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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The over-all objective of this chapter is to outline the purposes and strategies of this thesis. A statement will be made concerning the setting that was studied and the methodological techniques that have been employed in the research. Prior to handling these, however, a basic statement of the reasons for studying the community will be set forth. This introductory chapter will close with an outline of the organization of the thesis.

This researcher has had a basic interest in social stratification since his undergraduate studies. Consequently, he made a decision early in his graduate training to explore social stratification in his thesis. Since the concept of stratification is a broad one and can be applied to many social situations, the social setting to be studied had to be selected.

In November, 1972, a decision was made about the type of social setting to research. After collaborating with Dr. Wayne Wheeler, a Professor in the Department of Sociology in which I was pursuing graduate work, and who has a basic interest in the study of communities and social stratification, it was decided to study a geographically accessible community in the state of Nebraska.

The problem remaining to be solved at this stage was to determine the community in which to do the research. Thus, some time was spent
roaming the countryside, traveling through towns and observing behavior in these communities. During this phase, the researcher made several decisions: the size of the community to research would have to be medium by Nebraska standards. The reasons for this were; first, too small a community would tend to make the researcher too conspicuous; second, a large community might take longer to study and strain the financial resources unduly; and third, a medium-sized community would provide necessary facilities, such as sufficient motel accommodations, a library, and places to eat, should the researcher be in need of them.

Based on these criteria, and the fact that the researcher had friends from the community that he decided to study, Ports Ferry, Nebraska, a town of 6,000 persons was selected. A description of the community will come in chapter II.

The next problem to be dealt with concerned the community itself. A decision about who to study had to be made. After several months in the community, observing what went on and becoming more familiar with its ecological structure, a decision was made to study the two Catholic churches in the community. For the present time, let it be stated that the presence of two Catholic churches in a community the size of Ports Ferry seemed to present an interesting research problem. A statement about the history of both Catholic churches will be made later in this chapter.

With the setting established, a previous review of literature on community stratification studies was reinstituted, and a decision
about the methodology to employ was made. Before a decision about the
community in which to carry out the research was made, I had begun
again to consider W. Lloyd Warner's techniques for studying social
stratification studies, and a decision concerning the methodology was
made. Before a decision about the community to research was made,
this investigator had begun to consider the feasibility of using
Warner's techniques. But it was not until a decision was made to study
Porto Ferro that it was concluded that Warner's methodology could be
applied, with modifications, to the situation.

In Social Class in America, Warner (1949) presents an analysis of
his methods. A brief mention of the Warner technique will now be made.
A broader analysis of his method will be presented in chapter IV of
this thesis. Warner's two primary techniques are Evaluated Participation
and The Index of Status Characteristics. The former technique is
used to gain a subjective perspective on social stratification by ask-
ing individuals to rate one another. The present researcher used
Evaluated Participation by asking nine individuals, called judges, to
rate parishioners from their respective parishes. The Index of Status
Characteristics was used by Warner to gain information on social stand-
ing through objective criteria, such as source of income, occupation,
dwelling area, and house type. The Index of Status Characteristics is
used in this thesis in modified form. A third technique, The Church
Status Index, is used in this research, and will be discussed later in
this chapter.

To compliment these techniques, participant observation was used
throughout the research. By participant observation is meant the observing of and participating in the daily activities and lives of individuals in any particular social setting. Through the use of participant observation, knowledge of the community structure, interaction of individuals in various social settings, and style of life of members of the community became known to the researcher. Several chapters in this thesis utilize participant observation as the primary data gathering technique. In this regard, chapter II, "The Description of Ports Ferry", presents a description of Ports Ferry which is based on observation of the community. Chapter III, "Mass Related Behavior In Two Catholic Churches", primarily concerns interaction between members of the Catholic churches in Ports Ferry. The behavior of individuals before, during, and after mass was observed and recorded as data.

The basic goal of utilizing participant observation and the two Warner techniques plus The Church Status Index was to integrate data from observation with the data from the three methods attempting to show how the data based on observation relates to information from Evaluated Participation, The Church Status Index, and The Index of Status Characteristics. Chapter IX, the conclusion of this thesis, brings this to light.

A discussion of the concepts utilized in this thesis will now be presented. Three concepts need clarification at this point, these are: social stratification, social class, and prestige status. Social stratification is defined for purposes of this thesis as the means
which society uses vertically to separate individuals and groups based on certain prestige criteria such as amount of income, education, and occupation. This definition emerges from a review of the literature on the subject. The meaning of social class as used in this thesis takes on the Weberian dimension, that is, one's access to economic goods and his possession of economic goods. Chapter IV, the chapter on social stratification theory, presents further detailed analysis of Weber's concept of social class. Prestige status also is defined in the Weberian sense, as meaning the life chances and life styles of individuals. Prestige status pertains to the overt manifestations of styles of life of individuals.

The use of Max Weber's concepts in this research is emphasized due to the researcher's preference for the Weberian definitions, which also best accommodated the setting that was studied. Application of these concepts to the data comes in the chapters on methodology and data.

Earlier in this chapter it was suggested that a statement would be made concerning the focus of this thesis, the two Catholic churches of Ports Ferry. The two churches, St. John's and Holy Rosary both began as churches organized along ethnic lines, Holy Rosary Catholic Church emerging from St. John's. St. John's Catholic Church was originally built in 1862, and rebuilt in 1875 in its present location. St. John's early congregation was German American, but since its early days has lost any single ethnic identity it once had. (Kvapil, 1941)

Holy Rosary Catholic Church was constructed in 1890. The break
between the two churches occurred primarily because the Czechs in Cass County lived in Ports Ferry where they worked in the Burlington Railway's maintenance shops and other businesses and decided that they wanted a parish of their own. A pamphlet, published in October, 1941, by Holy Rosary Church for its golden jubilee described the need for a change in this manner:

With this large Czech population it was only natural that they, the Czechs, would desire a church and religious services of their own. (Kvapil, 1941)

Thus, according to the pamphlet, the construction of Holy Rosary Catholic Church was based primarily on the desire of the Catholic Czech population to worship in a building of their own, in their native tongue, and under the guidance of a Czech pastor.

During the research, at the instigation of the Archbishop of the District, St. John's and Holy Rosary Churches were to be closed and the Catholic population of Ports Ferry would attend the new church as soon as it was built. A preliminary step to this was the elimination of the names of both Catholic churches, and renaming the single new one "Church of the Holy Spirit." As of this writing, January 1974, construction of the new Catholic church is delayed, partly due to a disagreement as to where the church is to be constructed, and where the funds for the church would come from.

The third methodological technique used in this research, The Church Status Index, is now discussed. In addition to Evaluated Participation and The Index of Status Characteristics, The Church Status Index is used primarily in order to determine social
participation among members of Ports Ferry's Catholic church system. This technique consists of seven questions directed at obtaining data about interaction in the church system. One of the questions asked concerned the construction of the new Catholic church. Ultimately, analysis of individual social standing was based on the two Warner techniques and The Church Status index.

Before a further statement about the thesis organization is presented, a summary of this chapter to now, will be made.

The first part of this chapter deals specifically with the origin of the thesis idea. Basically, conversations with Dr. Wayne Wheeler from the Sociology Department at the University of Nebraska at Omaha and a long term interest in social stratification, were the reasons for pursuing research in Ports Ferry. The next step in this chapter was to suggest the methodology used for investigating stratification in Ports Ferry. After studying the literature on social stratification research, a decision was made to utilize the techniques that W. Lloyd Warner implemented in his research. The primary technique for gathering information on objective criteria of class such as income and education is Warner's Index of Status Characteristics. The primary technique for gathering subjective data on individual social standing is Warner's Evaluated Participation. Throughout the research the method of participant observation was utilized in order to gain an in-depth perspective of the community.

Three concepts of basic importance to this research are social stratification, social class, and prestige status. The definition of
stratification to be utilized for research purposes is based from a number of definitions, primarily Weberian, that have emerged over the years.

Last, a brief history of the two Catholic churches studied and the reasons why they separated has been presented. A further methodological technique was introduced in conjunction with the discussion of the Catholic churches. The technique, called The Church Status Index, is to be used as a measure of social interaction by Catholics in their church system.

The thesis is divided into nine chapters. Chapter I is the introduction of the thesis. Chapter I indicates the following: the purposes of the thesis, the methodology used in the thesis, a discussion of the setting in which the research was undertaken, a history of the main thesis concern, which is the two Catholic churches in Ports Ferry, and an outline of the thesis. Chapter II is a physical description of Ports Ferry. A discussion of the ecological structure of Ports Ferry is the topic of this chapter. Chapter III analyzes human interaction of members of the separate Catholic churches as they participate in the traditional ceremony of the mass. Chapter IV is a discussion of social stratification theory and its relevance for this thesis. Chapter V discusses the interview schedule used in this thesis. Chapters VI, VII, and VIII explain the methodologies of and analyze the data acquired through the use of The Index of Status Characteristics, The Church Status Index, and Evaluated Participation. Each one of these chapters focuses on one methodology and the data obtained through that
particular methodology. We shall see, based on the data from these chapters how the concepts of class and prestige status manifest themselves among Ports Ferry Catholics. The research is looking for the main elements of ranking in Ports Ferry and their interrelationships with theory and the bearing of those on the symbolic distinctions between the two churches and their proposed ultimate merger. Chapter IX is the conclusion of the thesis. This chapter will present the findings and assess the future for Catholics in Ports Ferry.

Attention will now turn to chapter II which is a description of Ports Ferry, Nebraska.
CHAPTER II

Description of Ports Ferry

Ports Ferry, Nebraska, is a community of approximately six thousand population, situated twenty miles south of Husker City, the largest metropolitan area in Nebraska. It is one of the oldest communities in Nebraska, having been an established community in the 1850's.

The community of Ports Ferry has the look of a town whose beginnings occurred in the middle 1800's. Many of Ports Ferry's homes are one hundred years old. The present business district was established in the 1870's. Many of the present businesses are housed in buildings constructed during that period.

Ports Ferry is a town that has been affected by the expansion of the urban area to the north. In the early 1960's, a major shopping center was built on the southern edge of Husker City, fifteen miles from Ports Ferry. The shopping center has attracted much of the business activity from Ports Ferry that was once exclusive to Ports Ferry's business district.

Citizens of Ports Ferry recognize the effects of the shopping center on the businesses in Ports Ferry. Several individuals indicate that "there probably won't be a business district in Ports Ferry by 1980."

Though Ports Ferry's economic and business future is somewhat
clouded by the effects of metropolitan competition, Ports Ferry, nevertheless, seems peculiarly unaffected by metropolitanism.

The community of Ports Ferry is similar to that of many other American towns. It is relatively quiet, with occasional hot-rod ding up and down its main streets. One observes that many people know one another and are congenial to "outsiders." Many houses, as stated, are old, while a number of modern homes are being constructed. Several areas of Ports Ferry are relatively new having been built in recent years.

The purpose of this chapter is to inform the reader of the appearance of Ports Ferry. Though it is unnecessary to describe each major street and area in Ports Ferry, an in-depth description of the community will be presented.

This chapter is divided into four sections. Each section will deal with an area of Ports Ferry: The West Area, The East Area, The North Area, and The South Area. A description of each area is made and maps showing each area discussed will be presented in order to give the reader a further idea of ecological organization of the community.
Description of Ports Ferry by Area

The West Area

Ports Ferry is a community "mixed" in housing style. For example, Holy Rosary Church, one of the foci of this study, is located in the west area. Surrounding the church, from the east, are a combination of $20,000 homes, white-painted, wooden, old-fashion homes, and what one might call lower class homes. The latter are represented by poor-appearing exteriors and front yards that have dirt but no grass. (Figure 1 page 16).

To the south of Holy Rosary Church one finds a progression from the lower class type housing to a more modern house type. As one moves away from Holy Rosary Church northward, lower class houses seem to surround the church. Wood on the exterior needs paint and in some cases replacement. Yards are generally in poor condition. When observing these houses, one can not help but notice the older model cars that are parked in front of them. Like the houses, most of the cars are also in need of repainting.

Ports Ferry is a community of many housing irregularities. One block south of the homes just discussed, houses in better condition begin to appear. One of the evaluating judges, to be discussed in chapter VIII, from Holy Rosary Church lives in one of these houses.

*At the time the interviewing part of this research was taking place the researcher was looking at homes and furniture in the Husker City Area because he was considering a move from his residence at that time. This proved a valuable experience when observing the exterior and interior of many houses in Ports Ferry.*
Generally, they are not as modern appearing as the older white wooden homes. They may, however, have well-kept lawns and are either recently painted or have asphalt shingles that cover exteriors. The reader should keep in mind that the houses and areas now being described are located fairly close to Holy Rosary Church. The last area to be described is two blocks south.

Moving on, directly south from Holy Rosary, the type of housing becomes more modern in appearance. Approximately six blocks south of Holy Rosary Church the houses begin to take on a "middle class" aura. While this researcher is not an expert on housing, the houses here seem no older than twenty years. Cars parked in front of the homes are later 1960 models and appear to be in good condition. The houses tend to be a mixture of brick and wood, are generally no larger than two stories, and are ranch-style in nature. A more detailed description of the south area of Ports Ferry will come later.

Again, let it be emphasized that Holy Rosary Church is located in the west area of Ports Ferry and the reason for this discussion is to give the reader a description of the area and homes surrounding one of the major foci of attention in this study, Holy Rosary Church and its social organization.

North of Holy Rosary Church is an area similar in housing style to that immediately south of it. The houses are generally in poor condition, yards are not kept up, and model and condition of cars are both indicative of lower-income and class orientation. The homes are in need of repainting and wood replacement. A majority of them
have porches which need new supports. The general physical appearance within a few blocks north and south of Holy Rosary is definitely that of a lower class nature. This area is situated down a hill from Holy Rosary Church across Main Street, the major dividing street in Ports Ferry. The streets north of Main in this part of Ports Ferry are usually dirt. In order to get to the north area of Ports Ferry on a normal tar surface, one must drive eastward on Main Street for one block, then head north. (Figures 2 and 3 page: 16 and 16a).

Earlier in this section, concerning the area immediately east of Holy Rosary Church, it was suggested that a mixture of modern, old, and poor housing exists side by side. Several reasons for this come to mind. First, land that was not occupied by housing at one time was later used for the purpose of building new homes. Most of these new homes were built among older and poorer homes. Second, dilapidated houses were torn down and replaced by modern houses, leaving older and poorer housing still in existence and in juxtaposition to the new homes. It is well to emphasize that it is not unusual to encounter such housing mixture in Ports Ferry. A successful, self-employed businessman, earning $20,000 a year can conceivably live next to a laborer earning less than half that amount.

A more general description of the west area of Ports Ferry will now be undertaken.

Generally, the farther west one proceeds, the more modern the housing, cars, dress of residents and the better kept the yards. The northwestern part of the town has a majority of what one can safely
call middle class homes. Discussions with residents of this area suggest that the homes are all ten years old or less and cost anywhere from ten thousand to twenty thousand dollars. The streets are paved, though in order to get to several of them, one must drive west approximately a quarter mile east of Highway 73-75, turn on a dirt road, drive one block north, and enter this area. Highway 73-75 is the farthest point west in Ports Ferry. As soon as this highway is crossed the rural mail delivery routes become the major roads.

The southwest area of Ports Ferry tends to have more expensive housing, and in housing style is the wealthiest part of Ports Ferry. There are a number of $75,000 plus homes in this area. The streets are designed in order to give a more contemporary appearance to the area. This area exhibits a number of 1970 model automobiles parked in garages and on driveways and streets. The houses are a mixture of brick, brick and wood, and wholly wood. The houses are painted various colors. The yards are in good condition.

Across Highway 73-75 and to the west is an area known as Copper Corale. Copper Corale is a new building site for very expensive homes. The homes are in the $50,000 range and ordinarily exceed this amount in cost. There are at the present time five homes located in Copper Corale. Three of these homes are now occupied, two are in the process of being purchased. (Figure 4 page 16a).
Figure 1. Holy Rosary Catholic Church

Figure 2. Two Blocks Northeast of Holy Rosary Catholic Church
Figure 3. Across the Street from Holy Rosary Catholic Church

Figure 4. Copper Corale
The East Area

The east area of Ports Ferry is generally marked by a larger number of poorer homes than any other section of the community. East Ports Ferry, as it will be referred to, encompasses the downtown business district as well as residences. A description of the business district will follow later in this chapter.

For the purpose of clarity of description, east Ports Ferry will be limited to Main Street, three blocks north including St. John's Church, and three blocks south. Southeast and northeast Ports Ferry will also be discussed.

Main Street, from approximately 1st to 8th Streets includes the business district. The business district has a number of small businesses. Taverns, three restaurants, a drug store, a carpet and drapery shop, an antique shop, a dress shop, the local newspaper, the community bank, and law offices are the major businesses. All of these businesses and the rest of those included in the downtown business district are at least twenty-five years old. The buildings probably are much older. A description of some of these businesses will give one an idea of their appearance. (Figure 8 can 25a).

The bank is probably the most modern appearing of all businesses. It has a brick exterior, a "shopping window" and a recently decorated interior. One of the more prominent members of the community owns this bank. His son also is connected with it as a member of the board of directors.

The newspaper's premises are older appearing. From the outside
it has a brick exterior. The interior (as one enters the building) is also older looking. The floor on the interior is wooden with many cracks in the wood, and the furniture, such as desks and chairs, are very old.

The drug store has a fairly contemporary interior, but as with the bank and newspaper, it exists in a building constructed at the turn of the century. It has a small coffee counter of eight seats, and the druggist is located in the rear part of the store. The drug store tends to be a place for shoppers to gather for conversation.

One of the restaurants served as a point of reference for this researcher. For the first few months of observation, he would first go to this restaurant, drink a cup of coffee, and leave from there for the rest of the day. Until he became familiar with the community, the restaurant served the purpose of placing Ports Ferry in perspective. Though later the research activity for any one day was determined before the researcher left his Husker City apartment.

The restaurant as location and institution is worthy of a few additional words. One section has a picture of all the churches in the community, of all Ports Ferry's schools, and its most recent high school football teams. This researcher gained much perspective on the community merely by studying the pictures of buildings. Most of the pictures are about ten years old and by studying them and going and looking at the churches and schools as they exist today, one can develop a certain insight into the changes in their exterior appearances over the years.
The counter section of the restaurant is a good place to listen to and to start conversations. Most discussions center around Nebraska football, the federal government's economic policies, and cattle rustling. In keeping with my research purposes, when I started conversations, my topic was usually the Catholic churches. Discussions seemed invariably to center around the Catholic church yet to be constructed. Whether Catholic or not, most people seem to recognize that most Catholics in the community approve of a "one" parish building and organization but that a "faction" exists in the Holy Rosary Parish that disapprove of its construction. "Those Bohemians" is usually the label applied to this faction.

At one point early in this research, a study of the restaurant only and conversation that went on in it was considered. I had previously known the owner of the restaurant and concluded that he would not have approved of my loitering inside the restaurant for eight hours a day, so the thought was abandoned.

One tavern served as an occasional resting and listening point. The tavern, which is located on the southeast end of Main Street, is also a part of a building constructed long ago. Without a doubt the major and, often time, only topic of discussion was Nebraska football.

An important observation of this research is that the downtown business district is not of major economic consequence. After browsing
around the business district for several weeks, never once did this researcher see a large crowd on either side of Main Street. Sporadic intermittent shopping tends to be the way of downtown customers in Ports Ferry. Even if the business district were to close down, according to a majority of those asked, the community would not suffer greatly.

Directly north of the east area of Ports Ferry, which again includes the business district, is a residential area that includes three churches.

The houses in this part of Ports Ferry are usually white wooden and older in appearance. They generally are in good condition. Their yards are neatly kept. Observation of the cars parked in front of these houses and those parked in open-door garages shows a tendency for the residents of these homes to have later 1960 model cars, a majority of them being Chevrolets. In this section of Ports Ferry is St. John's Catholic Church, the larger of the two Catholic churches in Ports Ferry.

St. John's Church is surrounded by older, white wooden houses. Across the street from St. John's Church there are different types of houses. One white, medium-size home is located across the street diagonally from St. John's Church. Its yard is in good condition as is the exterior of the house. Directly across the street from the church is a yellow painted, medium-size home with a good exterior and a well-kept lawn. Down the block, across from St. John's Church is a brown rock home. In terms of appearance, it is the most attractive
home on the street. The yard surrounding the home is in excellent condition. (Figures 5 and 6 page 25).

As one moves east on Avenue B, where St. John's Church is located, houses are of cement—gray on the outside, one generally in good condition, and the other in fair condition. One exception on this block is a large wooden house, painted green, which appears to be in good repair.

Two blocks east from St. John's Church a different housing style appears. On this block several small and medium-size homes are located. Both are generally in good condition and their lawns are well-kept. On the north side of this street, a large, green and cream-colored home is situated. The street that runs north and south from the avenue previously discussed has a similar appearance. One home is painted several colors, is a one-story, ranch style. Other homes on the block are not in as good condition from the exterior, and lawns, except for the first house mentioned, do not appear to get much attention. The street, Avenue C, directly behind St. John's Church has a number of fair-to-poor houses located on it. (Figure 7 page 25a).

The area, then, immediately surrounding St. John's Church is a mixture of some well-kept homes and a number of fair-to-poor houses. Generally, the further one goes north of St. John's Church, the more consistent are the homes in terms of their exterior appearance. One does not encounter homes with recent model automobiles parked in front of them or in garages with open doors.

The poorer housing in East Ports Ferry is located one block south
of Main Street. One of the families interviewed lives in this area. Generally, the homes may be considered "comfortable," but they have poor exterior appearances. The street directly behind Main has houses only on the north side. These homes are generally small and have businesses located either next to them or in close proximity. Across from these homes is a steep hill covered with a great deal of weeds and trees.

Approximately two blocks from this point are additional houses in the same style. As one drives along Lincoln Avenue, a number of poor-to-fair houses appear. The southeastern part of Ports Ferry probably gives the poorest economic appearance with reference to housing.

The farther east one travels along Lincoln Avenue, the more recent the house styles become. As with the southeastern part of Ports Ferry, the northeastern edge of the community has a large number of poorer homes. By comparison, the houses in the west area of Ports Ferry are both newer and better kept than those in the areas now being discussed. On the whole, the northeast portion of Ports Ferry does, however, have more well-kept houses than those in the southeast. Transients, such as Air Force personnel, and those who have a "hard time making ends meet" live in these outer areas of the community.

