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Abstract

Organizations are a key venue where individuals from different backgrounds have the opportunity to interact and yet we know very little about how social class background shapes interactions within the workplace. There is reason to believe that the differing value systems of social class groups influence their attitudes and behavior towards workplace connections and relationship formation. This article considers how social class background affects organizational social networks as well as the class-distinct values and attitudes that shape networking behavior of employees. To study this phenomena, I analyze a sample of 490 employees from a broad range of roles and organizations across the United States to find that (a) the attitudes toward networking and openness to friendship vary by class groups and mediate social class’s effect on network outcomes; (b) social class background does not appear to affect degree centrality but does affect class composition; and (c) social class mobility and institutional agency moderate these relationships. Additionally, I provide quantitative support that the middle social class hold central positions within organizations, particularly in connecting the lower and upper social class to one another, and thus merit more careful consideration by organizations and in future research.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

“The combined trends of increased inequality and decreasing mobility pose a fundamental threat to the American Dream, our way of life, and what we stand for around the globe.” -President Barack Obama

Rising inequality, both locally and globally, has generated increased attention to the topic of social class and the class culture gap. Given America’s history in considering itself a largely classless nation (Kingston, 2000; Mantsios, 2006), the recent recognition that classes are present, and the class divide is ever-growing, has elicited deep emotional responses as exemplified in the above quote. For centuries, the United States had prided itself on the promise of the American Dream, that anyone with the necessary work ethic and perseverance can find success (Bloom & Hobby, 2009; Lucas, 2011). However, as economic inequality rises, and upward mobility becomes more difficult, there is increased understanding that this dream, this promise, may no longer stand (if it ever did at all).

As a result of this change in perception, research in social class is rising across many social sciences as people begin to recognize the influence of class on a myriad of outcomes. Indeed, social class, or “the relative social rankings of organizational members based on differences in... economic capital (i.e., wealth), social capital (i.e., networks and connections), and cultural capital (i.e., tastes and practices developed through educational and personal experiences)” (Gray & Kish-Gephart 2013, p. 671), has been demonstrated to affect a broad range of physical, mental, and psychological outcomes. Health research shows that individuals in higher social class have lower depression, anxiety, stress, and mortality; and better cardiovascular and general health overall (Duncan, Ziol-Guest, & Kalil, 2010; Salokangas & Poutanen 1998; Warheit, Holzer, & Arey, 1975; McLeod & Kessler 1990; Leana, Mittal, Stiehl, 2012; Chen, Matthews, & Boyce, 2002; Chen & Matthews, 2001; Chen, 2004). Psychology and sociology research shows class has a significant influence on attitudes, such as food preferences.
(Maguire, 2017), political affiliation (Grumbach, 2015), respect for authority (Côté, 2011), and parenting styles (Lareau, 1987; Fiske & Markus, 2012; Martin, Côté, Woodruff, 2016); as well as behavior, including generosity (Miller, Kahle, & Hastings, 2015), perspective-taking (Preston & de Waal, 2002), and prosocial behavior (Martinsson, Villegas-Palacio, Wollbrant, 2015).

Despite the popularity of the topic, research on the networks of social classes and how classes interact with one another is surprisingly understudied in recent decades, particularly within the field of management. Given that one’s perception of class is so heavily based on a social ranking system that compares one’s place to others in a social setting, understanding how social networks and social class influence one another is an important point of consideration. Due to the dearth of research on this topic within the field of management, organizational network scholars have had to import many of the key assumptions regarding class from other disciplines, including that lower social classes have small, dense networks; higher social classes have large networks of weak ties; and that individuals’ networks have strong class-based homogeneity (Kadushin & Jones, 1992; Fiske & Markus, 2012; Lareau, 1987). Indeed, management literature relies heavily on these assumed social class differences in networks, including research in knowledge management; information seeking and innovation; cross-class interactions; job attainment and job advancement; and control, power and politics. This is problematic for two reasons.

