered by the questionnaire and which left the investigator with certain impressions regarding the conformity of this group in matters of selecting houses and residential areas.

There is no evidence that the Organization has a formal policy which requires of all its employees to follow certain standards of residence attached to various rank levels. However,
certain positions in the Company entail functions which oblige the individual to adopt a certain standard of residence in the interest of the Organization. Individuals who have to entertain on behalf of the Organization purposely follow a pattern of residential standards set by the Advanced Management Group, and occasionally they may be "coached" to adopt these standards. One may suspect that the position of people who do not conform may be endangered unless, as one person stated "one is very brilliant and can afford to behave in an unorthodox fashion". One may also suspect that a number of persons use their position and the concomitant functions (representation, entertainment) to rationalize their own desire to be identified with a certain socio-occupational group in a particular residential district.

Middle Management, generally, is not required to act officially or unofficially on behalf of the Organization according to most respondents' opinion. However, within the Middle Management group exists a vertical and horizontal grouping of supervisors who voluntarily or involuntarily are more concerned with adopting certain residence standards and following the pattern set by the Advanced Management group. The horizontal group consists of Department Heads. Once Middle Management persons have reached this rank level they begin to "wonder" whether they should move into certain residential districts, while some of them did without provocation or pressure, accepting it as "the right thing to do". To
them it is not a question of being able to afford a more elaborate house in high-class district but a question of whether they should - in view of their position and their career - adopt the standards outlined by the Advanced Management group.

The vertical group consists of members of certain Divisions and Departments. Although the prestige aspects of residence are stressed more by the upper ranks than by the lower ranks of Middle Management within these vertical groups, members of both groups are assumed to place greater emphasis upon residence relative to members of both other Divisions and Departments. A majority of respondents felt that the Sales Division and the Department of Public Relations tend to place greater stress upon the prestige aspects of houses and districts. Possibly, the Electricity and Gas Division belongs to the same group, although in these Divisions it may only be the "professional engineer" who is concerned with conspicuous residence. Furthermore, vertical groups are influenced by their respective Division or Department Head. It seemed quite obvious that a number of respondents looked for cues regarding choice of residence to their superiors while others considered themselves examples to their subordinates. A few persons stated outright that their subordinates should adopt certain standards of residence when they become supervisor in order that they may set themselves off from the labouring class and in order to acquire a "social behavior" which they considered essential for further promotion. How-
ever, the majority of respondents indicated that they had not
noticed that promotions were affected by a person's residence,
although some of them "hoped" there was no relationship. It
may be coincidental that those persons who are residing in un-
pretentious residences and districts are also among those who
made the relatively slowest progress in the Organization.
These persons forego satisfaction of prestige needs because
they hesitate to burden themselves with mortgages. It must
be assumed - and a few persons admitted it - that they are
less self-assertive in their profession. Therefore, their
slow progress and their disconcern with status stems from
the same psychological factor, namely a lack of self-confidence
in their ability. In fact, most respondents regarded those
persons who lived in accommodations which were beneath the
standards they might afford, as "misers" or "timid".

These subtle relationships and inferences made about
the person on the basis of his residence are probably the
most effective pressures in forcing him to conform. The
standard which requires of persons to be "just above the mark"
from what he really can afford, however, is in keeping with
the basis of western economy and seemingly makes it a "perpetum
mobili". This "mortgaging of the future" also drains a dispro-
portionally large share of physical and psychological energy
into the consumer good market leaving little for non-material
values.

Although this group has no precise standards which
members of the Middle Management group are expected to follow
in selecting residences, they seem to have very broad values which govern their residential mobility behavior. Above all they value the home and home life. For most of the time the house is the most important factor which they value more than cars, boats, travelling or other material or immaterial values, although there are exceptions. They have three reasons for emphasizing the home. First, they are concerned with the well-being of their family; second, they want it to be an asset to their immediate neighborhood, and third they value it as an investment and a traditional type of security.

They strongly believe that a person should improve himself in his occupation, as a member of society (social position), and in terms of his residence. The house should afford increasingly more comfort and should increase in investment value. They believe that persons naturally move to better residential areas and that they continue investing a fixed proportion of their income in the house.

They believe that a person should mortgage part of his future income in order to afford a good home in a good neighborhood, but they are critical of people who over-reach themselves or value ostentatious residences. They are less critical of people who do not appreciate their values although they may wonder about his judgment, his sense of responsibility for his family, and his self-confidence and ability.

The home is considered less important for their reputation than the neighborhood or residential district. The district is important because of the "kind of people living there"
which determines with whom they and their children associate and become identified, whether the area will depreciate or whether their property will be protected in order to assure an increase of their equity. The higher their equity in the house, the larger a cash-payment can be obtained when they decide to sell the house and move into a better area where correspondingly larger down-payments are required.

This group's concern for neighborhood facilities confines itself primarily to their effects upon the value of a person's property. The more they are concerned with prestige the further they want to segregate their residences from schools, churches and shopping facilities, not to mention industry of any type. This concern with separating residences and facilities may actually be explained in several ways. First, persons who feel that they can afford moving into exclusive districts assume that they are a two-car family consequently distances matter less. Second, "exclusiveness" itself increases property values. Third, there are no examples in the Metropolitan Area of prestige areas where residences and facilities are functionally integrated, consequently, the stereotype becomes the symbol of prestige, and distance from facilities almost measures the socio-economic status of a resident.