Lincoln Avenue is the main route east through Ports Ferry and is representative of the housing mixture so prominent in Ports Ferry. Several individuals interviewed live between 14th and 21st Streets along Lincoln Avenue. This section of Lincoln Avenue is the portion of the Avenue that could be considered modern in terms of house style.
Most of the homes in this section are similar in appearance. They are two-story houses with recent interior decorating. The yards run from fair-to-excellent. The former description is often due to the fact that the homes have recently been occupied and no sod has been applied to the soil.
Figure 5. St. John's Catholic Church

Figure 6. Across the Street from St. John's Catholic Church
Figure 7. Several Blocks East of St. John's Catholic Church

Figure 8. The Downtown Business District
The North Area

Because the north area of Ports Ferry was discussed with north-eastern and northwestern portions of the city, this section will be limited to a description of the entrance of the community and the section of Ports Ferry that includes Retirement Manor and the Masons' Home. A description of the area directly north of St. John's Church will also be undertaken. Earlier in this chapter a brief description of the drive into the community was made.

Ports Ferry is situated about five miles south on Highways 73-75, a major route north and south through Husker City. In order to travel to Ports Ferry from Husker City, one must drive south from the city until reaching Highway 34. This route is the way into Ports Ferry from Highways 73-75. Proceeding along number 34 into Ports Ferry, the landscape takes on a wooded appearance. The highway is a two-lane black top with many curves until one enters the community itself. The driver seems "to leave the city behind." The road certainly is not a modern, high speed thoroughfare, two cars having difficulty traveling in opposite directions due to its width.

The wooded appearance continues for approximately two miles until a hilly terrain begins to develop. A few farm houses are located on both sides of the road. As one comes closer to Ports Ferry, a sign advertising "Sunday Flea Market" appears, along with a gas station and a used car lot. Neither of these buildings is modern. Directly south of these buildings is the Masons' Home. This home is probably the most attractive and certainly the largest structure in the community.
The building is brown brick, four stories high and is surrounded by a well-manicured lawn. This researcher visited the home twice and was given a tour of a limited portion of the home. South of the Masons' Home is Retirement Manor. One of the interviewees lives in this Manor. All of the residents of this home are, as indicated by its name, old and retired. From what this researcher could observe, it does not appear that the home is well protected. A sign stating "No Solicitors" appears right on the inside of the door leading to the main floor. When this researcher went for an interview he was never asked about his purposes for visiting the home. (Figure 9 page 31).

Directly east of the Manor is 12th Street. This street has a fairly modern appearance. One of the rating judges lives on 12th Street. The houses on this street are well kept and in good condition. The lawns on the street are also in good condition. The house in which a rating judge from St. John's Parish lives is fairly new, exterior in good condition, and painted yellow. The interior is the most impressive part of the home. The furniture appears expensive and the home has a piano. (Figure 10 page 31).

There is a noticeable contrast between 11th Street and 12th Street. The houses on 11th Street are smaller and not as new as those on 12th Street. The lawns of the 11th Street homes are generally well kept and the exterior of the homes are in good condition. A drive south on either 12th or 11th Streets shows an increase in homes that are older in appearance. This seems to be a trend in this section of town. From 12th Street to approximately 8th Street, the homes six to seven
blocks north of St. John's Church are generally new, about fifteen years old. Driving south, toward the St. John's area on Avenue B, the homes are older, more of them being white-painted clapboard, many of them in the St. John's area, along with others in Ports Ferry, being at least one hundred years old.

Two of the major entrances into this northern section of Ports Ferry are Washington Avenue and Webster Boulevard. The latter is the first street in this section of town that extends from Highway 34. Webster Boulevard includes the area that has the church welcoming sign and the large "Ports Ferry Welcomes You" banner which is suspended over the boulevard. This boulevard serves as an entrance to the Masonic Home and Retirement Manor.

Webster Boulevard is nicely paved and is two-laned and converts into Washington Avenue. Washington Avenue is the street in Ports Ferry that leads to the downtown business district. Along this avenue is a motel-trailer court, a gas station, a soft ice cream stand, and a major food mart. Cement medians divide this avenue which is curved rather than a direct route to downtown Ports Ferry.

Across from Washington Avenue and the Masonic Home grounds is a pattern of white wooden houses. These homes appear older, but are well kept. The lawns of these homes are also in good condition. North of these homes on a dirt road 17th Street emerges, which is paved until it reaches the overpass of the Missouri Pacific Railroad. From this point the road becomes unpaved and rocky. A drive along this rocky section of 17th Street leads one to a rather isolated part of the
community. One of the interviewees lives in this section of Ports Ferry. The houses in this area generally have small acreages with crops. The interviewee mentioned has a corn crop growing to the rear of his house. One block west of this interviewee's home is a farm house and the beginning of farm land. All of the streets in this section of Ports Ferry are dirt and most of them rocky. This area, although near the Masonic grounds, must be approached along the dirt streets mentioned.

In summary, the north area of Ports Ferry consists of the drive into the community, the two major streets, Webster Boulevard and Washington Avenue, and includes streets four to five blocks east and west of this area.
THE NORTH AREA

Figure 9. Masonic Home

Figure 10. 12th Street - North
The South Area

The south area of Ports Ferry includes, for descriptive purposes, Fifth Avenue and south from the avenue. Fifth Avenue is five blocks south of Main Street. A description of the area north of Fifth Avenue was included in that of East Ports Ferry.

The south area of Ports Ferry has more recently built homes than any other part of the community. Though other sections of Ports Ferry have as nice or better appearing homes, South Ports Ferry has more "middle class" homes than the remainder of the community.

As a rule, the farther south in this part of the community one travels, the newer are the homes. Fifth Avenue is marked by a number of well-kept white-painted wood, large-and medium-size homes. The lawns are in good condition. The avenues directly south of Fifth Avenue, Sixth and Seventh Avenues, are also marked by similar style homes. (Figure 11 page 37).

The emergence of more recently built homes begins on Eighth Avenue. Eighth Avenue, also considered Patterson Street, has a number of two-story homes that appear no older than ten years. The homes on this street all seem to be built based on the same floor plan. Eighth Avenue connects with Chicago Avenue, a major route south through Ports Ferry. Chicago Avenue is marked by two motels, a number of gas stations, a small park, a root beer stand and a few homes. The researcher spent one week in a motel on Chicago Avenue. Chicago Avenue might be the busiest street in the community. During the day quite a few cars use this street. In the evening Chicago Avenue is used heavily, mainly
due to a root beer stand.

West from Chicago are Thayer, Hill, and Valley Streets. Thayer Street has a number of houses which deviate to some extent from the "middle class" look of homes in this area, most of these being older and needing paint. The front lawns are not as well kept as many of the lawns in the section of Ports Ferry now being discussed.

Hill Street is situated one block south of Thayer. Hill Street is much different in appearance than Thayer. Most of the houses on Hill Street are in good condition, generally wood construction but painted different colors, and the lawns are well-kept. Hill Street is one of the more attractive streets in the community. Even though the homes on this street are not recently built, the street has more trees and well-kept homes than do most other streets in Ports Ferry.

Valley Street sections off from Hill, and has an appearance similar to that of Hill Street. Valley Street has a number of medium-sized, wooden homes of different colors. The lawns on this street are in fine condition. There also are as many trees on Valley Street as there are on Hill Street. Similar to the three streets just discussed are Debra Avenue, Scott Street, James Street, and Rogers Circle. Rogers Circle is situated between James Street and Scott Street. Rogers Circle has about 20 homes. All of the homes, with the exception of two, are new, about five years old, and large. One notices the houses are a mixture of brick and wood and are large. The circular portion of the street has smaller homes that are wooden but of different colors. The lawns on this street are in good condition.
Rogers Circle, along with the other streets in this section of town, has more recent model cars parked in their garages and in front of homes than any other street in Ports Ferry. Scott Street is similar to that of Rogers Circle when considering newness of homes. Based on this researcher's knowledge of the community, the area just discussed is the most consistent in terms of house style, lawns and cars than any other in the town. (Figure 12 page 37).

Directly east of these streets Clinton Street, Hermia Street, Porter Street and Howell Street are situated on a hill. These streets are not as new when considering homes, but have a number of smaller wooden houses. The lawns on these streets are well-kept. The cars parked in garages and in front of homes are not recent models as are those on the streets previously discussed, but are no more than five years old.

The extreme south of Ports Ferry has several streets, Bryant Street and Andies Street, which are somewhat different from one another. Bryant Street is hilly and connects both Chicago Avenue and Lincoln Avenue. Many of the homes on this street are about fifty years old, white-wooden, and generally not as well-kept as are the homes just previously discussed. The lawns on this street are in fair-to-good condition. Andies Street is a curved street in the extreme south of Ports Ferry. Andies Street is not a new street and is marked by homes that are at least twenty-five years old. The homes are in fair condition and have lawns that are well kept. Both Bryant and Andies Streets have early 1960 model cars parked in garages and in
front of homes.

In summary, the south area of Ports Ferry is modern when considering homes. The families living in these homes appear younger than in other parts of the community.
THE SOUTH AREA

Figure 11. South Ports Ferry

Figure 12. South Ports Ferry
A summary of the chapter is now in order. Ports Ferry, Nebraska, is a community, homogeneous in ecological organization, but displaying diversity in appearance. The west area of Ports Ferry has a number of recently built houses. These are no more than ten years old. The east area of Ports Ferry, the oldest area of the community, has a number of old homes, and the greater share of run-down housing. The north area of Ports Ferry, where St. John's Church is situated, is an area which has much similarity in housing style and appearance. The south area is where the larger proportion of recently built homes are located. It exhibits diversity in housing style, since many older structures are also situated here. Holy Rosary Catholic Church is located in this south area.

Attention is now turned to chapter III, "Participant Observation of Mass Related Behavior in Two Churches."
CHAPTER III

Participant Observation of Mass-Related Behavior

in the Two Churches

There are three objectives of this chapter: first, an explanation of participant observation is made; second, an analysis of parishioners as they participate in the ceremony of the mass; and third, a conclusion to the chapter is presented.

In chapter I, "Introduction," participant observation is defined as the sociological method whereby the researcher observes and participates in the daily activities of those individuals whom he is studying. John Lofland, in Analyzing Social Settings (1971) emphasizes the importance of participant observation and highlights the reasons for its use in research such as this when he writes "that the internal world of sociology—or any other social world—is not understandable unless one has been part of it in a face-to-face fashion for quite a period of time." (Lofland, 1971:5) Lofland's point of view is important for the research in Ports Ferry. In order to develop an understanding of the structure of human relationships in Ports Ferry, a detailed and somewhat lengthy investigation of the community was needed if the proper questions concerning social class and prestige status were to be asked.

Participant observation was used in various ways in this research. First, this technique enabled the researcher to familiarize himself with the ecological organization of Ports Ferry as discussed in
chapter II. Second, participant observation enhanced the researcher's knowledge of the community through his participation in the daily social processes of the community. An example of this is the discussion that I had in M's Cafe with a number of Ports Ferry Citizens which often centered around community activities. These gave further insight concerning Ports Ferry. During the interviewing phase, observation of a number of Ports Ferry's Catholics enhanced general knowledge of the community. Analysis of the data from the interviews by use of The Index of Status Characteristics, The Church Status Index, and Evaluated Participation, the three data gathering methods used in this thesis, is made in chapters VI, VII, and VIII of this thesis.

Since the main objective of this thesis is to learn about social stratification and status in the two Ports Ferry Catholic churches, Holy Rosary and St. John's, the researcher decided it would be beneficial for research purposes if he attended a number of masses in both churches. The researcher entered the mass with the intention of determining whether or not it is a source of social cohesion for parishioners. The procedure for attending mass was to attend two masses per Sunday, one at Holy Rosary Church the other at St. John's Church. This was done for one month, or eight masses. The researcher sat in the rear of the church in all masses, basically to have the advantage of overlooking the entire congregation. At first, the objectives for attending mass—what the researcher desired to observe—were not well defined. After the first attendance at masses a decision as to which key points for observation was made. There were three. First, the
researcher observed interaction between parishioners before they entered the church. Second, he observed seating arrangements in the church during mass. Third, interaction among parishioners, and between parishioners and the mass celebrant was observed. For the purpose of comparison, these three steps will be assessed, first by individual church, and second by comparing the results of observation at each church with one another.

Holy Rosary Church

Holy Rosary Church is the smaller of the two parishes. The 1972 church list from which the sample for the study was drawn listed 115 parishioners. Holy Rosary has a predominantly Bohemian congregation.

Interaction between members of the parish before entering church seemed to depend on how long before mass started that the parishioners arrived. After several weeks of observing this, no explicit pattern of interaction was found to exist. If the mass started at 8:00, most of the parishioners arrived at about 7:50 and entered the church without speaking at any length with one another. Most of the parishioners in the Holy Rosary parish are adults and have known one another for a long time. Consequently, the basic pattern of interaction would be recognizing one another's presence, exchanging a few words, and then entering the church. Because this church serves a social as well as religious function, most of the interaction occurs after mass when there is more time to talk with one another. It may also be noted that some of the older parishioners arrive about 7:30 a.m. in order to pray the rosary before the beginning of mass. Approximately one-
third of the attendance at the 8:00 o'clock mass walks to church, due to the church's close proximity to the homes of a number of the parishioners.

The second aspect of observation concerned seating patterns in the church. This observation was pursued because the researcher wanted to know whether or not mass attendance was a place for primary groups such as the family and peer groups to gather and to be near one another. At Holy Rosary Church mass attendance was a place for family groups to join together. After I became more familiar with the parishioners I was able to tell to some degree who was related to whom. As for friendship-group seating arrangements, I cannot ascertain a definite pattern in terms of where one sat and whom one sat with.

The seating arrangement of the mass at Holy Rosary Church often times goes like this: The oldest members of the parish who attend the earlier mass sit in the front. Parents with young children sit directly behind the older members. The farther back in the church, the less the homogeneity among people sitting in them. The last few pews usually belong to youth in their teens, who for reasons never investigated normally occupy these seats. One might posit that the closer to the altar one sits at Holy Rosary Church, the more deeply ingrained in both the mass and the Catholic religion he is.

Interaction after mass normally centers around the presence of the celebrant who would conclude by leaving the altar and walking through the church in procession style and out the doors in order
to greet the parishioners. Small groups form around the priest, usually with the intention of greeting him. If the mass celebrant happens to be the head of both parishes, conversation would normally center around reconstruction of the Catholic parish system in Port Ferry. Most of the parishioners who pursue this line of inquiry with Father 3 speak positively about the reorganization. A few parishioners take it upon themselves to express their disagreement with the plans. Usually, then, interaction would center around Father 3. The formation of small groups around the priest is ephemeral, lasting no longer than fifteen minutes. Often times the mass celebrant finds his own way to these groups in order to say hello. After four successive weeks of observing the behavior just mentioned, the conclusion is reached that no one group formation seems to be permanent. The parish members move between groups to say hello and gossip. Based on what can be observed, the parish members seem to know one another well and are openly expressive about their positive feelings about one another.*

*A brief mention of the role of the researcher during mass may be made. The researcher is a baptized Catholic, but has not been an active Catholic for several years. I attempted at all times to remain an objective observer during mass, not using either mass as a means to fulfilling Sunday church obligations. I remained in the last pew in both churches at all times and observed the behavior of people during the mass. I did not participate in the mass ceremony except to kneel and stand at appropriate times. This was done to avoid being conspicuous to those sitting near me. Before mass, I remained outside, either in my car or standing near it observing pre-mass interaction. After mass, I would stand in a strategic position in order to observe post-mass interaction.
St. John's Church

The interaction before mass at St. John's Church takes about the same form as interaction at Holy Rosary Church. Most individuals attending the 10:00 a.m. mass would arrive around 9:45 a.m., make brief remarks to one another, and enter the church. One factor that might have influenced interaction is the location of the church from parking facilities. St. John's Church is situated on a small hill. If a parishioner parked his car and proceeded to enter the church, he would find a set of cement steps awaiting him, steps not conducive to conversation. So if interaction of any intensity is going to take place it must be in the back of the church or near the rectory. In brief, little interaction occurs before mass at St. John's parish; St. John's Church is also a larger parish.

Often times the researcher was unable to tell if those sitting next to one another were related to each other. Thus, the researcher attempted over a four-week period to recognize persons and whether they sat by each other every week. I was able to discern several definite seating patterns. One group of individuals sits in the middle of the right pew section every week. Though they do not come together, they sit together. The groups ranged from teenagers to middle-aged adults. It was learned that they are first cousins who come to mass with their families every Sunday and sit together out of respect for the adults' parents who are deceased. A second group consists of three women who sit together every Sunday. All three are sisters whose husbands are deceased.
The over-all seating arrangement at St. John's Church is very similar to that of Holy Rosary Church. The older parishioners sit in the front of the church, parents with young children directly behind them, and others randomly.

Interaction after mass is of the same nature as at Holy Rosary Church except that most of it is carried out in the back of the church. Groups form around the priest and discussion about the church reorganization is the basic topic. The groups are short lived and as with Holy Rosary Church, the celebrant moves around to pay his respects to those present.

A comparison of interaction patterns of attendance at mass at the two churches is now possible. First, both churches exhibited limited interaction among parishioners before mass. Interaction is more in nature of a recognition of one another. Similarities exist in seating arrangements between churches, particularly where both older parishioners and younger families are concerned. Whereas in Holy Rosary Church no definite seating arrangement by group is found, St. John's Church has several groups of persons who sit in about the same place each week. Third, except for possible differences because of physical arrangements outside the churches, both Holy Rosary Church and St. John's Church exhibit similar post-mass interaction, with most of it centered around the priest.

One further observation of behavior of members from both parishes should be given consideration. This is the behavior of people in response to the mass ceremony itself. At Holy Rosary Church, the
entire congregation participated in the ceremony of the mass. Most people responded to the priest and sang. Most individuals received Holy Communion. As for the intensity of involvement, from the "exterior," older people seemed to put more physically and emotionally into the mass than the rest of the congregation. This was seen in their "acting" more religious at all points in the mass. The young who occupied the last pews participated, but observation would suggest they did not "act" as involved as did the older parishioners. The rest of the congregation, especially the young families, participated in all phases of the mass.

The behavior during the mass at St. John's Church was very similar to that of Holy Rosary Church. The elderly parishioners showed more outward signs of religious involvement than the rest of the congregation. The group of adults and their children who attend mass together also "acted" more religiously than most of the parish. Outward signs, such as the way hands were positioned when praying, the closing of eyes during prayer, and the length of time heads are held down after receiving communion, seem to indicate more involvement in the mass ceremony than others, except for the older members.

A few further comments will be made before continuing this report. First, the researcher originally thought that Holy Rosary Church, at all phases of the observation, would show more signs of cohesiveness than St. John's Church due to the fact that Holy Rosary Church is primarily Bohemian. Based on the comparative observations carried out, the researcher is not able to assert that Holy Rosary parishioners
are more cohesive than St. John's parishioners. Second, an object of
attending mass was to see whether parishioners sat together in terms
of general social class position. The analyst was unable to determine
seating arrangements based on variations in prestige status. As
previously indicated, group seating arrangements tended to be based
on age and young families who attended mass together. Since this is
research in social stratification, the analyst was especially alert
to whether status groupings were prevalent when individuals from the
two parishes attend mass. It seems apparent from the observations of
Ports Ferry Catholics as they attend mass that participation in this
ritual is primarily for religious purposes and it does not appear to
matter whom individuals sit with when attending mass. This raises
the question whether or not socially significant status differences
exist within and between the two parishes. Chapters VI, VII, and VIII
which explain the methodology involved in the data collecting tech-
niques and analyze the data based on these techniques, focuses atten-
tion on the question of these differences.

We now turn our attention in the next chapter to social
stratification and prestige status theory.
CHAPTER IV

Social Stratification and Prestige Status Theory

There are two main objectives of this chapter. The first is to discuss important research that has been conducted in communities the major objective of which was to assess their social stratification and status patterns. The second is to explore relevant sociological theories on social stratification and prestige status in order to guide the exploration of our own data. The chapter will begin with an analysis of important research undertaken in community stratification. A discussion of major stratification theories follows. The chapter will conclude with a summary of main points from this chapter.

Much work has been published in the area of social stratification. Probably the earliest important impetus for the development of social stratification theory is in the works of Karl Marx from the 1840's and Max Weber's modifications and expansions in his "Class, Status, and Party." During the 1920's and 1930's in the United States, the study of community stratification became important to sociology.

Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd published the results of two studies of the same community, Muncie, Indiana, which they called "Middletown." In 1929, the first study, Middletown, was published, and eight years later, in 1937, Middletown in Transition, came out. A major contribution of both studies was to the understanding of social class as it relates to occupation. In the Middletown study, two
classes emerged: a working class and a business class. The working class was defined in terms of those individuals who used tools in order to make things. The business class was comprised of individuals who sell things and promote services and ideas. In the Lynds' attempt to understand the effects of rapid industrialization on Middletown, social class was only one of three research foci upon which they concentrated. The other two research factors were institutional functioning and social change. (Lynd and Lynd, 1929:22)

* Middletown in Transition was published during the Great Depression but after the period of intensive industrialization had begun. In this study, the Lynds continue to assess social stratification along occupational lines, stressing to a greater extent than previously divisions within each group. The Middletown of 1937 had six social classes according to the Lynds. The first social class, or the highest, was conceived by the Lynds to be the "old" middle class's becoming the upper class. Individuals who comprised this group were wealthy local manufacturers, bankers, several lawyers, and the local head managers of one or two of the national corporations with units in Middletown.

The second highest social class consisted of established smaller manufacturers, merchants, professionals, and the better-paid salaried workers of Middletown's big businesses. The middle class was composed of the minor employed professionals, the very small retailers and entrepreneurs, clerks, clerical workers, etc. The fourth class, possibly defined as the lower middle class, was comprised basically of skilled laborers, who sent their children to the local college. The
fifth class, which might be referred to as a lower class, was chiefly characterized by unskilled laborers. The lowest class, the last of the six identified by the Lynds', encompassed those individuals such as the "poor whites" who could not even reach the status of the unskilled worker. (Lynd and Lynd, 1937:458-460)

The importance of the Lynds research for social stratification theory and for this thesis is found not so much in what the Lynds reveal about Middletown, but in their basic contribution to a style of investigation that played a prominent role in future social stratification research. A second major contribution of the Lynds' Middletown publications is their methodology. The Lynds used participant observation, interviews, content analysis, and questionnaires as their basic techniques for gathering data. The Portis Ferry research, though not nearly as broad, uses participant observation and interviews as the basic methodological techniques for the collection of data.

The chief prototype for this thesis is the research carried out by W. Lloyd Warner and his associates during the 1930's, '40's and '50's. Discussion of Warner and his two basic techniques for studying social class will be presented in the chapters in which the data are analyzed.