First, when comparing across the disciplines, the few studies that have compared the social networks characteristics of different social classes have not come to the similar conclusions. Milroy and Milroy’s (1992) work in sociolinguistics proposed that upper social classes have a higher proportion of weak ties than their lower social class counterparts. Some have postulated that this is because with education and mobility comes greater options, allowing
a greater selection of network ties (Fischer, 1982). Others have found that higher socioeconomic status individuals join more groups, leading people to assume this leads to more ties (Bowman, 2008). Kadushin and Jones’s (2002) sociological analysis of New York City residents and their neighborhoods found that, in line with common assumptions, higher social classes have more diverse social networks while lower social classes had geographically local cohesive networks. Additionally, they found that lower social classes had fewer weak-tie diverse networks (Kadushin & Jones, 1992; Kadushin, 2002). However, contrary to what many scholars commonly believe about social classes’ social networks, it was higher social classes that had more cohesive networks. Additionally, Stephens, Cameron, and Townsend’s (2014) study in cross-cultural psychology challenged traditional perceptions in psychology and sociology that lower social classes have higher levels of social connection when they found that it was the lowest social class, the working poor, who felt most isolated.

Findings regarding the integration of social classes, or cross-class tie formation whereby an individual is connected with individuals outside of their social class, have been mixed as well. Most suggest that individuals will primarily connect with individuals like themselves. This is exemplified in the principle of homophily which states that “social interactions tend to take place among individuals with similar attributes” (Lin, Ensel, & Vaughn, 1981, p.396). Many researchers have posited that friendships are heavily influenced by social class homogeneity (Huckfeldt, 1983; Mardsen, 1987; Hampton & Duncan, 2011), while others have found that the dynamics of friendship were only minimally affected by class (Tampubolon, 2005; Buhai & van der Leij, 2006).

A second problem, networking within an organization is notably different than connections made in general society. There are several reasons organizations are distinct from
general society and research should be conducted specifically on organizational networking. Organizations, as a fundamental source of income, status, and social interaction which are core components to the definition of social class, are a leading contributor to class differences. Furthermore, since housing and schools are largely socioeconomically segregated (Musterd & Ostendorf, 2005; Altonji & Mansfield, 2011), organizations are one of the primary venues where people of different social classes interact with each other. Additionally, networking and tie formation is inherently different within organizations compared to general social structures at large. While one’s social network as a whole can be comprised of a broad range of family, friends, neighbors, and others, with tens of thousands of options, employees in an organization are constrained by those with whom they interact as a result of their job duties. Because much of the interaction is a function of their job, it is likely considered to be more instrumental than non-work ties. Moreover, individuals within an organization are situated within a power hierarchy which has been shown to significantly influence interactions and relationships (Ibarra & Andrews, 1993). Therefore, basing management research on assumptions from general networking instead of organizational networking could lead to underdeveloped findings or erroneous conclusions.

Organizational social networks, which I define as the specific set of linkages between employees (Ibarra, 1991), has widely recognized benefits to both individuals and institutions including access to social resources and opportunities (Hampton & Duncan 2011); social and emotional support (Cohen & Wills 1985); self-esteem and perceptions of control (Cohen & Syme, 1985; Brown & Harris, 1978; Cattell, 2001); and better health chances, job attainment, higher pay and occupational prestige (Wolf & Bruhn, 1993; Berkman & Breslow, 1983; Rogers, 1996; Boxman, De Graaf, & Flap, 1991; Lin, Ensel, Vaughn, 1981; Burt 2004; Rivera,
Soderstrom, & Uzzi, 2010; Song 2011). Perhaps most importantly for organizations, social integration leads to improved performance through enhanced cooperation and information sharing (Pedersen & Lewis, 2012).

Despite these clear benefits, many individuals are reluctant to engage in networking behavior within the workplace, particularly those who stand to benefit from it most—the lower social class. Additionally, individuals across all classes are thought to have poor cross-class social integration, or integration with those from a social class background different from one’s own (Huckfeldt, 1983; Liu & Duff, 1972), inhibiting true social integration. However, great debate surrounds the driving forces for these preferences and behaviors. Literature has identified both attitudinal factors, stemming from cultural upbringing, as well as organizational factors that serve to influence workplace social network formation.

