

Student Work

---

6-1-1966

**A Study of an Intra-Organizational Stratification System Viewed as a Network of Social Distance Strategies about a Set of Fixed Positions**

David Busch Oliver  
*University of Omaha*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>  
Please take our feedback survey at: [https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE](https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE)

---

**Recommended Citation**

Oliver, David Busch, "A Study of an Intra-Organizational Stratification System Viewed as a Network of Social Distance Strategies about a Set of Fixed Positions" (1966). *Student Work*. 2078.  
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2078>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).

A STUDY OF AN INTRA-ORGANIZATIONAL STRATIFICATION  
SYSTEM VIEWED AS A NETWORK OF SOCIAL DISTANCE  
STRATEGIES ABOUT A SET OF FIXED POSITIONS

A Thesis

168

Presented to the  
Department of Sociology  
and the  
Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies  
University of Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

by

David Busch Oliver

June 1966

UMI Number: EP73618

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73618

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of the College of  
Graduate Studies of the University of Omaha, in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master  
of Arts.

Frank H. Kelly      SOCIOLOGY  
Chairman                      Department

Graduate Committee

Name	Department
<u>Corra Ann Martin</u>	<u>Sociology, Chv.</u>
<u>Frank H. Kelly</u>	<u>SOCIOLOGY</u>
<u>Richard L. Kiboff</u>	<u>Psychology</u>
<u>Gaylon G. Kuehn</u>	<u>Sociology</u>

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people I should like to mention who made this research possible, but it is possible to name only a few. I first would like to thank Dr. John D. Coakley, Acting Director of the Omaha Women's Job Corps Training Center, who made the necessary arrangements with Burroughs Corporation which gave permission to use personnel, records and any additional materials which would be of help to the investigation. Next I would like to thank the seventeen Resident Counselors who gave their time in recording much of the data collected in the study. Finally, the cooperation of the enrollees residing in the Center in filling out the sociometric questionnaire administered to them should not go without acknowledgment.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Cora Ann Martin, my thesis advisor, who gave much of her time and patience in providing guidance and direction with the subject matter in a systematic way. Without her editing this thesis would be incomplete. Special thanks also go to Dr. Richard L. Wikoff who provided me with a better understanding of statistical procedures.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	12
Research Tradition . . . . .	12
Hypotheses to be Tested . . . . .	21
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	24
The Research Site . . . . .	24
Population and Sample . . . . .	26
Definitions . . . . .	30
Data Collection . . . . .	32
Data Analysis . . . . .	35
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	37
Test of Hypotheses . . . . .	37
Analysis of Deviant Cases . . . . .	39
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	54
Social Distance Patterns and Formal Status Relationships . . . . .	54
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	58
Implications for Further Research . . . . .	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	63

CHAPTER	PAGE
APPENDIX A. General Information Sheet . . . . .	68
APPENDIX B. Instructions . . . . .	69
APPENDIX C. Tabulation Sheet for Enrollee- Staff Contacts . . . . .	71
APPENDIX D. Frequency of Public Contacts With Staff Personnel Among High Positive and High Negative Subjects	72
APPENDIX E. Frequency of Private Contacts With Staff Personnel Among High Positive and High Negative Subjects . . . . .	73
APPENDIX F. Examples of Public and Private Contacts Recorded in the Omaha Job Corps Center . . . . .	74

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Choice Patterns for Roommate Preference of a Group of 240 Job Corps Girls . . .	29
II. Private Contacts Among High Positive Subjects in the Omaha Job Corps Center	41
III. Private Contacts Among High Negative Subjects in the Omaha Job Corps Center	41
IV. Positive Roommate Choice Patterns Among Deviant and Non-Deviant High Positive Subjects . . . . .	46
V. Negative Roommate Choice Patterns Among Deviant and Non-Deviant High Positive Subjects . . . . .	47
VI. Negative Roommate Choice Patterns Among Deviant and Non-Deviant High Negative Subjects . . . . .	51
VII. Positive Roommate Choice Patterns Among Deviant and Non-Deviant High Negative Subjects . . . . .	52



CHAPTER I  
THE PROBLEM

It is generally agreed that in a generic sense the concept social stratification refers to a structure of differential rankings which seems to occur in all societies. That is a structure exists of regularized inequality in which men are ranked higher and lower according to the value accorded their various social roles and activities through the process of self-and-other differentiation and ranking.<sup>1</sup>

If societies are organized on this basis, an inquiry may be made into the criteria of evaluation, that is, those differentiated social roles and activities that are the bases of evaluation of individuals and hence the determinants of their stratificational position. On the one hand sociologists have studied systems of social stratification that transverse institutions.

---

<sup>1</sup>Bernard Barber, Social Stratification: A Comparative Analysis of Structure and Process (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1957), p. 7.

They have differentiated and ranked virtually all members of an entire society according to unequal amounts of prestige, authority, power or wealth individuals may claim.<sup>2</sup> Other sociologists have studied differences which exist not only between ranks of the larger social order, but also within a stratum of the social order. In these analyses some members have been accorded more esteem than others on the bases of evaluational criteria which have relevance with the stratum.<sup>3</sup> Barber states:

Since every social role and activity in a society is evaluated in some respect, every social role and activity of an individual is potentially [italics in the original] a criterion of evaluation, or a basis, by which his position in the system of stratification is determined. . . . This ambiguity causes certain ranking problems for complex modern industrial societies. For how are highly specialized

---

<sup>2</sup>Milton L. Barron, Contemporary Sociology: An Introductory Textbook of Readings (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1964), pp. 395-96.

<sup>3</sup>For a detailed description of subtle but definite differential ranking of this type see William F. Whyte, Street Corner Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943).

roles of one kind to be compared with highly specialized roles of another kind, if each kind is in general [italics in the original] valued about equally.<sup>4</sup>

Barber notes the problem is reduced by "role insulation" in which various members of occupational groups, such as doctors, professors, businessmen, diplomats, navy officers, and religious leaders tend to associate informally far more among themselves than with members of other groups.<sup>5</sup> And as for differentiation within these groups, Barber observes that members of each insulated group do know how to judge among themselves, even though they may not be able to judge among members of groups with a different occupational specialty.<sup>6</sup>

Status equals within an occupational group (or within an organization) may perform in such a manner that their activities cause them to be differ-

---

<sup>4</sup>Barber, op. cit., p. 19 and 22.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

entiated and ranked within their own stratum by their peers. It is this differential ranking which arises among status equals in larger status structures that will be the concern of this paper.

In this context, status can denote deference given among status equals which tends to differentiate individuals on the basis of an affect structure among all who interact. Toby defines social stratification as "the organization of deference."<sup>7</sup> An individual's status is viewed as the consensus prevailing in his peer group regarding how much deference he is entitled to receive and from whom. Goffman defines deference as:

. . . that component of activity which functions as a symbolic means by which appreciation is regularly conveyed to [italics in the original] a recipient. . . . or of something which this recipient is taken as a symbol, extension or agent.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>Jackson Toby, Contemporary Society (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964), p. 214.

<sup>8</sup>Erving Goffman, "The Nature of Deference and Demeanor," American Anthropologist, 58:477, June, 1956.

Goffman delineates these marks of devotion as ways in which an actor celebrates and confirms his relation to a recipient. The individual may desire, earn, and deserve deference, but he is not allowed to give it to himself, being forced to seek it from others.<sup>9</sup>

In this view, intra-status relationships are a consequence of an affect structure in which some members are afforded more and some less deference than others. Deference, as Goffman notes, is a feeling expressed by symbolic means in which appreciation is regularly conveyed from one person to another. The structure of this affect system can be shown by sociometric data which is one measure of the amount of deference accorded various members of a peer group. The results would differentiate individuals on the basis of an affect structure in which some members are appreciated more than others.

Normatively defined patterns of social distance which exist between the strata in an organization

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 478.

tend to reinforce inter-status differentiation. The behavior of individuals in each stratum is constrained by a mutually recognized set of rules and obligations which function to integrate their individual action so that the organization proceeds toward its goals and objectives.<sup>10</sup> Manipulation of social distance between the strata becomes a factor affecting the deference system. This is probably intensified within a mobility-blocked stratum.<sup>11</sup>

The difference between superordinates and sub-

---

<sup>10</sup>Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), p. 195.

