

WORKING PAPERS FOR
Center for Research on Social Organization
Department of Sociology
University of Michigan

Working paper #71

August, 1971

Copies available through:

Center for Research on
Social Organization
330 Packard, room 214
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

THE PERSISTENCE OF ETHNORELIGIOUS DIFFERENCES
IN THE WORLDLY SUCCESS OF THIRD AND LATER
GENERATION AMERICANS*

by

Edward O. Laumann

University of Michigan
Center for Research on Social Organization

Paper to be read at the Annual Meeting of
The American Sociological Association,
Denver, Colorado. August 1971

*I want especially to acknowledge the many helpful suggestions and advice of my colleagues, Beverly Duncan, Otis Dudley Duncan and Paul Siegel, and my research assistants, Jane Hood and Gerald Hikel. The total study and this analysis were aided by grants from the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies, University of Michigan, and the National Science Foundation (GS-1929).

Over the years considerable attention has been given to the differential educational and occupational achievements of ethnic and racial minorities in the United States (cf. Handlin, 1954; Gordon, 1964; Nam, 1959; Lieberman, 1963; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1968; Duncan and Duncan, 1968; Thernstrom, 1969). Some groups, such as the Eastern European Jews, have been noted for their exceptionally rapid movement up the socioeconomic status ladder while other groups, such as the Italians and Negroes, have been notably less successful.

Three broad varieties of explanations or theories for the differential success of minority groups have been formulated. First, there are explanations that focus on a nationality group's competitive advantages or disadvantages deriving from certain features of its culture. For example, it has often been suggested that the Jews' high evaluation of education has greatly facilitated their meeting a critical prerequisite for access to high status occupations (cf. Slater, 1969, for a critical examination of this view). Weber (1930) and others (McLelland et al., 1958; ^{Lenski, 1960;} Rosen, 1959) have suggested that certain Protestant groups are especially likely to inculcate a this-worldly asceticism and need for achievement in their communicants that is highly likely, however unintentionally, to lead to worldly success. And finally, it has been argued that the traditionalistic peasant orientations of southern Italian and Polish immigrants made them especially ill fitted to their new urban environment.

The second type of explanation stresses the differing times of arrival of various groups such that northwest European groups were especially favored over southern and eastern European groups simply because they have had a longer time to assimilate to American conditions and possessed certain cultural features, such as Protestant religious preferences, that were more acceptable to the native "majority" American of British Protestant ancestry which provided the bulk of the settlers in the first 200 years of the nation's existence. The third type of explanation notes that discriminatory practices against specific minority groups, especially with regard to access to higher level educational and occupational positions, were practiced by "majority" Americans. Nearly every immigrant group has been subjected to such practices with greater or lesser intensity (cf. Higham, 1955) and with corresponding consequences for their socioeconomic success.

While no doubt each of these explanations has some merit and are, for that matter, not mutually exclusive, they all would seem to have one important implication which will be of special concern in this paper--namely, as minority groups become more fully assimilated to the host society and culture with each succeeding generation, differences in group educational and occupational achievements will inevitably disappear as whatever distinctive features of the groups for facilitating or hindering educational and occupational achievement moderate

and disappear over time. This is especially likely given that the period of mass immigration, whereby group identities could be sustained and revitalized by fresh recruits from the Old Country, is essentially over.

Recently Duncan and Duncan (1968) have presented unusually rich data, based on an enormous national sample, that document once again the presence of nationality group differences in educational and occupational achievements. One must concede that, with their introduction of certain controls, the differences appear to be rather modest in size (Duncan and Duncan, 1968: 360). There is, however, the distinct possibility that these differences might be underestimated because of the rather heterogeneous categories they were forced to employ. For they were constrained by their data (collected by the U.S. Bureau of the Census) to consider only differences in national origin for first (immigrant) and second generation (sons of foreign stock) Americans. Since they did not have information on specific religious preferences, they could only infer (admittedly with considerable plausibility, cf. Beshers et al., 1964) that the favored position of Russian Americans, for example, could be attributed to their predominantly Jewish religious preference. They also report the rather anomalous finding that German Americans are under-achievers. One might suspect that an inability to differentiate among Protestant and Catholics within the German group might mask important

relationships. Several recent studies (cf. Gockel, 1969; Goldsmith, 1969; Laumann, 1969; Warren, 1970) have noted, moreover, that the tripartite division of religious preference into Protestant, Catholic and Jew may cover up more than it reveals, especially for the highly differentiated Protestant denominations. Thus, there is good reason to suspect that the identifications of meaningful ethnoreligious groups would be of considerable assistance in developing an explanation of group differences in worldly success, especially if one wants to assess the relative merits of the notion of cultural pluralism as opposed to the theory of the melting pot (cf. Gordon, 1964). Finally, any theory that wishes to stress subcultural differences would have to demonstrate the successful transmission of these differences into the third generation (native sons of native parentage of foreign grandparent(s)).

