

Inter-Generational Social Mobility and Individual Differences among Dubliners

IAN HART*

BERNADETTE O'SULLIVAN

THE values of a culture are indicated by the personal qualities accompanying social success within it. Our object is to reveal some of the values of Dublin society by examining the relationship between certain personal qualities and social mobility among a sample of Dublin adult males.

The method adopted was that of comparing groups of social ascenders, social descenders and socially static male adults, matched for educational attainment and marital status, over a number of measures of intelligence, personality and attitudes. Subsamples were drawn from those in the sample of 2,540 male Dublin voters in Hutchinson's study¹ who were willing to give a second interview. The latter numbered 2,269, or 89 per cent of his sample. The first subsample (subsample A) was tested for intelligence with the Cattell *Culture Fair Intelligence Test*, Scale 3, Part 1, chosen because it was constructed specifically to "provide a concentrated measure of basic intelligence"² and "reduce as much as possible, the effect of past differences in school opportunity and other environmental influences on intelligence test performance".³ The test, which took approximately twenty minutes to administer, consisted of four timed subjects—Series, Classifications, Matrices and Conditions—the subject being required to perceive relationships within spatial patterns of different types. Although this may appear to require a distinct aptitude—perception of spatial relations—the test is a good test of intelligence, being highly

*We wish to thank Gay Redmond, Martin Daly, and Michael O'Farrell for help with projective testing and scoring of TAT stories. We also thank John Raven, Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin, for many helpful suggestions.

1. B. Hutchinson, *Social Status and Inter-Generational Social Mobility in Dublin*, Dublin, The Economic and Social Research Institute, 1969.

2. R. and A. Cattell, *Manual for the Cattell Culture Fair Intelligence Test: Scale 3*, Indianapolis, 1959, p. 9.

3. *Loc. cit.*

correlated with the general ability factor, as determined by factor analyses.⁴ Five scales of a personality test, the *California Psychological Inventory* (CPI), were also administered to subsample A. These scales (which consisted of 181 YES-NO type items) purport to measure, from the subject's self-assessment, such personality traits as Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Responsibility and Socialisation. The personality test preceded that for intelligence, taking about half-an-hour to administer. Interviews were carried out in the subjects' houses by field staff of the Survey Unit⁵ of The Economic and Social Research Institute. The only interview not successfully completed once started was that of a blind person who could not see the intelligence test problems.

We obtained further measures of personality from a content analysis of stories told to pictures of the Thematic Apperception Text (TAT), and from questionnaire items, in the case of a second subsample (subsample B) of ascenders, statics and descenders. Three drives were scored from TAT stories according to the methods of McClelland, and his associates.⁶ These were Achievement, Affiliation and Power. Extraversion and Neuroticism were assessed by questionnaire items. Information on interests, attitudes, values and upbringing was obtained through the use of other questionnaire items.⁷ In a second questionnaire (Questionnaire 2, given to both subsamples), we further investigated individual values and assessed some of the consequences of mobility.

Social status had been assessed from the subject's occupation, in accordance with the Hall-Jones scale. Mobility upwards was held to have occurred when a subject's status at the time of interview was higher than that of his father, mobility downwards, if it was lower.

Where a difference between means or proportions is referred to as "significant" without further elaboration, it is significant at beyond the 5 per cent probability level.

Subsample A

From the 2,269 subjects willing to be reinterviewed, 217 were selected, representing approximately 72 triads of social ascenders, statics and descenders. The members of each triad were matched as far as possible for educational attainment and marital status as the influence of these factors on mobility might have obscured that of personal qualities. Some 157 were given intelligence tests and the five scales of the CPI. The sources of sample loss were as follows: non-contact: 15; contact made but no interview given (without outright refusal): 20; new address:

4. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

5. Whose substantial help—in the form of interviewing, clerical and administrative work—we here wish to acknowledge.

6. *Motives in Fantasy, Action and Society*, ed. J. Atkinson, Princeton, 1958, p. 179-241.

7. Although McClelland, in such books as *The Achieving Society*, Princeton, 1961, considers Achievement motivation to be a distinct drive in its own right, we decided that a rating for Achievement motivation would need to be supplemented by information on the subject's evaluation of his environment.

4; deceased or moved from Dublin: 11; refusal: 10. Of those contacted, some 5 per cent definitely refused an interview. A further 10 per cent of those contacted did not give an interview and there was more sample loss through non-contact and change of address. There is thus a possibility that the sample tested was biased in some way. Of the 157 who gave interviews, 45 triads, whose members could be matched closely on educational attainment and marital status, were selected. The degree of success in matching for these variables may be seen in Table 1.