Cultural upbringing has been studied at extensively by sociologists, psychologists, linguists, and educational professionals alike. One of the primary theories of social class is that of the sociocultural model of self which states that “a unique identity… forms based on one’s environment and shapes how one responds to this environment” (Loignon & Woehr, 2017, p. 4; Stephens, Markus, Fryberg, 2012). Similarly, Bourdieu’s concept of habitus posited that “agents shape their aspirations according to concrete indices of the accessible and inaccessible, of what is and is not ‘for us’” (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 64). Habitus “generates perceptions, aspirations, and practices that correspond to the structuring properties of earlier socialization” (Swartz, 2012, p. 103). The environments in which individuals are raised has lasting effects on the way they view the world and subsequently, how they act within it. Research has shown that childhood social class is one of the most influential factors in predicting adult career choice because it is during childhood that individuals form a perception of what job prospects exist and are obtainable for
people like them (Vondracek, Lerner, Schulenberg, 1986; Zingaro, 1983; DeBell, 2006), and what they ought to value in a future career (Whiston & Keller, 2004). Additionally, management research has shown classes’ influence on ethical decision-making and behavior (Côté, 2011; Piff, Stancato, Côté, Mendoza-Denton, & Keltner, 2012), risk-taking preferences (Kish-Gephart & Campbell, 2015), leadership (Barling & Weatherhead, 2016; Fang & Côté, 2016), and mentoring relationships (Scully et al., 2017).

Organizational factors have also been identified that serve to influence and constrict social network formation within the workplace. The physical limitations of workspace often means that employees of different social classes work in separate locations or during different periods of time (e.g. warehouse employees have little interaction with employees at a company’s corporate headquarters) (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013). However, even in settings where classes converge, Kleinfeld (2002) suggests that “cultural groups may set up psychological boundaries when geographic boundaries slip away” (p. 2). Similarly, Putnam (2007) argued that even when people reside in diverse settings, they “appear to 'hunker down’ that is to pull in like a turtle” (p. 149). While organizations will vary in their level of social class diversity, it may be that even in settings with access to diverse-class others, psychological influences may be more powerful than environmental forces.

Class has been identified as a driving force for social distancing (Marx, 1978; Hipp & Perrin, 1999; Foy et al., 2014). Social distance refers to “the ways in which individual preferences, based in a person’s membership of specific social in-groups, influence social relations with people from other outgroups” (Hodgetts, Stolte, Radley, Leggatt-Cook, Groot, & Chamberlain, 2010). Some have suggested that higher-status individuals use distancing as a means of maintaining control over valuable resources by preventing lower status others from
accessing them (Bourdieu, 1984; Lamont & Lareau, 1988; O’Guinn, Tanner, Maeng, 2015). Separation can occur both cognitively, in considering lower-status others as less psychologically similar (Inesi et al., 2012), and physically when people spatially separate based on status (Lott 2002; Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013; O’Guinn, Tanner, Maeng, 2015). Lamont (2000) suggests that higher class individuals exclude others on the basis of a perceived moral, socioeconomic, and cultural superiority. Conversely, researchers have also observed that lower social class individuals can deny and separate from higher class individuals, denigrating white collar work compared to blue-collar work (Halle, 1984; Sennett & Cobb, 1972; Berger, 1960); and criticizing higher class parents who they perceive value work over family (Gorman, 2000). Stephens, Markus, and Townsend (2007) suggest that these behaviors stem from divergent values held by different social classes; while higher classes desire distinctiveness, lower social classes often gain power through collectives and therefore desire similarity and density within their class. The exact ways that these differences unfold in networks ties and organizational social networks warrants empirical investigated.