<sup>11</sup>Harvey L. Smith has characterized positions in the formal status structure of hospitals as "blocked mobility." The concept refers to the inability of persons to progress from one status level to the next. Where mobility is blocked, one would expect to find substitutes for promotion in the form of seeking significant social contacts and reducing social distance from superordinates. See Harvey L. Smith "The Sociological Study of Hospitals" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1949), footnoted in Robert Ferrucci, "Social Distance Strategies and Intra-organizational Stratification: A Study of the Status System on a Psychiatric Ward," American Sociological Review, 28:952, December, 1963.

ordinates in an organization is advertised by symbols which both understand. Symbols are commonly shared in the symmetrical relations of status equals but uncommonly shared in the asymmetrical relations between unequals. Consider the rules that govern linguistic symbols in a dyadic relationship. Hi is used mutually between intimates and non-reciprocally from superior to subordinate; Good morning is used mutually between strangers and non-reciprocally from subordinate to superior.<sup>12</sup> Brown notes further evidence of this phenomenon:

From whom does one feel free to borrow a pocket comb? The business executives told us they could ask for the comb of an intimate and also of a subordinate. But one cannot make such a request of either a stranger or superior. We asked about many behaviors of this kind. What sort of associate can one slap on the back? Again, we found, either an intimate or subordinate but not a stranger or superior.<sup>13</sup>

Brown states that acts of intimate association between persons of unequal status will exert forces

---

<sup>12</sup>Robert Brown, Social Psychology (New York: The Free Press, 1965), p. 95.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

toward the equalization of status:

This means that the member of the dyad who has less status should be motivated to increase the intimacy of the interaction since he stands to gain while the person of higher status should be motivated to resist such intimacy.<sup>14</sup>

The subordinate stands to gain status by minimizing social distance with the superordinate but the latter will lose status. Normatively, however, organizational culture rules that initiation of intimacy must come from above thereby reducing rebuffs and antagonism which may otherwise be suffered by the lower-status individual. Brown observes that a "universal norm" of superordinates initiating interaction with subordinates may then represent a social arrangement that serves to minimize antagonism between status levels.<sup>15</sup>

Symmetrical relations then, occur within each stratum and serve as a means of reinforcing inter-status differentiation and social distance. A person who attempts to manipulate social distance by seeking

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 97.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 99. ||



symbols of superiors may in the process, notes Brown, initiate intra-status differentiation and find that he is accorded less deference from his peers.

Goffman notes the same phenomenon:

Between status equals we may expect to find interaction guided by symmetrical familiarity. Between superordinate and subordinate we may expect to find asymmetrical relations, the superordinate having the right to exercise certain familiarities which the subordinate is not allowed to reciprocate. Thus, in the research hospital, doctors tended to call nurses by their first name, while the nurses responded with 'polite' or 'formal' address.<sup>16</sup>

The failure to so conduct interaction constitutes a breach of etiquette for the normative pattern of maintaining social distance has been violated.

Each position in the formal hierarchy of an organization has its relevant symbols in the form of activities, speech patterns (e.g., forms of address), and the like.<sup>17</sup> Symbols may be differentiated as "public" and "private" symbols. Public symbols refer

---

<sup>16</sup>Goffman, op. cit., pp. 481-82.

<sup>17</sup>James M. Beshers, Ephraim H. Mizruchi, and Robert Perrucci, "Social Distance Strategies and Status Symbols: An Approach to the Study of Social Structure," Purdue University, Mimeo, p. 320.

to knowledge of the activities, duties, norms and values attached to a particular status position.

They are public in the sense that they involve shared information among all the statuses in the organization regarding organizational activities. Private symbols refer to information regarding the personal, extra-organizational aspects of the occupant of particular status positions, e.g., first name interaction, information regarding families, and personal values and attitudes.<sup>18</sup> A subordinate can minimize distance between himself and a superordinate by gaining access to the private symbols of the superordinate. On the other hand, access to the public symbols of a particular superordinate position does not minimize distance with the superordinate since such information is part of the public domain.

Perrucci found that inter-status relationships

---

<sup>18</sup>"Public" and "private" symbols were brought to the attention of the author by Robert Perrucci who utilized the terms in his study of social distance patterns on a psychiatric ward in a state mental hospital. See Perrucci, op. cit., pp. 951-62.

between patients and staff on a psychiatric ward in a mental hospital had relevance for an intra-organizational stratification system in which patients who minimized social distance from staff personnel were afforded less deference than others.<sup>19</sup> This thesis is designed to test, in another organizational setting, Perrucci's finding.

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### I. RESEARCH TRADITION

One of the main features of norms of interaction is a definition of the "proper" social distance between actors. Park notes that all individuals in their personal relationships are clearly conscious of degrees of intimacy, i.e., of social distance. When A is closer to B than C, "the degree of this intimacy measures the influence which each has over the other."<sup>1</sup> Park observes further that the degree of intimacy which is allowed is normatively defined for the situation. He gives an example of the lady of the house who is on close personal relations with her cook, but these personal relations are maintained only so long as the cook retains her "proper" place. Informal face-to-face interaction may occur between the two persons in the kitchen with the norms of the status differential relaxed, but in the parlor the norms are rigidly defined.

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert E. Park, "The Concept of Social Distance," Journal of Applied Sociology, 8:339, 1923.

The anthropologist Malinowski notes a normative patterning of social distance among the Trobriand Islanders. Within the total culture of the Trobrianders, success with women confers honor and prestige on a man. Malinowski states:

Sexual prowess is a positive value, a moral virtue. But if a rank-and-file Trobriander has 'too many' triumphs of the heart, an achievement which should of course be limited to the elite, the chiefs or men of power, then this glorious record becomes a scandal and an abomination. The chiefs are quick to resent any personal achievement not warranted by social position [italics in the original]. The moral virtues remain virtues only so long as they are jealously confined to the proper in-group.<sup>2</sup>

Poole attempted to systematize the concept of social distance by delineating two forms--social and personal distance. Social distance applies to the situation described by Malinowski in which distance involves the regard one has for another as a representative of a group or collectively.<sup>3</sup> It is what the characteristic member of the in-group thinks of the

---

<sup>2</sup>Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), p. 429.

<sup>3</sup>Willard C. Poole, "Distance in Sociology," American Journal of Sociology, 33:102, July, 1927.

typical member of the out-group. Personal distance, on the other hand, is related to the face-to-face relationship described by Park in which distance is based on the regard one has for another individual. The distance between two persons is the extent to which one of the individuals is aware that a common life of ideas, beliefs, and sentiments is not shared between the other. It is the basis of one person's attitude toward another.<sup>4</sup>

Social distance does not apply only to personal relationships whether social or personal in character. Merton notes the development of social distance as an aspect of superordinate-subordinate positions in a bureaucratic setting.

A formal, rationally organized social structure involves clearly defined patterns of activity in which, ideally, every series of actions is functionally related to the purposes of the organization. In such an organization there is integrated a series of offices, or hierarchized statuses, in which inhere a number of obligations and privileges closely defined by limited and specific rules. . . . The system of prescribed

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 100.

relations between the various offices involves a considerable degree of formality and clearly defined social relations between the occupants of these positions. . . . formality facilitates the interaction of the occupants. . . . since the actions of both are constrained by a mutually recognized set of rules.<sup>5</sup>

A number of investigators have identified aspects of actions constrained by a mutually recognized set of rules.<sup>6</sup> However, the usefulness of these

---

<sup>5</sup>Merton, op. cit., p. 195.