These are the principal standards which the group values and to which they conform. Whether these standards make this socio-occupational group distinct from other groups
or whether they are merely a part of Middle Class standards cannot be decided on the basis of this investigation; it would be necessary to analyze the residential mobility of other socio-occupational groups with similar range of income. However, if it can be assumed that these values are held by a majority of middle-income families, then the following implications of this investigation for planning increases in importance.
On the basis of these values held by the majority of this Middle Management group, and possibly by other groups, one may question whether residential mobility generated by social mobility may be eliminated or reduced, and whether Community Planners can influence this type of residential mobility.

Upward social mobility must be understood as a process of segregation. In order to express increasingly higher social status, more exclusive status symbols are selected. Those groups of persons who recognize residences and residential areas, particularly, as status symbols will continue to segregate themselves in accordance with their increasing financial ability and their increasing socio-economic status. Because it is impossible to provide them with housing at an early stage of their social mobility which will continue to satisfy their future status needs, it seems almost impossible to eliminate this type of residential mobility unless residences and residential areas cease to have symbolic meaning. However, both are only symbolic values for the segregation of socio-economic classes, and probably not, as one may assume, an aping of the behavior of the top socio-economic class. Therefore, it is not enough just to eliminate the symbols,
they are mere symptoms of underlying motives; namely, the desire to express and emphasize inequality between individuals, groups and classes.

It may be possible to plan neighborhood units, which permit segregation on the basis of potential financial ability and anticipated social status; however, such neighborhoods as well as planned mixed socio-economic communities can merely satisfy the status needs of one or a limited range of socio-economic groups. The status of this group will be reflected in the rental or purchase value of the dwelling units which in turn identifies the position of the neighborhood and its inhabitants in the eyes of the Community. Once the income and the status of families has increased above this level, they are bound to move because they feel that they are entitled to a better residence, that they can afford it, that they have to express their increased status and financial ability by moving into a more expensive residence, and that they can and should remove themselves further from relatively lower socio-economic groups. Even if it were possible to encourage these persons to raise the prestige of their neighborhood by remaining there and by impressing upon others that they cherish different values than showing financial ability by moving into more expensive residences, and material values generally, the basic problem still remains. This basic problem must be understood as the desire of persons to emphasize social distance between groups and classes.
People generally do not admit this motive, yet they imply it by their action which engenders a vicious cycle that constantly reinforces the notion of inherent differences between groups and classes and repudiates the idea of the process of learning and the influence of the environment. Social and physical environment, after all, can be manipulated. These persons argue that they move from residential areas because they think, are being told, or have observed that the social environment in these areas has an undesirable influence upon the behavior, outlook, and educational and occupational goals of their children. They do not feel responsible or capable of exerting their influence upon the "community" in their residential district in order to change or "improve" this community's attitudes, values, and behavior. They do not go to their neighbor asking him whether they may assist him in maintaining his property in order that their own may not depreciate and they may feel secure while remaining in their residence. Maintaining property is considered "everybody's own business". The only means these people think they have for controlling their own and their children's destiny is avoiding "undesirable social environments", otherwise they feel they are penalizing their children for ideals which they themselves do not hold wholeheartedly. As soon as they are financially able to do so they leave this residential area. This results in the loss of a family whose influence may have contributed to forming a "community" in the real sense of that word where people help each other and mutually raise their standards. Once removed, they look back
upon an "undesirable social environment" where people do not care for property value or education - had they stayed, the situation might have been different. These people by their very action reinforce the difference between social groups and between "good" and "bad" residential areas. If there is such a value as "community spirit" or responsibility for one's fellow-man and, if this value represents the true basis for "stable and healthy urban communities", then these families certainly do not consider and ponder it.

Judging on the basis of the results of this investigation one must assume that families who move for reasons of status and prestige are not interested in forming "neighborhood communities" even if they would understand the meaning and value of such communities. These families move to "residential districts" - housing areas which are defined according to the socio-economic status of their resident population and indicate the family's position in the status hierarchy of society. They do not move to a particular area because they feel that they may have more in common with the people there (other than a similar socio-economic status) or because they want to become members of a "community" consisting of kindred families, but in order to adjust their residential and socio-economic status. It is the status of the district and the reputation of its residents in which they are interested, and not the people residing in the district.

These people rarely form close relationships in their districts or maintain intimate neighborhood relationships; their friends reside widely scattered over the Metropolitan area. Usually they made their friends through the Company
in Company clubs or in other types of associations, but rarely in neighborhoods. Excepting a few cases, the majority of members of this Middle Management group has never deferred their decision to leave a residential area for fear of destroying neighborhood relationships including their children's ties with playmates, schoolmates, and schools. One may think that these families who never lived in real "neighborhood communities" but always in the usual, unneighborly residential areas would act differently, if they could develop strong ties. However, if these families desire to form "communities" they would do so provided they have a common, overriding interest. This common interest cannot be aroused by providing a community focus such as a community center; indeed, community activities generated by such "centers" may create superficial "communities" -- the human interest in the problems and well-being of other members may be entirely lacking. Only on the basis of these particular common interests may we create "communities". However, the persons studied in the course of this investigation have shown that they are not willing to forego their satisfaction of status and prestige needs for the ideal of a "true community."