Warner has had profound effect on sociology. His works have received much acclaim and criticism. Many sociologists view his research as stepping stones to greater sociological works. Others look at Warner's research as being sufficient in itself. Still others view Warner's research as deficient, lacking conceptual clarification, lacking statistical analysis, and too anthropological in nature to contribute
to an increasingly sophisticated sociology. In other words, some sociologists who bask in the sun of statistics, find Warner's Yankee City investigations of Newburyport, Massachusetts, too weak and over-rated for further and similar pursuits of knowledge. (Pfautz and Duncan, 1950)

Pfautz and Duncan in their widely read criticism state that Warner's research places too much emphasis on the generalization of the findings of the Newburyport, Massachusetts, and Morris, Illinois, researches. The authors suggest that the Warner research can not adequately be performed in a large city such as Detroit. In brief, what Pfautz and Duncan suggest is that Warner was too qualitative in his approach. The authors also criticize Warner for his sampling techniques. According to the two sociologists, Warner over-emphasized the upper class while under-emphasizing the lower classes in his sample. A major point in the criticism is the assessment of Warner's statistical analysis. Pfautz and Duncan suggest that, based on the data from the Morris research, a correlation between Warner's two basic methods, Evaluated Participation, and The Index of Status Characteristics, is possible due to the amount of sampling error and poorly defined concepts. (Pfautz and Duncan, 1950:210-215)

Yet the basic importance of Warner for sociological research is seen in his attempt to integrate a great deal of qualitative material with quantitative data. His work stands as a major contribution to sociological literature in stratification and community study.

The Warner researches made a most important contribution to
sociology in its methods. While Warner used the same techniques as
the Lynds when analysis of data became important, it was his Evaluated
Participation and Index of Status Characteristics that played a promi-

nent role. Both techniques will be discussed to some extent in chap-
ters VI and VIII, but a brief mention of their content will now be
presented.

Evaluated Participation (E.P.) is used by Warner in order to gain
insight into the basic characteristics of social class. Warner assumes
that individuals in interaction in the social system are evaluated in
prestige terms by those with whom they are interacting, that the places
where individuals participate are evaluated, and that members of a
community are aware of the ranking. Because of these assumptions,
Warner holds that individuals can translate their evaluations of social
participation into class and prestige status ratings and that these can
be communicated to social scientific investigators. Examples of the
process of Evaluated Participation are rating by symbolic placement,
by status reputation, and by comparison. In general, what the Eval-
uated Participation is designed to do is to give the investigator a
large and diverse amount of data about the traits, characteristics,
and life styles, and prestige differences of a large number of individ-
uals. (Warner 1949a:35)

The Ports Perry research uses a modified form of this technique,
but for the same reasons. A general knowledge of the people under
study is believed to be necessary if a meaningful analysis of class
and prestige is to emerge.
Warner asserts that other factors play important roles in stratification research. He, therefore, developed The Index of Status Characteristics. Depending on where the research was conducted—Newburyport or Morris—the characteristics include occupation, source of income, education, house type, dwelling area, and amount of income. Warner assigned these different status characteristics varying weights and developed a seven-point rating scale for each characteristic. (Warner, 1949b:41)

The Index of Status Characteristics (I.S.C.) provided an "objective" approach for the study of social status prestige differences. A major purpose of The Index of Status Characteristics is to correlate it with Evaluated Participation. In other words, data obtained from Evaluated Participation placement is correlated with six (Warner dropped two of the variables, education and amount of income) status characteristics in order to determine relationship between social class and prestige placements by using the two techniques. (Warner, 1949c:41)

Using these techniques, Warner defined a social class system in both communities. His breakdown of the stratification system into six classes from the Newburyport research has found an important place in sociological literature.

In 1945 another major study carried out in a rather small community was published. Plainville, U.S.A., by James West, is considered by this writer to be unique in its style and methodology. (1945)

At the time West did his research, Plainville had a
population of 275. It was a rather isolated community, a good distance from any city of much size. West concentrated on participant observation, interviewing, and content analysis as his basic methodologies. (West, 1945a:2)

The community of Plainville was isolated from many modern ideas, especially when agriculture was concerned. On this basis, West was able to distinguish among social classes, agriculture being a major dimension in Plainville's social class distribution. Criteria for distinguishing among social classes center around the primary activity of Plainville which of course were farming and other rural-oriented occupations.

West discovered six criteria for social class and prestige in Plainville from which he interpreted the values and the behavior of the citizenry and determined the social class divisions. The six criteria were geographical residence, technology, lineage, worth, morals, and manners. Based on these criteria, West was able to determine social class divisions of the community. Two social classes existed in Plainville: a middle class and a lower class. The middle class consisted of the "good, honest, self-respecting, average, everyday working people." The lower class was divided into three strata: "the good lower class," "the lower element," and "the people who live like animals." (West, 1945b:120-124)

The basic similarities of the studies mentioned are seen in their community-oriented approaches. Yet, similarity in method is the key to data collecting in these studies. Major contributions of these
studies to the Ports Ferry research is the participant observation
approach, interviewing, and the emphasis on prestige dimensions--
matters to be discussed further in following chapters--and a consider-
ation of some major sociological theories upon which the research is
founded. Our attention will now turn to an exploration of several
major social stratification theories.

Previously, in this chapter, a brief mention of early sociological
theories on stratification was made. It was suggested that Karl
Marx and Max Weber contributed greatly to an understanding of strati-
fication. Other theorists are important, too. Thorsten Veblen's
Theory of the Leisure Class (1908) is an important statement concern-
ing specific aspects of social class and will be taken up later in
this chapter.

Peculiar as it might seem, the earlier works in stratification
theory seem to have more relevance for this thesis than do some of
the more recent ones. Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Thorsten Veblen have
more conceptual importance for the present study than do others. This
may be due to the emphasis recent theorists such as Davis and Moore,
(1945) and Tumin (1953) for example, place on expanding the works of
earlier theorists.

Karl Marx's conceptualization of class differences is important
for this thesis, not in terms of his emphasis on conflict, but in his
conception of class as being economically determined. In The Communist
Manifesto, he began his treatment of class by stating that "the history
of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles."
For Marx, this statement is the center of his criticism of capitalist society. He wrote:

In the earlier epochs of history we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebians, slaves; in the middle ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs, in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations. The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones. (Marx, 1932a:321)

It seems from discussions, such as that quoted, that Marx was preoccupied with an explanation of social class in terms of economic relationships between groups. The feudal system was replaced by manufacturing, and a division of labor developed in each workshop. As markets increased and exchange of commodities expanded, modern industry replaced the manufacturing system. (Marx, 1932b:322)

Through this type of thinking Marx shows the importance of economic relationships through his concepts of the Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat and exemplifies his economic determinism. The Bourgeoisie evolves out of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and exchange. It owns the industry in which the Proletariat, through its own historical fate, is forced to work. Through the oppressive processes of the Bourgeoisie and their industries, the Proletariat become more deeply alienated from and opposed to the Bourgeoisie and its power. Marx suggests that through the social psychological processes of social organization the Proletariat will overthrow the Bourgeoisie.

Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset, in "Karl Marx's Theory
of Social Classes" suggest that "in Marx's terms...a social class...
in any aggregate of persons who perform the same function in the
organization of production." The authors, commenting on slaves, patricians, serfs, etc., write that "these classes are distinguished from
each other by the difference of their respective position in the
economy." (Bendix and Lipton, 1966:7)

The importance of this conception of social class study for this
thesis is in the Marxian view of class as being economically oriented.
As will be shown later, however, this concept is too shallow to be
used as the sole definition of social class in this thesis. But, the
Marxian concept of class is important to a wider perspective of what
constitutes a social class and prestige status. In essence, the
research in Porte Perry reveals that the economic aspect of social
class as Marx elaborated it has a certain important air. One's posi-
tion in the economic organization of the community is relatively impor-
tant in Porte Ferry when other factors are considered in conjunction
with it.

This writer understands that Marx uses economic determinism as a
part of a theory which emphasizes the consequences of one's econom-
ically determined position in society, these being conflict and
alienation. These consequences of economic exploitation, based on the
data from Porte Perry, do not seem to be essential for analyzing class
and prestige in this research.

Max Weber wrote outstanding works in many fields one of which
will now be discussed. "Class, Status, and Party" (1946) was a
response to Karl Marx's conceptualization of class and stratification. In many ways Weber seems to be saying to Marx that a unidimensional approach to studying social stratification is a weak approach. Economic determinism is the center of Weberian attack in "Class, Status, and Party." What Weber suggests is that the economic conditions of man are not the sole ingredient for social stratification. Weber also contends that social differentiation is a tripartite phenomenon depending on one's possession of and access to economic goods, labeled "class-situation," one's social status is based on either negative or positive social estimation of honor, and power or "the chance of men or a number of men to realize their own will in a communal action, even if resisted." (Weber, 1946a:180)

Weber stands in direct opposition to Marxist dialecticism. The market situation in itself through competition and exchange creates differing life styles. Weber suggests "that the way in which the disposition over material property is distributed among a plurality of people, meeting competitively in the market for the purpose of exchange, in itself creates specific life chances." (Weber, 1946b:184)

Weber's most important contribution to this thesis and perhaps to the thinking of W. Lloyd Warner is his concept of "status honor." Status, according to Weber consists of social differences based on life chances and life styles. One's status situation is determined by a positive or negative social estimation of honor. Weber suggests that a relationship between one's class situation and status situation exists. Property is, "in the long run" the usual link between social
class and social status. But according to Weber, acquisition of property can be a detriment as well as a benefit to social status. Weber writes: "If mere economic acquisition and naked economic power still bearing the stigma of its extra-status origin could bestow upon anyone the same honor as those who are interested in status by virtue of a style of life claim for themselves, the status order would be threatened at its very root." (Weber, 1946b:185)

Weber writes that "status honor is normally expressed by the fact that above all else a specific style of life can be expected from all those who wish to belong to the circle." (Weber, 1946d:185) This style of life carried with it specific restrictions to social intercourse with those outside the "circle." Weber states that the development of status is essentially a question of stratification resting upon usurpation. Such usurpation is the normal origin of all status honor. An important means for protecting a particular "circle" is through endogamy.

At this point a discussion concerning the differences between status honor and prestige status is needed. Status honor implies that a social group will use its overt manifestations of life style to exclude other individuals from membership in their group. Prestige status means the overt manifestations of the life styles of individuals. One's prestige status is determined by his acquisition of status symbols. However, the prestige status differences between social groups can result in the use of these status differences for exclusionary purposes by social groups.

The concept of status honor is distinguished from social class
runs into problems in contemporary American society. For the most part, an economic definition of social class entails a significant relationship to social status (life chances and life styles) due to the multivariable importance that is attached to social position in contemporary society. Gerhard Lenski (Lenski, 1951:1) suggests four variables: income, occupation, education, and ethnicity play important roles in determining one's social position. The economic importance—occupation and income—determine to a large extent one's prestige status in contemporary society. With the increase in the competitive nature of complex American society, one's social and geographic mobility plays an important role in determining one's economic position, his ability to possess economic symbols, and his status prestige.

Weber's concept of status honor is not without importance for this research. Many economic symbols are unobtainable by a large majority of individuals and much status honor centers around the acquisition of these symbols. To clearly attempt a break between status honor and social class seems spurious in relation to contemporary American society.

Weber is not the only theorist of his period that concentrated on the concept of status and class. In 1899, a significant contribution to the study of social stratification and status prestige was published. The Theory of the Leisure Class, by Thorsten Veblen, is an analysis of the life styles of a specific status group.

Veblen's basic focus of attention is on the leisure classes of American society. Veblen's basic objective is to discuss the life
styles of upper and upper-middle class Americans. In order to do so, Veblen used a number of concepts, some of which are "the instinct of workmanship," "conspicuous consumption," "conspicuous leisure," and "pecuniary emulation." In brief, Veblen contended that higher status Americans live a life of leisure, do little work, and continuously display their wealth. It is through such behavior and the accompanying material symbols that the status of the upper class becomes known to the rest of society. Status is Veblen's key to social stratification. One gains high status through the types of behavior previously mentioned. The remainder of society obtains its prestige status by attempting to buy and possess the status symbols of the upper classes. Thus, Veblen felt that the upper classes set the cannons of taste for any community. In the concluding chapter of this thesis, the material discussed in this chapter will further be related to the findings of the research.

Both Thorsten Veblen and Max Weber were interested in the concept of prestige. Veblen suggested that prestige is acquired through wealth. Weber also used the concept of status as an indicator of an individual's social position. Weber, as previously mentioned, defined status as social differences based on life chances and life styles. Status is a social estimate of honor and prestige. Weber writes that "property as such is not always recognized as a status qualification...both property and propertyless people can belong to the same status group." Weber's notion of the importance of property stands in contrast to the position of Veblen. Veblen states that property is an essential factor
in one's wealth and eventual acquisition of status or reputation in society.

Earlier in this chapter, I stated that the principal basis for this thesis is the research undertaken by W. Lloyd Warner and his associates. In order to understand Warner's research, one must understand the theoretical and methodological undergirding of Warner. Emile Durkheim stands as the theoretical base for the research undertaken by W. Lloyd Warner.

The Social Life of a Modern Community, the first of six volumes included in The Yankee City series, outlines the importance of Durkheim for the Warner research. (1941)

Warner emphasizes the necessity of the collection of facts through observation in order that the social scientist may be able to classify and order the social world. The use of the term "facts" emerges from Durkheim's use of the phrase "social facts" which to Durkheim have "distinctive social characteristics and determinants which are not amenable to explanations on the biological or psychological level." (Durkheim, 1926:1-2) Social facts are, according to Durkheim, "something beyond us and something in ourselves." Social facts emerge when individuals interact and a social fact is caused by the social facts preceding it. Durkheim approached social facts from a "holistic" perspective, suggesting that social facts are integrated into a social organization, and in order to understand these social facts one must observe the social organization of which they are a part. Warner believes that by examining various kinds of social phenomena, such as
law, religion, social organization, and technology one can begin to understand "the essential and permanent aspects of humanity."

(Warner, 1941:7-10) Drawing further on Durkheim, Warner suggests that it is through scientific treatment of social facts that one can generalize about the social world. Throughout the Warner research one sees his use of Durkheim. Though Warner does not refer to Durkheim everytime, he sounds like him. Warner makes considerable use of Durkheim's view of an integrated community and approaches Yankee City from this perspective.

More recent works in the theory of social stratification give further insight into the stratification problem. Kingsley Davis and Wilbert E. Moore, in 1945, wrote "Some Principles of Social Stratification." (1945) In this article, Davis and Moore emphasize the importance of the system of positions in a society. The authors write: "As a functioning mechanism a society must somehow distribute its members in social positions and induce them to perform the duties of these positions. It must thus concern itself with motivation at two levels: to instill in the proper individuals the desire to fill certain positions, and once in these positions, the desire to perform the duties attached to them." (Davis and Moore, 1945:243) Davis and Moore suggest that a society must have rewards and a means of distributing these rewards differentially according to the positions. These rewards and positions become part of the social order and thus give rise to stratification.

Davis and Moore suggest that society distributes three basic
Rewards to its members: 1) sustenance and comfort, 2) the things that contribute to honor and diversion and, 3) the things that contribute to self-respect and diversion. Davis and Moore contend that, in any social system, rewards must be dispersed differentially according to positions. In a sense, the rewards are built into the positions, and due to the fact that the rights and prerequisites of different positions in a society must be unequal, then the society must of necessity be stratified, because that is precisely what stratification means.

(Davis and Moore, 1945b:245)

Melvin Tumin responds to the functional theory of stratification as presented by Davis and Moore with his essay "Some Principles of Stratification: A Critical Analysis." (1953) Tumin attacks the theory of Davis and Moore from various perspectives. Tumin believes that the word functional is abused by the two authors. Tumin responds by stating that in a society all positions are important, even some as important as those which require extensive training. From another perspective, Tumin suggests that Davis and Moore overlook one extremely important fact when speaking about the limited number of individuals in a society that can perform specific tasks. Tumin concludes that "the more rigidly stratified that a society is, the less chance does that society have of discovering any new facts about the talents of its members." (Tumin, 1953:390) Thus a society that allows only those with enough wealth to send specific members to be trained for important positions may be greatly overlooking those not so fortunate but who may have equal and better ability.
The purpose of this chapter has been to suggest some important theoretical contributions to the study of social stratification. A brief statement of the importance of these perspectives will now be presented.

The first part of this chapter deals specifically with research contributions to the study of social stratification. Three major studies are analyzed: the works of the Lynds, W. Lloyd Warner, and James West. These authors contribute to this thesis in two ways. First, they enhance the researcher's perspective and knowledge of their methods of studying social stratification, especially in small communities. Second, a framework based on their works was provided this researcher. The basic purpose of analyzing theorists such as Weber, Karl Marx, Thorsten Veblen, Emile Durkheim, Davis and Moore, and Tumin, is to provide more precise meanings of the concepts and the terms of social stratification and status prestige. Another is to provide insight not only of the concepts of stratification themselves but how it is to be used in this thesis.

Max Weber's concepts of class, status, and party are basic to an understanding of the subtleties of social class and prestige. Karl Marx and Thorsten Veblen both contribute heavily to the field of social stratification and the orientation of this thesis. Marx's conflict theory is not thought to be of great importance for this thesis, but his economic perspective is emphasized in order to show the way the concept evolved into the Weberian meaning of social class and the economic basis for prestige differences. Veblen's contributions to
a broader perspective on the meanings of status and class are important enough to mention in this chapter. Emile Durkheim is discussed in this chapter due to his theoretical importance to E. Lloyd Warner which is built in this thesis. The Davis and Moore-Verstappend theory provides new insight into the mechanisms and meanings of social stratification and mobility.

Chapter V "The Interview Schedule" is now presented.
The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the interview schedule used in this thesis. An explanation of how the interview schedule was developed, respondents attitudes toward certain questions, an analysis of two interview situations, and a breakdown of the questions used for developing the Index of Status Characteristics and The Church Status Index will be presented. The chapter concludes on a discussion of how the sample was related for this research.

The interview schedule used in the Ports Ferry research was developed after spending a considerable period of time in the community. The questions asked in the interview schedule derive from participant observation over a seven month period. The researcher observed the community and the Catholic churches for clues as to the types of questions that could be asked on the interview schedule. In other words, the researcher did not enter the community with a completely pre-established interview schedule. Instead he developed ideas of what to ask from observations of the community.

The researcher also used ideas in interview schedules from other studies to develop the interview schedule used in this thesis. Two studies served as guides in helping to construct the interview schedule. W. Lloyd Warner's Yankee City research used an elaborate interview schedule and Kayne Wheeler's Valley View research also employed
an in-depth interview schedule.

The interview schedule used in the Ports Ferry research is not as elaborate nor as long as Warner's or Wheeler's. It is much shorter but is constructed to elicit answers appropriate enough to allow a measure of social class. One major reason for developing an abbreviated interview schedule was that the researcher was not a member of the community. Consequently, he felt that a short interview with individuals he did not know intimately would more serve the purpose of obtaining objective information than if he attempted to tie interviewers down for several hours. The interview schedule is short due to one other factor, that being the amount of time the researcher himself had to devote to the research. A long interview would have meant fewer interviews per day, and more trips into the community, the cost of which would have been prohibitive.

The researcher, when developing the interview had no set number of questions in mind to ask. A number of topics were developed, and later were eliminated or combined in order to form a broader question. The final schedule contains 20 questions, with a number of the questions broken into divisions.

The questions that were ultimately used pertain to two of the three methodological techniques discussed in chapter IV. Seven questions are directed at obtaining information needed for The Index of Status Characteristics. Seven questions are also designed to obtain information for The Church Status Index. The remainder of the questions were developed in order to give the interviewer a better per-
spective on the families interviewed. Examples of these questions are those that ask for data on family size, the age of family members, and ethnicity.

As indicated earlier, the questions are structured in order to provide adequate responses. This is generally the case of questions constructed for the Church Status Index. Most of the questions in the Church Status Index ask for an assessment of one's social participation in church affairs. Discussions with respondents, sometimes lengthy, often emerged as a result of any particular question. An example of such a question is question #18, which asks: "Do you generally support the construction of one Catholic church in Ports Ferry?" This question stimulated much discussion from many informants, and sometimes only a moan, which said as much as an hour's worth of discussion.

The questions directed at obtaining objective information for prestige status, such as income, occupation, and education questions, really did not stimulate a great deal of discussion, but the opportunity to observe as to how people handle personal questions was an important by-product.

The interview schedule is structured in order to allow for continuity in what is being asked. It begins with questions such as those asking for one's name, residence, and family size and leads to more personal questions, such as income, education, and organizational questions, and ended with questions pertaining to church information. This was done in order to "bring the informant along" and to avoid discontinuity in thought.
The majority of the respondents were receptive to all of the questions. Some of the respondents hesitated when asked to reveal their incomes and financial support to the church, but after some consideration decided to release this information. The questions that the respondents seemed to find most interesting were those pertaining to church participation. A number of informants stated that these questions stimulated thoughts that they had neglected or forgotten. Many respondents appreciated the fact that someone had finally taken interest in their church organization.

The questions that some of the respondents were hesitant to answer have been mentioned. The question concerning income created the most frequent hesitancy. One question that tended to "hit" informants is the one asking to reveal ethnicity. Some respondents answered "American," and when asked to reveal their parents' or grandparents' ethnicity they would respond "American too."

In summary, the informants tended to enjoy being interviewed, and even though some questions were thought to be "personal," the majority of respondents answered all of the questions without hesitation. A brief discussion of several interviews will now be presented. The focus of attention will be on the reaction of interviewees toward the interviewer and the interview situation. It is mentioned now that a letter of introduction was mailed to those whom I intended to interview several days before I began interviewing.

Mr. P lives in the Holy Rosary area. Mr. P's home is typical of the house types in the area surrounding Holy Rosary Church. The
house is medium size, white wooden, and with a traditionally styled interior. Mr. P had received the letter of introduction two days before the interviewer went to his home. He reminded the researcher that he really did not have much time to think out whether or not he would consent to the interview, but stated he would let the researcher come in and, at least, to explain his intentions further. The interviewer elaborated somewhat further on the research objectives and then asked whether or not Mr. P and his wife, who had just entered the room, would accept the interview. They both agreed to the interview. The researcher presented the interview to Mr. and Mrs. P, allowed them to look it over, then asked for the interview schedule to be returned in order that the interviewer might begin with the questioning.

During the interview, Mrs. P seldom took her eyes off the interviewer. Mrs. P, an elderly woman, apparently was trying to decide whether or not she could tell from observing the interviewer if any other than the objectives as stated were a part of the interview. At the time the interview was being given, the researcher had fairly long hair, and this seemed to be a point of concern for Mrs. P. Mr. P answered most of the questions without asking Mrs. P for any advice. Mr. P had considerable eye contact with the interviewer and was straightforward when giving answers. The actions of both Mr. and Mrs. P could be described as nervous at the start of the interview but as the interview proceeded Mr. and Mrs. P were more at ease in the interview situation.
Mr. P created much discussion over his curiosity as to why certain questions were being asked. Mr. P was especially concerned about the question which asks whether or not he favors the construction of one Catholic church in Ports Ferry. Mr. P showed much emotion over this question. The construction of the new Catholic church was originally to be across the street from the P's house. Plans were changed and a decision was made to build the new church quite a distance from the P's home. The P's, in their late sixties, appeared to be afraid that they would be unable to attend church as often when the new church was completed. Mr. P felt that the plans to build the new church were against the wishes of the "elder" Catholics in Ports Ferry. He suggested that the plans to build a new church away from the original site were made without asking the parishioners of Holy Rosary Church what their feelings on the matter were.