<sup>6</sup>Kadushin found that a high degree of social distance between client and professional impedes stable client-professional relationships. Charles Kadushin, "Social Distance Between Client and Professional," American Journal of Sociology, 67:517-32, March, 1962; Pearlman and Rosenberg found that status distance is maximized among staff of comparatively high position, who are obeisant toward their superiors and whose mobility aspirations are blocked. Leonard Pearlman and Morris Rosenberg, "Nurse-Patient Social Distance and the Structural Context of a Mental Hospital," American Sociological Review, 27:56-65, February, 1962; Seeman and Evans found that differences in medical performance and practice were associated with different degrees of stratification on hospital wards to which interns were assigned. Melvin Seeman and John Evans, "Stratification and Hospital Care: I. The Performance of the Medical Interns," American Sociological Review, 26:67-80, February, 1961; Cummings found evidence to support the assumption that subordinates in any inter-status relationship would be concerned with minimizing distance up, while superordinates would be concerned with maximizing distance down or maintaining existing distance patterns. Carolyn L. Cummings, "Social Structure, Social Distance and Therapeutic Relationships in a State Mental Hospital" (unpublished Master's thesis, Purdue University, 1963); Perrucci's findings have a direct relationship to

studies is impeded by the lack of an organized conceptual framework. As Seeman and Evans point out, ". . . sociological theory has been excessively concerned with stratification in the community and too little concerned with organizational stratification."<sup>7</sup> They conclude that the key trouble is that an adequate theory of stratification directly relevant to organizational functioning is not available.<sup>8</sup> Thus, the difficult task remains of providing a well-grounded rationale for findings in these types of experiments.

One attempt to provide a rationale for findings of this nature is furnished by Goffman. He directs his attention to the development of a conceptual framework:

. . . when unusual intimacies and relationships do occur across the staff-inmate line, we

---

the present study and will be examined in greater detail later in this chapter. Robert Perrucci, "Social Distance Strategies and Intra-organizational Stratification: A Study of the Status System on a Psychiatric Ward," American Sociological Review, 28:951-62, December, 1963.

<sup>7</sup>Seeman and Evans, op. cit., p. 68.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 78-9.



know that involvement cycles may follow and all kinds of awkward reverberations are likely to occur, with a subversion of authority and social distance that again gives one the impression of an incest taboo operating within total institutions.<sup>9</sup>

Extrapolating from a dramaturgical model, Goffman speculates as to why social distance is functional in bureaucratic settings. He states that any extra concession to the audience on the part of one member of the team is a threat to the stand the others have taken and a threat to the security they obtain from knowing the stand they will have to take. He observes that when particular performers cross the line that separates the teams, a circuit of reverberations is set up which affects the subordinate team, the superordinate, and the particular transgressors.<sup>10</sup>

In applying these insights to a total institution, Goffman states that conformity to normative expectations

---

<sup>9</sup>Erving Goffman, Asylums (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1961), p. 93.

<sup>10</sup>Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1959), p. 201.

in such a social system includes inmates maintaining social distance from staff in order to maintain the inmate culture:

. . . the expectation that group loyalty should prevail forms part of the inmate culture and underlies the hostility accorded those who break inmate solidarity.<sup>11</sup>

The work most relevant to a study of social distance in an inmate culture is reported by Perrucci in a study of an intra-organizational stratification system among patients on a psychiatric ward in a mental hospital.<sup>12</sup> He found that the inter-status relationships between patients and staff had relevance for the intra-status relationships of patients themselves; social distance strategies between patients and staff were related to a deference system operating among the patients which tended to differentiate within the status group.

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 61. The similarity to the type of hostility which Bierstedt describes as a result of in-group cohesion and out-group threat is readily apparent. See Robert Bierstedt, The Social Order (New York: McGraw Hill Company, 1957), pp. 263-68.

<sup>12</sup>Perrucci, op. cit.

Perrucci assumes that within an organization, especially within a "mobility-blocked" caste-like structure, each person is concerned with maintaining or advancing his relative position in the strata. Under these circumstances one strategy by which mobility is achieved is minimizing social distance from superordinate levels and maximizing social distance from subordinate levels.<sup>13</sup> He suggests that intra-organizational stratification be conceptualized as a series of interlocking social distance patterns in which the manipulation of social distance constitutes reward and punishment.<sup>14</sup> Thus, Perrucci contends that differentiation of persons within the same stratum of an organization develops, in part, when certain individuals attempt to minimize social distance with those in authority and find reward in the attention they receive. At the same time these individuals appear to lose status in the eyes of their peers who find reward in interacting with each other. A patient who minimizes social

---

<sup>13</sup>Cummings, op. cit., p. 6.

<sup>14</sup>Perrucci, op. cit.

distance with staff occupies a position of low status in the affect structure of his peer group.

It has been observed that conformity to a normative pattern of maintaining social distance between strata in an organization can be, in part, a means of acquiring deference from status equals.<sup>15</sup> Further evidence is provided by Roethlisberger and Dickson in Management and the Worker. They find that the "rate-buster" who violates the informal production norms is held in low esteem by his fellow workers.<sup>16</sup> This illustrates the defensive informal organization which tends to arise among members of the in-group whenever there is an apparent threat to the integrity of the group.

If, within organizations, an in-group and out-group phenomenon occurs in mobility-blocked strata, the

---

<sup>15</sup>Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, p. 61.

<sup>16</sup>George C. Homans, The Human Group (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Incorporated, 1950), p. 60.

differentiation of the members must be related to some type of behavior exhibited by the actors in the out-group. Roethlisberger and Dickson find that the worker excluded from the in-group attempts to raise his rate of production above that normatively prescribed by his peers; Goffman finds that any inmate who crosses the staff-inmate line will be the object of hostility by those of the inmate culture; and Perrucci finds that if patients attempt to minimize social distance with staff personnel they occupy a low status position in their peer group. Each of these findings indicates a relationship existing between an affect structure operating in a mobility-blocked stratum and social distance strategies employed by members of the out-group in interaction with superordinates in the organization.

## II. HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED

Two hypotheses can be derived from this research tradition. First, it is hypothesized that in a bureaucratic setting the frequency of public contacts initiated by subordinate individuals with superordinate personnel does not affect the status position of the

subordinate in his peer group. In other words, the maintenance of normatively defined social distance does not affect the deference accorded an individual by his peers. Secondly, it is hypothesized that in a bureaucratic setting the greater the frequency of private contacts initiated by subordinate individuals with superordinate personnel, the greater the likelihood the subordinate will also occupy a low status position in his peer group. In other words, a subordinate who is attempting to minimize social distance with superordinates will lose deference in the affect structure of his peer group.

Differentiating between "public" and "private" contacts refines the measurement of the effect of interaction on intra-status relationships. It specifies further contingencies of Homans' propositions that "the more a man interacts with another, the more he likes him," and "the higher the esteem in which a man is held, the more interaction he receives from other members of his group."<sup>17</sup> This paper will examine

---

<sup>17</sup>George C. Homans, Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Incorporated, 1961), p. 203.

some of the conditions under which one is held in high or low esteem within a stratum by examining the relationship between liking and kinds of contact among status unequals in an organization.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### I. THE RESEARCH SITE

With the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the United States Congress launched a "War on Poverty" across the nation. By June 30, 1964, every major city had instituted planning to attack the problem of poverty and 500 community action programs had been initiated.<sup>1</sup> As one solution to combat the effects of poverty, the Opportunity Act authorized the establishment of a Job Corps (Title I, Part A). The law states in part:

The purpose of this part is to prepare for the responsibilities of citizenship and to increase the employability of young men and young women aged sixteen through twenty-one by providing them in rural and urban residential centers with education, vocational training, useful work experience, including work directed toward the conservation of natural resources, and other appropriate activities.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>United States Office of Economic Opportunity, Congressional Presentation, Vol. I (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 8.

<sup>2</sup>United States Office of Economic Opportunity, Establishment of Job Corps Training Centers for Women (Washington: Government Printing Office, November 16, 1964), p. 1.



An urban Job Corps center for women is located in Omaha, Nebraska, and provides an excellent organizational setting to test the hypotheses of this study. The Omaha center is situated in a large hotel in the center of the city. The enrollee capacity of the center is 335 girls.

Within the Job Corps Center there exist clearly defined norms regulating social distance patterns between a superordinate position occupied by counselors and a subordinate position occupied by enrollees. These status positions provide maximum opportunity for contacts between enrollees and staff, i.e., between subordinates and superordinates, within the organization.