TABLE 1: *Subsample A by Mobility Status, Educational Attainment and Marital Status*

<i>Educational Attainment</i>	<i>Mobility Status</i>		
	<i>Ascenders</i>	<i>Statics</i>	<i>Descenders</i>
University incomplete	1	1	1
Secondary complete	7	7	9
Secondary incomplete	6	5	4
Technical or Vocational complete	15	18	16
Technical or Vocational incomplete	3	1	2
Primary complete	11	9	9
Primary incomplete	2	4	4
Totals	45	45	45
<i>Marital Status:</i>			
Married (including widowed)	33	31	27
Single	12	14	18
Totals	45	45	45

There was a slight tendency for ascenders to be more likely to follow courses of supplementary education than descenders; and they were also more likely to have a higher educational attainment than the modal one for the relevant status category, as shown in Table 29 of Hutchinson's study, compared with statics or descenders. Descenders, indeed, were more likely to have an educational attainment below the mode.

The paternal and present status categories of the subsample by mobility group were as in Table 2:

TABLE 2: *Subsample A by Mobility Status and Paternal and Present Social Status Category*

Status Category	Mobility Status					
	Ascenders		Statics		Descenders	
	Paternal	Present	Paternal	Present	Paternal	Present
1. Professional and Higher Administrative	0	0	0	0	2	0
2. Managerial and Executive	0	8	1	1	16	0
3. Higher non-manual	0	9	4	4	14	1
4. Lower non-manual	0	16	5	5	4	8
5. Skilled manual	15	12	24	24	9	15
6. Semi-skilled manual	4	0	5	5	0	9
7. Unskilled manual	26	0	6	6	0	12
Totals	45	45	45	45	45	45

Twenty-four ascenders rose by three categories, and twenty-one by two. Twenty-one descenders fell by three, and twenty-four by two. The three mobility groups were very similar in their age composition, although it should be noted that twenty ascenders were aged between 21 and 34, and only six over 54; whereas 17 descenders were in the first age group, and 10 in the second.

RESULTS

TABLE 3: *Mean Raw Scores and Variances of Raw Scores on Culture Fair Intelligence Test by Mobility Status*

Mobility Status	Mean Raw Score	Mean IQ	Variance of Raw Scores
Ascenders	19.98	97	30.59
Statics	18.83	94	26.01
Descenders	17.59	89	19.49

A correction for age was applied, as younger people tend to do better on the test. Since information on age was not available in 3 cases, the results were calculated from 42 triads.

Although a wide overlap of scores occurred between ascenders and descenders, the mean for the former was significantly greater than for the latter. The mean IQ of 93 for the subsample as a whole was remarkably low. This mean dropped to 88 points (or 17.2 raw score points) when scores were weighted according to the representation of subjects' age and occupational groups in the Dublin County Borough. It should be borne in mind that Scale 3 of the *Culture Fair Intelligence Test* is used mainly with North American high school and college students.

Nevertheless, it is used also with the general population, and the IQ's for the Dublin groups were therefore derived from their raw scores by means of a conversion table for the general adult population.⁸ When personal inquiry was made of the test authors, it transpired that the standardisation group on which the conversion table was based consisted largely of high school students, with a sprinkling of unselected young adults.⁹ There is therefore the possibility that an occupationally unselected Dublin group was being compared with a North American group of slightly higher intellectual standing. To throw further light on the matter, a comparison was made between the means for Dubliners in the two highest status categories (Professional and Higher Administrative, and Managerial and Executive) and those for young Americans engaged in professional activities.¹⁰ The mean raw score for 18 Dubliners was 18.7; for the Americans, 23. The mean raw score for American under-graduate students¹¹ is 26. Thus Dubliners scored well below average on the *Culture Fair Test*.¹²

The CPI scale of Dominance consists of 46 questions concerning the subject's behaviour and attitudes, and seeks to assess factors of "leadership ability, dominance, persistence and social initiative".¹³ Capacity for Status consists of 32 questions, and attempts to measure the "personal qualities and attributes which underlie and lead to social status".¹⁴ The scale of Sociability contains 36 questions designed to identify persons of "outgoing sociable, participative temperament".¹⁵ The CPI was designed as a psychological measure for the general, non-psychiatrically disturbed, North American population.

The only difference between means approaching significance was that for Capacity for Status, where the difference between ascenders' and descenders' means occurred at just beyond the 10 per cent probability level. The only significant difference between variances appeared between statics and descenders for Sociability. The trend in the case of means was as expected, the score progressively falling from the ascending to the descending categories. With the exception of the scores of statics on Sociability, a similar trend was apparent in the variances.

8. *Manual for the Cattell Culture Fair Intelligence Test: Scale 3*, Table 3, p. 19.

9. Personal communication from R. Kulhavy, Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Illinois, January, 1970.

10. *Manuel—Test d'Intelligence de R. B. Cattell*. Paris, 1953, p. 14.