Furthermore, these people appeared to be little concerned with the availability of such neighborhood facilities as shops, schools, playfields, churches, or community centers; to the contrary, some of them resented having these facilities in the immediate neighborhood because they felt that these
facilities depreciate the prestige of their residential area. If they are concerned with schools at all it is primarily for reasons of the reputation of the school and the children attending the school have in the eyes of the community. Their interest in "community centers" can be assumed to be small because most of these people belong to Company or private clubs, and are not even interested in "meeting the right people" other than from their "organization". Therefore, the provision of these community facilities would hardly provide a stimulus for community action, not to speak of the possibility of developing strong bonds among families or to the neighborhood. Even if it were possible to generate community action and produce cohesion among resident families, it is doubted that these ties to the neighborhood will be stronger than those forces which compel these families to adjust residence periodically to their changing status and prestige needs. Therefore, it is also doubted that "planned neighborhood units" are attractive to these families, that they will produce "communities" in the true meaning of this word, and that they will contribute to the stability of urban communities both in terms of reducing spatial mobility or in terms of giving families a sense of belonging, a sense of pride in the "neighborhood community", and a feeling of security. These must be considered the basic factors for creating "stable and healthy urban communities".
Perhaps it is necessary to re-examine the function of the "neighborhood" in the modern urban environment, and to re-evaluate the necessity for producing spatial stability in order to reduce mental instability and insecurity, generally. Actually, we are not really capable of evaluating the good and bad effects of spatial mobility. Although we may assess some of the costs which are born by the individual and the community and are the results of spatial mobility, we are not able to evaluate these costs in the light of the beneficial contributions which arise from the same spatial mobility. Spatially, mobile families do not vanish but merely change their locale and their affiliation with one community for that of another. Although these families may not always consider their moves to be improvements of their circumstances and opportunities, in most cases they are motivated by the desire or opportunity to improve themselves. We are living in a society which becomes increasingly more complex and more involved, and which ceases to consist of small nucleated communities. There is a tendency to reduce local peculiarities and to enable families to disregard physical distances. As interests and relationships become more and more metropolitan and international in scope, the possibilities for personal adjustment become much greater. People of to-day have a greater choice of finding suitable occupation, a suitable place to work, an agreeable climate, or an attractive social and physical environment than they
had before in rural and small urban communities. No doubt this freedom of choice accounts for a great deal of psychological instability but so does lack of choice and the compulsion to accept conditions which are disliked. For good or worse, we have to accept the fact that families will become increasingly more mobile for various reasons; among them, as this investigation tried to show, an increasing concern with status and prestige. Indeed, this concern may affect larger proportions of urban populations.

It is not implied here that planners should lose interest in creating residential neighborhoods; to the contrary, they should attempt to provide the physical matrix of potential neighborhood communities for a variety of different socio-economic groups. Furthermore, they should accept the fact that these neighborhoods most certainly will not reduce spatial mobility and become village-type enclaves in metropolitan societies. If planners feel that they should not use their influence to reduce, for example, the need for physical segregation of social groups, as this may be considered undesirable, then they should plan neighborhoods which may satisfy the prestige needs of families concerned with the satisfaction of such needs.

Undoubtedly, spatially mobile families find it difficult to assimilate everywhere and often suffer anguish and anxieties. This is particularly true for families who move from one city to another. Whyte, discussing "The Organization
Man", describes these problems in great detail. These families obviously are desirous of moving into "functioning communities" if these communities consist of equally mobile families. In other words, the mobile family is not interested in "stable communities" but thrives in "transient communities". They purposely select neighborhoods which really have limited potentials for reducing spatial mobility, yet the community created by these neighborhoods give these mobile families a sense of stability. Their sense of stability is fostered by the great amount of family interaction which takes place in a neighborhood community as is Park Forest. However, it is the association of kindred families which really gives them a feeling of belonging. In other words, the segregation of families with similar objectives, similar experiences, and similar values produces stability and not the fact that the neighborhood has a community center, is laid out in a certain fashion, and provides certain facilities. In the case of these transient families, segregation in planned neighborhoods contributes to a different type of stability than is usually implied. However, these families which move within one urban environment for reasons of prestige do not consider themselves transients in the sense in which other families moving from city to city experience transientness and their role as strangers. Consequently, they do not have the same experience of being "all in one boat" which is actually the bond between inter-city movers. Their only bond with the residents of the areas to which they move is their socio-economic status which,
in fact, implies competition rather than harmony because they are determined to increase their status further and further.

One may conclude, therefore, that even segregation of social groups in residential, neighborhoods will not produce "communities" unless this segregation is also the result of common experiences which people have and which makes them distinct from the majority of the resident population. Training and a career in Middle Management of large Organizations may be such a common experience. This implies that the formation of "communities" is dependent upon segregation of ingroups belonging to one larger socio-economic group. In other words, an agglomeration of Middle Management persons of certain levels of income may produce a "community", whether they are at all interested in segregating themselves in these terms is questionable. However, promoters of sub-divisions are already catering to these occupational in-groups and may, as a by-product of their intentions, actually create "communities". These neighborhoods are entirely different from those envisioned by Community Planners - they do not mix various groups but separate them out.