It is the duty of the Resident Counselor to place special emphasis "on the face-to-face relationship between herself and the enrollee, providing assistance to the enrollee which will lead to greater self-understanding and acceptance."<sup>3</sup> In addition, the counselors

---

<sup>3</sup>Burroughs Corporation, Defense and Space Group, Radnor Division, Job Corps Training Center for Women at Omaha, Nebraska (Submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity in response to RFP No. 2. Paoli, Pennsylvania: Burroughs Corporation, March 2, 1965), Ch. 3, p. 1.

have the most primary and direct contact with the enrollee:

The Resident Counselor will live on the same floor as the enrollees assigned to her and will be available, if called, throughout the day and night. . . . The Resident Counselor will have first-level purview of all activities of the enrollees, including their education, recreation, and leisure time, as well as their aspirations, accomplishments, difficulties, and deportment.<sup>4</sup>

## II. POPULATION AND SAMPLE

Each individual in the enrollee population of the Omaha Job Corps is screened prior to their acceptance into the program by the Women in Community Service (WICS), a national volunteer organization. The WICS volunteers are instructed to make certain that every enrollee comes from a "culturally disadvantaged" home environment in which the physical and emotional conditions offer no opportunity for the girl to become an effective and employable citizen.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., Ch. 3, p. 2.

<sup>5</sup>A detailed screening manual is provided for this purpose. See United States Office of Economic Opportunity, Handbook for Job Corps Screening (Washington: Government Printing Office, January 20, 1965).

The girls range from sixteen through twenty-one years of age. Every geographical region in the United States is represented. The girls come from over forty different states and, with only a few exceptions, none of the girls know one another before they arrive at the Center. At the time of the study three hundred and seven enrollees were in residence.

All 307 were requested to complete a sociometric questionnaire in which they were asked: "If you were given the choice of four girls in the Center you would like to have as a roommate, which four girls would you choose?" and "What four girls would you not prefer to have as a roommate?" (See Appendix A). These sociometric choices were made by all the girls at one time in order to prevent collusion. Two hundred and forty girls (78.2 per cent) filled out the questionnaire.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>It was impossible to get a 100 per cent turnout for any activity, meeting, or function which involved large numbers of enrollees in the Omaha Job Corps Center.

The sample consists of two groups. The first group contains those girls who received six or more favorable roommate choices; the second group contains those girls who received six or more unfavorable roommate choices. The former group, the high status group, is comprised of thirty-four girls and the latter, the low status group, contains thirty individuals.<sup>7</sup>

The range of choices, as expected, included most of the girls participating. Only twenty (8.3 per cent) received no positive choices, and eighty-one (33.4 per cent) received no negative choice. However, an overchosen group was clearly defined for both the positive and negative choices. Thirty-five girls (13.9 per cent) received six or more positive choices, and thirty-four girls (18.1 per cent) received six or more negative choices. Table 1.

---

<sup>7</sup>Not included in the low status group are three enrollees who were sent home prior to the experimental period. Also, one girl appeared in both overchosen groups (she received seven favorable and seven unfavorable roommate choices) and was excluded from the sample.

TABLE I  
CHOICE PATTERNS FOR ROOMMATE PREFERENCE  
OF A GROUP OF 240 JOB CORPS GIRLS

Roommate Preference	Number of Girls Receiving Choices		
	<u>5 or fewer</u>	<u>6 or more*</u>	<u>Total</u>
Positive	216	35	251**
Negative	154	34***	188

\*One girl was later excluded from each sample population since she appeared in both the overchosen positive and overchosen negative group.

\*\*The total number of positive choices exceeds 240 since the choices were made from a population of 307.

\*\*\*Three girls were sent home prior to the experimental period.

This sampling procedure serves to maximize the difference in affect structure by clearly differentiating those accorded maximum deference and those not receiving deference from peers. The two samples represent the dependent variable for the hypotheses in the study since they delineate the status position

occupied by an enrollee in her peer group.

### III. DEFINITIONS

As noted in Chapter Two this study proposes to test the following hypotheses:

(1) In a bureaucratic setting the frequency of public contacts initiated by subordinate individuals with superordinate personnel does not affect the status position of the subordinate in his peer group; and

(2) In a bureaucratic setting the greater the frequency of private contacts initiated by subordinate individuals with superordinate personnel, the greater the likelihood the subordinate will also occupy a low status position in his peer group.

The quantitative and qualitative measures of subordinate-superordinate contacts represent the independent variable for the hypotheses in the study. The dependent variable is represented by the hierarchical position a subordinate occupies in the affect structure of her peer group. For this study the subordinate population consists of Omaha Job Corps enrollees and the superordinate positions are those of Resident Counselors.

A contact is defined as an exchange of verbal

or nonverbal symbols between two interacting individuals of unequal status which takes place in the organizational setting and is identified and recorded by the Resident Counselors during the experimental period. A private contact is viewed as an enrollee attempt to minimize social distance with staff personnel by seeking personal or extra-organizational knowledge of the staff person, i.e., first name interaction, information regarding families, and personal values and attitudes. A public contact is viewed as an enrollee attempt to seek knowledge of the normal organizational duties, activities, values, and responsibilities of the staff person or staff position, i.e., information which is shared among all the statuses in the organization, thus public contacts do not constitute the minimizing of social distance with staff personnel.

Status refers to an enrollee's position in relation to her peers, i.e., her status equals, determined by an affect structure operating within the group in which some girls are given more deference than others. As noted above, on the basis of a

sociometric questionnaire, an enrollee receiving six or more choices as a desirable roommate was designated as occupying a high status position in her peer group. An enrollee receiving six or more undesirable roommate choices was designated as occupying a low status position in her peer group.

#### IV. DATA COLLECTION

The sociometric test was administered by seven Resident Counselors on their respective floors at the same hour. The enrollees were given instructions and asked to fill out the choices independently. Those girls (twenty) who refused to fill out the questionnaire were permitted to leave the room.

One week following the selection of the two sample populations, seventeen Resident Counselors recorded all interaction which occurred between themselves and the enrollees appearing in the two groups for a period of five days.<sup>8</sup> Whenever, in the course of

---

<sup>8</sup>Twenty-four Resident Counselors were employed at the time of the study. Seven of these could not participate in the collection of data, two because of illness, and the other five because they had been on duty for only three weeks and could not recognize the subjects in the two sample groups.



their daily activities and duties, the counselors found themselves in a contact situation with an enrollee who initiated the interaction, they recorded the contact situation using quotes or a few brief sentences which would provide a description revealing the substance of the contact. Immediately thereafter they categorized the contact as either "private" or "public," i.e., as either minimizing social distance or not minimizing social distance (see Appendices B and C).<sup>9</sup>

Prior to the test period a training session was held with the counselors informing them of procedures and providing them an opportunity to ask questions. Probable contact situations were role-played by various counselors in the group.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>The counselors were instructed to record each contact as soon as possible after the interaction had occurred.

<sup>10</sup>The counselors were given no clue as to the aim or purpose of the study. They were informed that to tell them the hypotheses might result in a bias in their recording of contacts.

Typical contact situations appear below as they were recorded. They are illustrative of the nature of public and private contacts as perceived and classified by the various Resident Counselors.<sup>11</sup>

Public contacts: 'I won't be able to come to speech club tonight.' 'Welcome back Miss \_\_\_\_\_, when can I get my shoes?' 'I didn't get a chance to talk with Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ today, but I will first thing tomorrow.' 'Hi Miss \_\_\_\_\_, what would you do if you were in my position? (Discussion of what Carol plans to do after she graduates).'

Private contacts: 'Hi beautiful! What 'cha doin? Are you busy? . . . . I'm mad! What time are you going to your room?' 'Hi Sad Sack, why aren't you smiling today?' 'Okay, today you'll be Sad Sack all day.' 'Hi, how's my girl today?' 'Were you and Miss \_\_\_\_\_ always this crazy when you were in college?' 'Miss \_\_\_\_\_ are you a good friend of Miss \_\_\_\_\_?'