11. *Manual for the Cattell Culture Fair Intelligence Test: Scale 3*, Table 4, p. 20.

12. It may be that Dubliners tend to be less intelligent than others; or that the more intelligent Dubliners tend to emigrate; or that the test, either as it is essentially, or in its timed version, is not a fair measure of intelligence for Dublin or Irish people. Knapp ("The Effects of Time Limits on the Intelligence Test Performance of Mexican and American Subjects", *J. Educ. Psychol.*, 51, 1960, pp. 14-20) found on Scale 2, both parts together, a mean increase of power (unlimited time) over speed (fixed time limits) of 3.28 points in raw scores for North American adults, and 6.82 for Mexican adults. A relatively large mean increase of 2 or 3 raw score points might occur if Scale 3, Part 1, was given as a power test to Dubliners. This would bring the IQ for the Dublin group (weighted for age and occupational representation) close to 97. However, according to Knapp the mean score of North American adults would also rise—to an equivalent I.Q. of 104.5.

13. H. Gough, *Manual for the California Psychological Inventory*, California, 1964, p. 10.

14. *Loc. cit.*

15. *Loc. cit.*

TABLE 4: Mean Raw Scores and Variances on Dominance, Capacity for Status and Sociability Scales of CPI by Mobility Status

Mobility Status	Dominance		Capacity for Status		Sociability	
	Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance
Ascenders	24.22	41.65	16.02	18.50	20.09	18.81
Statics	23.36	29.00	15.09	16.13	19.93	25.20
Descenders	22.58	27.72	14.56	13.89	19.91	14.54

In Table 5, data are given for results on the Responsibility and Socialisation scales of the CPI. Unlike the first three scales, which seek to assess poise, ascendancy and self-assurance, these relate to the factor of social maturity. Responsibility aims at identifying "persons of conscientious, responsible and dependable disposition and temperament"¹⁶ and the concept is concerned more with the potential for harnessing impulse than with the extent to which behaviour presently conforms to social rules. The concept also relates to the individual's level of social concern. Socialisation, more concerned with the attained level of social adjustment, is defined as indicating "the degree of social maturity, integrity and rectitude which the individual has attained".¹⁷ Responsibility consists of 42, and Socialisation of 54 items. Two items were dropped from the latter scale to improve prospects for administration in an Irish context.

TABLE 5: Mean Raw Scores and Variances on Responsibility and Socialisation Scales of CPI by Mobility Status

Mobility Status	Responsibility		Socialisation	
	Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance
Ascenders	26.78	28.59	32.20	25.25
Statics	24.82	28.13	31.31	33.93
Descenders	24.13	19.16	30.49	23.03

The difference between ascenders' and descenders' means for Responsibility was significant, while that between ascenders' and statics' occurred at beyond the 10 per cent probability level. Again the trend of mean values was in the expected direction. Although there was no consistent decrease in the variance from ascending to descending categories, the variances of the ascenders, as in the case of the first three scales, exceeded those of the descenders.

16. *Loc. cit.*

17. *Loc. cit.*

As with intelligence, the overall mean score on each scale was very low. The mean Dominance score was at the 20th percentile, Capacity for Status, 15th percentile, Sociability, 17th percentile, Responsibility, 14th percentile and Socialisation at the 23rd percentile, of scores for the North American standardisation group of about 6,000 males. Of the standardisation group, the author says that it included "a wide range of ages, socio-economic groups, and geographical areas, but the sample is not offered as a true random sample of the general population".¹⁸ Nevertheless, when mean scores are considered for various American occupational and social groups, it is apparent that Dubliners come well down the list.¹⁹ Since little cross cultural research has yet been done with the CPI, it is hard to say whether the Irish scores would be low, or the American scores high, in an international context. It is also debatable whether the CPI measures what it purports to measure outside the North American context. However, the consistent trend of mean scores in the mobility groups seems to indicate that it is measuring, even if roughly, psychological factors related to social mobility in Dublin.

It will be noted that the differences on the Intelligence and Personality Tests were observed although the distribution of absolute educational levels was almost the same in each group. Ascenders were, however, more likely to have a higher, and descenders a lower, educational attainment than the modal one for their paternal social status category. We decided, therefore, to compare the two groups—ascenders with higher than, and descenders with lower than, modal education—to see if the differences between means were decreased when the factors of relative educational advantage and disadvantage were given full weight in influencing the results. Conceivably, for example, an ascender from the unskilled manual category would have had less need for intelligence and dependability if he had had the advantage of a secondary education.

In Table 6, results are given on the Intelligence Test and five personality scales for the 32 ascenders with more than, and 31 descenders with less than, the modal educational level of their paternal status category.