The general atmosphere of this particular interview was congenial. The P's were both receptive to the interview, especially as the interview neared completion. This type of interview atmosphere was similar to that of many others.

One interview stands out as a methodological achievement. The interview was also with an individual from Holy Rosary Church. Mr. C, as he will be referred to, lives in one of the better housing areas in Ports Ferry. Both Mr. C and his wife are Polish immigrants, arriving in America and settling in Ports Ferry in 1954. The day I went to interview Mr. C, I learned that I had preceded my letter of introduction. Mr. C, a middle-aged man, still had a marked Polish accent,
and had some difficulty in understanding the researcher's purpose for being at his home. Nevertheless, he allowed the researcher to enter his house, in order that he might review the interview schedule. Mr. C skimmed the interview schedule and allowed the interviewer to proceed with his questioning. Mrs. C was not at home during the interview, but did return home from shopping before the interviewer left.

Mr. C was ever curious as to the "real" purposes of the interviewer's being at his home. Mr. C continuously asked whether or not the Bishop had sent the interviewer to his home, and if the Pastor of the Catholic church in Ports Ferry had wanted to find out why he was not giving financial support to the church any longer. Every time Mr. C asked about this, the interviewer answered "No" and restated his objectives, but still Mr. C would proceed and say, "Well, I've told him lots of times I hurt my back, and cannot work as much anymore."

After Mr. C answered the question asked, he invariably returned with a question for the interviewer. If the researcher asked a question about income, Mr. C would answer the question, then return with a question referring to the interviewer's income. In cases like this, the researcher would state as honestly as possible his answers to Mr. C's questions.

About halfway through the interview, Mr. C interrupted the interviewer, and asked him if he would like a drink. The researcher answered "No," but Mr. C returned with a loud, "Why not?". The sound of Mr. C's response was so commanding that the researcher felt com-
pelled to accept. Additionally, there were still more questions to ask. The shot of whiskey Mr. C gave the interviewer was a large one. Mr. C quickly downed his, arose from his chair, went to the kitchen sink where a fifth of whiskey was located, turned and looked at the interviewer who had only drunk one sip of his, and said, "You ask questions better than you drink whiskey." Mr. C grabbed another large shot glass, refilled his glass, filled the extra shot glass, and then returned to the table. As expected, the extra shot glass was meant for the interviewer. The interviewer dare not decline, fearing what a second "No" would bring from Mr. C. The interviewer, not a "man of liquor" was slightly jarred when he left the C's home, and could not continue interviewing for that particular day.

Mrs. C arrived home ten minutes before the interviewer left. Mrs. C was told the purposes of the interviewer's presence by Mr. C and she read the responses that Mr. C had given the interviewer. Mrs. C was not surprised at the rather jittery condition of the interviewer for she had noticed the two shot glasses in front of the interviewer. Many of the informants were hospitable, but none could match the hospitality of Mr. C.

One further aspect of the interview should be mentioned. Most of the informants received the letter of introduction that had been mailed several days before the interviewing began. The letter, a copy of which is located in the appendix, was a brief summary of the research purposes. Even though this letter was sent to the informants, many still felt they did not understand the research objectives. Some
Informants were skeptical as to the purposes of the interviewer even after the interview had been completed. One major reason seemed to account for this apprehension. It was stated, in chapter I, that the Catholic churches in Ports Ferry were going through a period of change. Both Holy Rosary Church and St. John's Church had lost their formal titles and identities, and were known as "the Church of the Holy Spirit." A new church was to be built, and the old churches would eventually be demolished. Many parishioners felt it was time for a change but some felt the change did not respect the opinions and desires of the parishioners. There was an atmosphere of confusion among the parishioners over the change. The Ports Ferry research was being undertaken during this period. Thus, many people felt that the interviewer was working for the Church, or the Bishop. Still another reason looms high as a possibility for informant apprehension. A majority of the informants were elderly. Many of these informants had never heard of sociological research, nor of sociology, and consequently could not understand its purposes. The term sociology itself has been associated with ideologies such as "socialism," "civil rights," and others that tend to be suspect. This too could have accounted for the skepticism of the informants. However, the majority of those interviewed, no matter how apprehensive, were congenial and informative. For this the researcher owes them a great deal.

Attention will now turn to a breakdown of the questions used for The Index of Status Characteristics and The Church Status Index. The following questions are those pertaining to The Index of Status.
Characteristics.

Question # 2: Question # 2 asks for the address of an individual and thus provides information about dwelling area as well as information on the house type factor. This question, combined with observer analysis, is the basis for data on house type.

Question # 4: This question asks for information on occupation of family members. Husband's occupation is used as the basis for determining occupational rating.

Question # 7: Question # 7 inquires into the educational attainment of family members. The education of husband and wife is used to determine educational rating.

Question # 8: This question asks for data on income of family members. The income of husband and wife is used to determine income rating. It also provides for data on source of income. The interviewer's concern here is whether or not a respondent has some additional source of income other than that received from his primary occupation.

Question # 11: This question deals with membership in community organizations.

In summary, the interview schedule provides information on the seven factors included in The Index of Status Characteristics. These factors are: dwelling area, house type, occupation, education, income, source of income, and organizational membership.

Chapter VII of this report provides a detailed analysis of The Church Status Index and questions utilized in the interview schedule.
for obtaining information for The Church Status Index. These questions as they are presented in the interview schedule will now be reviewed.

Question #10 asks respondents whether or not they are presently members of church organizations and committees. Question #14 concerns whether respondents had in the past belonged to any church organization or committee.

Question #15 asks respondents about the amount of financial support they give to their parish.

Questions #16 and #17 focuses on the interaction patterns of the members of both parishes.

Question #18 asks respondents to state their opinions on the construction of the new Catholic church in Porta Ferry.

Question #20 asks respondents to state how frequently they attend Mass.

Question #19 was not scored. Question #19 was asked only to determine if any dislikes about specific ethnic groups affected situations such as the building of the new Catholic church in Porta Ferry.

In summary, the interview schedule used in this research has two objectives: first, to obtain data on important status characteristics of Porta Ferry Catholics, such as income, occupation, and education; and second, to obtain data on prestige status characteristics associated with social participation in church affairs.

The last objective of this chapter, an explanation of who constitutes the sample for this thesis and how it was chosen, is now discussed. The sample was drawn from separate church lists from both
parishes. The lists available at the time of the research were six months old. The church lists, however, were incomplete. By this is meant that the lists still included those who had moved and those who had died both before and during the research. Thus, some individuals drawn from the lists who had moved before the research do not appear in the sample. The most important fact about the sample is that it was drawn from the last separate lists that will exist in the separated Catholic churches in Ports Ferry. This is due to the fact that the two parishes have combined under one name. The writing of the final lists was done in order to prepare for the closing of both churches due to plans to build one Catholic church in Ports Ferry that would absorb members from the former, two-parish structure. A new list of members of the churches under one name had not been developed at the time the Ports Ferry research was being undertaken.

Randomization was used in order to obtain a sample for interviewing on The Index of Status Characteristics and The Church Index and to obtain the judges for Evaluated Participation. A random sample was made from each church list.

The determination as how many individuals to interview from each parish was based on populations. The researcher wanted approximately 25 per cent of the total number of members belonging to each parish to be interviewed. This figure was arrived at based on the maximum number of individuals the interviewer could afford to interview, and an estimation of time involved and other costs involved when interviewing. On this basis, it was decided to interview 25 per cent or 27 individuals
from Holy Rosary Church, the smaller of the two parishes, and 25 per cent, or 73 from St. John's Church, the larger of the two parishes. The 1972 Holy Rosary Church list has 115 names. The St. John's Church list for the same year has 290 names. I had considerable difficulty reaching my goal of interviewing 25 per cent of the parishioners from each parish list. This is especially true for St. John's Parish. I was able to obtain 26 interviews from St. John's Parish. There are three reasons why I fell short of my interviewing goal for St. John's Parish. First, many parishioners whom I intended to interview refused the interview. Approximately 25 individuals refused an interview. Second, a number of St. John's parishioners had moved from the community. Fifteen individuals had moved before the interviewing began. Third, the remaining seven parishioners to be interviewed were never at home when I was at their residence for an interview. This could have been due to summer vacations, employment, or any other number of reasons. I had spent much time and money on traveling expenses going to these homes for an interview. Consequently, I decided to end the interviewing from the St. John's Church list with the 26 interviews that I had obtained. Twenty-three of the 27 intended interviews from the Holy Rosary Church list were completed. Holy Rosary Parishioners agreed to be interviewed more readily than St. John's Parishioners. This might have been due to the fact that I interviewed the Holy Rosary sample first and word had not yet reached St. John's Parishioners concerning the type of questions that I was asking. Holy Rosary Parishioners are less mobile, and do not move from the community as fre-
quently as St. John's Parishioners. Many parishioners from St. John's parish are employed at the nearby Air Force Base and are transferred frequently. A more detailed analysis of the parishioners from each parish is presented in chapters VI, VII, and VIII on methodology and data.

In summary, a total of 49 persons were interviewed from the two parishes.

Chapter VI, The Index of Status Characteristics is now taken up.
CHAPTER VI

The Index of Status Characteristics and Its Application

There are two main objectives of this chapter; first, an explanation of the methodology of The Index of Status Characteristics (I.S.C.) is presented. Second, the data acquired through the use of The Index of Status Characteristics are presented and interpreted. Concerning the first objective, The Index of Status Characteristics is explained by discussing the manner in which W. Lloyd Warner used it and the way it is used in this research. In reference to the second, members of both Holy Rosary Catholic Church and St. John's Catholic Church are analyzed in terms of data obtained through The Index of Status Characteristics.

This chapter begins with an explanation of The Index of Status Characteristics and is followed by a presentation of data obtained through The Index of Status Characteristics on the Holy Rosary parish sample. The data from St. John's parish are presented third. This chapter closes with an interpretation of the meaning of the data as it relates to prestige status.

The first technique to be analyzed in this research is The Index of Status Characteristics. W. Lloyd Warner defined this technique as an instrument for measuring status group placement, (1949) The Index of Status Characteristics was constructed by Warner from characteris-
tics associated with particular statuses in the community. Based on this inspection, Warner concluded that six factors are correlated highly with status placement. These are occupation, amount of income, source of income, house type, dwelling area, and education. Warner next developed a rating scale for measurement of these status characteristics. A seven point scale was constructed for each of these factors, one representing the highest score and seven representing the lowest. His next step was to see how the status characteristics correlated with Evaluated Participation. Warner found that all six factors correlated highly with Evaluated Participation. For purposes of simplification, two factors—amount of income and education—were dropped. Warner's final scale of Index of Status Characteristics included occupation, source of income, house type, and dwelling area. Each one of these factors was given a weight. Occupation was given a weight of four, source of income a weight of three, and house type and dwelling area each weights of two. Thus, based on the seven point rating scale and the weights given each factor, any individual or family rated was assigned a score. For example, a person given a score of eight on occupation acquired the score by multiplying his rating on occupation, which in this case is two, times the weight given to occupation, which is four. A person's weighted total is obtained by summing an individual's or family's score on the four factors. Any person or family rated could thus receive a score ranging from twelve (highest status) to eighty-four (lowest status). (1949)

Further explanation of the rating scale is desirable. In order
for Warner to rate his status factors, he had to decide what categories included in each factor would receive certain specific ratings. For example, the status characteristic, source of income, was rated this way: inherited wealth received a score of one, profits a score of two, salary a score of three, wages a score of four, and so on up to a rating of seven. Warner did this with all status factors. He thus had to determine what categories of occupation would receive the highest ratings, the second highest, etc., what dwelling areas constituted a rating of one, two, etc. and what house types would receive certain specified ratings.

The Index of Status Characteristics was developed by Warner in order to determine the relationships between the evaluations of social standing which individuals give to one another and one's own social standing based on criteria such as source of income, occupation, house type, and dwelling area.

An explanation of The Index of Status Characteristics as it is used in this research will now be given. The Index of Status Characteristics was modified from the form which Warner established. First, the number of status characteristics was increased from four to seven. Second, each characteristic used by Warner was given a greater weight. Third, changes within each status characteristic were made. Fourth, several status characteristics such as source of income and organization membership were scored differently than the other status characteristics used in this research.

Finally, seven status characteristics are used in this research.
These are occupation, which is given a weight of eight, amount of income weighted seven, house type weighted six, dwelling area weighted six, source of income weighted five, education weighted four, and organizational membership which was assigned variable scores.

Delineation of the status characteristics as used in this research will now be presented.

Occupation is categorized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (1 through 7)</th>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>High Status Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dentists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bankers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Middle Status Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountant - Large Firm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The professional occupational categories are defined in this research as professions that generally require at least a college education and are generally conceived of as being the most important occupations in American society. Three professional occupational categories are used here. High status professionals are professions believed to be among the most important occupations in American society. This is indicated in the 1947 and 1963 N.O.R.C. studies. Occupations placed in high status professional categories also come from interviews with the judges in the Evaluated Participation part of this research. Middle and low status professional categories are also derived from these sources. In the case of the latter category, occupations placed here are considered professional in reference to the sources mentioned and the fact that physical labor, such as that required by skilled and semi-skilled workers is minimal, which tends to separate the low status professionals from occupational categories directly below them.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (1 through 2)</th>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Middle Status Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public School Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Railroad Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Low Status Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager - Small Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor Union Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Railroad Conductor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk in Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Semi-Professionals: Skilled Laborers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trained Machinist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bartender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machine Operator in a Factory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Unskilled Laborers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taxi Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk in a Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gas Station Attendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Farm Laborers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full or Part Time Employees on a Farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rating (1 through 7) 

Occupational Category

Seven  The Unemployed: Unstable Workers

The ratings for occupation are based on three sources: the breakdown in occupational structure used by Warner, the Hodge, et al., restudy of the 1947 National Opinion Research Center studies, and the evaluations which the nine judges indicated during the use of Evaluated Participation. Generally, the seven point scale resembles that of Warner's, with the exception of the titles for the various categories. Three professional categories are used in this scale stemming from the amount of prestige the nine judges assigned to various professional occupations. Not all professional occupations are given the same prestige rating. Therefore, it became necessary to divide the professional occupations into the three categories.

The income scale is based on the data from interviews. The analyst wanted to discover the income ranges of his sample before constructing income ranges. The following is the seven point rating scale ultimately used for income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Amount of Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>15,000 dollars plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>12,000 - 14,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>9,000 - 11,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>7,000 - 8,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>6,000 - 6,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>5,000 - 5,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>Below 5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Income is defined as the total family income for one year. Thus, husband and wife might each earn $8,000 annually, a figure which would rate a four on the income scale, but their combined income would equal $16,000 which rates a one on the income scale.

The house type scale is based on the Warner house type scale with some modifications. Several factors determine house type rating. These are the condition of the house (from the outside) and its size, condition of the yard, and year the home was built (although this information was not often available). The following is the seven-point rating scale for house type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>House Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Excellent houses, large; old or new, well-kept yards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Good houses, houses well kept, basically smaller than houses given a rating of one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Good houses, usually white wooden, average size homes, good condition, yards well kept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Good-to-fair houses, small, not in as good condition; needs work on the exterior, usually painting, yards in fair condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Fair houses, small not in as good condition as those given a rating of four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Poor condition, in need of a complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six repainting, usually small houses, but medium to large houses fall into this category.

Seven Dilapidated homes: houses that should be demolished, usually uninhabited.

At times a house could have been placed in several categories. When this problem arose, a comparison was made with others that already had been rated and a determination made as to what rating to give the house.

The dwelling area scale is also based on the Warner scale, with modifications. Dwelling area is based on the following criteria: first, if houses seemed to be constructed at a similar time; second, geographic location with a number of houses built in the same style; third, altitude of area where houses were situated; and fourth, part of town (whether the house was in West, East, North, or South Ports Ferry).

The following is the seven-point rating scale for dwelling area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>Dwelling Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td></td>
<td>High South, Far West, Copper Corale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td></td>
<td>North, Houses close to Masonic Home, 12th Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td></td>
<td>North, Houses by St. John's Catholic Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td></td>
<td>Central area, houses directly surrounding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rating vs. Dwelling Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Central business district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>East, various areas of community marked by diversity of houses usually with a house type rating of four to five.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Directly north and south of Holy Rosary Catholic Church (not inclusive of all houses though).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>Some areas along Lincoln Avenue, various parts of the community where a number of houses, usually in poor condition are situated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A factor that often enters the picture is that Forts Ferry is a community marked by housing irregularity. At times a modern, well-kept home is built in a somewhat run-down area. Under these circumstances, the analyst found it necessary to rate the area accordingly regardless of house type.

Source of income has no seven-point rating scale. Several reasons for this exist. Originally the analyst thought he would discover a large proportion of his sample that had a source of income other than that of their primary occupation. This belief was based on the view that individuals in small communities gain income through inheritance, moonlighting, profits from business ventures, stocks, etc. After investigating the data, the analyst discovered that only a small proportion of the sample fell into this category. All of those indi-
Individuals have a source of income that they earn through a secondary occupation, such as part-time mechanic, a part-time farm laborer, and a ticket seller in the theatre. Because of this factor, source of income can be referred to as secondary source of income or secondary occupation. None of those with a secondary source of income obtained this income through inheritance, stock, or business ventures. In relation to theory, there tends to be an absence of individuals who would fall into a high status as proposed by Veblen. To my knowledge, no Catholic in Ports Ferry acquires income from inheritance; consequently it would be quite difficult for one to think in terms of a leisure class among Ports Ferry Catholics. Based on facts such as these it was not necessary to devise a seven-point rating scale for source of income. Thus it was decided to give a numerical rating to those who have a secondary source of income. Any one receiving a source of income from secondary sources is given a score of five, those not receiving such an income are given a ten. This is done due to the fact that income is viewed as an important correlate of prestige status by Ports Ferry Catholics. Additional income then is used in terms of scoring. The analyst considered dropping this factor and combining it with the amount of income factor. A decision was made not to combine the two factors because of the individuals with a secondary source of income and what proportion their part-time employment contributed to their total income. Furthermore it was decided to keep this factor because it is important for discovering more about the sample and provided additional information concerning prestige status.
Education is used in the research whereas in Warner's Jonesville research it was not a part of the rating scale. Education is included as a measure of social class because of its general importance in American society. It is realized that a portion of the sample might be older and not affected by the contemporary standards for education. Nevertheless, the variable is utilized as an additional means for establishing social class differences.

Education is categorized in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Educational Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Four years of college (degree) with at least an M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>College graduate (B.A. only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>At least two years of college; A degree from a vocational technical school (providing a high school diploma has previously been received).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>High school graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>High school but no diploma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Eighth grade completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>Less than eighth grade education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final factor included in The Index of Status Characteristics is organizational membership. Organizational membership means belonging to some voluntary association, such as The Veterans of Foreign Wars, The American Legion, or The Rotary Club, if one is a male. Organizations women might belong to are The Bridge Club, The Parent-Teacher
Association, The Ports Ferry Women's Club, and the like.

Through interviews and informal conversations with citizens of Ports Ferry it was learned what the more prominent male and female associations in Ports Ferry are. Based on the interviews and the conversations, a list of selected organizations for both men and women was developed. Ratings on the organizational variable are based on this list.

In order to be rated on the organizational variable, no ratings for any one organization were developed. Instead, an individual's rating on the organizational variable was dependent upon how many organizations one was a member of. Five organizations for men, and three for women plus auxiliary membership in one or more of the male organizations was used to determine one's score.

The following is a list of selected organizations. The list is not all-inclusive of organizations in Ports Ferry. It is based on discussions with individuals in Ports Ferry which indicate that the following organizations have the most prestige status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Bridge Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Legion</td>
<td>Parent-Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran of Foreign Wars</td>
<td>The Ports Ferry Women's Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagles - F.O.E.</td>
<td>Auxiliary membership in one or more of the male organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The means for computing scores on this factor is quite simple. If an individual does not belong to any organization mentioned, he is given a score of ten. If married, both spouses are scored on the variable, and their scores summed. Single individuals are scored, then their score multiplied by two in order to avoid any discrepancy between scores of single persons and married persons. If an individual belongs to one organization, he receives a nine; two organizations, an eight; three organizations, a seven; and so on. The lowest possible score on this variable is five.

The following explains the scoring on this variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten Points</td>
<td>Membership in no organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine Points</td>
<td>Membership in one organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight Points</td>
<td>Membership in two organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Points</td>
<td>Membership in three organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Points</td>
<td>Membership in four organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Points</td>
<td>Membership in five organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of the scoring on The Index of Status Characteristics will now be made. After computing an individual's score on the seven factors, the scores on these factors are added to obtain a total score. Any person or family rated could thus receive a score ranging from 41 (lowest possible score) to 237 (highest possible score), which indicates that individuals scoring low have high prestige status, and individuals scoring high have low prestige status.

Information for all the status factors was obtained through use of
the interview. Analysis of the data from the interview schedule was presented in the last chapter.

An analysis of Holy Rosary Catholic Church based on The Index of Status Characteristics is now presented.

The reader should keep in mind the weights given to each factor and the various methods of scoring. In order to help the reader along these lines, a discussion of how to interpret the scores will be useful. For instance if the range on a factor, such as house type, is stated to be thirty to six the reader should first remember that the weight of the house type factor is "six", and that a seven-point rating scale is used to calculate the scores. Thus a score of thirty indicates that an individual lives in a house given a rating of five on the seven-point scale and this score was obtained by multiplying the weight of the factor times the rating. In this instance weight of six times a rating of five equals thirty. Consequently, as with all of these factors, the higher scores are indicative of lower prestige status and the lower scores are indicative of higher prestige status.
Holy Rosary Catholic Parish

Holy Rosary has a considerable range, 69 to 219, in scores on The Index of Status Characteristics. The mean score on the range is 156.3; the median is 157. An analysis of the seven measures on The Index of Status Characteristics will provide some understanding for this.

House type scores range from 12 to 30. The mean for this factor is 23; the median is 24. Three households have scores of 12, three have scores of 18, fifteen have scores of 24, and only two scored 30. The house type factor has the bulk of its scores between 24 and 30. Six individuals have scores which create much of the diversity on this measure of social status. This seems to indicate that the majority of individuals in the Holy Rosary sample live in average-to-small houses that are in good condition. Individuals scoring 12 and 18 on this factor live in larger, more modern, well-kept homes.