Finally, two pertinent questions arising from this study should be posed. First, assuming that "neighborhoods" may be planned which facilitate the type of segregation that apparently is required to produce functioning "communities", are the concomitant problems of group conformity, social pressure, and maladjustment of individuals worthwhile the ef-
fort of achieving "belonging" and "stability" for the residents of these "neighborhood communities"? If we can make a choice between affording people a sense of stability for which they will have to pay by subjecting themselves to group norms, of which some may be highly undesirable, or maintaining the present state of so-called "urban anonymity" which leaves people entirely free to choose and create their own "communities" that will not be confined to limited residential neighborhoods, how should we decide? In pursuing the present tendency of building sub-division and planned neighborhoods, are we not creating problems and pressures whose effects upon the individual and society cannot yet be measured or fully understood? If planners think that there is a need for manipulating the physical and social environments of present and future urban communities, and that it is their task to improve these environments, should they not first inquire into the effects their planning may have before they assume that whatever Community Planning rectifies in our urban areas can only be an improvement of prevailing conditions?

Second, should planners facilitate segregation of socio-economic groups and occupational in-groups? In other words, should they always "plan with the people" and provide residential neighborhoods which facilitate segregation or should they attempt to reduce segregation in order to remove some of the tensions and ills resulting from visual social
class differences? Apart from the fact that experience has shown that socio-economic groups will continue to segregate themselves, this does not remove the responsibility from the Planner to decide how he intends to manipulate some of the basic values of society if he has already decided that he will manipulate the physical environment, and, consequently, the social environment. Should he be content with making urban life more efficient and more pleasant or should he be content with adjusting some of the more obvious ill-effects of our Western economic system and Western society? For example, should the Planner accept the fact that the "rules" of free competition continue determining whether low-income families have to live in least desirable housing and areas or should he interfere with the function of the real-estate market, and, indeed, some of the basic values of our society? Should planners press for a minimum standard of housing for all members of society, and if it is undesirable to provide public housing, suggest other ways by which low-income families may be placed in the position where they can afford decent housing in pleasant areas? If planners consider it their task to improve the conditions under which communities are formed should they not also, at least in their own minds, decide what kind of communities they want to create and what type of social system and social values they plan to alter or reinforce?

These questions cannot be answered without making
further investigation of the relationship of housing and social values and, as this investigation has attempted to show, these relationships are important. Housing and residential areas are not simply means which satisfy functional needs but configurations of social systems and values held by a society. While manipulating these "configurations" Planners should bear in mind that an effective manipulation requires an understanding of the social forces which are at work and that these forces and social values will have to be adjusted first before, for example, residential mobility for reasons of prestige and status may be reduced or eliminated.
APPENDIX I

The Questionnaire
Interview schedule ( )

1. Married __ 2. Year ___ 3. Children ___ 4. Age(s) ________

5. When did you join BCE? ___ 6. Period away from Van. (Serv.)
7. When did you achieve your first supervisory position? ______
8. Has your office always been at ____? Period ________________
   Other ___________________ Period ________________

9. Do you mind disclosing your annual salary? How much is your
   annual salary? ______

10. Beginning with year of marriage could you give me the addresses
    of your past residences?
11. During which periods did you stay at each place (give years)?
12. What type of dwelling were your previous residences and what
    type of dwelling is your present residence? (room, suite,
    apt., single-det., duplex)
13. How many rooms did each dwelling have including your present one?
14. What were the lot sizes in each case - including your present
    dwelling? (to be given only for single-detached homes -
    rented and owned)
15. Did you own or rent in each case - including your present
    dwelling?
16. Given in round figures, how much was the rent, building or
    purchasing price for each place - including your present one?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Address</th>
<th>11 Period</th>
<th>12 Dw.Tp.</th>
<th>13 Rs</th>
<th>14 Lot</th>
<th>15 O/R</th>
<th>16 Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. What reasons prompted you to move away from .......? (beginning with address 1 etc.)

18. As you were looking for a new place, did you inspect several houses or did you take the first you found because it suited you?

19. Where were the places located which you inspected - in one general neighborhood or more or less scattered all over town?

20. Why were you particularly interested in finding a place in this (or these) residential areas?

21. What reasons did you have for selecting the particular house?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17 Reasons/Moving</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20 Select. N.hood</th>
<th>21 Select. House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Do you intend to remain at this place for the next 10-15 years?

23. Which particular circumstances may induce you to move to another residence?

24. Would you be looking for a larger place? ____ Why? ___

25. In which particular residential area would you make your future home?

26. In why ways, do you feel, would it satisfy you to make your future home in this (these) residential neighborhoods?

27. Do you think, in general, that when people achieve a substantial increase in salary and a more responsible position in their profession, that they
   a) feel they have achieved a higher social status position?