This paper has two principle objectives: First, if we can identify a set of ascriptive membership groups, specified simultaneously in terms of the principal country of origin of one's ancestors and one's detailed religious preference, for the native white population, can we demonstrate differences among the groups in the degree to which educational achievement and occupational prestige are transmitted from fathers to sons? Second, can these differences be shown to persist for third and later generation members of these groups?

Source of the Data

The data were collected during the spring and summer of 1966 in the greater metropolitan area of Detroit by the Detroit Area Study, University of Michigan. The sample consisted of 1,013 native-born white males between the ages of 21 and 64, representing 80 per cent of the eligible households sampled. Fourteen per cent of the households originally sampled refused interviews, and an additional 6 per cent was lost because no one was found at home after repeated callbacks or for other reasons. Since this sample is exclusively native born, it assures us that the discovery of ethnoreligious differences is attributable to persisting subcultural differences and not to differences between immigrants and native-born Americans.

Some Preliminary Considerations

Since the entire study was originally conceived to be an exploration of ethnoreligious differences in values, attitudes and behavior in an urban population, considerable pains were taken to measure the key variable of ethnoreligious group membership. In addition to asking the respondents to indicate their subjective identification with a country of origin--to which they were permitted to respond with multiple countries,^{1/} we also asked them to indicate the country of birth of their parents, grandparents, and great grandparents

(this last question was asked only if the first two sets of ancestors were all born in the United States or Canada). While we do some violence to our data by ignoring for this analysis the matter of multiple countries of origin for the 39 per cent of the sample who reported them, we are assuming that the individual's first country mentioned is his principal country of origin.

Well over sixty countries of origin were reported by our respondents. Obviously, we had to group these countries into a smaller set in order to obtain sufficient numbers to sustain any sort of statistical analysis. The ethnic groups finally identified were the following: "Anglo-American" (England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, English-speaking Canada, Anglo-Saxon, only American), "German" (all German-speaking countries, Switzerland, Holland, and Belgium), "French" (including all French-speaking countries and French Canadians), "Italian" (all from Italy plus five persons of Spanish origin), "Polish" (only Poland), Irish (Irish Catholics only), "Slavic" (all Slavic speaking countries other than Poland), "Jewish" (including all those expressing a Jewish religious preference regardless of specific country of origin).

The number of generations in the United States is determined by the response to the set of questions on the country of birth of the respondent's ancestors. Respondents in the third and later generation are at the minimum those, both of whose parents

were born here or in Canada.

Regarding religious preference, we have broken down the Protestants into the following four groups: "Presbyterians" (Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Quakers, and Unitarians), "Lutherans", "Methodists" (94% of this group so identified plus Evangelical and Reformed, Dutch or Christian Reformed, United Church of Christ), and "Baptists" (97% of this group so identified as American and Southern Baptist plus Jehovah's Witnesses, other fundamentalist groups) (cf. Laumann, 1969, for detailed explanation).

The Analytic Model

Following the reasoning in Blau and Duncan (1967: 140-147, 163-177), we propose to examine the intergenerational transmission of the achieved characteristics of educational achievement and occupational status by the application of regression analysis. The correlation coefficient is a summary statistic by which we can indicate the degree to which the respondent's educational and occupational statuses covary with those of their fathers. For our purposes, we are especially concerned with determining whether the regression slopes, b_k , for our set of ethnoreligious groups appreciably vary around the common slope for the total sample. The analytic model employed is operationalized in terms of the following equation:

$$Y_{ki} = a_k + b_k X_{ki} + e_{ki} ,$$

where Y_{ki} is the number of school years completed or the occupational prestige score (Duncan, 1961) of respondent i in group k , a_k is the intercept of ethnoreligious group k on the ordinate, b_k is the regression slope for ethnoreligious group k , X_{ki} is the number of school years completed or occupational prestige score of the respondent i 's father in group k , and e_{ki} is the error term.