In the case of Intelligence, Capacity for Status and Responsibility, the difference between means is greater than in Tables 3, 4 and 5. Differences between means for Intelligence and Responsibility are now significant at the 1 per cent level of probability, and the difference for Capacity for Status at the 5 per cent level.²⁰

18. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

19. For instance, the Dubliners' mean score on Socialisation, 31.33 (pro-rated for two items not given), comes between the 15th and 16th groups from the front in a series of 21 groups. The means of these groups range from 39.44 to 26.53. The male American means for the 5 scales were as follows: Dominance, 27; Capacity for Status, 19.33; Sociability, 24.5; Responsibility, 31; and Socialisation, 36.5.

20. In the case of Capacity for Status and Responsibility, the ascenders' variance was significantly greater than the descenders'; in the case of Intelligence also, the ascenders' variance was greater than the descenders' ($p < 10$). H. Walker and J. Lev point out in *Statistical Inference*, New York, 1953, p. 158, that the t value obtained for a difference between means of samples with unequal variances may be referred to a table of normal probability where the samples number 30 or more.

TABLE 6: *Ascenders with Relative Educational Advantage and Descenders with Relative Educational disadvantage by Mean Scores on IQ Test and Personality Scales*

	IQ Test (Raw Score)	Dominance	Capacity for Status	Sociability	Responsibility	Socialisation
Educationally Advantaged Ascenders	20·87*	24·91	16·34	19·63	27·06	32·22
Educationally Disadvantaged Descenders	17·15*	22·97	14·13	20·33	23·27	30·50

* $n = 30$ as the correction for age could not be applied where the age was not obtained

The difference between means increases slightly for Dominance, remains almost constant for Socialization and is in the reverse direction for Sociability. The last difference is, however, not significant.

It thus seems that ascenders who stayed on at school were among the brighter, more responsible and forceful of the general group of ascenders; and the descenders who left school early were among the less bright, less responsible and less forceful of the general group of descenders. It may be objected, however, that the ascenders in Table 6 had an absolutely higher level of education than the descenders in that Table and thus might be expected to do better on the tests: of the ascenders, 14 had some secondary education, compared with only 5 of the descenders. This objection, however, has relevance only to the results for Responsibility,²¹ as analysis showed that the Intelligence and Capacity for Status scores were not significantly associated with absolute level of educational attainment in subsample A as a whole. To control the effect of absolute educational attainment on Responsibility, we compared the mean Responsibility scores of fifteen ascenders and thirteen descenders from Table 6, who had a similar level of vocational, educational attainment. The fifteen ascenders' mean score was 28·27, that of the descenders, 25·08. Using a distribution-free test of the difference in mean level between two groups,²² the difference between the means was found to be significant at the one per cent level. There is thus some evidence that those with a relative educational advantage *vis-a-vis* their original status are also endowed with certain socially useful assets of intelligence and

21. A point biserial correlation coefficient of .17 was obtained between educational attainment and score on Responsibility.

22. The test is the fourteenth given in M. Quenouille, *Rapid Statistical Calculations*, London, 1959.

personality; and that, conversely, those with a relative educational disadvantage are of lower intelligence and lack useful personal traits.

Subsample B

This subsample was chosen similarly to the first, that is, from ascenders, statics and descenders from the original sample who were willing to be re-interviewed. As before, we tried to select triads similar in educational background and marital status. One hundred and forty-eight men were chosen in this way. Of these, 105 were given TAT's and questionnaires. There were 20 non-contacts or eliminations (not outright refusals, but no interview given), 21 refusals and two deaths. The outright refusal rate, approximately one in seven, is high but perhaps expected in the case of such an interview. The overall response rate of 71 per cent is close to that for subsample A so that there is again the possibility of sample bias. The 105 TAT's included 26 triads closely matched in respect of education and marital status. Table 7 shows the distributions according to these variables, and Table 8 the paternal and present status categories of the three mobility groups.

TABLE 7: *Subsample B by Mobility Status, Educational Attainment and Marital Status*

<i>Educational Attainment</i>	<i>Ascenders</i>	<i>Statics</i>	<i>Descenders</i>
Secondary complete	1	1	1
Secondary incomplete	5	4	5
Technical or Vocational complete	5	7	5
Technical or Vocational incomplete	1	0	1
Primary complete	11	9	9
Primary incomplete	3	5	5
Totals	26	26	26
<i>Marital Status:</i>			
Married (including widowed)	20	23	19
Single	6	3	7
Totals	26	26	26

Unlike the results for subsample A, ascenders did not follow courses of supplementary education more often than descenders. Eleven ascenders had a higher than modal educational attainment for their paternal social status; twenty-two descenders had a lower level.