28. Do people at BCE in general feel that a person has achieved a higher social status position if he has achieved a substantial increase either in salary and a more responsible position?  
   a) both ____________________

   b) salary increase __________ c) more responsibility ___

29. Do you think that this depends upon
   a) the previous level of income and position? __________

   b) the Division or professional group person belongs to?

30. In your case, for example, when you achieved a substantial raise in salary and/or a more responsible position, did you feel at any time that you had achieved a higher social status position?

31. After which occasion did you feel that way? 31a. Which year was this?
32. What about the future - do you think that there is a possibility that you may experience another significant increase in social status position?

33. (if NO to 30-32) What particular change of circumstance would give you a sense of accomplishment and the feeling that you have achieved a higher social status position?

34. Do you think, in general, that when people select houses one of the factors that influences their choice is the appropriateness of the house and the neighborhood for their particular social status position?

35. Do you think, in general, people in BCE consider the appropriateness of the house for their particular social status position?

36. Would you say that more emphasis is placed upon the house and neighborhood as a means of expressing social status position and for obtaining prestige by persons in certain

   a) Divisions
   b) professional groups
   c) income groups

37. For people in your occupational position, generally, do you think, that the appropriateness of the house and neighborhood in view of a person's social status position is taken into consideration?

38. For people of your occupational group in BCE, do you feel, this relationship has some meaning?

39. How important, would you say, is this relationship in influencing the choice of houses and residential areas?

40. Why, do you think, is it important (or not important)?

41. In your case, for example, when you are selecting a new place to live, do you consider at all how appropriate the house is for a person in your social position?

42. What about the neighborhood - do you consider whether it is appropriate?
43. In what ways, would you say, do these considerations affect your choice of
   a) the house ______  b) the neighborhood ______

44. (if NO to 38-43) What particular features about a house and a residential neighborhood, would you think, are considered appropriate for a person in your social position?
   a) house _______________  b) neighborhood _______________

45. Do you think, that the type of house and type of neighborhood reflects anything about the person himself? ______

46. In what ways?
   a) house _______________  b) neighborhood _______________

47. Do you think, that people in BCE tend to use type of residence and neighborhood as a factor for evaluating a person? ____________________________

48. If somebody buys an expensive home which considering all the possible circumstances he really could not afford according to his income, what would you feel about him, and what motives, do you think, might he have? ____________________________

49. Now, if somebody lives in an environment which is below the standard which he could afford according to his income and position what would you think of him, and what motives might he have? ____________________________

50. If you would live in what you consider a poor residential area, do you think, it might affect your progress in BCE at all? ____________________________
51. In what ways, do you think, might it affect your progress and your relationships with others in the company? 

52. Would you say that your past choices of residences (or some of them) were influenced by some of these considerations regarding the effect a choice may have upon your promotion and relationships in the company? 

53. How about future choices? 

54. Now, would you please select from among the areas shown on this map five areas each which you consider

   a) high status residential areas
   b) middle " " "
   c) low " " "

55. Now, considering all persons with whom you associate frequently in your and their home, where would you say have

   (1) you and (2) your wife made the most friends?

   a) in the neighborhood
   b) through the Company
   c) in clubs, asc. etc.
   d) otherwise (university etc.)

56. Are some of your club, association, company or 'other' friends also neighbors? 

57. Are most of your and your wife's friends living in your general neighborhood of between 4 - 6 blocks distance in each direction? 

58. Have you ever deferred your decision to move away from a neighborhood because you did not wish disrupting your or your family's neighborhood ties (friends, school, church, associations, etc.)? 

59. Would you now consider neighborhood friendships important enough to stay in the same residence or within the neighborhood?
60. Do you generally maintain your former neighborhood friendships after you have moved into another area? __________

61. What reasons, do you think, may be responsible for (a) discontinuing or (b) maintaining former neighborhood friendships?
   a) ________________
   b) ________________

62. Have you ever moved or do you consider moving into an area because your friends, colleagues, or relatives are living there? __________

63. Are you anxious to make new friends in your neighborhood, or do you rely mainly upon your old friends? __________

64. Reconsidering all your previous decisions in selecting a certain dwelling in a particular neighborhood which of the following considerations had the most influence upon your decision? Considering your moving intentions which of these considerations would be influential in making a decision in the future? - Please, select in order of importance by placing (1),(2) etc. behind the respective consideration.

   a) location of dwelling with respect to work and/or downtown generally? __________ __________
   b) location of dwelling with respect to nearness to friends, colleagues and/or relatives? __________ __________
   c) suitability of house and neighborhood to satisfy the functional needs of the family? __________ __________
   d) maintaining reasonable balance between housing costs and expenses for household, education, cultural activities, travelling and other valued activities? __________ __________
   e) appropriateness of the house and neighborhood in view of one's social status position? __________ __________
   f) specify other ________________ __________
APPENDIX II

Methods for Determining a Status Hierarchy of Residential Areas
METHODS FOR DETERMINING A STATUS HIERARCHY OF RESIDENTIAL AREAS

Several methods were investigated which could be employed for the purpose of ranking residential areas according to status and prestige which these areas may have in the eyes of the community and which they may impart upon and derive from their inhabitants.