Our statistical analysis has three objectives. First, we want to evaluate the differences among the slopes of the regression lines for the ethnoreligious groups by calculating the ratio of variance between slopes to variance within groups as a means of detecting the presence of interaction effects. Essentially this test (Hald, 1954: 580) determines whether the set of slopes of the ethnoreligious groups, b_k , varies appreciably around the common slope, \bar{b} . Second, we want to determine whether the regression lines are identical (i.e., coincident) or different from one another (Hald, 1952: 579-584). That is, the first test merely establishes whether the slopes, b_k , are equal. It could be that the within-group relations of education or occupational status to the dependent variables for each of the groups were equivalent, but that the regression lines themselves were not identical but parallel to one another (i.e., significant differences among the a -intercepts). Parallel lines would indicate the presence of group differences, net of the educational or occupational differences among the groups. Finally, the

regression slope for each ethnoreligious group was compared to the weighted average for all groups, using a method developed by Tukey (Acton, 1966: 184-187), to test for the significant departure of any specific group slope from the common slope. Several groups might deviate significantly from the common slope while all the others did not. Such a situation, especially if the deviating groups were numerically small, would not necessarily result in a significant F ratio on the first test, but would be identified by the Tukey Test.

Findings

Table 1 represents selected socioeconomic and socio-religious characteristics of the fifteen groups in the Detroit

Insert Table 1 about here.

metropolitan area for which we have sufficient cases to proceed. One can readily see that there is considerable variation among the groups on each of the indicators. While there is considerable variation among the Protestant groups on mean school years completed, mean occupational status, and mean total family income, Catholic groups, with one or two notable exceptions, appear to be much more tightly clustered on these measures. With regard to the summary indicators of

socioreligious characteristics, there is considerable variation within the Protestant and Catholic groups with regard to church attendance and devotionism. But all the Protestant groups are predominantly composed of third and later generation Americans while the Catholic groups are split between those, including the Irish, Germans, French, and Anglo-Americans, who are predominantly third and later generation Americans and those, including Slavs, Italians, and Poles who are predominantly second generation Americans.

The basic findings relevant to the degree to which the fifteen groups^{2/} vary among themselves in transmitting education and occupational status from fathers to sons are summarized in Table 2. The first column reports the

Insert Table 2 about here

total number of cases included in the regression analysis for the total sample, second generation sub-sample, and third and later generation sub-sample. The common slope for each analysis appears in the second column. Column 3 reports a test which determines whether the slopes, b_k , are significantly different from the common slope, \bar{b} , reported in column 2, for the men irrespective of ascriptive group membership. In the case of the regression of sons' school years completed on fathers' school years completed,

we note that the slope, b_k , significantly vary around the common slope for all three samples. This result would support the hypothesis that the ethnoreligious groups do in fact differ among themselves in the degree to which there is intergenerational transmission of educational achievement. But there is no support for such an hypothesis with regard to the intergenerational transmission of occupational status. Column 4 reports the F tests to determine whether the regression lines are coincident or parallel, given that the slopes are equal. For the educational regression analyses, we can reject the hypothesis that the lines are identical. In the case of occupational status, however, only among third and later generation Americans can we reject the null hypothesis that the lines are identical.

Column 5 reports the results of comparing specific group slopes with the common slope to detect significant differences, utilizing Tukey's (Acton, 1966: 184-187) technique for calculating confidence intervals for the discrepancy between the group slope and the common slope. Column 3 reported the results of a test that determines whether the set of slopes varies appreciably around the common slope. In the latter case if there are a number of groups who do not differ among themselves, the test is likely to fail to be very much affected by the presence of several groups who do in fact differ from the common slope but are not sufficiently numerous to affect the overall pattern.

The Tukey technique was developed to permit the detection of specific group departures from the common slope. To facilitate discussion and interpretation, the groups in Column 5 have been divided into those which are significantly above the common slope and those which are significantly below the common slope.