TABLE 8: *Subsample B by Mobility Status and Paternal and Present Social Status Category*

Status Category	Ascenders		Statics		Descenders	
	Paternal	Present	Paternal	Present	Paternal	Present
1 Professional and Higher Administrative	0	2	0	0	2	0
2 Managerial and Executive	0	0	0	0	3	0
3 Higher non-manual	0	8	0	0	11	1
4 Lower non-manual	2	10	3	3	4	1
5 Skilled manual	6	6	16	16	6	11
6 Semi-skilled manual	9	0	5	5	0	3
7 Unskilled manual	9	0	2	2	0	10
Totals	26	26	26	26	26	26

Age was not significantly associated with any of the TAT variables. Seven ascenders rose by three levels and the remainder by two. Eighteen descenders fell by two levels, 5 by three, and 3 by four.

Results: TAT variables

McClelland's instructions for arousing Achievement motivation²³ were not used as they have a pressurising tone which might have caused resentment. To provide a milder stimulation of Achievement motivation, we preceded the TAT with a digit span memory test.²⁴ This was ended when the number of digits called out exceeded the subject's capacity for recall. Due to some subjects' initial reactions, we could not always give the digit test. This reduced the number of triads who could be assessed for Achievement motivation after failure on the first test from 26 to 16.

The introduction to the TAT resembled the instructions of the manual.²⁵ The eleven pictures used were selected after a small pilot study showed they elicited more stories than others. Usually given in the same order, they were TAT Numbers 1, 8BM, 14, 2, 7BM, 6BM, 4, 9BM, 20, 13MF and 18BM. Some subjects could not invent eleven stories and some stories could not be scored for all three variables—Achievement, Affiliation and Power. In order to reduce the random variance, ratings were made only for those five stories which showed the smallest percentage of pro-ratings for each variable. Thus, subjects were rated for Achievement on stories to TAT Numbers 1, 8BM, 2, 7BM and 6BM; for Affiliation on stories to 8BM, 2, 7BM, 6BM and 4; and for Power on stories to 2, 7BM, 6BM, 4 and 18BM. Mean ratings based on less than three stories were

23. *Motives in Fantasy, Action and Society*, p. 66.

24. No significant difference appeared between mobility status groups on the digit memory test.

25. H. Murray, *Thematic Apperception Test Manual*, Harvard, 1943, p. 3.

excluded, reducing the number of triads to 25 for Affiliation and 24 for Power.²⁶ Two psychologists and a student psychologist administered the TAT's; a psychologist trained in the scoring methods of McClelland and his associates blind scored them. Achievement motivation was defined as the wish to compete with some standard or to improve performance at work, Affiliation as the wish to be emotionally and positively close to others, and Power as the wish to influence or control the behaviour, sentiments or ideas of others. Table 9 shows the number of triads tested and mean ratings and variances for mobility status groups.

TABLE 9: Mean Ratings and Variances on Three TAT Variables by Number of Triads and Mobility Status

TAT Variable	Number of Triads	Ascenders		Statics		Descenders	
		Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance
Achievement	16	2.00	2.67	4.50	7.87	3.00	6.67
Affiliation	25	5.28	15.21	5.04	15.21	3.72	9.46
Power	24	5.79	5.13	5.63	5.20	5.71	2.56

The difference between statics' and ascenders' means on Achievement was significant at the 1 per cent level,²⁷ and the difference between ascenders' and descenders' means on Affiliation occurred at a probability level slightly greater than 10 per cent. When the nonparametric Wilcoxon Test²⁸ was used, the difference between statics' and ascenders' means in respect of Achievement remained significant at the 1 per cent level. To check the statics' superiority on Achievement, two other psychologists blind scored the stories for that variable, using an impressionistic, clinical method.²⁹ Statics were again superior, although the chance probability of the difference between means was now about 9 per cent. They also rated stories for Affiliation and Aggression; in respect of the former, statics' mean again exceeded that of descenders, the difference now being significant; in respect of the latter, descenders' mean significantly exceeded that of ascenders.

In general, ratings for Achievement were very low. The maximum possible scores in Table 9 were: Achievement: 11; Affiliation: 11; and Power: 8. As with the Intelligence Test and CPI results, we examined what happened to

26. Individual means were based on as few as three stories as follows: Achievement: 2; Affiliation: 4; Power: 4.

27. Using a correction for unequal variances; see *Statistical Inference*, p. 158.

28. S. Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, International Student Edition, 1956, pp. 80, 81.

29. The Spearman Rank Order correlation coefficient between the two methods of scoring for Achievement was .45.

differences between means when ascenders of relatively high educational level were compared with descenders of low educational level. However, no significant difference appeared between means. When ratings were analysed for the effects of education and paternal status category combined with mobility group, no significant difference appeared between educational groups, but static manuals were rated higher on Achievement than ascending manuals ($p < .01$ for difference between means).