Several contact situations were very similar in content but were classified differently by the counselors. Although in some instances these discrepancies may be due to individual differences among

---

<sup>11</sup>The statements are taken verbatim from the instrument provided the counselors for the purpose of recording the contact situations. (See Appendix F for further examples.)

the counselors in terms of their perception of social distance patterns, many times the difference was due to the situational context.

#### V. DATA ANALYSIS

The significance of the attempt to reduce social distance will be ascertained by testing the statistical significance of the difference between the high status and low status groups' use of public and private symbols. The null hypotheses to be tested against their alternatives are: (1) The two samples come from populations which do not differ significantly in their mean number of public contacts, and the alternative hypothesis, the two samples come from populations which do differ significantly in their mean number of public contacts; and (2) The two samples come from populations in which the mean number of private contacts for the high status sample is equal to or significantly greater than the mean number of private contacts for the low status sample, and the alternative hypothesis, the two samples

come from populations in which the mean number of private contacts for the low status sample is significantly greater than the mean number of private contacts for the high status sample. A two-tailed test of significance will be used for the first hypothesis, but, since the direction of difference is predicted in the second hypothesis, a one-tailed test of significance will be used. A t test will test the degree of significance at a .05 level of confidence.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Does the quantity and quality of enrollee-staff contacts for overchosen individuals high on positive and negative roommate choices vary systematically with the status position occupied by the girls in the status hierarchy (affect structure) of their peer group? The following hypotheses are formulated in an attempt to answer this question:

(1) In a bureaucratic setting the frequency of public contacts initiated by subordinate individuals with superordinate personnel does not affect the status position of the subordinate in his peer group; and

(2) In a bureaucratic setting the greater the frequency of private contacts initiated by subordinate individuals with superordinate personnel, the greater the likelihood the subordinate will also occupy a low status position in his peer group.

#### I. TEST OF HYPOTHESES

The data show that the range of public contacts is 1 to 18 for the high status group and 0 to 18 for the low status group. The high status group has a standard deviation of 8.66 and 9.55 is the standard

deviation for the low status group. The modal number of contacts is similar for each group--6 for the high status group and 7 for the low status group (Appendix D).

The high status group and the low status group, exhibit similar means in regard to public contacts with staff personnel. A t test of the significance of difference between the means of the two groups reveals that there is no significant difference. Since no relationship was predicted in regard to public contacts, hypothesis one is supported. There is every indication that public contacts are not related to the status (affect) position occupied by the subordinate in her peer group.

However, with regard to private contacts a different pattern is revealed. The range of contacts is 0 to 31 for the high status group, however, only one high status girl sought private symbols on more than 19 different occasions and she had a total of 31 contacts. There were 5 high status girls who did not seek private symbols. The range for the low status group is 1 to 41. A measure of the dispersion of contacts in each group shows a standard deviation of 8.43 for the high status group and 15.99 for the low status

group. This indicates greater variability within the low status group in the number of occasions on which the girls sought private symbols (Appendix E).

Enrollees high on positive roommate choices show a mean of 5.62 private contacts during the five-day recording period, while on the other hand, enrollees high on negative roommate preference show a mean of 11.77 private contacts during the recording session. A t test of the significance of difference between the means of the two groups reveals that there is a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence. Since the substantive hypothesis predicted a relationship in this direction in regard to private contacts, hypothesis two is supported. These data support the contention that private contacts with superordinate personnel are related to the low status (affect) position occupied by a subordinate in her peer group.

## II. ANALYSIS OF DEVIANT CASES

The finding of no significant difference in regard to public contacts and status position is as

predicted and can be accepted with little difficulty. However, further inspection of the data with regard to private contacts raises questions. As predicted the low status group sought private symbols more frequently than the high status group, but when the data is examined more closely (see grouped data, Table 2) two groups of deviant cases are identified. One, high status girls who seek private symbols and do not lose deference (one-fourth or 23.5 per cent of the high status group) and two, low status girls who do not compensate for low status by seeking private symbols (two-thirds or 66.6 per cent of the low status group). Table 3. These individuals do not conform to the expectations of the study in the sense that high status girls minimized distance from superordinates above the norm of their high status partners (6 or fewer contacts), and low status girls do not minimize distance from superordinates as would be expected from the norm of their group (12 or fewer contacts). Not only do the deviants run counter to the expectations of the study, they represent nearly one-fourth of the high status group and two-thirds of the low status group.



TABLE II

PRIVATE CONTACTS AMONG HIGH POSITIVE SUBJECTS  
IN THE OMAHA JOB CORPS CENTER

No. of Contacts	Hi Positives (N=34)	
	No.	%
7 and over . . . . .	8	23.5
0 - 6 . . . . .	26	76.5
Total . . . . .	34	100.0

TABLE III

PRIVATE CONTACTS AMONG HIGH NEGATIVE  
SUBJECTS IN THE OMAHA JOB CORPS CENTER

No. of Contacts	Hi Negatives (N=30)	
	No.	%
13 and over . . . . .	10	33.3
0 - 12 . . . . .	20	66.7
Total . . . . .	30	100.0

This clearly points to the danger of interpreting in a cause-effect framework as Perrucci does.<sup>1</sup> Further, it points to the fact that while a statistical test of the group data supports the hypotheses, such a test is obscuring a large proportion of individual deviants.

Some explanation for this finding is sought in additional data collected as well as in records provided by the Job Corps Center. The high status and low status deviants were isolated and the following factors were examined to see if an explanation might be found.

In regard to the high status deviants it was first ascertained that the deviants were not an artifact of reporting of contacts by the counselors or

---

<sup>1</sup>Perrucci states, "The rejection of these patients, by other patients, is not simply the result of 'doing favors' for staff or being closely identified with them but is primarily due to their attempt to maximize social distance from other patients and minimize social distance from staff." See Robert Perrucci, "Social Distance Strategies and Intra-organizational Stratification: A Study of the Status System on a Psychiatric Ward," American Sociological Review, 28:955, December, 1963.

sociometric choices by girls living on their respective floors. The eight girls were distributed among six different counselors on six different floors.

Data were examined for the deviant and non-deviant high status girls in regard to racial distribution and amount of education completed. In each case no differences were found nor were they found to differ by geographical region of origin or by urban-rural background.

The next area of investigation was to ascertain whether or not the high status deviants received roommate preference from low status girls thus accounting for their high status position. A thorough examination of choice patterns revealed no such pattern. High negative girls did not give the high positive deviants enough choices to account for their high status in the peer group.

Leadership was next examined as a possible explanation. Homans interprets Jennings' data as indicating that established leaders may ignore group

norms.<sup>2</sup> The Department of Evaluation and Guidance had added a question to the sociometric instrument which asked: "If a Student Court is organized, what girl on your floor would you like to see as a judge on that Court?" (see Appendix A). Although this dimension of deference was not part of the original study, the data allowed an examination of the relationship between leadership and choice patterns.

Only two of the eight high status deviants were selected as leaders. Each received the second highest number of choices on their respective floors. On the other hand, three of the non-deviants were selected as the first leader and one as the second leader on their respective floors. Leadership, then, does not seem to offer an adequate explanation for the deviant cases.

One final attempt was made to uncover an explanation for the unexpected results in the high

---

<sup>2</sup>George C. Homans, Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Incorporated, 1961), pp. 324-27.

status group. A comparison was made between the deviant and non-deviant girls on the basis of the number of positive and negative roommate choices each received from the enrollee population. Since a girl was afforded deference--a high status position--due to six or more favorable roommate choices on a sociometric questionnaire, it might be significant if she also received a number of unfavorable choices. For example, if a girl received six favorable choices and five unfavorable choices as opposed to six favorable choices and no unfavorable choices for another girl, there would be a clear difference in the deference pattern. Accordingly, the two groups, deviant and non-deviant, were compared along these dimensions.

Table 4 reveals no significant difference between the two groups in regard to positive roommate choices. Each group received an approximate mean of seven favorable choices from their peers, and the dispersion of contacts indicated by the standard deviation scores is similar.