Another area that begs greater exploration is the role of the middle social class in organizational networks. Social class theorizing is often about the lower social class or the upper social class, traditionally comparing the focal group to simply those not in the focal group. However, research of the middle social class specifically is scant and often outdated (for an exception, see Stephens, Markus, Townsend, 2007 or Kish-Gephart & Campbell, 2015). What little has been done suggests that this group may play critical bridging roles in organizations (Huckfeldt, 1983; Liu & Duff, 1972). Class in society, and within organizations, is dependent on a ranking system that structurally places the middle class between the lower and upper social classes. This may provide middle social class actors more opportunity to form cross-class ties.
with both other classes (Huckfeldt, 1983). Social networking literature would suggest that if these middle class employees are filling structural holes within the organizational network, they are likely important conduits of information and social capital (Burt, 1992), making them a valuable area for study.

Thus, there are several important research questions that emerge from the current inconsistencies and oversights in the literature. Broadly, what is the effect of childhood social class on organizational social network characteristics?; what are the mechanisms that lead to differences in class-based network characteristics?; how do organizational characteristics influence organizational network characteristics?; and what is the role of the middle social class in the organizational network?

In sum, this study will integrate two highly related fields, social class and social networking, to explore how these processes unfold in the organizational setting. I will achieve this by (a) collecting data within organizations, about the influence of social class on the characteristics of organizational networks, (b) differentiating between three primary classes: the lower, middle, and upper social class, and (c) analyzing the mechanisms by which social class has such an effect, generating a deeper understanding of class differences. I propose that the causes of such distinctions are rooted in sociocultural differences in class groups that are first developed in childhood and carried into adulthood and ultimately into organizations.

In shedding light on this important phenomenon, I hope provide empirical findings to either confirm or challenge long-held assumptions and advance current theories of social class by identifying the class-specific attitudes and behaviors that shape organizational behavior. Additionally, I hope to advance the literature on social networks by investigating how social class influences organizational social networks dynamics. Furthermore, I hope that through the
results of this study organizations will become better equipped to increase social integration of different social classes in ways that will benefit all employees and the organization as a whole.

A broad range of theories will drive this study including sociocultural model of self (Stephens, Markus, & Fryberg, 2012), the theory of habitus (Bourdieu, 1990), social networking theory (Liu, Sidhu, Beacom, & Valente, 2004), and the theory of homophily (Lin, Ensel, & Vaughn, 1981), to allow for a comprehensive consideration of network composition. The sociocultural model of self will be the organizational framework for understanding cultural class-based differences in network characteristics.

Hypotheses are tested with existing employee networks using ego network analysis which entails a micro approach to network analysis by considering all of the local connections of an individual’s (ego’s) organizational network. Using this method, one person provides all information regarding their own attributes and the connections they have within their organizational field. Because ego network analysis does not require full organizational representation, data collection does not hinge on the response rate of a group. This method allows for breadth as the sample is comprised of employees across a vast spectrum of diverse roles and geographic locations, representing a wide range of organizations that vary in size, industry, and social class diversity.

In the next chapter, the literature on social class and social networking are reviewed, including research on the development of social class theories, the strength of childhood social class, and the environments of the lower, middle, and upper social class. Next, a theoretical model and hypotheses are introduced, based largely on the sociocultural model of self and the proposed class-based attitudinal differences. The model considers the moderators social mobility, institutional agency, and organizational structure, as well as the mediators attitude toward
networking, openness to friendship, and work/family identity. After the hypotheses development, the methods and research design will be articulated, followed by the results from the empirical study and analysis. Lastly, a discussion of the findings will be considered, along with the limitations of this study, implications of the research, future avenues for exploration, and the practical application for both employees and managers.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The first section of this chapter will review social networking. I will begin by describing social networks broadly before examining the motivations that drive networking behavior. Next, I will discuss social resources and social capital, followed by an overview of relevant social networking theories.

The second section will review social class research. First, I will discuss social class as a construct including the factors that influence its meaning, various definitions in the literature, and the focal definition for this study. Then I will review the development of social class theories over time, the disciplines from which they originate, and how that influences our modern understanding of social class theory. A particular emphasis will be given to the sociocultural model of self and, relatedly, the concepts of Bourdieu, as they are the driving theories for this dissertation. Given the importance of childhood socialization to these core theories, I will then describe the environments of the lower and higher social classes and the cultural disparities that arise from their differences, including values, attitudes, and behavior.