Questionnaire 1

Twelve items made up abbreviated scales of Eysenck's Neuroticism and Extraversion factors. No significant difference emerged for Extraversion but Neuroticism did show a significant difference between statics and descenders, statics' mean being higher. Ascenders' mean fell between the two others. Statics thus scored high on both Achievement and Neuroticism, which recalls Eysenck's view that Neuroticism is positively correlated with the need for Achievement.³⁰ Analysis showed, however, that those of subsample B who scored high on Neuroticism were not more likely to score high on Achievement. Other items of Questionnaire 1 sought to assess interests, attitudes, values and perception of upbringing. As the Appendix shows, there were few pronounced differences between mobility groups. Ascenders were more likely to consider themselves creative than either of the other groups ($p < .10$), and they were more prone to feel they had been reared with little or no strictness, compared to descenders ($p < .10$). They were significantly more likely than the other groups to consider religion of little or no importance.

Questionnaire 2

This was sent through the post to both subsamples. A response rate of 82.2 per cent was obtained through the use of reminders and an interviewer. As with subsamples A and B, ascenders and statics originated mainly in the manual, and descenders in the non-manual, status categories. Distribution of levels of absolute educational attainment was approximately the same in each mobility group. The Questionnaire consisted of seven items with which recipients could agree or disagree. The first five concerned values related to achievement.³¹ They were:

Item 1: "All I want out of life in the way of a career is a secure, not too difficult job, with enough pay for an average standard of living".

Item 2: "When a man is born, the success he is going to have is already in the stars so he might just as well accept it and not fight against it".

30. "Several studies have been carried out to investigate the relation between academic performance and personality . . . The usual result has been to demonstrate that Neuroticism . . . is positively correlated with achievement"—H. & S. Eysenck, *Personality Structure & Measurement*, London, 1969, p. 90.

31. They are taken, with appropriate modifications for Irish conditions, from B. Rosen, "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension of Social Stratification", *Motives in Fantasy, Action and Society*, Ch. 35.

Item 3: "Planning only makes a person unhappy since a person's plans hardly ever work out anyway."

Item 4: "Nowadays with world conditions the way they are, the wise person lives for today and lets tomorrow take care of itself".

Item 5: "Nothing in life is worth the sacrifice of moving far from your parents' home".

Answers showing disagreement or an achievement-minded, planning, individualistic approach to life, were scored one, answers showing agreement, nought. Table 10 gives the mean scores and variances for mobility status groups.

TABLE 10: Mean Scores and Variances on Values Related to Achievement by Mobility Status

	<i>Ascenders</i>	<i>Statics</i>	<i>Descenders</i>
	(<i>n</i> = 59)	(<i>n</i> = 57)	(<i>n</i> = 59)
Mean	4.02	3.69	3.41
Variance	1.56	1.58	1.90

The ascenders' mean was significantly greater than the descenders'. Little difference, however, appeared between the two groups in respect of individual items. Ascending manuals had significantly higher means than static manuals or descending non-manuals. Again, little difference was apparent between answers on individual items, although only 23 per cent of ascending manuals agreed with Item 5, compared to 42 per cent of descending non-manuals ($p < .10$). Thus, the only pronounced attitudinal difference between ascending manuals and any other group was that less of them, compared to descending non-manuals, would have been reluctant to leave home.

Items 6 and 7 concerned subjects' opinions about their social position and the extent to which they felt they were treated fairly by society.

Item 6: "How do you feel about your present position in society—is it too high, O.K., or too low?"

Item 7: "Do you consider that our society gives people a fair chance?"

Table 11 shows the proportion of each group who felt their position in society was too low and the proportion who felt society did not give people a fair chance.

TABLE 11: Opinion on Present Social Position and Fairness of Treatment by Society by Mobility Status

<i>Opinion</i>	<i>Ascenders</i>	<i>Statics</i>	<i>Descenders</i>
	%	%	%
Present Position in Society too low	26.3	36.8	27.1
Society does not give people a fair chance	49.2	59.6	44.8

The proportion of statics showing discontent exceeded that of any other group on both items. The proportion of static manuals who believed society did not give people a fair chance clearly exceeded the corresponding proportion of ascending manuals and descending non-manuals combined, the difference almost being significant. This sense of grievance recalls the statics' high Achievement scores on the TAT but there was no tendency for statics with high Achievement scores to be more discontented than other statics.

Summary and Conclusion

The degree to which scores overlapped between mobility groups, as indicated by the variances in Tables 3, 4, and 5, suggests we are far from being a meritocratic society. Yet a clear link was shown to exist between certain personal qualities and social mobility in Dublin. Ascenders, who were mainly from manual categories, were characterized by the following tendencies:

- (a) They tended to score more highly on tests of intelligence and responsibility than descenders.
- (b) They were more likely than other groups to consider religion of little importance.
- (c) They were slightly more interested in social success, slightly more likely to plan for the future, and rather less reluctant to leave the parental home, than descenders.
- (d) They tended to have lower ratings than descenders on Aggression.
- (e) Ascenders, like statics, had a greater spread of scores on the psychological tests than descenders.