The Inspection Method

The inspection method involves the establishment of a criteria of overt housing and neighborhood characteristics and the application of this criteria by actual inspection of areas. The criteria adopted consisted of the following criterion-items each of which was judged on a point-scale.

a) Age of building.
b) Size of building.
c) Style of building.
d) Special features of the building, ie. picture window, porch materials.
e) Size of lot.
f) Extent and character of landscaping.
g) Special lot features, ie. driveway, pool, trees, lawns, stone walls etc.
h) Location of the lot and house with respect to other lots, houses and street.

\[\text{Map 1 drawn after a sketch prepared by Professor Griffith Taylor is included as an example of what is assumed to be a use of a type of "Inspection Method". G. Taylor, \textit{Urban Geography}, London, Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1949.}\]
General appearance and condition of the neighborhood.
Distance to schools, shops, institutions, industries, parks, main roads and transit system.
Distance to known prestige areas.

These criteria were to be applied to the residence of each respondent. The idea was that one person can maintain a certain consistency in making subjective judgements and produce a scale of status areas whose validity could be questioned on the basis of the applied criteria but which would be consistent as a rank system. The scale actually was applied to several residences but found impractical for the following reasons:

1. The entire scale was based upon subjective judgement. Subjective evaluation makes sense if the investigator is sufficiently familiar with the social structure of the community, is aware of the various features which are used by different social groups as status symbols and has adequate knowledge of the historical development of residential areas.

2. The criteria itself were not adequate to bring out certain features if their combination with other features varied inconsistently. For example, the age of a building may be an asset rather than a deterrent if it occurs in combination with certain other features. However, in order to assure objectivity, each item had to be judged on its own merits, consequently, various combinations of features tended to produce similar total values. However it was felt, that some houses and areas should have a lesser prestige value or would have attraction only
for a particular group of society. Consequently, this comparative method which required that all features had to be taken out of their context, made the method impractical.

The Assessment Value Method

In order to find a method which would eliminate subjective evaluation and would reflect the present attitude of the community to the various residential areas, an attempt was made to use assessment values as a basis for ranking residential areas. Although land assessment is based upon 60% of the actual market value of lots in the City of Vancouver, a certain uniformity of values at this level would permit comparison of residential areas. While land improvement values vary considerably with each improvement, it was felt that the proportional relationship of improvements to land values would be fairly constant in the various residential areas which were not influenced by changing land uses. Furthermore, it was assumed that the fair market price upon which land assessment is based would be a good reflection of the value which a particular community places upon all residential areas. The assessment values, therefore, would reflect all the possible combinations of features which determine the value of an area as a neighborhood and which it was difficult to determine by inspection.

The available assessment data is in the form of foot-

2 See Map 2.
frontage values. The assessment of all lots in one block facing one street is determined on the basis of a uniform foot-frontage value for that portion of the block. If the foot-frontage value for one side of the block is set at $30.- and each lot has a 40' frontage and a uniform depth of 120', each lot is assessed at a value of 30 x 40 = $1,200.0. Adjustments are made if the lots are of irregular shape, are not served by a back lane or if adjacent land uses influence the possible value of a lot.

The average foot-frontage values are determined on the basis of all the lot sales which have taken place in the area during the previous two years. An average market value is determined which is assessed at 60% and divided by the average lot frontage of lots found in each half of a block. Assessment values are adjusted on the average every two years and if sufficient sales records are available to assure a fair re-assessment. If no or only a few sales have taken place in an area and it is difficult for the assessor to establish the fair market price of lots in a particular area, the assessment may remain constant for a considerable period. Therefore, the assessment values of these areas usually lag considerably behind the fair average for all areas.

For the purpose of establishing a hierarchy of residential status areas, the Assessment Method presented the following limitations.

1. Assessment procedure was based upon foot frontage values per individual block. This means, that values have to
be averaged for larger areas in order to permit meaningful
comparison.

2. Foot frontage values indicate the demand which
exists for certain lot sizes in certain areas, but not absolute
and comparative land values. For example, a considerable
demand may arise for 28' lots because an industry has attracted
a large number of low-income families. The sudden demand will
raise the average price of 28' lots above their usual value
and therefore, foot frontage assessment values will be equally
inflated and appear considerably higher than values in other
areas for larger lots. The price of the lot may be high for
the low-income group; however, compared with the price for
larger lots in other areas, it may be very small. In order to
make foot-frontage values meaningful for comparing areas, they
would have to be translated into actual lot values, because
socio-economic groups differ in terms of the size and value of
a lot which they can afford in a certain area. Two entirely
different income groups may be able to afford the same size of
lots if these lots are situated in different areas.

3. Assessment values are not readjusted each year nor
at the same time in each area of a city. Usually, one area lags
one to two years behind another area. Since assessment values
may rise on an average by $5. per foot frontage value, the
time lag may introduce a considerable bias to the entire
comparative method.
4. Foot frontage values are readjusted if sufficient number of sales records are available for the previous two years. If it is not possible to determine the fair market price for lots in an area, re-assessment may lag considerably behind the possible market value. Therefore, very stable areas enjoy comparatively low assessment.

5. Assessment of mixed residential-commercial areas is particularly high thereby contributing to the general confusion.

6. An attempt was made to find average lot sizes for various areas and to determine the actual values of lots in the various areas. However, in spite of the grid street pattern, lot sizes differ considerably and the method was found impractical.