TABLE IV  
 POSITIVE ROOMMATE CHOICE PATTERNS AMONG DEVIANT  
 AND NON-DEVIANT HIGH POSITIVE SUBJECTS

No. of Positive Choices	Deviants (N=8)	Non-Deviants (N=26)
10 . . . . .	0	. . . . . 3
9 . . . . .	1	. . . . . 1
8 . . . . .	1	. . . . . 5
7 . . . . .	3	. . . . . 3
6 . . . . .	3	. . . . . 14
	$\bar{X} = 7.00$	$\bar{X} = 7.08$
	S.D. = 7.072	S.D. = 7.21

$t = .027$

$P > .05$

Inspection of Table 5, however, reveals the first evidence disclosing a difference between the two groups. The deviant group received a mean of 3.14 negative roommate choices as opposed to a mean of .73 negative roommate choices for the non-deviant group. These figures when compared with those in Table 5 show a clear difference in the affect pattern

of high status girls. The deviant group, although high on roommate preference, received more negative choices than the latter. A  $t$  score of 1.697 indicates a significant difference between the two means at a .05 level of confidence.

TABLE V

NEGATIVE ROOMMATE CHOICE PATTERNS AMONG DEVIANT  
AND NON-DEVIANT HIGH POSITIVE SUBJECTS

No. of Negative Choices	Deviants (N=8)	Non-Deviants (N=26)
5 . . . . .	3	0
4 . . . . .	2	0
3 . . . . .	0	4
2 . . . . .	0	0
1 . . . . .	2	7
0 . . . . .	1	15
	$\bar{X} = 3.14$	$\bar{X} = .73$
	S.D.=3.69	S.D.=1.29

$t = 1.697$

$P < .05$

Although Tables 4 and 5 offer no real explanation for the deviant findings in the high status group they do indicate a difference in the affect structure. Turning now to the findings in the low status group, the deviant girls will be examined along the same dimensions discussed above.

Twenty girls (66.7 per cent of the low status group) sought fewer private contacts than their low status partners who conformed to the expectations of the study. First it was ascertained that the deviants were not an artifact of reporting of contacts by the counselors or sociometric choices by girls living on their respective floors. The twenty girls were distributed among thirteen different counselors on seven different floors.

As in the high status group, the deviants and non-deviants were examined in regard to racial distribution and amount of education completed. In each case no differences were found among the low status girls. The enrollees' geographical region of origin and urban-rural background also showed no dissimilarities.



An investigation ascertaining whether or not non-deviants in the high status group afforded the low status deviants positive choices (or vice-versa) showed that such a pattern was not the case. There was no relationship between low status deviants and high status non-deviants in terms of positive roommate choices.

As expected there was not a prevalence of leadership choices among the low status girls. One girl, however, a low status non-deviant, was chosen as the first leader on her floor. No other low status girl received leadership status.

Finally, an attempt was made to see if an affect pattern similar to the pattern identified in the high status group was apparent among the low status girls. Since a girl was afforded a low status position due to six or more unfavorable roommate choices, it might be significant if she also received a number of positive choices. For example, if a girl received six negative choices and five positive choices as compared to six negative choices and no positive

choices for another girl, there would be a clear difference in the affect structure of the low status group. The deviant and non-deviant low status girls were compared along these dimensions.

Tables 6 and 7 reveal no significant differences between the deviant and non-deviant low status girls. Thus the affect structure does not appear to show a dissimilarity between deviants and non-deviants as it did in the high status group.

Analysis of available data offers but one difference between deviants and non-deviants. In the high status group, the deviants received more unfavorable roommate choices from their peers than did the non-deviants. It would be interesting to administer a sociometric questionnaire again in six months to see whether or not at that time the deviants would receive enough negative roommate choices to place them in the low status group.

In summary, the difference between the two sample group means (high status and low status) was significant in regard to private contacts, but it

TABLE VI

NEGATIVE ROOMMATE CHOICE PATTERNS AMONG DEVIANT  
AND NON-DEVIANT HIGH NEGATIVE SUBJECTS

No. of Negative Choices	Deviants (N=20)	Non-Deviants (N=10)
49 . . . . .	0	1
33 . . . . .	1	0
21 . . . . .	0	1
18 . . . . .	1	0
15 . . . . .	0	1
13 . . . . .	1	0
12 . . . . .	1	1
11 . . . . .	3	1
10 . . . . .	1	0
9 . . . . .	1	1
8 . . . . .	3	0
7 . . . . .	3	1
6 . . . . .	5	3
	$\bar{X} = 10.15$	$\bar{X} = 14.20$
	S.D.=11.81	S.D.=18.90

$t = .591$

$P > .05$

TABLE VII

POSITIVE ROOMMATE CHOICE PATTERNS AMONG DEVIANT  
AND NON-DEVIANT HIGH NEGATIVE SUBJECTS

	Deviants (N=20)	Non-Deviants (N=10)
No. of Positive Choices		
3 . . . . .	6	3
2 . . . . .	6	2
1 . . . . .	3	2
0 . . . . .	2	1
	$\bar{X} = 2.35$	$\bar{X} = 2.40$
	S.D. = 2.72	S.D. = 2.79
	$t = .045$	$P > .05$

appears that individual differences within each group (deviant and non-deviant cases) warrant further investigation. There are high status girls who minimize social distance from superordinates and there are low status girls who do not minimize social dis-

tance from superordinates. Why should the former receive deference from their peers and the latter not receive deference from their peers? This study was concerned with descriptive statistical properties of the sample group and not individual properties within each group. Nevertheless, further research should be directed toward these within group differences.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis a research tradition of the study of social structure as it relates to intra-organizational stratification has been extended. The focus has been upon the existence of social distance patterns between subordinate and superordinate positions in the Omaha Women's Job Corps Training Center and the manner in which the manipulation of social distance is a significant aspect of intra-status relationships.

#### I. SOCIAL DISTANCE PATTERNS AND FORMAL STATUS RELATIONSHIPS

The basic assumption derived from the research tradition was that social distance patterns were an empirical reality in inter-status relationships. It was assumed that a normative pattern of maintaining social distance between status unequals existed for individuals in bureaucratic and organizational settings, and specifically, informal group norms prescribed the maintenance of social distance between subordinate and

superordinate positions. Further, it was assumed that failure to adhere to the informal expectation of one's peer group in regard to prescribed social distance would be associated with a low status position, i.e., lack of deference given to the individual by his peers.

It was hypothesized that "public" contacts, i.e., contacts not regarded as attempts to minimize social distance, would not be related to status for the subordinate in his peer group. However, contacts of a "private" nature, i.e., contacts which involved the minimizing of social distance, were expected to be associated with low status accorded the subordinate by his peers. The following hypotheses were formulated and tested.

(1) In a bureaucratic setting the frequency of public contacts initiated by subordinate individuals with superordinate personnel does not affect the status position of the subordinate in his peer group.

It was found that the mean number of public contacts for both high status and low status subordinates was not significantly different. This finding indicates that no relationship exists between gaining access to public symbols of staff and the status position accorded individuals by their peers. The

hypothesis was supported.

(2) In a bureaucratic setting the greater the frequency of private contacts initiated by subordinate individuals with superordinate personnel, the greater the likelihood the subordinate will also occupy a low status position in his peer group.

The data provided support for the above hypothesis. The mean number of private contacts for the low status group was significantly higher than the mean number for the high status group.

Since "private" contacts were operationally defined as subordinate attempts to minimize social distance with staff personnel by seeking extra-organizational information, the findings of this study support Perrucci's findings using the population of a psychiatric ward in a state mental hospital. Both studies indicate that a relationship does exist between social distance patterns and intra-organizational stratification.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert Hanson has noted that very few sociological studies have been replicated in the area of social organization. Robert Hanson, "Evidence and Procedure Characteristics of 'Reliable' Proposition in Social Science," American Journal of Sociology, 68:357-71, January, 1958; Berk found that fewer than twenty-five studies have been replicated with fully one-third of these refuting the original hypotheses. Bernard B. Berk, "Organizational Goals and Inmate Organization," American Journal of Sociology, 71:523, March, 1966.