The intention of this review is to lay the foundation for Chapter 3 where I apply the sociocultural model of self to social networking to theorize and predict how childhood social class environments impact organizational social networks.
Social Networks

The study of social networks is valued for its perceived ability to interpret social behavior as a reaction to social linkages and the nature of such relationships (Ibarra, 1991). Broadly, social network theory “focuses on the role of social relationships in transmitting information, channeling personal or media influence, and enabling attitudinal or behavioral change.” (Liu, Sidhu, Beacom, & Valente 2017, pg. 1). While many scholars have focused on the utilization of networks to identify and attain resources that exist within one’s network, including both tangible and intangible resources (Milroy & Milroy, 1992), there are other benefits to networks including an enhanced understanding of one’s place in relation to others, which conveys centrality, power, and status (Sparrow, Liden, Wayne, & Kraimer, 2001). Networks also provide socialization by transmitting norms and social support (Podolny & Baron, 1997; Sparrow et al., 2001).

Research has shown that networks can provide social support, self-esteem, and identity (Cattell, 2001). Further, larger and more diverse social networks can increase access to information and the identification of opportunities such as the obtainment of higher paying positions (Boxman, DeGraaf, & Flap, 1991; Flap & Boxman, 1998; Hampton & Duncan, 2011; Parks, DiTomaso, & Post, 2005). At the group level, diversity within networks enhances social integration (Glanville, 2004), and social integration then enhances cooperation and helping behaviors (Dumas & Sanchez-Burks, 2015; Pedersen & Lewis, 2012).

Social networks are studied at both the individual and group level. The social network of a group represents the observed connections between group members. Group or ‘global’ social networks are typically described by their density, or the “overall level of interaction of various kinds reported by network members” (Sparrowe et al., 2001, pg. 317). The higher the interaction between group members, the greater the density of the network. An individual or ‘ego’ social
network in its broadest sense is defined as “everyone you now know, everyone you have ever known, and everyone who knows you even though you don’t know them” (Burt, 1992, pg. 59). Social networking literature frequently uses the term ‘ego’ to refer to the focal individual and ‘alter’ to refer to those with whom they are connecting.

**Motivation of Network Behavior**

The field of social networks has suggested there are two primary drives of network behavior, safety and efficacy. These forces originated in the psychology literature on motivation (Greenberg, 1991; Haidt & Robin, 1991), but have been aptly applied to social network formation by organizational scholars (Kadushin, 2002). These drives originate in childhood but have enduring influences into adulthood. Safety is described as an inherent need that can be achieved through the formation of close, affiliative relationships which illicit the “feeling of physical, intellectual, and psychological relaxation” (Greenberg, 1991, pg. 137). Efficacy has been described as a child’s “need to do and learn how to do” (Kadushin, 2002, pg. 81; Hendrick, 1942), and is typically achieved through autonomy and self-sufficiency. The need for safety draws people closer together while the need for efficacy encourages people to separate from the group. As such, the motivation for efficacy is in contrast with the affiliative drives of safety (Greenberg, 1991; Kadushin, 2002). The effect these forces have on network structures is, as Kadushin (2002) explains, “safety corresponds to and is generated by networks of cohesion, while efficacy comes about from separation and corresponds to networks with structural holes and is typical of brokerage situations” (pg. 77). Structural holes refer to a lack of tie between two individuals (Kadushin, 2002), while a broker refers to individuals who serve as an intermediary between two otherwise unconnected ties.
Although safety and efficacy forces are both innate, efficacy drives are dependent on the satisfaction of safety needs. In this way, the environment in which people find themselves can shape networking behavior. Those whose ability to satisfy their need for safety is inhibited by environmental factors will be less inclined to pursue efficacy drives.