The Census Data Method

After inspection of overt characteristics and use of assessment values had failed to yield an objective comparative method by which residential areas could be ranked in terms of a status hierarchy, Canada Census data was investigated for the purpose of establishing a suitable criteria. Because the 1956 census did not enumerate a great variety of population and housing characteristics by census tracts, the 1951 census had to be resorted to. Of the available data the following characteristics were selected to establish a criteria:

---

3 See Map 3.
1. Median Income of the Family Head Wage Earner.

Although median income for male and female wage earner are available, it was felt that the family head's income is the important one in determining the socio-economic status of the family. Furthermore, type of housing and neighborhood is selected in relationship to the family head's income rather than in relationship to the combined income of all family wage earners. The income of other family members may not be stable for various reasons and their contribution usually is only available for a limited period. However, a greater proportion of married women may be wage earners in the lower economic groups, this possible bias had to be accepted.

2. Number of Males and Females earning more than $4,000 per Year.

An area with a high proportion of persons earning more than the majority of the wage earning population usually has particular attractions which can be afforded by this group. However, apart from the general socio-economic differences these persons may have statute in the different groups of their class and therefore attract certain groups into different areas. The appreciation of an area may be determined by the kind of people of a certain economic group living there rather than by their number. Although these differences could not be assessed, to include this particular criteria at least would emphasize selected group influence over average financial ability of the entire population in an area.
3. Number of Male Professionals.

This criterion was selected to emphasize quality of inhabitants in relationship to average income. Average income may be high for an area with a very homogeneous socio-economic group while in another area deviation of wage earnings may be considerable although independent income and quality of a small high income group actually imparts status to the entire area. In an area with a large proportion of wage earning servants, the average income figure may be determined by the servants rather than by the proprietors who may have independent means. However, it was not possible to obtain figures on independent income, number of self-employed and number of other high-quality groups other than managers which may include managers of apartment houses.

4. Number of Persons of British Origin.

Because the Census does not differentiate between Canadians and immigrants, persons of British origin as compared to persons of non-British origin had to be used as criteria. This criteria is considered valuable because it separates areas inhabited by lower economic groups from areas inhabited by lower economic foreign groups. The latter usually have a lower status because racial and ethnic origin, education and ability to speak the language, different customs and attitudes, type of employment followed and standards of living, cleanliness and morals are perceived as different and more distant than those
of the native lower economic group. Therefore, a high concentration of foreigners in an area indicates cheap housing and generally undesirable location. In case of the University area this criterion backfires, because here the foreign element may be an attraction rather than a detriment.

5. Number of Divorcees and compared to Number of Married People.

This criterion distinguishes between those areas which are predominantly occupied by families and those with a high proportion of unattached and divorced persons. Since unattached and divorced persons are usually attracted to areas which have a high proportion of boarding and apartment houses, are situated close to downtown, industrial areas and large institutions, these areas usually have less status in the eyes of the community — if the majority of the population resides in single-family residential areas as is the case in Vancouver.

6. Number of Rooms per Dwelling.

Number of rooms per dwelling distinguishes between single-family districts and apartment and converted single-family house districts. Furthermore, it distinguishes between high, middle and low class residential areas if the assumption is correct that income rather than family size determines the size of house. Although this assumption is proven by this investigation, two factors distort its validity. First, middle and high income families tend to have greater families than used to be the case, consequently, large houses may serve a functional
need rather than a status need. Second, although building costs are similar in a metropolitan area, lot prices and taxes are cheaper in the outlying districts, therefore, low income groups may afford to build larger houses in these districts than they could in central areas.

7. Number of Persons per Room.

This criterion has the same value and limitation as the above; however, it emphasizes different housing characteristics. For example, this criterion tends to bring out single-family areas which are inhabited by a large proportion of old people and childless couples. Generally speaking, these are quiet neighborhoods with a good reputation.

The data for each criterion was arranged into ten categories. In each case the following scale was applied to determine the ranking of residential areas from Upper Upper to Lower Lower status:

1. Median Income of the Family Head Wage Earner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper upper</td>
<td>$3,899 - $3,700</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower lower</td>
<td>$2,099 - $1,900</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each value was given a weight of 2, that is multiplied by 2, as the values of all criteria were added to determine the final value of a census tract in terms of status.

2. Number of Males and Females earning more than $4,000 per Year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Persons per 1,000 pop.</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper upper</td>
<td>99 - 90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower lower</td>
<td>9 - 0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each value was given a weight of 3.

3. Number of Male Professionals.
Upper upper - 259 - 234 persons per 1,000 pop. Value: 10
Lower lower - 25 - 0 persons per 1,000 pop. Value: 1

Each value was given a weight of 1.

4. Number of Persons of British Origin.

Upper upper - 91% - 84% of population in the census tract Value: 10
Lower lower - 27% - 21% of population in the census tract Value: 1

Each value was given a weight of 1.

5. Number of Divorcees as compared to Number of Married People.

Upper upper - 310 - 280 married people for one divorcee. Value: 10
Lower lower - 29 - 0 married people for one divorcee. Value: 1

Each value was given a weight of 1.