Further analysis of private contacts raised questions which were not resolved. As expected the low status group sought private symbols more frequently than the high status group, but when the data were examined more closely, two groups of deviant cases were identified. One-fourth of the high status girls minimized social distance from superordinate personnel by seeking private symbols yet did not lose status, and two-thirds of the low status girls did not minimize social distance from superordinates yet occupied low status positions. These findings indicate that while group data for high status and low status girls support the hypotheses there remain a sizeable number of individual deviants in each group.

Some explanation for this finding was sought in additional data collected in the organizational setting. No difference was found between deviants and non-deviants in the low status group. However, in the high status group deviants received a significantly greater number of negative roommate choices than non-deviants. This points to a clear difference

in the affect structure of high status girls. The girls who minimized social distance received more unfavorable roommate choices than the non-deviants who maintained social distance. Nevertheless, these girls continued to receive deference from their peers.

## II. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of this study include the necessity of relying on the subjective judgment of counselors as they classified "public" and "private" contacts in the organizational setting with no strategy for assessing the reliability of their classification. This limitation was recognized and an attempt was made to minimize it by an extensive training session in which the counselors practiced classifying public and private contacts. In the training session the two concepts were demonstrated by having counselors role-play attempts to seek private and public symbols of staff personnel and then discuss classification.

A further limitation was the necessary reliance on the counselors to record each incident or contact

in addition to their regular tasks. Tape-recording each contact would have been valuable but impractical since interaction took place anywhere in the Job Corps Center. In any case the cost of using tape-recorders would have been prohibitive.

### III. IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The findings of this study add to the accumulating data from which an adequate theory of intra-status stratification can be constructed in the future. The data presented in this research were collected in an organizational setting quite different from settings in which the majority of studies of intra-organizational stratification have been conducted--i.e., psychiatric wards, hospitals and mental institutions. Since the data support the results of the research in other organizational settings, greater confidence can be placed in the accumulating findings.

Additional research should be directed toward the analysis of deviant cases. Why do girls who minimize social distance not lose deference from their

peers? Perhaps the deviants in the present study were in the process of either losing or gaining deference as the result of their social distance strategies. The research design, measuring sociometric choices at only one point in time, did not allow this hypothesis to be tested. However, a longitudinal study in which sociometric choices were made six months or so from the completion of the present study would provide a test of this hypothesis.

The situational aspects of each contact between superordinates and subordinates might also provide some explanation for the deviant findings. For example, the minimizing of social distance may be permitted in the snack bar but not allowed in the administrative offices of the organization. As Park implied, the lady of the house can be on close personal relations with her cook in the kitchen where the norms of the status difference are relaxed, but in the parlor the norms are rigidly defined. The instrument used for recording the contacts should, perhaps, have called for a designation of where the interaction took place in the research site.

Stouffer and Toby observed that a description of an institutionalized social norm must take into account not only the beliefs and behavior of a modal member of the group but also the individual variability in the perception of obligations.<sup>2</sup> Of special interest was role-conflict which occurred between one's institutionalized obligations of friendship and one's institutionalized obligations to a society. They suggested that it was possible to order people along a continuum according to a predisposition to select personal considerations in these types of obligations. To the extent that an individual was consistent, in varying types of situations, the tendency was considered a personality predisposition.<sup>3</sup> This suggests that individual differences in preception of group norms might also account for some of the variance in the individual's conception of social distance norms.

---

<sup>2</sup>Samuel A. Stouffer and Jackson Toby, "Role Conflict and Personality," American Journal of Sociology, 56:396, March, 1951.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 395.

In summary, Seeman and Evans have said that sociological theory has been too much concerned with stratification in the community and too little concerned with organizational stratification. The findings of this thesis extend the research tradition of intra-organizational stratification and point to areas which need further clarification. The task at present is to examine those variables which have relevance for intra-organizational stratification and incorporate new sets of variables which, when tested, will lead to the development of middle range theory.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. BOOKS

- Barber, Bernard. Social Stratification: A Comparative Analysis of Structure and Process. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1957.
- Barron, Milton L. Contemporary Sociology: An Introductory Textbook of Readings. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1964.
- Bierstedt, Robert. The Social Order. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1957.
- Brown, Roger. Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Goffman, Erving. Asylums. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1961.
- Goffman, Erving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1959.
- Homans, George C. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Incorporated, 1961.
- Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Incorporated, 1950.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.
- Toby, Jackson. Contemporary Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Whyte, William F. Street Corner Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

## B. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

United States Office of Economic Opportunity. Congressional Presentation, Vol. I. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

United States Office of Economic Opportunity. Establishment of Job Corps Training Centers for Women. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

United States Office of Economic Opportunity. Handbook for Job Corps Screening. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

## C. PERIODICALS

Berk, Bernard B. "Organizational Goals and Inmate Organization," American Journal of Sociology, 71:522-34, March, 1966.

Goffman, Erving. "The Nature of Deference and Demeanor," American Anthropologist, 58:473-501, June, 1956.

Hanson, Robert. "Evidence and Procedure Characteristics of 'Reliable' Propositions in Social Science," American Journal of Sociology, 68:357-71, January, 1958.

Kadushin, Charles. "Social Distance Between Client and Professional," American Journal of Sociology, 67:517-32, March, 1962.

Park, Robert E. "The Concept of Social Distance," Journal of Applied Sociology, 8:339-44, 1923.

Pearlin, Leonard, and Morris Rosenberg. "Nurse-Patient Social Distance and the Structural Context of a Mental Hospital," American Sociological Review, 27:56-65, February, 1962.



- Perrucci, Robert. "Social Distance Strategies and Intra-organizational Stratification: A Study of the Status System on a Psychiatric Ward," American Sociological Review, 28:951-62, December, 1963.
- Poole, Willard C. "Distance in Sociology," American Journal of Sociology, 33:99-104, July, 1927.
- Seeman, Melvin, and John Evans. "Stratification and Hospital Care: I. The Performance of the Medical Interne," American Sociological Review, 26:67-80, February, 1961.
- Stouffer, Samuel A., and Jackson Toby. "Role Conflict and Personality," American Journal of Sociology, 56:395-406, March, 1951.

#### D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Cummings, Carolyn L. "Social Structure, Social Distance and Therapeutic Relationships in a State Mental Hospital." Unpublished Master's thesis, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, 1963.
- Smith, Harvey L. "The Sociological Study of Hospitals." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1949.

#### E. OTHER PUBLICATIONS

- Beshers, James M., Ephraim H. Mizruchi, and Robert Perrucci. "Social Distance Strategies and Status Symbols: An Approach to the Study of Social Structure." Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, 1963. (Mimeographed.)

Burroughs Corporation, Defense and Space Group, Radnor Division. Job Corps Training Center for Women at Omaha, Nebraska. Submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity. Paoli, Pennsylvania: Burroughs Corporation, 1965.

## APPENDIX

## APPENDIX A

## GENERAL INFORMATION SHEET

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Floor \_\_\_\_\_

If you were given the choice of four girls in the Center you would like to have as a roommate, which four girls would you choose?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_

What four girls would you not prefer to have as a roommate?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_

If a Student Court is organized, what girl on your floor would you like to see as a judge on that Court?

1. \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B

Instructions

1. Only record those contacts which occur between yourself and the enrollee listed on the preceding page.
2. Only record those contacts which are initiated by the enrollee herself.
3. Complete the data sheet at the first opportunity following the contact situation.
4. Enter the date at the beginning of each day during the five day experimental period.
5. Enter the enrollee's name and number (see preceding page for number) in the space provided to indicate the enrollee making the contact.
6. Describe the contact situation by using quotes or in a few brief sentences that reveal the substance of the contact.
7. Mark (X) the appropriate classification of the contact situation as either a private or public attempt to gain knowledge of your extra-organizational or organizational position (see definitions below).

Definitions:

Private--this category should be marked if the enrollee seeks personal or extra-organizational knowledge of you and/or your position (such as first name interaction, personal information such as family background, personal values and attitudes as well as private professional information). If the en-

## APPENDIX B

rollee asks to do favors for you or seeks special attention which she could get from her peer group, then this too should be marked as "Private."