The evidence appears fairly clear that certain groups, most notably the German "Presbyterians", Irish Catholics, and Jews, are most successful in transmitting educational achievements from father to son while other groups, especially the German Lutherans, Anglo-American Baptists, Polish Catholics, and Protestants, origin not ascertained, are decidedly less likely to transmit educational advantages (or disadvantages) across generations. (See Tables 3 and 4 for detailed summaries of the regression parameters for the third and later generation subsample.) The three groups most successful in transmitting

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

educational advantage are precisely the three who rank as the top three groups in worldly success (see the first three columns of Table 1). Conversely, the groups who were least successful in transmitting educational advantages were typically ranked near the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder.^{3/}

In an effort explicitly to explore the assumption that the subgroups composing broad ethnic (e.g., German and Anglo-

American) and religious (e.g., Roman Catholic and Protestant) categories are essentially similar to one another with regard to the intergenerational transmission of educational and occupational status, we calculated the relevant F tests for common slopes and identity of lines separately for the four German-American, five Anglo-American, seven Roman Catholic, and seven Protestant groups for the total sample and third generation and later sub-sample. In the case of the educational regression analyses, all the F-tests were highly significant while the tests for the occupational regression analyses were not significant except for the five Anglo-American groups. These results would seem clearly to imply that assumptions about the internal homogeneity of such broad social categories are incorrect and that these group differences do persist into the third and later generations.

The problem of interpretation is considerably complicated by the fact that while we consistently find group differences in educational transmission persisting into the third generation, we find less consistency with regard to group differences in the transmission of occupational status. There is some reason to believe, however, that the failure to find such differences with regard to occupation may be due to our measure of occupational status, the Duncan Index of Socioeconomic Status, which is a highly reliable indicator of prestige differences among occupations but is relatively insensitive to functional differences among occupations of approximately

equal socioeconomic status. As Table 5 demonstrates, ethno-religious groups having essentially equal means on the Duncan Index do in fact differ in their distributions across occupational categories. Table 6 attempts to summarize these differences by presenting the indexes of dissimilarity between the occupational distributions within groups having essentially identical means. For example, in the case of the highest status set of groups, 21.5 percent of the Jews would have to be re-distributed among the occupational categories for them to have an identical distribution to that of the Anglo-American Presbyterians--this is despite the fact that they only differ 4.2 points on the Duncan Index. A similar index of dissimilarity is obtained for Anglo-American and German Presbyterians who differ by only 1.2 points. Needless to say, since the sizes of the subgroup samples are quite small, considerable caution should be exercised in interpreting these results.

Discussion

Because of the excessively small number of cases in many of the groups, one should be very cautious in drawing conclusions about specific groups from this sample. With this caveat in mind, however, it does seem useful to speculate about the meaning of the results especially in the light of the results reported by Duncan and Duncan (1968) on a much larger national sample.

The Duncans (1968: 357-358) report:

The survey results reveal fairly substantial differences among national-origin groups with respect to both educational and occupational achievement. Especially distinguished by high achievement are the Russian-Americans, who outrank not only the other minorities, but also the native-of-native majority. The lowest achievement is recorded on the part of native Americans whose fathers were born in Latin America, most often in Mexico. It is neither of these groups which most closely resembles the third-generation in achieved status, however, but rather the Irish, the Canadians, the Germans, and the "other Europeans", such as Czechs. Moreover, were a measure of vertical mobility to be constructed by subtracting from the mean achievement score of respondents the corresponding mean score for their family heads, the group of "other European" origin would outrank Russian-Americans with respect to occupational mobility; and German-Americans would appear to be low achievers in the educational sphere.

They subsequently speculate that the unusual achievements of the Russian-Americans may be attributed to the large proportion of Jews in this group. Our results strongly support their hypothesis in that the Jews (predominantly of Russian extraction in our sample) are unusually high achievers. But perhaps it is even more interesting to note that our third-generation Slavic Catholic group (also principally of Russian origin) also manifests unusually high upward mobility.

While they note that German Americans appear to be underachievers (once their starting points are taken into account), we can suggest that this may be more specifically due to the underachievement of German Catholics who comprise 42 per cent of our sample of third and later generation German

Americans. Third generation German Lutherans, on the other hand, have been unusually upwardly mobile, both educationally and occupationally (see Tables 3 and 4). Anglo-American groups manifest similar variability in amounts of mobility and intergenerational transmission of educational and occupational status.

More generally we believe that these data are certainly consistent with the notion that more or less ascriptive membership groups in the native white population are continuing to provide important subcultural variations in the behavior and attitudes of third and later generation Americans (cf. Laumann, 1969, for a description of the impact of ethno-religious differences on friendship choices). Future research must give considerably greater and more careful attention to the identification of relevant subgroups. It seems abundantly clear that overly simplistic categorizations of membership groups that rely exclusively either on presumed ethnic origin or broad religious preference are more likely to mislead than to enlighten us.

