

we should be duly thankful. Wide distribution in the United States of this or of a comparably inexpensive American edition would be highly desirable.

GEORGE GAYLORD SIMPSON
American Museum of Natural History

Elmtown's youth: The impact of social classes on adolescents. August B. Hollingshead. New York: John Wiley; London: Chapman & Hall, 1949. Pp. x+480. \$5.00.

Social class in America: A manual for the measurement of social status. W. Lloyd Warner, Marchia Meeker, and Kenneth Eells. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949. Pp. xiii+274. \$4.25.

These two books, both written by sociologists, describe the social classes in a Midwestern town which is called Elmtown in one book and Jonesville in the other.

Elmtown's youth is "an analysis of the way the social system organizes and controls the social behavior of high-school-aged adolescents reared in it." The purpose of *Social class in America* is not the description of the town as such, but rather, the exposition of methods of analyzing social classes, with illustrative material drawn from this town.

Considered together, the two volumes detract from each other. Two sets of pseudonyms are used; yet the characters are recognizable from one book to the other, since the leading citizens and informers are naturally the same for both. Incidents are somewhat disguised to protect the identity of the inhabitants, and these disguises also vary, giving a feeling of unreality to the same events in this very real community.

Considered separately, the volumes represent two important contributions in the study of community life in America.

In *Elmtown*, Dr. Hollingshead found 735 adolescents of high school age in a community of some 10,000 people. The community tended to ignore the 345 adolescents who were not in school. In general, the children remaining in high school belonged to the families in better and more stable economic position.

Many fascinating details are given of the methods used to teach children "acceptable and unacceptable behavior relative to the family, the job, property, money, the school, the government, men, women, sex, and recreation. It is perfectly normal for families in the same or an adjacent [social] class, concentrated in a particular residential area, . . . to provide their children with significantly different learning situations from those of families in other classes who live in other residential areas."

The analysis of the process by which the young unskilled worker adjusts to the demands of the working world is particularly interesting. The adolescent takes a job to secure "freedom" (from school and from dependence on his parents). The jobs "are mean, dirty, undesirable, and generally seasonal or temporary." These factors "produce discontent and frustration, which motivate the young worker to seek another job, only to realize after a few weeks that the new job is like the old one." The average boy holds five jobs in his first year to a year and a half out of school. Afterwards, he becomes a more

stable worker at a slightly higher rate of pay.

In *Social class in America*, Dr. Warner and his co-authors give two measures for analyzing social class. The crux of "Evaluated Participation" is persuading a community to judge each other's social class. "The Index of Status Characteristics" consists essentially of the sociologist rating the individual by judging his position in the social hierarchy in regard to occupation; source of income, house type, and dwelling area. These facts can ordinarily be secured easily.

The book is probably not the final one in the series written by Warner and collaborators. In the reviewer's opinion, there will be still further refinements of these measures. The present exposition will convince most readers, however, of the reality of social class; and will teach something about the methods of studying a community.

My own reaction to the scales of social class is that the values used for them are those of the small-town banker. Most scientists at one time or another must meet the inspection of the banker. But in addition, scientists class each other's prestige on a scale having little in common with the banker's.

A class structure for university scientists might be constructed along the following lines:

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| Upper-Upper. | Has the highest originality; constructs theories which other scientists test for years to come. |
| Lower-Upper. | Spends all possible time on research. Constructs theories dealing with limited areas. Envis the originality of the Upper-Upper. |
| Upper-Middle. | Is a revered teacher of younger scientists. Can verbalize the theories proposed by two upper classes adequately. Publishes an occasional research paper. |
| Lower-Middle. | Teaches other scientists, but has no reputation. Has published nothing but his doctoral dissertation. |
| Upper-Lower. | Teaches a scientific subject in a routine manner to students who are not enthusiastic. Turns in grades promptly at the end of the term. |
| Lower-Lower. | Fails to meet his classes. His students complain to the administration about him. His knowledge is limited; he takes to telling jokes unrelated to his subject. |

A farming community such as Jonesville (Elmtown) places at the top people who have been prosperously living there for some generations. A group of scientists might place at the top an individual who has been rapidly promoted from one institution to another, with consequent impoverishment of his bank account, and with the additional factor that his neighbors in a physical sense might not know him. Sociologists will have to take account of the fact that the human being is complicated enough to strive in more than one type of prestige structure.

HELEN M. WOLFLE
American Psychological Association