Examples might include statements such as: "Karen, can I get your coffee for you today?" "Hi, what's up today, can I help you or stay here with you?" "I'll go see Mr. Oliver and get that information for you." "Hi ya 'ol pal."

Public--this category should be marked if the enrollee seeks or attempts to gain access to the knowledge of the normal organizational duties, activities, values, and responsibilities of your staff position.

Examples might include such statements as: "When do I get my I.D. privileges back?" "When is the next Assembly?" "Do I serve dinner this week?" "I lost my key, can a new one be made?" "Can I use the typewriter to practice my typing?" "Who do I see to take care of this matter?"



## APPENDIX D

FREQUENCY OF PUBLIC CONTACTS WITH STAFF  
PERSONNEL AMONG HIGH POSITIVE AND HIGH  
NEGATIVE SUBJECTS

Hi Positives	Total No.	Hi Negatives	Total No.
Rebecca R.	3	Geraldine G.	18
Maxine S.	3	Joyce H.	4
Linda W.	9	Gloria F.	7
Ester H.	16	Arvella M.	9
Maria M.	16	Rosemary M.	12
Jessie E.	6	Jawatha B.	12
Marsha G.	6	Billie Jo S.	10
Tressie H.	10	Sallie W.	15
Rosali M.	2	Mary A.	11
Gayle R.	1	Carolyn D.	8
Mary W.	8	Mary J.	8
Brenda B.	15	Rosie S.	7
Nellie H.	5	Marian E.	8
Peggy M.	7	Octavia A.	6
Barbara M.	6	Ethel D.	17
Joan O.	7	Sharon C.	7
Maxine R.	14	Avis C.	5
Phyllis A.	12	Jo Ann S.	4
Lula Mae B.	7	Mary E.	4
Sandra B.	3	Laverne G.	0
Rosie B.	6	Kathy S.	11
Carrie B.	9	Clara T.	7
Gilda C.	5	Alice B.	8
Mary C.	9	Arlillian B.	4
Beverly D.	3	Sylvia C.	17
Mary L.	1	Carolyn N.	10
Carol M.	1	Maureen O.	4
Judith M.	8	Barbara R.	6
Helen O.	15	Sharon S.	7
Carol R.	18	Sylvia S.	11
Cheryl S.	3		
Gloria S.	4		
Diana W.	6		
Susan W.	3		
	$\Sigma = 247$		$\Sigma = 257$
	$\bar{X} = 7.26$		$\bar{X} = 8.57$
	S.D. = 8.66		S.D. = 9.55

Difference between the two groups in Public Contacts:  
 $t = +.562, P > .05.$



## APPENDIX E

FREQUENCY OF PRIVATE CONTACTS WITH STAFF  
PERSONNEL AMONG HIGH POSITIVE AND HIGH  
NEGATIVE SUBJECTS

Hi Positives	Total No.	Hi Negatives	Total No.
Rebecca R.	6	Geraldine G.	41
Maxine S.	1	Joyce H.	2
Linda W.	4	Gloria F.	32
Ester H.	19	Arvella M.	10
Maria M.	6	Rosemary M.	25
Jessie E.	0	Jawatha B.	11
Marsha G.	2	Billie Jo S.	6
Tressie H.	4	Sallie W.	24
Rosali M.	6	Mary A.	13
Gayle R.	0	Carolyn D.	3
Mary W.	11	Mary J.	3
Brenda B.	4	Rosie S.	6
Nellie H.	0	Marian E.	3
Peggy M.	11	Octavia A.	3
Barbara M.	4	Ethel D.	32
Joan O.	13	Sharon C.	6
Maxine R.	31	Avis C.	2
Phyllis A.	3	Jo Ann S.	7
Lula Mae B.	2	Mary E.	11
Sandra B.	0	Laverne G.	1
Rosie B.	5	Kathy S.	6
Carrie B.	1	Clara T.	16
Gilda C.	5	Alice B.	6
Mary C.	2	Arlillian B.	2
Beverly D.	1	Sylvia C.	34
Mary L.	6	Carolyn N.	11
Carol M.	2	Maureen O.	5
Judith M.	13	Barbara R.	5
Helen O.	8	Sharon S.	14
Carol R.	11	Sylvia S.	13
Cheryl S.	3		
Gloria S.	6		
Diana W.	1		
Susan W.	0		
	$\Sigma = 191$		$\Sigma = 353$
	$\bar{X} = 5.62$		$\bar{X} = 11.77$
	S.D. = 8.43		S.D. = 15.99

Difference between the two groups in Private Contacts:  
 $t = \dagger 1.856$ ,  $P < .05$ .

## APPENDIX F

EXAMPLES OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE CONTACTS  
RECORDED IN THE OMAHA JOB CORPS CENTERPublic Contacts:

Phyllis A., Approached me concerning her linen and need for a new blanket. She wanted a note for the linen room (the note is a legitimate means for acquiring new linen).

Linda W., 'How could I get this I.D. card fixed? It's about to fall apart.'

Rosie B., 'Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_, do you have the iron and ironing board? I would like to use them.'

Carol R., Found me in her room and said, 'Are you our R.A. (Resident Counselor) while Miss \_\_\_\_\_ is off?'

Maria M., 'I am Maria \_\_\_\_\_. Miss \_\_\_\_\_ asked me to introduce myself to you. I told her we already knew each other.'

Rosie B., Telephone Call: 'Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_, I'm here at Creighton (Creighton University Dental School) and all of the girls are finished. Will you please send a car after us?'

Brenda B., 'Miss \_\_\_\_\_, when do we go shopping for spring clothes? Did you find out how much money I could spend? (Each enrollee is allowed so much money every month.)

Mary C., Told me she had gone for her LPN interview at Tech High School.

Maxine R., 'Good afternoon, Miss \_\_\_\_\_. May I have my I.D. (identification card which permits the enrollee to leave the Center unescorted) please? Thank you.'

## APPENDIX F

Maria M., Stopped to ask about speech club  
(a speech club was organized and was seeking new  
members).

Ester H., 'Have you seen the nurse, Miss\_\_\_\_\_?'

Diana W., 'Could you help Miss\_\_\_\_\_?  
\_\_\_\_\_ is sick.'

Joan O., 'Miss\_\_\_\_\_, I can't participate in  
gym tonight because I could't find my shoes.'

Nellie H., 'I went to my girl friend's con-  
firmation today. It was so pretty.'

Gilda C., 'Hello, Miss\_\_\_\_\_. I'm sure glad  
that Monday is over. Now the week will go fast.'

Beverly D., 'I wish Bonnie would come back.  
This room is just too quiet without her.'

Carol R., 'Guess what? I'm going to graduate  
this month. I want to stay in Omaha.'

Private Contacts:

Rosie S., 'I saw your boyfriend on the 3rd  
floor. He's cute.'

Clara T., Engaged in a very personal conversa-  
tion pertaining to the advantages of having a  
wig (the counselor wore a wig).

Ethel D., 'Hello glamour lady, you always look  
so nice.'

Gloria F., 'You and Earl (Earl is the counselor's  
boyfriend) going out tonight? Take me with ya.'

## APPENDIX F

Mary A., On elevator: 'You sure look good for this time of night. I'll hurry cause I know you're in a hurry. I could never look that good, not in my whole life.'

Ethel D., Ethel came to my room and asked if I needed something from the store. I gave her money and told her she could get a coke. She returned with coke and money and would not take payment for my coke.

Carolyn N., 'Why don't you and Miss \_\_\_\_\_ come down to the Virginia Cafe for lunch. That's where I work.'

Gloria F., 'Can I comb your hair?'

Jawatha B., 'Hello, how are you? You like green don't you? You had on something green yesterday.'

Sylvia S., Saw me in department store buying a girdle: 'You're too little to buy those things.'

Rosemary M., 'Good morning, beautiful. . You get prettier every time I see you.'

Sylvia C., 'When you going to loan me your car Miss \_\_\_\_\_?'

Clara T., 'Hi baby! How's my girl? What did you do over the weekend? Where did you go?'

Mary A., 'Hi baby, when are you going to take me over to your mother's to see the baby (counselor's mother had recently given birth to a child)?'