Dwelling area as a measure of social status has a greater range than does house type. It too has scores between 24 and 30, the range being 30 to 6. The mean on this factor is 22; the median is 24. Only one couple has a score of 30, sixteen scored 24, five have scores of 18, and one scored 6. Over 70 per cent of the couples from Holy Rosary Church who were interviewed have the same score on both house type and dwelling area. This indicates that the majority of Holy Rosary parishioners live in areas marked by similarity in house type. Very few parishioners live in houses that could be considered high status.

Occupation also provides a similar perspective. The scores on the occupational variable range from 40 to 8 but approximately 82 per
cent are the same. The mean on the occupation factor is 30.8; the median is 32. Two individuals have scores of 40, nineteen have scores of 32, one scored 16 and one has a score of 8. The similarity in scores is primarily due to the fact that the majority of those interviewed are skilled workers and farmers who own small acreages. The individual who scored 8 is a process engineer, an occupation that is considered to be, in this research, in the most prestigious occupational category. The reader is reminded that in all factors, the highest score in a range indicates lower social status; the lower score indicates higher social status.

Interestingly, whereas the variable that is given the most weight in this research, occupation, has the highest percentage of similar scores, the variable that is given the lowest weight, education, has the greatest amount of variation, and a more profound effect on Index of Status Characteristic scores. The scores on the education measure range from 56 to 6. The mean is 31.8; the median is 32. One couple scored 56; one has a score of 43, one scored 44, two households scored 40, twelve families have scores ranging from 30 to 38, and six have scores under 30. Twelve couples on the measure have different scores, whereas on the three measures previously discussed fewer than half this many had such variation in score. The husband in the couple who scored six on the education factor has a masters degree in engineering, the husband in the couple who scored a 56 has less than a sixth grade education. The majority of individuals had at least a high school diploma, whereas six had at least two years of college. The fact is
that these individuals had greater variability in numbers of years of education than the researcher originally believed to be the case.

Income as a measure of social class shows less variability than expected. The income scores range from 49 to 7, with six families having scores of 7, the lowest on the income variable. The mean on the income factor is 20.7; the median is 21. This is due to the fact that three of the six income scores are combined incomes of both husband and wife. Earlier in this chapter it has been stated that in order to rate one on the income variable, an individual must have had an income of at least $15,000 a year.

One particular couple scored a 49 on this factor, one scored 35, and thirteen have scores ranging from 20 to 23. Eight couples score under 20, with six of these already having been mentioned as having scores of 7.

The family that scored a 49 was earning less than $4,000 a year at the time of the interview. This was primarily due to the fact that the husband was near retirement and was not working steadily.

The highest income figure from the Holy Rosary parish sample is stated to be $19,000 annually. This is combined income, with the husband earning $15,000 yearly, enough in itself to rate one and the wife earning $4,000 annually.

The average income of those interviewed is higher than might otherwise have been expected. The average income for the Holy Rosary parish is approximately $10,500 annually. Analysis of the income data shows this to be quite possible because only two out of twenty-three families
earn less than $7,000 a year while twelve of the twenty-three earned at least $10,500 annually, with six of these earning over $12,000 a year. Two families reported annual incomes of $9,000, while seven others had incomes between $7,500 and $8,500 a year.

Though the analyst formerly believed that income would have a wider range than reported, income differentials did effect the Index of Status Characteristic scores considerably. The major reason for this seems to be that, relative to the other indices of social class, with the exception of education, income shows more diversity, thus effecting the cumulative Index of Status Characteristics score.

The scores on the source of secondary income scale range from 10 to 5, with eighteen couples having a score of 10, and five scoring 5. In the first part of this chapter it is suggested that the source of secondary income scale would be defined as income from other than primary occupation. The scale is structured in terms of whether or not a couple had some additional source of income. As it developed, only five couples have some additional source of income. Originally, the analyst thought that more informants would have other sources of income than that derived from occupation. Analysis of the interviews and the scores on the "source of income scale" reveals the analyst's misconception of small communities, or at least of the community in which this research was undertaken. Through informal conversations with Ports Ferry residents, the analyst was led to believe that many individuals have incomes other than those derived from their occupations, and that many families, especially farm families, derive additional
income from inheritance. One conversation with a downtown business owner, Mr. S, suggested this to be a pattern in Ports Ferry. A conversation with another Mr. S, a parishioner of Holy Rosary Church also revealed similar views. Speculation could suggest that only a few of the parishioners interviewed from both Catholic churches have some additional income due either to their being underrepresented in the sample or because of individual misconceptions of each other. Because of the few individuals with a secondary source of income, no mean or median is computed for this factor.

A last measure of social class included in The Index of Status Characteristics is membership in community organizations. Whereas with source of outside income indication of not having an extra source meant a score of 10, not belonging to any community organization also meant a score of 10 for a family. Scoring on this measure has previously been discussed. The scores on the community organization dimension range from 20 to 17. The mean on this factor is approximately 19; the median is 19. This means that the most organizations any individual belongs to is three. The breakdown of the scores is as follows: eleven couples received a score of 20, four received a score of 19, seven received a score of 18 and one received a score of 17. Eleven of the twenty-three couples revealed no membership in any community organizations, and twelve revealed that they were members of at least one community organization. Of these eleven, eight couples are members of more than one community organization. Based on this data, it seems that Holy Rosary parishioners do not place heavy emphasis on belonging
to a community organization. The individuals who do belong to community organizations tend to belong to at least two organizations.

Analysis of social stratification based on The Index of Status Characteristics may now be presented. Earlier in this chapter the range of scores from The Index of Status Characteristics from Holy Rosary parishioners was presented. The range is 69 to 219. Enumeration of prestige status was based on ranges of scores. The basic method of arriving at status groupings is to look for ranges in scores within The Index itself. After evaluating the scores, the number of status groupings in Holy Rosary, based on The Index of Status Characteristics, was derived. The analyst discovered five status groupings in the Holy Rosary parish. Three families fell into the category of very high status. The scores in this category are 69, 112, and 174. The scores are separated by large ranges. The three families are placed into the very high status category because the ranges between these scores and the remaining scores are large enough to place them into their own status grouping. Another reason for placing the three families into this prestige status grouping is that the scores in themselves are low and are indicative of high status. One problem can be seen in that the differences between the three scores might suggest that they are indicative of three separate statuses. In order to avoid the problem whereby the entire range could indicate, for example, four status groupings and four separate statuses, it was decided to combine families in prestige status groups. The analyst assessed after viewing the range on The Index of Status Characteristics that it would at times
be necessary to place families into the same status category although
the differences in the scores of these families would be large. Con­
sequently, the lowest scores, as previously mentioned were grouped to­
gether primarily because they are indicative of very high status. The
next status group is the high status group. Four families in the sam­
ple fall into this category. The scores of these families are 142, 146, 147, and 149. These families may be considered high status be­
cause their scores directly follow the very high status category.
These four families show considerable similarity in the scores they
receive. Only seven points separate the highest and lowest scores in
this category. Scores ranging from 154 to 166 are considered to be
middle status. Ten families have scores that fall in this range. The
next prestige status grouping is the low status group. Three families
in the sample are considered to be low status. The scores of these
families are 172, 174, and 179. The final status grouping in the Holy
Rosary sample based on The Index of Status Characteristics is the very
low status group. Three families fall into the category. Their
scores are 183, 189, and 219. The first two scores are basically the
same, whereas the last score, 219, is separated from these scores by
approximately 30 points. Because these scores are the highest in the
range, they are indicative of very low status. Whereas the scores
that fall into the very high status category are considerably different
from each other, one score in the very low status category is consid­
ered different than the other two scores in this prestige status cate­
gory. Again, the analyst combined the scores based on their position
on the range.

Assessing this range in terms of prestige status, the analyst suggests that the range indicates that members of Holy Rosary Catholic parish are differentiated among themselves on the basis of prestige status and that they vary relative to life chances and life styles as operationally defined. The overt manifestations of status, such as house type, are indicative of overt variations in life styles. For example, although the majority of Holy Rosary parishioners live in similar homes, six of the twenty-three families interviewed live in house types that are indicative of higher status than the remaining sample.

Another indicator of differentiation among Holy Rosary parishioners in terms of prestige status is the income factor. The income factor is also interpreted as displaying a certain uniformity among the Holy Rosary sample, but it too is indicative of status differentiation. Six families earn an annual income which is indicative of high status. The figure of $15,000 annually is suggested to be a high status income, and is given a rating of one on the income scale. Two families display scores on the income factor which is indicative of low status prestige. One couple has a score of 49, which is the lowest score one can receive on this factor. Another couple received a score of 35 which also is indicative of low status prestige. Based on the income data, it is suggested that the majority of the Holy Rosary sample has the same status prestige, whereas ten couples display differences in status prestige, with eight of these receiving high
status scores and two receiving scores indicative of low status prestige as seen in Table I, page 106 for data on The Index of Status Characteristics.

One factor which cannot always be interpreted overtly, but which shows much variation in status prestige is education. Since education is valued highly in our society, it is considered to be an indicator of status. Three couples receive scores on this factor that indicate high status. One of these couples has a score of eight, which means that both spouses have four-year college degrees and have or are pursing higher degrees. Another couple has a score of 20. The husband has a four-year college degree and the wife is an L.P.N. Twelve couples have scores that are indicative of middle status and four couples have scores indicative of low status.

Though the Holy Rosary sample is differentiated in terms of status, it is difficult to assess whether status variations are indicative of what Weber calls status honor. Weber used this term when referring to "a specific style of life that can be expected from all those who wish to belong to the circle." (Weber, 1946:183) By this Weber means that some social groups exhibit styles of life and prohibit others from belonging to these groups. Observations on Ports Ferry Catholics does not lend support to any suggestions that there are status groups among Catholics in Ports Ferry that prohibit other Ports Ferry Catholics from social interaction with them. The data on The Index of Status Characteristics do, however, indicate that status differences do exist among Ports Ferry Catholics, and that where Holy
Rosary parishioners are concerned status differences are not a source of social separation. Further exposition of this phenomenon will come at the conclusion of this chapter.

A table for the Holy Rosary Index of Status Characterization is found on the next page.

An analysis of St. John's Catholic Church is now presented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Source of Organization Characteristics</th>
<th>Index of Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
St. John's Catholic Parish and Comparison With Holy Rosary

St. John's Catholic parish will now be analyzed in the same manner as has been Holy Rosary Catholic parish.

Analysis of St. John's parish will begin with The Index of Status Characteristics. Evaluated Participation will follow, and The Church Status Index is third.

The scores on The Index of Status Characteristics range from 114 to 204. The median score on the range is 155.

The scores on the house-type factor range from 30 to 12. The St. John's parish sample mean is 21 compared to the Holy Rosary parish sample mean of 23. The median on this factor is 24 compared to the Holy Rosary median of 24. Twelve of these scores are below 20. The breakdown of scores on this factor is as follows: two families have the high status score of 30; twelve couples scored 24 on this factor; eight have scores of 18; one couple scored a 16 on this factor; and three informants have a score of 12.

Based on the data, approximately 44 per cent of the St. John's sample live in better than average housing (twelve scores below 20). Another 44 per cent live in at least average houses. These are in comparison with the Holy Rosary sample where only six individuals have scores indicative of better than average housing.

This can be interpreted several ways. First, St. John's parishioners tend to live in newer homes than Holy Rosary parishioners because Holy Rosary parishioners have lived in their homes most of their
lives and have not moved into newer homes in Ports Ferry. Still another factor is that St. John's parishioners tend to be younger than Holy Rosary parishioners. The greater number of St. John's parishioners with sons and daughters at home have purchased newer houses in Ports Ferry. Furthermore, St. John's parish has attracted the new Catholic residents who have moved into Ports Ferry and have purchased homes there.

The range of scores on the dwelling area factor is 30 to 18. The mean for St. John's parish sample on this factor is 21.6, whereas the Holy Rosary parish sample mean is 22. The St. John's parish sample median is 24, compared to the Holy Rosary parish sample median of 24. The majority of the St. John's parish sample interviewed lives in average dwelling areas in Ports Ferry. Data indicates this: one informant scored a 30, a rating of five on this factor which indicates living in a dwelling area below average in appearance; fourteen informants have scores of 24 on this factor, indicative of living in average residential areas; and eleven individuals have scores of 18, indicating residence in better than average dwelling areas.

The basic difference between St. John's and Holy Rosary parishes on this factor is that the latter has six informants living in better than average dwelling areas whereas St. John's parish has eleven. Holy Rosary has the only informant with a rating of six on this factor, indicative of residence in an upper class area. As a whole, St. John's parish has 92 per cent of its sample living in average-to-better than average living areas whereas Holy Rosary parish has 95
per cent of its sample living in average-to-better than average living areas. The data on this factor suggests no sharp difference between parishes exists in this respect.

A noticeable difference between St. John's parish and Holy Rosary parish is found when considering occupation as a status characteristic. St. John's has a smaller range than Holy Rosary but less similarity in scores. The range for St. John's parish is 40 to 16, with two families scoring 40, seventeen scoring 32, five households scoring 24, and two scoring 16. The St. John's parish sample mean on the occupation factor is 29.7; the Holy Rosary parish sample mean is 30.8. Both parish samples have a median of 32 on this factor. Holy Rosary parish has the couple with the highest occupational rank in both parishes, but St. John's parish has seven families with scores below 30, indicative of middle professional occupational status, whereas Holy Rosary parish has only two scores below 30. Both parishes have approximately the same number of families with scores above 30, but in percentage terms, this translates into 82.6 per cent of Holy Rosary parishioners with scores 30 and above, and 72.1 per cent of St. John's parishioners with scores of 30 and above. These data indicate that St. John's parish has proportionately more families in higher status occupations than Holy Rosary parish.

St. John's parish has a smaller range on another status characteristic, education, but again has more variation in scores. The range for scores on education for St. John's parish is 48 to 20, with one score of 48, two scores of 40, three scores of 36, thirteen scores of
32, two scores of 28, one score of 26, two scores of 24, and two scores of 20. The St. John's parish sample mean on the education factor is 31.5, compared to the Holy Rosary parish sample education mean of 31.3. Both the St. John's parish sample and the Holy Rosary parish sample have medians of 32 on this factor. The reader is reminded that education scores are cumulative, based on the scores of both husband and wife. Based on the data, the persons in St. John's parish sample average high school educations. A score of 36 usually indicates that both spouses have a high school degree (weight of 4 times rating of 4 equals 16). Scores below this suggest the male has more education, at least a college degree, and the female a high school degree. Compared to Holy Rosary, the St. John's parish sample indicates that 76 per cent of its families have a high school education or better, whereas the former has 65 per cent of its sample with at least a high school education.

The sample from St. John's parish has an income distribution approximately the same as that of Holy Rosary's. The mean for the St. John's parish sample on this factor is 21 compared to the Holy Rosary parish sample mean of 20.7. Both parish samples have a median of 21 on this factor. The major difference between the two parishes is that the Holy Rosary sample has six scores or approximately 26 per cent of its members indicating incomes of/or exceeding $15,000 annually, whereas in the St. John's parish, four, or approximately 15 per cent of the sample indicates an income of $15,000 or more annually. A combination of wife and husband income is used on this factor. The highest reported
annual income from the St. John's parish sample is $18,000 annually. In this instance, the husband is the only spouse employed. His occupation is reported as that of postal clerk. Both parishes average scores of 24 on the income factors which suggests that, given the income weight of seven and a rating of between three and four, the average income for each parish is approximately $9,500 annually.

Sources of income for St. John's parish are similar to those of Holy Rosary's. The Holy Rosary parish sample indicates five or approximately 22 per cent of its informants with a second source of income. The St. John's parish sample has four, or about 16 per cent of the informants with a secondary source of income. This indicates St. John's parishioners are apparently in less need of a secondary source of income than Holy Rosary parishioners. This can be interpreted as meaning Holy Rosary parishioners use secondary income in order to keep the status they have in their parish. No informant from either parish reports receiving an inheritance or profits from investment. If additional income does come into the family, it is usually because the husband is employed part time in some skilled or semi-skilled job. No mean or median is computed for either parish sample since few families have secondary sources of income.

Fewer than half of the persons in the St. John's parish sample state that they belong to any community organization, twelve belonging to one or more community organizations. Of these twelve, only two families indicate that both spouses belong to two community organizations and five that they belonged to one community organization. A
similar picture is found in the Holy Rosary parish. A little over half
the persons in the Holy Rosary sample belong to community organizations.
Approximately 52 per cent of informants from both parishes state that
they belong to community organizations. The data from the St. John's
parish sample are similar to those found in the Holy Rosary parish
sample. The major difference between the parishes is that if Holy
Rosary parishioners belong to community organizations they tend to
belong to at least two (one per spouse) whereas St. John's parishioners
normally belong to only one community organization and the individual
most likely to belong is the male. St. John's parish sample has a
mean of 19.1 on this factor compared to the mean of 19 for the Holy
Rosary parish sample. The median for St. John's parish sample on this
factor is 22, whereas the median for the Holy Rosary parish sample is
19.

The Index of Status Characteristics for St. John's parish reveals
five status groupings. The range for the St. John's Index of Status
Characteristics is 114 to 204. The five status categories are as
follows: very high status, high status, middle status, low status,
and very low status. The scores for these status groupings are as
follows: very high status, 114 to 119; high status, 131 to 136;
middle status, 143 to 157; low status, 164 to 174; and very low status,
180 to 204. Both St. John's and Holy Rosary parishes have five status
groupings. The medians based on the ranges are approximately the same.
The St. John's median is 155; the Holy Rosary median is 157. It is
easier to determine status groupings for the St. John's Index of Status
Characteristics than for Holy Rosary's because the scores are closer together in the St. John's range. Furthermore differences exist between the parishes in terms of the scores in the five status groupings. For example, the scores for the Holy Rosary very high status grouping are 69, 112, and 134. The scores for the St. John's very high status category are 114, 117, 118, and 119. Whereas in the Holy Rosary range the score of 134 is a very high status score, the score of 134 in the St. John's range is a high status score. The reason for the difference lies in the variation between scores in the two ranges.

Again it is stated that St. John's parish has less variation in scores than Holy Rosary parish. One status category, however, displays similarity between the parishes in terms of variation in scores. This is the very low status grouping. Both parishes show much variation between scores in this category, especially St. John's parish. The scores for the St. John's very low status category are 180, 185, 186, 192, and 208. This is a difference of 24 points. The Holy Rosary very low status scores are 188, 189, and 219. The difference between the top and bottom scores here is 31 points. The remaining status groupings in both parishes show similarity in differences between scores within each status category. For example, the difference between the top and bottom scores in the middle status category for Holy Rosary is 12 points, whereas 11 points differentiates the top and bottom scores in the middle status category for St. John's.

A comparison of variations in status scores within each parish will now be presented. Following this, a discussion of variations in
prestige status scores between both parishes will be assessed. The scores, for example on house type and dwelling area, indicate that families in both parishes live in houses and dwelling areas that are indicative of overt variations in life styles in their respective parishes. Families within each parish display variation in annual income. In the Holy Rosary parish sample, six families report annual incomes of $15,000 and more, indicative of high and very high status. Two families earn incomes considered to be low status incomes, approximately $6,000 annually. The bulk of the Holy Rosary parish sample shows that families earn middle status incomes of approximately $9,000 annually. Variations in annual income exist in the St. John's parish sample. Four families earn high status incomes. Two families report incomes that are indicative of low prestige status. The majority of the St. John's income scores are interpreted as being indicative of middle prestige status. Another status factor, occupation, displays some variation in prestige status within each parish. St. John's parish has minor variation, with two families reporting high status occupations, and only two families reporting low status occupations. An example of the high status occupational category is an individual who is an architect, whereas an example of the low status occupational category is an individual who is a gas station attendant. The majority of St. John's parishioners have middle status occupations, such as those that fall into the middle and low professional status categories and those that fall into the semi-professional and skilled laborers category. Occupational variation in St. John's parish is minor. One
family reports a high status occupation, one a middle status, or middle professional occupation, and only two report low status occupations, such as that of a semi-skilled laborer. The majority of families from Holy Rosary parish report middle status occupations. In summary, both parish samples indicate that variations in prestige status within each parish exist. Some prestige status factors display more variation than others.

Variations in prestige status exist within each parish and variations in prestige status exist between parishes. Occupational prestige differences within each parish were just discussed. Occupational status variations between parishes is now discussed. Data just presented on prestige status differences within each parish sample would lead one to assess that relatively few differences in occupational prestige status exist between parishes. Differences in status on this factor do exist. When presenting the scores on occupation for the St. John's Index of Status Characteristics, it was reported that 72.1 per cent of St. John's parishioners have scores above 30, which is indicative of middle status occupations, such as semi-professionals and skilled laborers, and low status occupations, such as unskilled laborers. The Holy Rosary parish sample has 82.6 per cent of occupational scores above 30. The majority of these scores are middle status occupations. But the difference of 11.5 per cent indicates that St. John's parish has more families with higher status occupations than Holy Rosary parish. This is in view of the fact that both parishes have two families at both ends of the occupational scale. The major
difference between the parishes is that St. John's has five families with scores of 34, indicative of low status professionals, or a rating of three, whereas Holy Rosary parish sample has no families below 30, except those two who have already been discussed. St. John's parish sample has five families with scores below 30 in addition to the two higher occupational status families. Based on the occupation factor, the St. John's parish sample has higher occupational status than Holy Rosary parish sample. St. John's parish displays higher prestige on the house type factor, there being 44 per cent of the St. John's sample living in houses that have a rating of three or better. This is interpreted as meaning that 44 per cent of St. John's parish live in middle status to high status housing. Only 26 per cent of the Holy Rosary parish lives in middle status to high status housing. When discussing this point in the analysis of house type for the St. John's Index of Status Characteristics, it was suggested that Holy Rosary parishioners have lived in their homes for many years, whereas St. John's parishioners tend to be younger many of whom have recently moved into the community and have purchased new homes. These homes, with their modern designs receive higher status ratings than the white wooden structures because of their exterior appearance and because they are quite often larger than the white wooden homes.

Another factor, education, indicates variation in prestige status between parishes. Seventy-six per cent of the St. John's sample have a high school education or better, compared to 65 per cent for Holy Rosary parish sample. The major factor here is that St. John's parish
is younger and has been exposed more to the need for at least a high
school education. The Holy Rosary parish sample is older, generally
in the late 40's and early 50's and less likely to have pursued higher
education. But since education is valued so highly in our society,
it is suggested that the differences in educational attainment between
parishes is interpreted as St. John's parish having higher educational
prestige status than Holy Rosary parish.

One factor in which the Holy Rosary parish indicates higher pre-
stige status is income. Using the rating of three on the income factor
as a tool for income analysis, 64 per cent of the Holy Rosary parish
sample has a rating of three or better on this factor. This indicates
that the majority of Holy Rosary parishioners earn $9,000 or more
annually with 55 per cent of the St. John's parish sample earning $9,000
or more annually. Furthermore, 26 per cent of the Holy Rosary parish
sample have an income of $15,000 or more annually, whereas only 15 per
cent of the St. John's parish sample has this upper status income.
This is the only status factor where the Holy Rosary parish sample
exhibits higher prestige status.