Statics, who were mainly from manual categories, were characterised as follows:

- (a) They tended to be rated more highly than ascenders on Achievement motivation (using two methods of scoring).
- (b) They tended to score more highly than descenders on Neuroticism.
- (c) They tended to be rated more highly than descenders on Affiliation.
- (d) Statics in the manual categories were more likely than ascending manuals or descending non-manuals to believe that society did not give people a fair chance.

It is unlikely that change of social status accounts for more than a small fraction of the difference between mean IQ's of ascenders and descenders. Since all would have changed categories after childhood, and since IQ's are quite stable after the age of six or seven,³² any change due to change of category would have been much smaller than actually observed.³³ Differences in IQ between ascenders and

32. B. Berelson and G. Steiner, *Human Behaviour—an Inventory of Scientific Findings*, New York, 1964, p. 215.

33. The difference between means of ascending and static manuals was about seven points, that between descending and static non-manuals, about nine points.

descenders are probably due to a combination of native endowment and educational stimulation during childhood.³⁴ The extent to which intelligence is a social asset may be amplified by the relationship (shown in Table 6) between it and educational level relative to paternal status, this index of educational attainment being positively associated with mobility upwards. Environmental factors, including status change, probably had a greater effect on Responsibility and Achievement scores.³⁵

Assessment of Achievement motivation and values related to achievement gives conflicting results. On the TAT, statics exceeded ascenders in ratings on Achievement motivation. On Questionnaire 2, ascenders exceeded statics in scores based on Achievement-related values. Of the two tests, the Questionnaire was probably more vulnerable to any tendency for subjects to give ideal-type responses and therefore more likely to be affected by the influences of social status and change therein.

Descenders, who were mainly from non-manual categories, were less competitive and critical of society than statics. The small scatter of their test scores on the *Culture Fair* and CPI distinguishes them from both ascenders and statics. Descenders would seem to lack both the intelligence and drive of the other groups and, consequently, their social involvement. They resembled statics, however, in that they were more interested in religion than ascenders—a surprising result for Ireland, which may show a decline in religious values or a growing individualism in religious matters. The fact that ascenders were brought up more freely than descenders suggests the latter possibility. Descenders' low ratings on Affiliation and high ratings on Aggression suggest that personal maladjustment may have caused their descent but their low scores on Neuroticism do not confirm this theory.

Although Dublin society values intelligence and may value a sense of responsibility, scores on the relevant tests were very low. This may show the invalidity of the tests in an Irish context but further exploration needs to be made with internationally used tests. With regard to Achievement motivation, findings from an unpublished study,³⁶ which used TAT-type pictures of industrial and occupational scenes, suggest our TAT ratings accurately reflected a generally low level of concern with achievement. There is, of course, nothing wrong in not being interested in achievement, at least in achievement of a vocational kind, but perhaps one should be prepared to accept only a mediocre standard of living as a result. One may argue, however, that a trait like gregariousness represents a social achievement which should be recompensed. Obviously, the concept of

34. Early educational stimulation does seem to affect the level of measured intelligence; see *Human Behaviour—An Inventory of Scientific Findings*, p. 217.

35. Childhood experiences may affect the level of Achievement motivation in later years; see S. Lipset and R. Bendix, *Social Mobility in Industrial Society*, University of California Press, 1963, p. 244.

36. E. Molloy and R. Corcoran, *Some Psychological Characteristics of Small Businessmen*, Dublin, The Economic and Social Research Institute, 1970.

achievement which we have used is quite narrow and arbitrary. What we need more than further Achievement motivation testing a la McClelland is an understanding of the Irish concept of achievement. We would thus be in a better position to understand Irish society from the inside, as it were. For the present, we can only say there is no firm evidence that Achievement motivation, understood as a striving after excellence in one's job, is greatly valued by Dublin society.³⁷

APPENDIX

The following were the numbers in the mobility groups who gave each type of answer to the questions of Questionnaire I.

Number	Answer	Ascenders	Statics	Descenders
1.	Would you say you were a creative person, that is, often coming up with new ideas about things?			
	Yes	21	14	14
	No	5	12	12
2.	How much pressure did your parents put on you to do well at school when you were a child?			
	A lot	1	3	3
	A fair amount	12	10	9
	A little	4	7	8
	No pressure	9	6	6
3.	Which is better for a country?			
	A lot of freedom for everyone	7	4	7
	Not so much freedom but more protection from criminals, delinquents and anti-social people	19	22	19
4.	Which kind of personality would it be better to have if you were the father of a family?			
	Strong and firm	0	4	4
	Friendly and encouraging	25	21	21
5.	Which is more important to you?			
	Success in life	10	9	7
	Getting along well with people	12	13	15
6.	How strictly do you feel you were brought up?			
	Very strictly	8	6	7
	Fairly strictly	9	13	16
	Slightly strictly	5	5	1
	Not strictly at all	4	2	2
7.	How much of a welfare state have we in Ireland at present?			
	Too much	0	1	1
	As much as is necessary	8	5	6
	Not enough	18	20	19

37. For a discussion of why this kind of motivation may be low in Ireland generally, see B. Hutchinson, "On the Study of Non-Economic Factors in Irish Economic Development", *The Economic and Social Review*, 4, 1970, p. 509-529.