6. Number of Rooms per Dwelling.

Upper upper - 6.5 - 6.3 rooms per dwelling. Value: 10
Lower lower - 3.8 - 3.6 rooms per dwelling. Value: 1

Each value was given a weight of 3.

7. Number of Persons per Room.

Upper upper - 0.9 persons per Room. Value: 9
Lower lower - 0.5 persons per Room. Value: 1

Each value was given a weight of 2.

On the unweighted scale Census Tract 38 (University) obtained the highest score with 50 points, while Census Tract 6 (Chinatown) obtained the lowest score of 6 points. On the weighted scale Census Tracts 38 (University) and 31 (West portion of S. W. Marine Drive) achieved the highest score of 96 points each, while Census Tract 6 (Chinatown) obtained the lowest score of 12 points.
Although the entire method technically is crude and probably inaccurate from a statistical and sociological point of view, its added limitations are the following:

a. Selection and weighting of criteria was entirely subjective and not based upon statistical analysis or previous methods of this kind.

b. The data was restricted to population and housing characteristics as they existed in 1951. Since then considerable development has taken place in outlying areas while central areas have changed their characteristics on account of a large influx of immigrant population, expansion of industrial and commercial establishments and the changing wage, price and family structures.

c. In many cases the census tracts are too large to differentiate accurately between high and low class areas.

On the other hand it was found that popular opinion does not change its attitude to areas as quickly as these areas may change their character and therefore a fairly high correlation between this hierarchy and the one established on the basis of popular opinion could be established, particularly for the very good and very bad areas.
INDEX MAP of RESIDENTIAL AREAS
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STATUS OF AREAS
on the basis of Foot Frontage Assessment Values 1957/1958
Source: Assessment Dept. City of Vancouver

- $40—$35 First Class
- $34—$29 Second Class
- $28—$23 Third Class
- $22—$17 Fourth Class
- $16—$11 Fifth Class
APPENDIX III

Status Hierarchy of Residential Areas in the Vancouver Metropolitan Area
STATUS HIERARCHY OF RESIDENTIAL AREAS
IN THE VANCOUVER METROPOLITAN AREA

(based upon a survey of opinion among
39 persons in Middle Management positions)

The method of determining this "Status Hierarchy" is
described in detail in Part Three, Chapter II, Section "Methods
based on the "Status Hierarchy". However, for a better under­
standing of the accompanying map, the following should be noted.

The breakdown of the Metropolitan Area into "residential
areas" is based upon Canada Census 1951, Census Tracts. Because
certain areas, e.g. West Vancouver, North Vancouver District,
were too large for meaningful differentiation between residential
areas, and because some areas, e.g. 22, 23, 32, 34, 47, included
one or two residential areas with different socio-economic
populations or with different types and ages of houses, these
areas were further subdivided. Areas separated by a broken line
represent such subdivisions. The black digits give the number
of the Census Tract or its subdivision. Small tracts are sub­
divided into A, B, and C divisions.

As was explained in Part Three, Chapter II, the "Status
Hierarchy" was broken down into Upper, Middle, and Lower Class
residential areas for descriptive purposes and on the basis of
"status Values". The red and blue areas are also the "Better
Residential Areas" with "status values" ranging from 1 - 27.
These "status values" are placed in green digits below the Census
Tract number. The "status values" of all other areas (28 - 74)
are placed in red digits below the Census Tract number.
APPENDIX IV

Moves to Present Residence in Four Different Groups of Status Areas
MOVES TO PRESENT RESIDENCE IN FOUR DIFFERENT GROUPS OF STATUS AREAS

The five maps included in this Appendix describe the actual residential mobility of the thirty-nine persons interviewed in the course of this study. The following residences of each person are shown on the maps:

a) Present residence

b) Last residence before present one unless this was a temporary residence, e.g. staying with friends or relatives while searching for a permanent home or while the home was being built.

c) In-between residence, e.g. between first residence and last residence before present one. If the in-between residence was a temporary residence as described above it is excluded. In case of persons who occupied more than four residences including the present one in course of their mobility, the first house (rented or owned) after the first residence is shown.

d) First residence upon being married includes any type of residence.

The entire 74 residential areas included on each map are broken down as follows:

**STATUS AREAS 1 - 17**

- Upper Upper Residential Areas
- Middle Upper Residential Areas
- Lower Upper Residential Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATUS AREAS 18 - 27**

- Upper Middle Residential Areas
- Middle Residential Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both STATUS AREAS 1 - 17 and 18 - 27 are defined as "Better Residential Areas" in which twenty-one persons of the Middle Management group interviewed are now residing. STATUS AREAS 18 - 27 are separated in two maps in order to retain clarity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS AREAS 28 - 44</th>
<th>Status Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Residential Areas</td>
<td>28 - 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle Residential Areas</td>
<td>38 - 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS AREAS 45 - 74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Lower Residential Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Lower Residential Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Lower Residential Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these areas five persons are residing who have not moved since they became married or residents in the Vancouver Metropolitan Area. Following the moving direction of each person, it may be observed how each person changed residence from one group of status areas to another, or within groups of status areas. The two persons who are now residing in Census Tracts 14 and 15 are both accommodated in apartments.
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