FOOTNOTES

1. Specifically, respondents were asked: "What national background do you think of yourself as having--that is, besides being American (Canadian)?" Interviewers were instructed to accept clear assertion of "only American nationality" without probe and to record the exact answer to the question.
2. While we used all fifteen groups for the total sample regression analysis, we were forced to use only seven groups in the regression analysis of second generation members because of insufficient numbers in the other eight groups. Only the Jewish group had to be dropped from the set of 15 groups in the third and later generation subsample because of insufficient numbers.
3. In a similar analysis, Blau and Duncan (1967) (cf. Duncan, 1968) have shown that the intergenerational transmission of educational status is somewhat lower and occupational status much lower for Negroes, a group ranked at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder, than for whites.

REFERENCES

- Acton, F.
1966. Analysis of Straight-Line Data. New York: Dover Publications.
- Beshers, James, Edward O. Laumann, and Benjamin Bradshaw
1964. "Ethnic Congregation-Segregation, Stratification, and Assimilation," Social Forces 43: 482-489.
- Blau, Peter M., and Otis Dudley Duncan
1967. The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley
1968. Socioeconomic Background and Occupational Achievement: Extensions of a Basic Model. Final Report Project No. 5-0074 (EO-191). U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 69-76.
- Duncan, Beverly, and Otis Dudley Duncan
1968. "Minorities and the Process of Stratification," American Sociological Review 33: 356-364.
- Gockel, Galen L.
1969. "Income and Religious Affiliation: A Regression Analysis," American Journal of Sociology 74: 632-647.
- Goldstein, Sidney
1969. "Socioeconomic Differentials among Religious Groups in the United States," American Journal of Sociology 74: 612-631.
- Gordon, Milton M.
1964. Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hald, A.
1952. Statistical Theory with Engineering Applications.. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Handlin, Oscar
1954. The American People in the Twentieth Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Higham, John
1955. Strangers in the Land. Rahway, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Laumann, Edward O.

1969. "The Social Structure of Religious and Ethno-religious Groups in a Metropolitan Community," American Sociological Review 34: 182-197.

Lenski, Gerhard

1960. The Religious Factor. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Lieberson, Stanley

1963. Ethnic Patterns in American Cities. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

McClelland, David C., et. al.

1958. Talent and Society. Princeton: Van Nostrand.

Nam, Charles B.

1959. "Nationality Groups and Social Stratification in America," Social Forces 37: 328-333.

Rosen Bernard C.

1959. "Race, Ethnicity and the Achievement Syndrome," American Sociological Review 24: 47-60.

Slater, Mariam K.

1969. "My Son the Doctor: Aspects of Mobility Among American Jews," American Sociological Review 34: 359-373.

Taeuber, Alma F., and Karl E. Taeuber

1968. "Recent Immigration and Studies of Ethnic Assimilation," Demography (forthcoming).

Thernstrom, Stephan

1969. "Religion and Occupational Mobility in Boston, 1880-1963," Conference on Applications of Quantitative Methods to Political, Social, and Economic History, University of Chicago, June 1970.

Warren, Bruce L.

- 1970a. "Socioeconomic Achievement and Religion: The American Case," Sociological Inquiry 40 (Spring).
- 1970b. "The Relationship Between Religious Preference and Socio-Economic Achievement of American Men," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Weber, Max

1930. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Translated by Talcott Parsons. London: George All and Unwin, Ltd.

Table 1. Summary of Selected Socio-economic and Other Characteristics of the 15 Ethnoreligious Groups and Total Sample