<i>Number</i>	<i>Answer</i>	<i>Ascenders</i>	<i>Statics</i>	<i>Descenders</i>	
8.	Which would you consider the greater national weakness among Irish people?	As individuals they are too inclined to let others tell them what to do	14	17	15
		As individuals they are too inclined to tell others what to do	12	9	11
9.	Which do you think is the truer proverb?	Spare the rod and spoil the child	13	11	11
		Time is money	11	13	13
10.	If you were a father, how would you feel if your fourteen year old son was not interested in school?	Very concerned	21	21	19
		Fairly concerned	5	4	6
		Slightly concerned	0	1	0
		Not concerned at all	0	0	1
11.	If you were a father, how would you feel if your fourteen year old son asked you to give reasons for your decisions on the amount of freedom he should have?	Very angry	2	2	4
		Rather angry	7	5	3
		Rather pleased	8	10	15
		Very pleased	9	9	4
12.	Are you happiest when you get involved in some project that calls for rapid action?	Yes	22	17	18
		No	2	8	6
		Don't know	2	1	2
13.	Do you usually take the initiative in making friends?	Yes	14	18	16
		No	10	8	6
		Don't know	2	0	4
14.	Are you inclined to be quick and sure in your actions?	Yes	20	16	12
		No	4	9	11
		Don't know	2	1	3
15.	Would you rate yourself as a lively individual?	Yes	19	17	16
		No	5	9	6
		Don't know	2	0	4
16.	Would you be very unhappy if you were prevented from making numerous social contacts?	Yes	11	10	12
		No	15	15	12
		Don't know	0	1	2
17.	Do you prefer action to planning for action?	Yes	18	16	18
		No	7	10	7
		Don't know	1	0	1
18.	Please mark how important each of these things is to you by putting a mark for each under: VERY IMPORTANT or QUITE IMPORTANT or SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT or NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL. Put only one in the VERY IMPORTANT category. If	(a) <i>Job</i>			
		Very important	4	6	4
		Quite important	16	13	14
		Slightly important	1	2	3
		Not important at all	0	0	0
		(b) <i>Family</i>			
		Very important	13	12	15
		Quite important	8	9	5
Slightly important	0	0	1		

Number	Answer	Ascenders	Statics	Descenders	
	retired, assume you are still working. If unmarried, assume you are married.	Not important at all	0	0	0
	(c) <i>Personal Freedom</i>	Very important	1	2	0
		Quite important	13	11	12
		Slightly important	5	3	7
		Not important at all	2	5	2
	(d) <i>Friends</i>	Very important	1	0	0
		Quite important	12	13	10
		Slightly important	7	6	10
		Not important at all	1	2	1
	(e) <i>Religion</i>	Very important	2	1	2
		Quite important	6	16	17
		Slightly important	7	3	1
		Not important at all	6	1	1
	19.	If married, which would you really prefer?	An evening at home with the family	18	19
		An evening out with men friends	4	1	2
		Not married	3	5	4
20.	Do you sometimes feel happy, sometimes depressed without any apparent reason?	Yes	13	20	13
		No	11	4	11
		Don't know	1	1	1
21.	Does your mind often wander while you are trying to concentrate?	Yes	18	23	18
		No	7	2	7
		Don't know	0	0	0
22.	Are you frequently "lost in thought" even when supposed to be taking part in a conversation?	Yes	12	14	12
		No	13	11	13
		Don't know	0	0	0
23.	Are you sometimes bubbling over with energy and sometimes very sluggish?	Yes	17	17	16
		No	7	7	7
		Don't know	1	1	2
24.	Are you inclined to be moody?	Yes	16	13	9
		No	9	11	16
		Don't know	0	1	0
25.	Do you have frequent ups and downs in mood, either with or without apparent cause?	Yes	10	13	8
		No	14	11	17
		Don't know	1	1	0

Note: In some cases the number of triads is less than 26 because of uncodeable answers. Questions Number 12-17 inclusive are the abbreviated form of Eysenck's Extraversion/Introversion questionnaire and 20-25 inclusive the abbreviated form of his Neuroticism-Stability questionnaire.