Based on the four factors discussed, occupation, house type,
education, and income, St. John's parish has a generally higher pre-
stige status on the first three, whereas Holy Rosary parish has higher
prestige status on the income factor.

In reference to the dwelling area factor, 40 per cent of the St.
John's parish sample live in better than average dwelling areas whereas
26 per cent of the Holy Rosary parish sample live in better than
average dwelling area. This is interpreted as meaning that the St. John's parish sample has more families who live in higher status dwelling areas than the Holy Rosary parish sample. When discussing this factor in the analysis of St. John's parish sample it was reported that no sharp differences between parishes exist. Ninety-two per cent of the St. John's parish sample and 95 per cent of the Holy Rosary parish sample live in middle status dwelling areas, or areas marked by housing consistency in terms of the period when the homes were built and in geographic location. These areas display a "clean" condition. When viewing this factor, differences between the parishes disappear when assessing the samples as a whole.

It was reported earlier that the majority of families in both samples have no secondary source of income. Twenty-two per cent of the Holy Rosary parish sample and 16 per cent of the St. John's parish sample have secondary income sources. The assessment made of this difference is that St. John's parishioners are in less need of a secondary source of income in which to maintain their prestige status. Consequently, the higher percentage for Holy Rosary parish is not interpreted as higher prestige status but possibly as an indicator of lower prestige status since the type of work performed in acquiring a secondary source of income is semi-skilled.

Organizational membership indicates little variation in prestige status between parishes. Both parish samples show a little over 50 per cent belonging to community organizations.

Viewing the differences between parishes as shown by the present
analysis, the parish with the higher prestige status on the majority of status factors is St. John's parish. St. John's parish displays higher prestige status on the following status factors: occupation, house type, education, and source of income. There are basically no differences between parishes on the organizational status factor. The Holy Rosary parish sample has higher prestige status on the income factor. In discussing dwelling area, the St. John's and Holy Rosary parish samples display similarity except that the latter has more families living in better than average, or middle status to high status dwelling areas. But when looking at the samples as a whole, the differences disappear.

In light of the theory around which this thesis is organized, especially that of Max Weber, it appears that the concept of status is important when distinguishing between parishes and within parishes. Certain criteria, such as house type and dwelling area, which are overtly assessed as indications of life styles, bring to light the differences between the parishes. When analyzing the data on occupation, income, education, source of income, and organizational membership, which one cannot always see, as one can see house type and dwelling area, variations in life style seem to become more important. The St. John's parish sample shows higher prestige status on the majority of these variables because it is a younger population that tends to be more socially mobile both geographically and vertically. It is conceivable that higher occupational prestige among the St. John's parish sample is important in effecting where families in the
sample live and the house in which they live. It is also conceivable that as the families in the St. John's parish sample grow older, they will earn higher annual incomes than the families of the Holy Rosary parish sample due to the fact that they will have reached the occupational peaks in which Holy Rosary parish families are presently at.

One further comment must be made. When assessing the Holy Rosary parish sample, it was suggested that status differences exist within the Holy Rosary parish sample, but status groups as defined by Weber do not exist. Status differences, or overt variations in styles of life exist between both parishes, but this analyst believes that status communities do not exist within or between both parishes, that is, groups as closed groups, in which the members prohibit interaction with members of other status communities based on the similarities in life style. It is this researcher's opinion that the overt manifestations of differences in the life styles of the Catholics in Ports Ferry that were interviewed do not manifest themselves in closed social groups. A possible reason for this is that the Catholic population in Ports Ferry is small, and that interaction among Catholics, as will be seen when discussing The Church Status Index, is frequent among all Catholics irrespective of prestige status.

A table for The Index of Status Characteristics for the St. John's parish sample and two tables that compare the St. John's parish sample with the Holy Rosary parish sample are located at the end of this chapter.

An analysis of prestige status in terms of The Church Status Index is presented in the next chapter.
TABLE II

ST. JOHN'S INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Weight = 6</th>
<th>Weight = 6</th>
<th>Weight = 8</th>
<th>Weight = 4</th>
<th>Weight = 7</th>
<th>Weight = 7</th>
<th>Weight = 7</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Index of Status Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House Type</td>
<td>Dwelling Area</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Source of Income</td>
<td>Organization Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The scores for individuals on the factors of The Index of Status Characteristics are provided, along with the total scores of individuals on The Index of Status Characteristics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>Dwelling Area</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The scores for individuals on the factors of The Index of Status Characteristics are provided, along with the total scores of individuals on The Index of Status Characteristics.
CHAPTER VII

The Church Status Index and Its Application

There are three objectives of this chapter: first, to explain the methodology of The Church Status Index; second, to present the data acquired through use of this Index by analyzing both Catholic churches separately; third, to interpret the meaning of the data for prestige status.

The Church Status Index was developed in order to determine degree of one's social participation in and contribution to his respective parish. Data from Evaluated Participation clearly indicate that one's social standing in the Catholic church system in Forts Ferry depends a great deal on how often individuals participate in and contribute to the welfare of their respective parishes. Data from The Church Status Index was obtained through use of the interview schedule. The Church Status Index is based on responses of individuals to seven questions in the interview schedule. The following are the questions used to obtain data for The Church Index.

Question # 10: Do you belong to any church organization or committees?

Question # 14: Have you ever belonged to any church organizations or committees?

Question # 15: How would you describe the amount of financial support you give to the church?

Question # 16: How would you describe the amount of contact you have with members of your parish?
Question # 17: How would you describe the amount of contact you have with members of the other parish?

Question # 18: Do you generally support the construction of one Catholic church in Ports Ferry?

Question # 20: How frequently do you attend services?

Question # 10 and # 14 were used in order to determine whether or not individuals belonged to any church organization or committees.

Question # 10 concerns present membership in either a church organization or committee. Since participation in church affairs is of considerable importance, question # 10 was asked in order to determine whether or not individuals participated in church affairs through membership in some church related organization.

Question # 14 is used in order to determine whether an individual not presently a member of some church organization or committee had at one time been a member. This is important because one's not presently being a member of a church organization could be due to factors such as age, health, or dissatisfaction with the changes occurring in the Catholic church system in Ports Ferry. Recognition of membership in the past suggested social participation in parish activities at least once in the life of an individual. The scoring on question # 10 is as follows: The maximum points a family receives for not belonging to a church organization is 10 points. The minimum number of points a family receives on this question is 0 points. Four organizations and one activity category for both males and females are used for determining family score on question # 10. The more organizations a family belongs to, the lower is that family's score on question # 10. If
a family belongs to one church organization, the family score on question #10 is 9. If a family belongs to two church organizations, the family score is 8. If a family belongs to eight organizations, the family score is 2. This same technique is used for scoring on question #14. If a family, not presently a member of some church organization, states that in the past both spouses belonged to six church organizations, the family would receive a score of 4.

In summary, the purpose of questions #10 and #14 was to determine the degree of social participation individuals had in their respective parishes. The following is a list of church organizations and committees men and women can belong to in the Port Ferry Catholic church system.

**Men**

- The Knights of Columbus
- Reorganization Committee
- St. Vincent de Paul

Any activity assessed as being an important contribution to the parish to which one belongs.

**Women**

- Altar Society
- Legion of Mary
- Parish Council of Women
- Catholic Daughters of America

Any activity assessed as being an important contribution to the parish to which one belongs.

---

*Both St. John's and Holy Rosary Catholic Parishes now have the same organizations and committees. Traditionally, the parishes had their own separate organizations and committees, except for the Knights of Columbus which included men from both parishes.*
Question # 15 was asked in order to determine one's financial support to his respective parish. This question is included because traditionally financial contributions to one's parish are indicative of the concern persons had for parishes' well-being. The variable is scored in the following manner: if one gives nothing to his parish, he is assigned four points; small financial support, three points; moderate financial support, two points; and above average financial support was counted as one point.

Questions # 16 and # 17 are concerned with social interaction of individuals in their own parishes and social interaction of individuals of one parish with individuals from the other parish. These questions were asked due to the importance the judges placed on social interaction as a measure of social standing. Both questions are scored similarly. If one had no contact with either members of his parish or the other parish, he was given a score of 3; if one had occasional contact, he was given a score of 2; if one had frequent contact he was given a score of 1.

Question # 18 concerns the support individuals give to the construction of the new Catholic church in Forts Perry. This question was asked because the construction of the Catholic church could have effect on one's social participation in church affairs. The construction of the new church would break down the separation of churches along ethnic group lines, and would effect Holy Rosary parish (Czech oriented) more than St. John's. Several interviews with members of the Holy Rosary parish indicated that some persons were less willing--
or not willing at all—to participate in any way in their parish's affairs due to the plans to construct the new church. More data on this will be presented in chapter VII.

The scoring on question #18 is based on three responses, a "no" response receives three points, a "neutral" response receives two points, and a "yes" response receives one point.

The last question to be scored on The Church Status Index concerns how frequently one attends mass. This is asked because the analyst came to understand, based on observations and interviewing, that frequent mass attendance (at least once a week) is indicative of social participation in parish affairs and also a source of social cohesion in the parishes.

The scoring on question #20 is based on four responses: a response of "less than four times a month" received four points; "once a week" received three points; "twice a week" received two points; "more" (more than twice a week) received one point.

In summary, The Church Status Index is an instrument used to determine social participation in church affairs. The Church Status Index is constructed of seven questions oriented toward finding out, based on a variety of factors, how much individuals participate in the affairs of their respective parishes.
The Church Status Index Applied To Holy Rosary Church

Analysis of the Holy Rosary parish sample based on The Church Status Index is now presented.

The scores on The Church Status Index for question #10 range from the maximum of 10 points to 7 points. Four couples have scores of 10, fourteen have scores of 9, two score 8, and three have scores of 7. These data suggest that most Holy Rosary parishioners, if they belong to any church organization, belong to only one. In other words, only one spouse per family indicates membership in a church organization. Females prevail in this case. Most of the women interviewed from Holy Rosary stated that they belong to the Altar Society. If the men belong to any organization, they tend to belong to the Parish Council of Men.

Question #14 also concerns membership in church organizations. The question is oriented toward past membership. The researcher wanted to know whether or not a parishioner, if giving a "no" answer to question #10, had previously belonged to a church organization. Question #14 is scored similarly to question #10. If an informant indicated that he/she was at the present time a member of some parish organization, he/she was not scored on question #14. Most individuals presently members of some organization had been for some time. The objective of question #14 is to determine whether or not a person not presently a member of a church organization, is not a member due to some reason such as disagreement over the new Catholic church to be built in Portis Ferry. If a member had belonged to an organization in
the past, but is not presently a member of some organization, he is scored according to the number of organizations he was a member of in the past.

The scores on question # 14 range from 10 to 4. Only one family indicated no past membership in a church organization or committee. (Two couples have scores of 4, which means that both couples in the past belonged to a combination of six organizations each.) Three families have scores of 9; one scores 8; four have scores of 5. In total, eleven families indicate that they are past members of church organizations. Of those eleven, three are couples--those with scores of nine--one spouse of which does not presently belong to church organizations. The remainder are couples with neither spouse presently a member of a church organization although at least one was in the past. A significant feature is that 47% of the Holy Rosary sample (11 of the 23 families) indicate that they no longer belong to church organizations or committees. This can be interpreted as meaning Holy Rosary parishioners have lost interest in parish affairs since the merger of the two parishes.

Questions # 16, # 17, # 18, and # 20 are used primarily to determine social participation of parishioners in the two Catholic parishes. Questions # 16 and # 17 are concerned with social interaction of individuals in their own parishes and the counterpart other parish. The reader is reminded of scoring on these questions: if a person has frequent contact, a score of one is given; occasional contact, a score of two is given; no contact, a score of three is given. On question
#16, concerning social interaction with parish members, nineteen families indicate that they have frequent social interaction with parish members. Frequent interaction usually means that one’s social activities outside of the home are with parish members. The other four scores are 2, indicating the majority of Holy Rosary informants consider themselves as having frequent social interaction with members of their own parish.

Question #17 indicates the social interaction between members of different parishes. Thirteen families have a score of 1 on this item while two have a score of 3, indicating no social interaction with members of other than their own parish. The general consensus of those scoring a one on this is that they have known individuals from St. John’s parish for a long time and enjoy having social interaction with them. They do not apparently feel there are any barriers such as ethnicity to social interaction. The two families who score 3 on question #17 indicate that they prefer interacting with those of their own parish, because it was more convenient and that the only contact that they have with members of St. John’s parish is when they occasionally go to mass there. Not one individual indicates any kind of dislike or other negative reason for not having more frequent or at least occasional social interaction with counterparts in St. John’s parish.

Question #18 is interesting and important to this research. The sample indicates that the Holy Rosary parishioners have frequent interaction with members of St. John’s parish, and that they are in favor
of the construction of a new Catholic church which would combine both parishes. Sixteen couples, score 1, or in favor of the construction of a new parish, seven scored 3, or opposed to the construction of the new church. The majority of those in favor of the new parish indicate that they feel it is best for their children's future. Many informants recognize that a new church could create more cohesion among Catholics in Ports Ferry, even though it did to a degree exist among Catholics in Ports Ferry at the time of the research.

The seven families who oppose the building of the new church did so for various reasons: "inconvenient, too far away," "old way of mass the best way, will have to travel too far in order to attend mass, could break friendships," "we already got two, why do we need another one?" "if they'd ask the parishioners, I'd be for it," "they'll only be asking for more money, so I'm against it," "our church has been here for too long, don't want to see it torn down, don't want to go to a new church," "too much politics in this church business, we weren't really asked, so why be for it," "don't like new style churches." Most of the informants are concerned with the inconvenient distance that the new church will be from their homes and the lack of involvement of parishioners in determining the fate of the Catholic parish system in Ports Ferry. The importance of this question is increased if viewed in the light of the fact that the majority of the informants are in favor of the building of the new church.

Question # 20 concerns mass attendance and is another way to view social participation. Most families indicate they attend mass at least
once a week. When asked if mass attendance is important for social as well as religious reasons, the majority answered no, but indicate that being with friends at mass is important for their worship. Mass is also viewed as a place to interact, if briefly, with friends, and possibly to establish times when individuals might get together. Though mass is not viewed as a place to involve oneself socially, the informants indicate that mass carries sociability functions as a time to be with friends and to make plans for future gatherings.

Question #15 is intentionally placed last in this analysis. The majority of couples indicate they give moderately to the church. Eleven families suggest that they give average financial support to their church. Six suggest they give above average, or about ten dollars a week, or more, to the church. The remaining families suggest they make small financial contributions. The majority of the latter families state they would give more but other financial obligations limit their church support. Based on what one gives to the church and his reasons for giving it is possible to get some insight into how deeply committed to the Catholic religion and the church informants are. Most couples state they give a certain amount because they feel they will be rewarded in the "end" and also because they feel their parish is in need of financial support. A major reason for giving to the church seems also to be the recognition parishioners receive from the clergy for consistent financial support. This assessment is based on several discussions with Holy Rosary parishioners.

In summary, The Church Status Index provides for an assessment of
social participation of parishioners in the social life of their parish. Holy Rosary parishioners tend to participate strongly, except for membership in church organizations, as indicated by the indices of The Church Status Index. Social change in the Portis Ferry Catholic Church System has apparently decreased the unity among parishioners and Holy Rosary parish that once existed. Based on the other criteria, such as financial support, mass attendance, interaction with parish members, and support for the new church to be built, Holy Rosary parishioners indicate a strong tendency to interact with one another and to support their parish. A discussion of social status scores based on The Church Index is now in order.

The range of scores for The Church Status Index in the Holy Rosary sample is 14 to 31. The mean for the Holy Rosary parish sample is 21.7. The median is 21. Due to several factors, the differences between scores on The Church Status Index for the Holy Rosary sample is rather small. One of these factors is methodological. The size of the numbers used as weights on the majority of The Church Status Index factors is small. Consequently the differences between scores are minimal. A second factor concerns the sample interviewed. The analysis of the criteria used on The Church Status Index indicates that on the majority of the factors Holy Rosary parishioners show marked similarity. They tend to belong to the same number of church organizations, give equal amounts of financial support to their parish, attend mass frequently, and interact with parish members and St. John's parish members with equal frequency. Based on this factor and the scoring technique
difference between scores for The Church Status Index is small. Although the difference between scores is small, the analyst is able to distinguish three status categories, high, middle, and low. The range of scores for the high status category is 14 to 18. Six families fall into this category. The scores are indicative of extensive participation in Holy Rosary parish affairs. Observation of scores of families on the factors included in The Church Status Index in the high status category indicate that on the majority of factors included in this index these families receive the lowest scores, indicative of high status. For example, two families receive the lowest Church Status Index score of 14. On four of the factors involved in this index, financial support to the church, frequency of interaction with Holy Rosary parishioners, frequency of interaction with St. John's parishioners, and attitude toward construction of the new Catholic church, these families receive scores of 1, the lowest possible score on each of these factors. Nine families are included in the middle status category. The range of scores in this category is 19 to 23. Families in this category are considered to be middle status primarily due to the fact that on the majority of the factors included in Church Status Index these families, if one were to average score, received a middle score, or a score between the highest and lowest possible score on a Church Status Index factor. For example, one family with a score of 19 has a score of 2 on question #15, which concerns financial support to the church. There are three possible points on this factor, a score of 2 falls between the highest status
score (1 point) and the lowest status score (3 points). This family received a score of 3 on question # 17 which deals with frequency of interaction with members of St. John's parish. The score of 3 indicates that this family rarely interacts with members from St. John's parish. There are 7 possible points on question # 17. On question # 20, concerning frequency of mass attendance, this family has a score of 3 out of 4 possible points. This means that the family attends mass once a week. Thus, on the factors discussed this family indicates a middle status in relation to social participation in Holy Rosary parish. Families in the low status category have the highest possible scores on the majority of status factors included in the Church Status Index. Having the highest possible scores indicates that these families, for example, score 3 on factors that have only 3 points and 9 or 10 on 10 point factors. The reader is reminded that the lower scores on the factors are indicative of higher prestige status and that the higher scores on these factors are indicative of lower prestige status. The range of scores in the low status category is 25 to 31. A family with a score of 25 has the highest possible score on three of the seven status factors included in the Church Status Index and the next to highest score on another status factor. The family with the highest score on the range for the Church Status Index, a 31, has the highest possible score on four status factors and the next to highest score on two other status factors. In summary, status categories for the Holy Rosary sample, based on the Church Status Index are based on the scores families receive on the various factors.
Although it was previously stated that the majority of Holy Rosary parishioners score similarly on The Church Status Index, it can now be noted that variations in prestige status based on social participation in Holy Rosary parish do exist. Families in the high status category display similarity on the majority of status factors. Their scores on the factors are indicative of high status. They meet the criteria of the "judges" (individuals interviewed during Evaluated Participation to be discussed in chapter VIII) assessment of the importance of social participation in church affairs as this is brought out in Evaluated Participation. High social status in both parishes, according to the "judges" interviewed from both parishes is, to a large extent, dependent upon how much one does for his church. Families in the middle status category exhibit less social participation in Holy Rosary parish and concern for their parish than high status families. They are, to use the words of one informant, "people who do something for their church, but do it occasionally." Low status families, according to their scores on the index do very little for their church. Thus they receive low status scores. Individuals interviewed during the Evaluated Participation phase of this research suggested that parishioners who do little for their parish receive low status from other parishioners.

In summary, prestige status variations exist in Holy Rosary parish based on the degrees of social participation of parishioners. The table for the Holy Rosary Church Status Index is located on the follow-
Analysis of the St. John's sample with respect to the Church
### TABLE V

**Holy Rosary Church Status Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Question Ten</th>
<th>Question Fourteen</th>
<th>Question Fifteen</th>
<th>Question Sixteen</th>
<th>Question Seventeen</th>
<th>Question Eighteen</th>
<th>Question Twenty</th>
<th>Church Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The left hand column marked "individual" indicates that the scores of individuals run horizontal to the number of an individual. The far right hand column is an individual's total score on The Church Status Index.
The Church Status Index Applied to St. John's Church

Analysis of the St. John's parish sample based on The Church Status Index is now presented.

Questions #10 and #14 concern membership in a church organization. Question #10 asks whether or not an individual is presently a member of a church organization. The scoring on this factor was previously discussed in this chapter but a reminder that it is based on a combining of spouses' individual scores is in order, most of the St. John's parish sample reports belonging to at least one church organization. The scores on this factor range from 10 to 5. Eight couples are given scores of 9, which usually indicates that the spouse belonging to an organization is the wife. Nine couples indicated that they belong to more than one church organization, and this usually means that each spouse belongs to one church organization. Eight couples state that they are not presently members of some church organization.

Question #14 is asked primarily to determine whether or not individuals not presently members of a church organization might be past members of such an organization. The range of scores on this factor is 10 to 2. There are instances in which one spouse belongs to an organization and the other does not. In order to understand scoring on this factor, further explanation is needed. A score of 9 indicates that only one spouse has ever belonged to an organization and this was a past membership. A score of 5 indicates that one spouse has never belonged to a church organization. If a couple indicates past member-
ship in three organizations, they are given a score of 2. A score of 8 indicates that neither spouse is presently a member of a church organization but at least one had belonged to two organizations in the past, or that each spouse had belonged to one organization. If both spouses indicate they never belonged to a church organization, they are assigned scores of 10 on both questions # 10 and # 14. Four couples stated that they had never been members of an organization. The majority of informants answering # 14 belonged to at least two church organizations in the past.

Question # 15 concerns financial support of the church. The majority of parishioners indicates that they give average financial support to the church. Average financial support means about twenty dollars a month. Four couples state that they give less than average financial support to St. John's. Two couples indicate that they give above average financial support to their parish. In comparison to Holy Rosary, St. John's respondents indicate that they contribute less financial support to their parish. Based on the data, one can suggest that couples from both parishes support their churches generously even if one might term this "average".

Questions # 16 and # 17 are concerned with social interaction in the parishes. Question # 16 is concerned with interaction couples have with members of their own parish. The majority of the couples indicate that they have frequent social interaction with fellow St. John's parishioners. Sixteen couples state that they have frequent interaction with parishioners from St. John's parish, whereas the
remainder of the sample, eleven respondents, suggest they have occasional interaction with members of their parish. No couples state that they rarely have interaction with members of St. John's parish, whereas two Holy Rosary couples suggest as previously reported, they rarely interact with Holy Rosary parishioners.