Ethnoreligious Groups	Total No.	Mean School Years Completed	Mean Occup. Status	Mean Total Family Income	Percent Attend Church Once a Week or More	Percent Highly Devotional ^a	Percent Third Generation or More
All Protestants	499	12.0	45.3	\$10,117	27.5	32.7	82.4
Protestant Groups							
German Presbyterians	25	13.8	58.0	14,999	40.0	24.0	92.0
Anglo-American Pres.	72	13.7	59.2	12,639	22.2	33.3	84.7
German Methodists	32	13.0	50.4	11,154	28.2	38.7	78.1
German Lutherans	57	12.2	49.9	11,635	38.6	47.4	71.9
Anglo-American Meth.	40	11.4	46.5	10,357	22.5	30.0	77.5
Anglo-American Baptists	80	10.2	36.0	8,941	30.0	32.9	91.3
Protestants, Origin N.A.	30	9.5	32.0	8,286	16.7	30.0	76.7
All Roman Catholics	427	12.0	43.2	9,999	71.2	53.6	58.4
Catholic Groups							
Irish Catholics	65	12.7	51.1	12,054	80.0	53.1	83.1
Slavic Catholics	38	12.3	45.5	9,647	65.8	54.0	26.3
German Catholics	80	12.2	48.6	9,944	70.9	50.6	81.3
Italian Catholics	55	12.0	44.1	9,700	60.0	37.8	25.5
French Catholics	51	12.0	41.2	9,625	76.5	60.8	92.2
Anglo-American Caths.	33	11.2	43.3	12,167	60.7	56.2	72.7
Polish Catholics	111	11.0	39.6	9,917	67.3	58.4	35.1
Jews	29	14.8	63.4	14,688	3.4	17.2	17.2

^a"Devotionalism", following Lenski (1960:25-26, 57-60), was measured by summing up the answers to two questions: (1) "When you have decisions to make in your everyday life, do you ask yourself what God would want you to do--often, sometimes, or never?" (2) "Which of these describes most accurately how often you yourself pray? a) more than once a day, b) once a day, c) once or twice a week, d) rarely, e) never." Respondents were considered highly devotional who said they prayed at least once or twice a week and considered God's wishes often or that they considered His wishes sometimes and prayed daily.

Table 2. Summary of Tests for Common Slope, Identity of Regression Lines, and Specific Group Departures from the Common Slope, for the Total Sample, Second Generation, and Later Generations.

	(1) Total No.	(2) Common Slope (b)	(3) Test for Common Slopes	(4) Test for Identity of Lines	(5) Tukey Test Above the Slope	(5) Tukey Test Below the Slope
Total Sample						
Education	798	.405	F=3.213, p<.01	F=2.967, p<.01	German Pres., Irish Caths., Jews	German Lutherans, Anglo Bap- tists, Polish Caths., Prots., Ori- gin, N.A.
Occupation	801	.271	n.s.	n.s.	-----	-----
Second Generation						
Education	185	.417	F=3.445, p<.01	n.s.	German Cath., Jews	-----
Occupation	223	.234	n.s.	n.s.	-----	Anglo-Caths.
Third and Later Generations						
Education	530	.372	F=2.673, p<.01	F=3.364, p<.01	German Pres., Irish Cath., French Cath.	Germ. Luth., Polish Cath., Slavic Cath., Prots., Origin, N.A.
Occupation	550	.256	n.s.	F=2.300, p<.05	Anglo Cath.,	Ital. Cath., Slavic Cath.

Table 3. Regression Parameters for Fathers' and Sons' Educational Attainment, for Fourteen Ethnoreligious Groups Three or More Generations in the United States.

Ethnoreligious Group	Total No.	Mean School Years Completed, Sons	Mean School Years Completed, Fathers	Gross Change Intergenerationally	Slope (B)	Correlation (r)
Protestant Groups						
German Presbyterians	23	13.9	9.2	4.7	.558	.393
Anglo-American Pres.	61	13.8	11.1	2.7	.259	.164
German Lutherans	41	13.3	8.1	5.2	.049	.030
German Methodists	25	13.2	8.6	4.6	.434	.275
Anglo-American Methodists	31	11.5	6.6	4.9	.439	.394
Anglo-American Baptists	73	10.2	6.3	3.9	.281	.246
Protestants, Origin N.A.	23	9.0	5.4	4.6	.168	.259
Catholic Groups						
Slavic Catholics	10	14.1	9.0	5.1	.139	.118
Italian Catholics	14	13.9	10.2	3.7	.470	.166
Irish Catholics	54	12.7	9.3	3.4	.612	.419
German Catholics	65	12.2	9.2	3.0	.430	.291
French Catholics	47	12.2	7.3	4.9	.571	.421
Polish Catholics	39	11.6	7.8	3.8	.000	-.000
Anglo-American Catholics	24	11.2	9.6	1.6	.482	.369

Common Slope, \bar{B} , for All Groups = .372

Table 4. Regression Parameters for Fathers' and Sons' Occupational Prestige, for Fourteen Ethnoreligious Groups Three or More Generations in the United States.