A similarity exists between the two parishes with respect to the interaction factor. Members of each parish indicate they have frequent interaction with fellow parishioners although those from Holy Rosary stress this factor more. Eighty-one per cent (19) Holy Rosary parishioners indicate frequent interaction with members of their own parish, compared to 61 per cent (16) of St. John's parishioners having frequent interaction with members of the St. John's parish. This can be interpreted as due to Holy Rosary's Czech and ethnic composition creating a greater social cohesion and more frequent social interaction among parish members. St. John's parish, on the other hand, has a more heterogeneous character along ethnic lines. St. John's parish contains a number of members with a variety of ethnic backgrounds who are stationed at a nearby air force base. St. John's parish also has more young people, a less traditional membership.

Question 17 focuses on interaction with members of the other counterpart parish. St. John's couples indicate that they have some frequent interaction with Holy Rosary parishioners. Approximately 53 per cent of the St. John's sample suggest that they have frequent interaction with Holy Rosary parishioners. Approximately the same proportion of Holy Rosary parishioners indicate that they have frequent
interaction with St. John's parishioners (55 per cent). The point here is that informal discussions with members from both parishes would seem to lead one to think that the percentages are higher. Frequently parishioners would state that church affiliation does not matter, and consequently does not affect frequency or interaction between members of both parishes. The data suggest, however, that the assessments of people when discussing this matter are not entirely correct.

Question #18 asks whether parishioners are in favor of the construction of one Catholic church in Ports Ferry. The majority of St. John's informants indicate that they are in favor of the construction of one Catholic church. Most parishioners who favor building of a new church give as their reason that it is a move intended for the future which will be in the best interests of the younger Catholics in the community. Most who do not favor a merger suggest that they have been tied strongly to St. John's parish and do not prefer a change. Both parish samples indicate overwhelmingly, a desire to see the new church built.

Question #20 inquires about frequency of church attendance. This question is used to determine along with the other Church Status Index factors, how deeply one is involved in his parish. Three couples indicate that they attend mass more than once a week. The remainder of the St. John's parish sample state that they attend mass but once a week, with the exception of two who state they attend mass fewer than four times a month. The similarity between the two parishes on this variable is striking.
In summary, based on the factors included in The Church Status Index, St. John's parishioners tend to take interest in parish affairs. They show their greatest concern for their parish and the Ports Ferry Catholic church system through their support for the construction of a new Catholic church in Ports Ferry, and the degree of interaction they have with parish members.

Analysis of prestige status derived from the scores on The Church Status Index is now presented.

The range of scores on the Church Status Index for the St. John's parish sample is 12 to 33. The mean for the St. John's parish sample is 21.1. The median is 22. Observation of the scores suggests three status groupings may be derived from the range. The three status categories are as follows: the high status category, the middle status category, and the low status category. Nine families have scores that are indicative of high status. The range of scores in this status category is 12 to 17. The family with the score of 12 has the lowest possible score on four of the seven status factors included in The Church Status Index. This family also has the next to lowest score on two other status factors. Based on this family's scores on the status factors this family is suggested to have high status. The score of 12 is the lowest Church Status Index score from the two parishes. Two families have scores of 17. Both families have the lowest possible score on three of The Church Status Index factors, and the next to lowest score on one other status factor. In summary, families in the high status category from St. John's parish show very
low scores, indicative of high status on the majority of status factors. In comparing the high status category from both Holy Rosary and St. John's parish, much similarity appears. The range of Church Status Index scores for Holy Rosary parish is 14 to 18. The range of scores on this index for St. John's parish is 12 to 19. St. John's parish has both a lower (12) and higher score (19) for the high status category. When comparing the parishes in terms of percentages, 38 per cent of the St. John's parish sample (10) fall into the high status category, whereas 26 per cent (6) of the Holy Rosary parish fall into this status grouping. This percentage difference indicates that the St. John's parish sample has more families who participate strongly in the social life of their parish than Holy Rosary parish. Furthermore, this might indicate that Holy Rosary parishioners are participating less in the social life of their parish due to their tendency to oppose the construction of the new Catholic church more than St. John's parishioners.

Since Holy Rosary parish was founded on ethnic grounds and the new church would break up the remaining homogeneity of Holy Rosary parish, Holy Rosary parishioners might be participating less in the affairs of their parish since the new pastor, who directs both parishes, also has the responsibility of expediting the construction of the new church.

The differences between the parishes are also noticeable in the middle status category. Seven families fall into the St. John's parish middle status category. The range of scores for this status grouping is 19 to 25. The majority of families in this category have scores that fall between the lowest (high status scores) and the highest (low status
scores). For example, the families with the score of 19 have four status factor scores that fall between the high status and low status scores. The family with the score of 23 have three scores that fall between high and low status. Based on the scores of families in the middle status category for the St. John's parish sample, the families in this category participate occasionally in the affairs of their parish. A main point of interest is that fewer families fall into the middle status category for St. John's parish than they do the high status category. Respectively, the percentages are 26 per cent (7 families) and 38 per cent (10 families). This could mean that fewer families become involved in the social life of their parish due to the heterogeneous character of St. John's parish. St. John's parish has a sizeable portion of its members from a nearby air force base. A sizeable number of its parishioners live in a community fifteen miles north of Port Ferry. This indicates that a large proportion of St. John's parishioners are geographically and occupationally mobile and probably do not live in the area long enough to become involved in parish affairs. This is also indicated in the low status category which is discussed shortly. Comparing the middle status category from both parishes, seven families or approximately 26 per cent of the St. John's parish sample belong to the middle status category; whereas, nine families or 38 per cent of the Holy Rosary parish sample fall into the middle status category. This presents an interesting dilemma. St. John's parishioners tend to participate more strongly in parish affairs than Holy Rosary parishioners, but Holy Rosary parishioners show a greater tendency to
participate occasionally in church affairs than St. John's parishioners. When the percentage of families from both the high status and middle status categories from both churches are compared, the parishes are equal, 64 per cent. In other words, 64 per cent of the Holy Rosary parish sample and 64 per cent of the St. John's parish sample fall into the high status and middle status categories on The Church Status Index.

It appears that when taking both samples in their entireties, differences in social participation of members from both parishes becomes a matter of degree. The St. John's parish sample shows more families who participate strongly in church affairs than does the Holy Rosary parish sample, but the differences narrow as the status categories are further assessed. This factor is indicated further in the low status category. Nine families from the St. John's parish sample fall into the low status category. This represents 34 per cent of the St. John's parish sample. The range of scores for this category from St. John's parish sample is 26 to 33. The families in this category show low status scores on the majority of the factors included in The Church Status Index.

A cautionary note must be included here. Though the majority of scores of these families on the status factors are indicative of low status, the scores that tend most to influence their low status on The Church Status Index are questions #10 and #14. These are the questions concerning present and past membership in church organizations. Seven of the nine families have the maximum (10 points) or near maximum scores on both of these factors. This can be interpreted
as meaning families in this status category are probably occupation-
ally mobile, and do very little for St. John's parish while they are
in the Ports Ferry area, which includes belonging to any church or-
ganizations or committees. The scores of low status families on
questions # 10 and # 14 are even more important when observing the
scores of some of these families on other status factors included in
The Church Status Index. For example, one of the families with a
score of 29 has high status scores on three status factors. This
family has a score of 1 on both questions # 16 and # 17 which concern
interaction with members of parishioners from one's parish and the
other Catholic parish. This family also has a score of 1 on question
# 18 which concerns construction of the new Catholic church. The
questions that have the most influence on this family's prestige
status in terms of The Church Status Index are questions # 10 and # 14.
An interesting comparison is the other family with a score of 29 who
has low status scores on five of the seven status factors included
in The Church Status Index. Holy Rosary parish has six families, or
26 per cent of the Holy Rosary parish sample in the low status category.
Holy Rosary parish has fewer families with low status on The Church
Status Index factors than St. John's parish. This is probably due to
the fact that St. John's parish is a heterogeneous parish, whereas
Holy Rosary is not. A sizeable proportion of St. John's parish is
occupationally mobile and do not spend much time in Ports Ferry. This
affects the degree of social involvement these families have in St.
John's parish. Families in the low status category from Holy Rosary
parish tend to fall there because they have withdrawn socially from their parish due to their opposition to the construction of the new church, and their ages. Many Holy Rosary parishioners are elderly, and probably decrease their involvement in church affairs. Furthermore, one cannot overlook the fact that seven families, or 30 per cent of the Holy Rosary parish sample oppose the construction of the new church whereas only three families, or 10 per cent of the St. John's parish sample oppose the building of the church.

A comparison of both parish samples based on The Church Status Index reveals the following: first, St. John's parish has more families in the high status category than Holy Rosary; second, Holy Rosary parish has more families in the middle status category than St. John's parish; and third, Holy Rosary parish has fewer families in the low status category than St. John's parish. Based on these factors, it appears that when all status categories from both parishes are considered, very little difference exists in prestige status between the parishes. These differences may also be attributed to the mobility of St. John's parishioners who are not members of their parish long enough to get involved in parish activities, and the greater opposition of Holy Rosary parishioners, who have lived in Ports Ferry for many years, to the construction of the new church. While it is taken up in detail in the concluding chapter of this thesis, it can now be pointed out that there tend to be more status differences between the two parishes based on The Index of Status Characteristics than The Church Status Index.
Table VI, the St. John's Church Status Index Table, and Tables VII and VIII which compare the two parish samples on the scores for The Church Status Index are found on the following three pages.

Attention is now turned to chapter VIII, "Evaluated Participation."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Question Ten</th>
<th>Question Fourteen</th>
<th>Question Fifteen</th>
<th>Question Sixteen</th>
<th>Question Seventeen</th>
<th>Question Eighteen</th>
<th>Question Twenty</th>
<th>Church Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scores on the measures of The Church Status Index for individuals are provided, along with the total scores of individuals on The Church Status Index.
### TABLE VII

Comparison of Scores on The Church Status Index for the Holy Rosary Parish Sample and the St. John's Parish Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Question Ten</th>
<th>Question Fourteen</th>
<th>Question Fifteen</th>
<th>Question Sixteen</th>
<th>Question Seventeen</th>
<th>Question Eighteen</th>
<th>Question Twenty</th>
<th>Church Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scores on the measures of The Church Index for various individuals are provided, along with the total scores of individuals on The Church Index.
CHAPTER VIII

Evaluated Participation and Its Application

The three objectives of this chapter are to first, explain the methodology of Evaluated Participation; second, analyze Holy Rosary Church members and St. John's Church members using Evaluated Participation; and third, interpret the meaning of Evaluated Participation for prestige status in the parishes.

W. Lloyd Warner (1949) defined Evaluated Participation "on the propositions that those who interact in the social system of a community evaluate the participation of those around them, that the place where an individual participates is evaluated, and that the members of the community are explicitly or implicitly aware of the ranking and translate their evaluations into social class rating that can be communicated to the investigator." Warner's definition suggests that Evaluated Participation is an instrument used to gather data about individuals based on how individuals see one another in a social system.

Warner outlines six steps in his Evaluated Participation. The following is a discussion of each of these steps:

1. Rating by matched agreements. Warner compared the evaluation of informants in order to determine whether or not different individuals rate others in the community similarly in terms of social class.
2. Rating by symbolic placement. Informants remark about characteristics of individuals that symbolically place individuals in certain social positions. This can be identification of individuals by ecological area and social traits.

3. Rating by status reputation. In this technique, individuals are rated on the basis of some kind of trait that they have. Such characteristics were "leader," "substantial citizen," "dirty and immoral."

4. Rating by comparison. Here individuals are rated relative to others who have already been established as belonging to a certain social class.

5. Rating by simple assignment. Informants assign individuals to a particular class without delineating the entire social class configuration.

6. Rating by institutional membership. Informants suggest that individuals belong to a specific "institution" such as a clique, a church, or family whose status position has been previously determined. (Warner, 1946:36)

This thesis modified Warner's Evaluated Participation by narrowing the process to four steps. This was done primarily to save time during the interviews.

Evaluated Participation in this research was based on interviews with individuals called "judges." The judges were randomly selected from parish lists. Originally, five judges from each parish were selected to be interviewed. One judge, from St. John's parish, who is
District Court Judge, declined the interview.

The judges served several functions: First, they provided an assessment of the sample to be interviewed for The Index of Status Characteristics. Second, the judges suggested various social class configurations that exist in their respective parishes. This was viewed as being important because, before interviewing the judges, this researcher had only a vague notion concerning social class structure in the Catholic church system. Third, interviewing the judges gave the analyst an opportunity to visit with members of the Catholic churches in their homes, which afforded access to information on the interior of some of the homes in Ports Ferry. Of course, the judges, through their rating of fellow parishioners and discussing social class with the investigator, met the expected requirements of the Evaluated Participation technique.

Evaluated Participation, as already suggested, was modified for this research. The four steps ultimately used in this study were:

1. Social class identification. The judges were asked to identify the number of social classes that they believed exist in their specific parish.

2. Social class placement. Informants were asked to place individuals into the social classes they were previously asked to identify. Names of individuals randomly selected from parish lists were placed on 5x7 cards. The judges rated individuals from their respective parishes by placing them into the social classes that had been identified in step 1.
3. Social class analysis. The judges were asked after the previous two steps were completed to state what characteristics encompass the social classes they had identified.

4. Rating by matched agreements. The analyst matched the evaluation of individual judges in order to determine whether or not the judges agreed on where to place individuals and how many social classes exist in their respective parishes.

In summary, Evaluated Participation was used in order to obtain data about social classes and what constitutes social classes in the Catholic church system of Ports Perry.

Holy Rosary Parish

The procedure for analyzing Holy Rosary Church based on Evaluated Participation is as follows: first, two of the four elements of Evaluated Participation as it is used in this research are discussed. They are social class identification--the number of social classes each judge recognizes--and social class analysis--the characteristics that each judge states encompass each social class and, second, the two remaining elements of Evaluated Participation are discussed, through an analysis of one of the procedures, matched agreements, the method used to determine the extent to which the judges agree on the social class structure of Holy Rosary parish. While dealing with matched agreements, a fourth matter, social class placement, or the placement of parishioners into social classes is discussed by emphasizing the agreements or disagreements of the judges with respect to social class placement.
Three of the four judges recognized an "upper-middle" class, a "middle" class, and a "lower-middle" class. No judge suggested that a "lower" class exists in Holy Rosary Church.

Judge I suggested that three social classes exist in the Holy Rosary parish. The three classes recognized by Judge I were an "upper-middle" class, a "middle" class, and a "lower-middle" class. In terms of social class analysis, Judge I suggested that the classes are composed of the following characteristics. First, the upper-middle class is made up of individuals who do something for the community and the church. Upper-middle class individuals are "civic minded" and generally have the respect of most Ports Ferry citizens. The upper-middle class is comprised of "farmers, trades people, such as carpenters, post office employees, and it has no professional people." Second, the middle class is comprised of people with less income than upper-middle class individuals, older and retired people, and those individuals with less interest in their community. Third, the lower-middle class includes individuals with "social problems" such as drinking, but the people in this category are generally "hard working."

Judge II did not break down Holy Rosary into social classes, but did suggest that some individuals do "a little better than others," and that some individuals have "had a bad time," such as Mr. K who "has a bad back from an injury." Judge II suggested that Holy Rosary is comprised of "ordinary working people and has no really wealthy people."

Judge III recognized three social classes: an upper-middle class,
a middle class, and a lower-middle class. The upper-middle class characteristics given by this judge include better jobs, such as business owners and real estate people, high incomes, and more work in the church and the community. The middle class characteristics are good incomes, larger families, and less education than the upper-middle class individuals. The types of occupation associated with this class are farmers, store clerks, bank tellers, and common laborers. The lower-middle class is made up of individuals with little education, little income, and manual laborers. Individuals in this class do little or nothing at all for their community or parish.

Judge IV recognizes four social classes in the Holy Rosary parish. The four classes are upper class, upper-middle class, middle class, and lower-middle class. The upper class characteristics are "lots of money, individuals who do a lot for the church, and some education." Upper-middle class characteristics are those of persons who "make good money and do something for the church" and "individuals who are primarily farmers." Middle class individuals are "common people who have all types of jobs, usually laborers, not much money, and whose educational background is about high school." Lower class characteristics are individuals who "don't do anything for anybody, people with low types of jobs, and no education to speak of."

In summary, the evaluation of the judges tends to suggest several important social class characteristics: social participation in both community and parish, good jobs, and money. Of the three, the first factor tends to be the most important, especially participation in
church affairs. Participating in church activities indicates to these judges that individuals are interested in their church as a social organization that keeps people together.

The first part of this analysis of Evaluated Participation emphasizes three of the four parts of Evaluated Participation in this research; they are, social class placement, social class identification, and social class analysis. A discussion of the fourth aspect, matched agreements, will now be presented.

The purpose of matched agreements is to assess whether or not the judges agreed on where to place particular couples. The procedure for performing matched agreements is performed in the following manner. The three judges' ratings are combined with one another in order to determine agreement. Thus, ratings of Judges I and III are combined. I and IV are combined, and III and IV are combined. This is the total number of combinations possible of the Holy Rosary parish judges. Judge II did not recognize any social classes nor rate any couples, therefore his ratings cannot be combined with those of the other three judges.

Judge-set I-III agreed on fourteen of twenty-seven names they were given to rate. Judge-set I-III disagreed on twelve families and where they should be placed. One family had moved from the parish and was not rated by either judge.

Judge-set I-IV agreed only on where to place five names. This judge-set disagreed on twenty names, and did not rate two of the names. When a judge-set could not rate families it was either due to a family's
moving or the judges not knowing the person well enough to make a rating. If Judge I rated family "B", and Judge IV did not, matched agreement on this individual had not been achieved.

Judge-set III-IV agreed on where to place fifteen names, disagreed on ten names, and was unable to rate two individuals.

In terms of percentages, judge-set I-III agreed on 52.8 per cent of names to rate, judge-set I-IV agreed on only 18.5 per cent of names to rate, and judge-set III-IV agreed on 35.5 per cent of names to rate. Combined, the judges' percentage of agreement on names was approximately 41 per cent. Based on the size of the church and how well individuals seem to know one another, this total reflects lack of agreement.

Originally, the researcher believed that there would be much agreement by the judges on where to place members of their parish. Perhaps a major reason for the judges not agreeing more often with one another on where to place couples is their conception of social class. Many disagreements arose from the fact that the judges placed many families in an upper-middle class which is their highest social class, whereas another judge placed the same people in the middle class which is, in turn, his highest social class designation. Data show that 32 individuals were placed in the upper-middle class and 30 in the middle class. The question arises as to whether the judges placed families into social classes that were basically the same, but different in the label applied to them. The researcher, when interviewing the judges asked them to think seriously about social class in their parish, and then to place individuals into the classes. The analysis would ask a
judge, "Are you positive about the social class breakdown you have
given me? Are you sure family "X" belongs in the "middle" class and
not the "upper-middle" class? Are you positive there is a difference
between the "middle" and "upper-middle," "lower-middle" and "middle"
classes you have suggested exist?" Not once did the judges change
their categories.

Based on the preceding analysis, it appears that the evaluators
in Holy Rosary parish vary in their social class and prestige status
evaluation of fellow parishioners. This is due to the different social
classes which the judges perceive exist in Holy Rosary parish. The
emphasis by the judges is on a middle-class orientation. The differ-
cences in matched agreements, as previously discussed, is due to the
way the judges categorize the middle class. Often the judges variously
place the same family within the middle class. Consequently, certain
disagreements arise because the judges do not agree as to which middle
class category a family is to be placed. One important criterion for
distinguishing among the middle classes and all social classes identi-
fied is the emphasis the judges place on doing something for one's
parish. Often, families with similar status characteristics, such as
occupation and income are placed into different classes within the
middle class because the judges feel that some families are more ac-
tively involved in the affairs of Holy Rosary parish than other families.
Thus, the importance of social participation of families in parish
activities, as discussed in chapter VII on The Church Status Index,
manifests itself in terms of both prestige status and social class.
This is illustrated by the fact that the three judges who evaluated Holy Rosary parish in terms of social class emphasized the contribution that families in their highest social class categories make to Holy Rosary parish.

The Holy Rosary parish table for Evaluated Participation is found on the next page.

Attention is now turned to an analysis of St. John's parish based on Evaluated participation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Judge-Set I-III</th>
<th>Judge-Set I-IV</th>
<th>Judge-Set III-IV</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
<th>Class 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>LM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>LM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>No 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = Agreement by a certain judge-set  
- = Disagreement by a certain judge-set  
NC = Individual not placed in any class by one or both judges  
M = Middle Class  
UM = Upper-middle Class  
LM = Lower-middle Class  
U = Upper Class  

These columns indicate the social class ratings given to individuals by each judge.
St. John's Parish

Analysis of Evaluated Participation in the St. John's parish will now be presented. St. John's parish is analyzed in the same manner as Holy Rosary parish. Four of the five judges interviewed from St. John's parish indicated differences in terms of social class.

Judge I from St. John's parish stated that there exist five social classes in the parish. An upper-upper class, a lower-upper class, a middle class, a lower-middle class, and a lower class. The upper-upper class is comprised of those families with good educations or "those who are interested in education." The people in this class have a "good outlook" on life. The lower-upper class is comprised of families who are "capable, with leadership qualities, a good education, but with less education than the upper-upper class and those with tolerance."

The middle class encompasses the young (early thirties) with "some education, farmers with some education, and solid citizens, who are hard workers but have little education. The family life of middle class people is good." The lower-middle class includes "hard workers, with very little education, who also are solid citizens, but are poor."
The lower class according to Judge I are the "older people, not intellectuals, and women who are good homemakers." Judge I emphasizes education as the most important social class factor probably because she is a retired school teacher.

Judge III recognized three social classes: upper-middle, median, and lower-middle. The upper-middle class is composed of those who "continuously help the church, make good pay, and are good-supporting
in terms of financial support to the church." Doctors, lawyers, farmers, and the self-employed are examples of individuals to be found in the upper-middle class.

The median class includes families "not as cooperative as upper-middle class people. Median class families do not work whenever something is going on in the church, and do not belong to any church organizations." The self-employed, air base workers, and heavy equipment managers are examples of the occupations of family members in the median class.

Judge IV suggested three social classes exist in St. John's parish but did not know where to place the widowed, retired, and single individuals.

The upper class includes professional and business people. These individuals "involve themselves in church activities frequently, and have good incomes." Upper-middle class families have "less money than upper class people, are basically farmers, but also frequently involve themselves in church activities." Middle class families have "just average incomes and don't get as involved in church activities." Whereas Judge I stresses education as the primary social class value, Judge IV stresses income and involvement in church activities as the primary social class values.

Judge V recognizes upper, upper-middle, middle-middle, lower-middle, and lower class stratification system in St. John's parish. The upper class are "rich people who have had money in the family for years." The upper-middle class people "own their own homes, invest
their money, and have good jobs, such as building contractor, county judges, and merchants in business for themselves." The middle-middle class comprises "laborers, and tenant farmers." The lower-middle class includes "widowers, single people, and young married couples who have not had a good start, but will be something someday." The lower class includes "individuals on social security, people who can't meet ends, and hard workers who will never get anywhere." Judge V, a farmer, did not emphasize church involvement as an important measure of social class. However, Judge V has been an active parish member for years and is presently serving on the church reorganization committee. Judge V has become frustrated with his involvement in church activities and felt, at the time of the interview, that the new pastor was "out to get him off the committee" because he believed that the new pastor "wants new blood" on all church committees.

Judge II is intentionally placed last in this discussion. Judge II did not wish to rate his fellow parishioners. After numerous attempts to get Judge II to cooperate, it was decided to allow Judge II to "just talk" about St. John's parish. Judge II suggested that "the line of demarcation was too small" to separate people into social classes. It was this judge's intention to classify everyone in St. John's parish as "good Americans whose nationalities have been melted," consequently, eliminating social class. Judge II is not receptive to the term "social class." He feels this term is offensive and that to think of social classes is not an American thing to do. His insistence on this line of thought led the interviewer to pursue another question, that of
construction of the new Catholic church. Judge II indicated that "new land was bought by Holy Rosary parish thus everybody thought the new church would be called Holy Rosary Church," but this type of occurrence "is not unusual anymore in the Catholic churches in Port Ferry."

Judge II would not state whether he was for or against construction of the new church. After pursuing this line of conversation the interviewer again returned to the question of social class. This time he asked, "then, Judge II, you would suggest that everyone in St. John's parish is equal." Judge II quickly responded, "No, not equal, but there are no social classes." Judge II laughed and stated that there was no way one could get him to rank fellow parishioners. He did say, however, that he was too old to be "conned" into saying something he feels doesn't exist. With that in mind, the interviewer became convinced.

Attention now will focus on matched agreements. Six judge-sets comprised the St. John's Evaluated Participation. The judges in St. John's parish were asked to rate all those that the analyst intended to interview. A major problem appeared because all the judges did not know enough about a sizeable number of the sample to rate them. This problem was further compounded by the fact that one judge might have rated a particular individual, and another judge either could not rate or would not rate the individual. Thus, with judge-set I-III, 34 families were rated, and approximately 30 were not. Judge-set I-III agreed on where to rate seven families, but disagreed on twenty-seven. A breakdown of the judge-sets in terms of agreements and disagreements
on matched agreements will further underscore this problem.

Judge-set I-IV agreed on where to rate 15 families and disagreed on 15. Judge-set I-V agreed on the ratings of 12 families and disagreed on 27. Judge-set III-IV agreed on the placement of 9 families and disagreed on 19. Judge-set III-V agreed on the placement of 14 families and disagreed on 20. Judge-set IV-V agreed on the ratings of 9 families and disagreed on 21. In total, the judge-sets agreed on where to rate 63 individuals, while disagreeing on 119 individuals.

As with Holy Rosary parish, different judges conceived of different social classes in the parish. The different social class configuration of the judges affects the large number of disagreements concerning placement of individuals.

The judges in both Holy Rosary and St. John's parishes encountered the same problem in reference to matched agreements. Judges from both parishes, especially Holy Rosary parish conceive of a middle class consisting of three or more sub-classes. The judges from both parishes are inconsistent concerning which middle class, such as upper-middle, middle-middle, or lower-middle, they place families in their respective parishes. This is the chief reason why so many disagreements arise in matched agreements. It is important that one not overlook the fact that even though these disagreements arise, judges from both parishes definitely recognize differences between these classes in terms of prestige status. Judges from St. John's parish recognize differences between the classes in terms of income, occupation, education, and most importantly, what one does for his or her parish. For example,
Judge IV recognizes an upper class. This class is categorized by professional and business people and families actively involved in church affairs. Judge III, distinguishes between the middle classes by emphasizing differences between families who work whenever the church, St. John's, needs them and those who do not. Judge I recognizes two upper classes and bases her determination of upper class on education. Judge I is actively involved in church affairs and states that active participation in church affairs enhances one's prestige status in St. John's parish.

Differences are recognized to exist between the parishes in terms of social class identification. Not one judge from Holy Rosary parish recognizes an upper class in Holy Rosary parish, but two judges from St. John's parish recognize upper classes in St. John's parish. Judge I from St. John's parish brings this difference to light. When discussing social class, Judge I stated that St. John's parish has a broad social class structure because of the different types of families in the parish. Judge I indicates that because a number of St. John's parishioners are from the nearby air force base and often do not earn what she refers to as average incomes, nor are they college educated, St. John's parish has lower-middle and lower classes. Judge III from Holy Rosary parish recognizes three social classes, but indicates that it is not easy to categorize Holy Rosary parish families into social classes because the families are basically similar on many status characteristics. It is the assessment of all four judges from Holy Rosary parish that because of the Czech ethnic orientation of Holy
Rosary parish it is difficult to divide Holy Rosary parish into social classes. The St. John's parish judges, however, often state that due to the heterogeneity of St. John's parish, especially the mobility of young parishioners, it is possible to categorize St. John's parish into social classes. One major similarity between parishes, although partially indicated, is that the division of the parishes into social classes is based on variations in prestige status characteristics, such as income, occupation, education, where one lives, and social participation in church affairs.

In summary, both Holy Rosary and St. John's parishes contain persons of distinguishable social classes based on the evaluations of the judges from both parishes. Analysis of matched agreements indicates that the judges do not often agree on which social class to place particular families. It is the assessment of this analyst that the disagreements of the judges is due to the differences in prestige status characteristics that the judges assess as being important in the make-up of the different social classes.

Table X, the table for St. John's matched agreement is found on the next page.

Attention is now turned to a chapter devoted to interpretation and conclusions.
TABLE X
ST. JOHN'S MATCHED AGREEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Judge I</th>
<th>Judge II</th>
<th>Judge III</th>
<th>Judge IV</th>
<th>Judge V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Set I-III</td>
<td>Set I-IV</td>
<td>Set I-V</td>
<td>Set III-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>5 DNR</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>5 DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NC = No Class  UM = Upper-middle Class  M = Middle Class
U = Upper Class  LM = Lower-middle Class  L = Lower Class
DNR = Did Not Rate:  St. John's Judges often did not know individuals they were asked to evaluate, thus they did not evaluate them. This differs from the "no class" category in that the "no class" category indicates a judge knew of a person, but could not rate an individual. A number in front of DNR indicates which judge did not know where to place an individual, no number indicates neither judge evaluated an individual.
TABLE X
ST. JOHN'S MATCHED AGREEMENTS CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Judge-I Set</th>
<th>Judge-II Set</th>
<th>Judge-III Set</th>
<th>Judge-IV Set</th>
<th>Judge-V Set</th>
<th>Judge-I Class</th>
<th>Judge-II Class</th>
<th>Judge-III Class</th>
<th>Judge-IV Class</th>
<th>Judge-V Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5 DNR</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>5 DNR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 NC</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4 NC</td>
<td>3 NC</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3 NC</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4 NC</td>
<td>3 NC</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3 NC</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4 NC</td>
<td>3 NC</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UU</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>UU</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UU</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>UU</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>UX</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UU</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UU</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>UM</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3 NC</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>3 NC</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4 NC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1 DNR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>4 DNR</td>
<td>5 DNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 + 3 DNR</td>
<td>1 DNR</td>
<td>1 DNR</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 DNR</td>
<td>1 DNR</td>
<td>1 DNR</td>
<td>3 DNR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE X

ST. JOHN'S MATCHED AGREEMENTS CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Judge I</th>
<th>Judge II</th>
<th>Judge III</th>
<th>Judge IV</th>
<th>Judge V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-III</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>I-V</td>
<td>III-IV</td>
<td>III-V</td>
<td>IV-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1 DNR</td>
<td>1 DNR</td>
<td>1 DNR</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The majority of the judges were unable to rate individuals from numbers 50 to 57.
CHAPTER IX

Interpretation and Forecast

The objectives of this chapter are: first, to summarize the data concerning prestige status as it relates to the two Catholic churches; second, to assess the meaning of these data for the future of Ports Ferry Catholics; and third, to assess the meaning of the changes occurring in the Catholic parishes for the future of Ports Ferry, Nebraska.

Status differences exist between the two Catholic parishes in Ports Ferry. Data presented in chapter VI from The Index of Status Characteristics indicate that the St. John's parish sample has higher status on the majority of status factors in The Index. The St. John's parish sample has higher status in the house type, occupation, education, and secondary source of income factors. The Holy Rosary parish sample has higher status on the income dimension.

The meaning of these status differences between the two parishes stems from the fact that Ports Ferry Catholics have traditionally believed that St. John's parishioners have higher prestige status than Holy Rosary parishioners. During the Evaluated Participation part of this research, analyzed later in this chapter, the judges from both parishes indicated that they feel that St. John's parishioners have higher status professions, live in higher status houses and have higher annual incomes than Holy Rosary parishioners. Based on these status
factors, the judges felt that St. John's parishioners have more prestige status than Holy Rosary parishioners. The judges lend support to their beliefs by suggesting that the Czech ethnic affiliation of Holy Rosary parishioners and their traditional occupation—that of semi-skilled laborers—gives them lower prestige than St. John's parishioners have.

The status differences can be further explained through the use of the concept of "symbolic integrating factors," as explained by Jesse Bernard in her book, The Sociology of Community (1971). Bernard uses the phrase in reference to the research of W. Lloyd Warner. In critiquing Warner, she suggests that components of The Yankee City paradigm have proven to be unsuccessful. For example, the emphasis Warner placed on voluntary associational membership as an integrating element when in fact such membership served a power related function which enabled the upper classes to exclude certain individuals from joining their associations. Bernard, however, suggests that Warner's discussion of status and symbolic integration is successful when one focuses on the symbols that social groups use to display their power. As an example, she cites the creation of a Black identity based on slogans such as "Black Power" and "Black is Beautiful." These symbols serve as sources of social integration in conjunction with power arrangements of a social group. Similarly serving to integrate a social group, the status differences between Holy Rosary Church and St. John's Church can be conceptualized with the phrase symbolic integrating factors. Over the years, Ports Ferry Catholics have become
aware of the status differences between the two parishes. These status differences have become symbolic integrating factors for each of the two parishes viewed separately. St. John's parishioners have organized their parish around the conventional American status symbols which appear on The Index of Status Characteristics whereas Holy Rosary parish has organized itself around the status symbol of ethnic identity. Consequently, the forms of integration in the two parishes are based on different status components.

On the one hand, integration is based primarily on criteria such as house type, education, income, and occupation and on the other hand, integration is primarily a function of ethnic identity. The two different sets of integrating components serve as instruments by which St. John's parishioners and Holy Rosary parishioners tend to evaluate one another. St. John's parishioners have not been oriented toward one occupational category, one educational status, or one house type or one geographic area whereas Holy Rosary parishioners have organized their community around Holy Rosary parish and have not spread themselves through the community as St. John's parishioners have. The semi-skilled occupational status of the majority of Holy Rosary parishioners is due to the occupational status of the immigrant Czechs who moved to Ports Ferry. Many of the sons of these Czechs are employed in similar occupations.

One status factor that is misassessed by the judges and other Ports Ferry Catholics is the income factor. St. John's parishioners have come to be symbolized as the higher status Catholics in Ports
Ferry. Consequently, individuals believe that St. John's parishioners have higher incomes than Holy Rosary parishioners. The income data from both parish samples indicates the opposite. The Holy Rosary parish sample shows a higher annual income than the St. John's parish sample.

The manner in which the status symbols from both parishes have been integrated effect the manner in which Ports Ferry Catholics view them. Bernard uses another phrase, collective representations, to elaborate further on this point. (Bernard, 1971b:69) The status factors, income, occupation, education, organizational membership, house type, and dwelling area represent a collectivity of status symbols. Because the overt manifestations of the life styles of St. John's parishioners are indicative of higher status, individuals believe that, if St. John's parishioners live in higher status houses and dwelling areas, they earn higher incomes than Holy Rosary parishioners. Consequently, the symbols taken as a collectivity can lead to incorrect evaluations on the status factors. The Theory of the Leisure Class, by Thorsten Veblen (1949) is used here to further elaborate on this point. Veblen focuses on the life styles of upper class Americans and attempts to explain these life styles through various concepts such as conspicuous consumption, conspicuous leisure, and pecuniary emulation. The consumption habits, the great amount of time spent in leisurely activities, and the acquisition of females and their eventual upper status roles are symbolic integrating factors and collective representations of the upper classes. Relative to the discussion of the two parishes, the status factors from The Index of Status Characteristics indi-
cate that the St. John's parish sample has higher prestige status on the majority of the status factors than the Holy Rosary parish sample. However, this does not mean that the sample from St. John's parish is representative of Veblen's conception of the leisure class. The sample from St. John's parish does not fit the criteria of Veblen's leisure class because of the work habits, the means of income, and the house types and residential locations of these families.

Status differences between the two parishes based on The Church Status Index present an interesting situation. The St. John's parish sample has more families proportionately with high status based on this index than the Holy Rosary parish sample but the Holy Rosary parish sample has fewer families proportionately with low status on The Church status index than the St. John's parish sample. Holy Rosary parish sample also has more families proportionately in the middle status category than the St. John's parish sample. This seems to indicate that the St. John's sample has more families who more actively participate in St. John's Church affairs than do families in the Holy Rosary parish sample who actively participate in the affairs of their church. However, when the samples are viewed in their entirety, the differences in status based on this index narrow. The status factor of social participation in church affairs tends to be equally valued and integrated by the two parishes. Doing something for one's parish is a status symbol because it indicates that individuals are concerned about their parish and its communal life. This is indicative of why fewer Holy Rosary than St. John's parishioners are strongly involved in the
affairs of their parish. Because Holy Rosary parish is founded on ethnic identity, the plans for the building of the new church and thus assimilating the Czechs into the mainstream of American life may have had the effect of lessening the concern of Holy Rosary parishioners for their parish's future since Holy Rosary Church has been the symbolic integrating factor for Porta Perry Czechs since the late 1900's. St. John's parish is not confronted with this problem. Its heterogeneity makes the transition to the new church much easier.

Evaluated Participation data present variations between the parishes. Judges from St. John's parish recognize upper classes and lower classes in their parish whereas Holy Rosary parish judges recognize a broad middle class divided in several middle class categories. This again reflects the heterogeneity-homogeneity differences between the two parishes. St. John's judges understand that their parish is not based on a single ethnic identity. St. John's parishioners are more diverse in factors such as occupation, age, education and residential location than Holy Rosary parishioners. Thus, the judges from St. John's parish are able to identify a diversity of social classes based on its heterogeneity in their parish. Holy Rosary judges, on the other hand, state that their parish is homogeneous on the status factors just mentioned and deny that their parish has diverse social classes, such as upper or lower. The ethnic homogeneity of the parish brings the judges to assess that their parish is alike in terms of social class. Social class differences in Holy Rosary parish are differences in one class, not in three or more different social classes.
Based on the data from The Index of Status Characteristics, The Church Status Index, and Evaluated Participation, the future of Ports Ferry Catholics may be seen in the following manner. The merger of the parishes when the new church is completed will make for an easier transition for St. John's parishioners than for Holy Rosary parishioners. St. John's parishioners are younger and more heterogeneous. Consequently, the merger which will add to the heterogeneity the St. John's parishioners are accustomed to, will be more easily made for St. John's parishioners than for Holy Rosary parishioners. Holy Rosary parishioners are not accustomed to worshipping in or focusing their church activities around a heterogeneous church and parish. The ethnic homogeneity of Holy Rosary parish will become a part of a heterogeneous ethnic structure and a parish diverse on many status factors. This may eventually lead to the emergence of even more distinct groupings based on status honor, a feature that does not exist in either of the two parishes at the present time. In "Class, Status, and Party" Max Weber (1946) discusses the concept of status honor as meaning the honor social groups possess based on their social status. Status honor can be integrated into the group to the extent that it is used as a means of excluding individuals from membership in the group. These status groupings may center their social organization around symbolic integrating factors parallel to but distinctive from those of the parishes to which members or their ancestors formerly belonged. In the beginning, however, the former allegiances may have the effect of dividing the new church. As Holy Rosary parishioners adjust to their new
situation integration of all parishioners will eventually occur, eliminating the former cleavages but creating new status honor groupings.

During the transition period, Holy Rosary parishioners perhaps will develop organizations symbolic of their Czech identity and former membership in Holy Rosary parish. These may have positive effects for the transition because they could serve as reference points for Czech identity, or they may increase the difficulties of transition because they may further divide the new parish. In summary, the success of the merger of the two parishes and the transition will depend to a large extent on the adjustment of Holy Rosary parishioners to a heterogeneous situation and to how St. John's parishioners react to the responses of Holy Rosary parishioners to the new parish.

The effects on Ports Ferry due to the changes in the Catholic parishes may be viewed as follows: The merger can eventually effect a residential relocation of parishioners, especially the younger generations of the former Holy Rosary Church. The Czech community that surrounds Holy Rosary Church may slowly be dispersed throughout Ports Ferry. Many of the houses surrounding Holy Rosary Church are old and lived in by families with Czech origins. Because Holy Rosary Church will not be the primary worship facility for Ports Ferry Czechs and no worship is planned in either Holy Rosary or St. John's Churches after the new church is built, younger Czechs may eventually relocate in the community thus affecting the ecological organization of the community. It is possible that the houses surrounding Holy Rosary Church, now lived
in by Czechs will lose their locational importance as they lose their symbolic center as Holy Rosary Church, once the source of all Czech social activities and worship, closes its doors for good.

In summary, the prestige status and social class differences among Roman Catholics in Ports Ferry may become more pronounced after the new church is completed. Whether or not the status differences manifest themselves in the creation of status honor groupings, which could result in negative consequences for the new church, or whether the status differences will have few negative effects will depend on the participation of all parishioners, especially those from Holy Rosary Church, in church affairs and the worship services which center around the new church to be built in Ports Ferry.
APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO INDIVIDUALS SERVING AS JUDGES DURING EVALUATION PARTICIPATION
Dear

I would like to introduce myself to you. My name is Robert Franzese. I am a sociology instructor at Iowa Western Community College, Council Bluffs, Iowa. I also teach for the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

I am presently doing a study of the Catholic Churches in Ports Ferry. The Reverend Paul S. suggested that you could be a help to me in doing this research.

The study I am doing concerns both Holy Rosary and St. John's. The objective of the study is to determine prestige status in each parish.

Your part in the study will be to act as a judge in evaluating members of your parish. The procedure is rather easy. I will come to your home and ask you to place members of your parish into social classes. I will have a number of cards with names on them. All you will need to do is to sort the cards into as many social categories as you feel exist. Next, I will ask you why you have done so. I will write your responses on the cards.

The information that you give me will be invaluable. The time that you will spend doing this will be approximately one hour. I might have to make several visits to your home.

You need never worry that your name might be used in this research. No one will ever know how you rated your fellow parishioners.

Father S. suggested that you could be of help to me. I certainly hope that you decide to give me the opportunity to speak with you.

I hope to see you within one week of your receiving this letter.

Respectfully yours,

Professor Robert Franzese
Iowa Western Community College and
The University of Nebraska at Omaha
APPENDIX B


content of introduction to other chapters unaltered
July 12, 1973

Dear Parishioner,

I would like to introduce myself to you. My name is Robert Franzese. I am a sociology instructor at Iowa Western Community College, Council Bluffs, Iowa. I also teach for the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

I am presently doing a study of the Catholic Churches in Ports Ferry. The study I am doing concerns both Holy Rosary and St. John's. The objective of the study is to determine prestige status in the two parishes.

You are one of one hundred families that I will interview concerning this research. All one hundred families were chosen by random sample from separate church lists.

Your part in this research will be to answer questions from an interview schedule.

Father Paul S. has been most helpful with other parts of this research. I hope you will decide to help me in a similar manner.

I plan to begin this part of the research on Monday, July 16, 1973, and hope to visit with you sometime during that week.

Respectfully yours,

Professor Robert Franzese
Iowa Western Community College and
The University of Nebraska at Omaha
APPENDIX C

INTERNET SCHEME
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Please answer all questions to the best of your ability. All answers and statements will be kept in strict confidence. No one but the interviewer will know what you have said.

1. Name: a. Husband ___________________________________________
   b. Wife _________________________________________________
   c. Family size ___________________________________________

2. Address
   a. What year was the house built? ___________ b. How many
      rooms in the house? _________ c. How new is the furniture?
      _________ d. Do you have a basement? _________ e. Do you own your home?
      __________________

3. Do you own an automobile? ____________________ _________________________

4. Occupation:
   a. Father's occupation ______________________________________
   b. Mother's occupation ____________________________
   c. Occupations of other adult family members _________________

5. How many children of all ages are there in the family?
   a. Under five years of age _________
   b. Between five and eleven years of age _________________
   c. Between twelve and eighteen years of age _____________
   d. Between nineteen and twenty-one years of age ______
   e. Above twenty-one years of age __________
   f. Total number of children ________________

6. How many of the above children are living with their parents? _____

7. Education:
   a. Husband __________________________
   b. Wife ____________________________
   c. Other adult members of the family _________________________

8. Income:
   a. Husband _________________________ Source ___________________
   b. Wife ___________________________ Source ___________________
   c. Other adult members of family Source _______________________
      Source _______________________
      Source _______________________

9. What is the nationality of the husband?
   a. Czech _______ b. German _______ c. Bohemian ______
   d. English, Irish, Scotch _______ e. Don't know ______
   f. Other ___________________________________________
10. Do you belong to any Church Organizations or Committees? _____
   If yes, please specify:
   a. Husband
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
   b. Wife
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
   c. Other adult members of the family
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________

12. When did the ancestors of the husband and wife come to the United States?
   Husband ____________ Wife ____________

13. How many years have you been a member of your parish? ______
    Have you ever changed parishes? ______ If so, when? ______

14. Have you ever belonged to a parish organization or committee? ______
    If so, when? ______
    Please specify what organizations and/or committees you have belonged to:
   a. Husband
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
   b. Wife
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
   c. Other adult members of the family
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________
      ____________________________________________________________

15. How would you describe the amount of financial support you give to the church?
   a. Nothing ___________ c. Moderate _________________
   b. Small _______________ d. Above average ______________

16. How would you describe the contact you have with members of your parish?
   a. Nothing _____ b. Occasional _____ c. Frequent _____

17. How would you describe the contact you have with members of the other parish?
   a. Nothing _____ b. Occasional _____ c. Frequent _____

18. Do you generally support the construction of one Catholic Church in Forts Ferry?
   a. Yes _______ b. No _______ c. Neutral _____
19. Do you now, and have you ever, attended Mass at the other parish? Yes ________ No ________ If not, is it due to a dislike of any member or members of that parish? Yes ________ No ________ Is the dislike based on nationality differences? ______________

20. How frequently do you attend services?
   a. Once a week ______________
   b. Twice a week ______________
   c. More ______________
   d. Less than four times a month ______________
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