Ethnoreligious Group	Total No.	Mean Sons' Occup. Status	Mean Fathers' Occup. Status	Gross Change Intergenerationally	Slope (B)	Correlation (r)
Protestant Groups						
German Presbyterians	23	60.6	53.5	7.1	.258	.255
Anglo-American Pres.	61	60.2	53.2	7.0	.237	.265
German Lutherans	41	55.6	33.8	21.8	.277	.265
German Methodists	30	50.5	39.6	10.9	.217	.239
Anglo-American Meth.	34	46.3	28.0	18.3	.183	.145
Anglo-American Baptists	79	36.3	23.8	12.5	.263	.250
Protestants, Origin N.A.	24	25.2	22.7	2.5	.131	.214
Catholic Groups						
Slavic Catholics	10	48.8	28.9	19.9	-.219	-.092
Italian Catholics	14	44.8	23.5	21.3	-.034	-.017
Irish Catholics	55	50.4	43.5	6.9	.284	.306
German Catholics	66	48.6	39.9	8.7	.231	.221
French Catholics	48	40.7	35.2	5.5	.283	.255
Polish Catholics	40	41.9	28.3	13.6	.167	.149
Anglo-American Catholics	24	42.7	43.8	-1.1	.581	.542

Common Slope, \bar{B} , for All Groups = .256

Table 5. Occupational Percent Distributions of the Ethnoreligious Status Groups, Grouped by Approximately Equal Means on the Duncan Index of Socioeconomic Status.

Ethnoreligious Status Group	Mean Duncan Index	Prof., Self-Employed	Prof., Salaried	Mgrs. & Officials	Self-employed Sales & Prop.	Clerical & Retail Sales	Crafts-men & Foremen	Operatives Laborers	Total
(58.0 - 63.4)									
1. Jews	63.4	17.9	21.4	17.9	21.4	0.0	10.7	10.7	100.0
2. Anglo Pres.	59.2	1.4	30.6	16.7	22.2	8.3	7.0	13.9	100.0
3. Germ. Pres.	58.0	8.0	28.0	8.0	12.0	16.3	8.0	20.0	100.0
(48.0 - 51.1)									
4. Irish Cath.	51.1	1.5	21.5	13.9	15.4	3.1	21.5	23.1	100.0
5. Germ. Meth.	50.4	6.3	28.1	6.3	9.4	6.3	18.7	25.0	100.0
6. Germ. Luth.	49.9	3.6	21.4	8.9	12.5	12.5	14.3	26.8	100.0
7. Germ. Cath.	48.6	1.3	13.9	13.9	11.4	10.1	32.9	16.5	100.0
(40.0 - 47.0)									
8. Anglo. Meth.	46.5	0.0	20.0	12.5	7.5	17.5	12.5	30.0	100.0
9. Slavic Cath.	45.5	0.0	18.4	13.2	2.6	5.3	34.2	26.3	100.0
10. Ital. Cath.	44.1	3.6	10.9	9.1	12.7	7.3	34.6	21.8	100.0
11. Anglo. Cath.	43.3	12.1	9.1	9.1	6.1	3.0	24.2	36.4	100.0
12. French Cath.	41.2	2.0	9.8	7.8	13.7	2.0	29.4	35.3	100.0
(39 and below)									
13. Polish Cath.	39.6	0.9	10.9	8.2	8.2	4.6	35.5	31.8	100.0
14. Anglo. Bapt.	36.0	0.0	8.8	7.5	1.3	6.3	31.3	45.0	100.0
15. Prots., N.A.	32.0	0.0	6.3	3.1	0.0	9.4	34.4	46.9	100.0

Table 6. Indexes of Dissimilarity of the Occupational Distributions of Ethnoreligious Groups, Grouped by Approximately Equal Means on the Duncan Index of Socioeconomic Status.*

(58.0 - 63.4)			(48.0 - 51.1)					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
1	---	21.5	31.9	4	---	16.5	15.2	18.4
2	---	---	21.5	5	---	---	13.8	27.7
3	---	---	---	6	---	---	---	23.6
				7				---

(40.0 - 47.0)					(39 and below)				
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15		
8	---	22.4	30.9	30.2	30.4	13	---	14.9	19.9
9	---	---	16.1	25.7	22.1	14	---	---	8.2
10	---	---	---	23.1	14.5	15	---	---	---
11	---	---	---	---	13.5				
12	---	---	---	---	---				

*The numbers in the rows and columns refer to the ethnoreligious groups as listed in Table 5.