**Value Embedded in Social Networks**

The satisfaction of both safety and efficacy needs can be aided or inhibited by the resources (or lack thereof) that originate from individuals or the networks to which they belong. Resources are traditionally understood as tangible materials that aid one in the pursuit of their goals. However, there are other, more intangible resources that one may possess such as knowledge, information, or social skills. It is important to note that resources, especially those that are intangible, can reside with a single individual or within a group. Personal resources are in the sole control of an individual and can be used freely without the consideration of others (Lin, 1999). There are two related and complimentary constructs in social networking literature that describe resources that are embedded within networks: social resources and social capital.

Social resources are “the wealth, status, power as well as social ties of those persons who are directly or indirectly linked to the individual” (Lin, Vaughn, & Ensel, 1981, pg. 395). Unlike personal resources, which are possessed by one person who can individually decide how to use or dispose of them, social resources are subsumed in social structures and include both the social relationships and resources accessible through these relationships (Lin, 1999). Social resources are accessed through one’s network and can be passed, borrowed, or shared between members that may be directly or indirectly connected (Lin, 1999).

The theory of social resources suggests that social groups come to form pyramidal structures with advantages for those that occupy higher positions. At the top of the pyramid,
members hold more resources, have greater accessibility to the remaining structure, and there are fewer occupants, and so fewer with whom to share (Lin, 1999). Greater personal resources, coupled with the visibility and accessibility to the remaining structure, creates a concentration of social resources in addition to the personal resources occupants already possess. However, access to these rich resources is available only to those who are themselves embedded in the top network. Based on this view, scholars have theorized that it would be to individual’s benefit to engage in a “reaching-up” process by seeking ties with others higher in the pyramidal structure, who are thought to have greater resources and influence that stand to benefit the individual seeking help (Lin, 1999).

Developed independently of social resources, social capital offers a complimentary interpretation of resources within networks (Bourdieu, 1981; Coleman, 1988). Portes (1995) defines social capital as “the capacity of individuals to command scarce resources by virtue of their membership in networks, or broader social structures” he goes on to note that “the ability to obtain [social capital] does not inhere in the individual . . . but instead is a property of the individual’s set of relationships with others” (pg. 12-13). Like social resources, social capital refers to resources in a social network (Lin, 1999). However, the focus on capital shifts the emphasis to the instrumentality of such resources, and as such considers aspects such as investing or mobilizing (Lin, 1999). The emphasis on instrumentality has particular importance for theorizing about networking behavior within organizations as it is believed that there are class differences in the perceived morality of instrumentality.

**Competing Theories of Tie Formation**

To the extent that individuals perceive that social connections may provide the resources they desire, they will be motivated to pursue relationships with others. However, networking
literature contains competing theories regarding the strategies for tie formation. From one perspective is the theory of homophily (Homans, 1950; Lin, Ensel, & Vaughn, 1981) which states that because individuals are more likely to interact with individuals similar to themselves, they are more likely to create ties, particularly strong ones, with homophilous individuals. The other perspective is the prestige principle which proposes that individuals tend to pursue people of higher status (Laumann, 1966; Lin, Ensel, & Vaughn, 1981). The prestige principle is highly complementary to the theory of social resources whereby the theory of social resources provides the explanation of the phenomenon described by the prestige principle. Because individuals higher in the pyramidal structure have greater resources, individuals who desire superior resources will be motivated to expand their social network to include higher-tiered ties.

Further integrating tenets of social networking literature, one can also see the parallel between the competing hypotheses of the prestige principle and homophily and safety/efficacy drives. Safety drives would encourage forming and cultivating ties with close others, who are similar and therefore non-challenging. This would mirror the tenets of homophily which suggests people interact and connect with people like themselves. However, efficacy motivations drive people to separate from their group in search of new experiences. Similarly, the prestige principle and the theory of social resources would encourage individuals to pursue ties with people above them in the hierarchical structure, outside of their safe network, to gain access to novel, and often superior, social resources and the more tangible resources that come with them.

**Summary and Conclusion**

Social networking literature provides a wealth of theory about how and why people connect to one another. Yet it also presents competing motivations and theories that necessitate deeper explanation. Throughout the course of this study, I will discuss the class environmental...
and cultural factors of childhood socialization that create enduring values and beliefs that in turn shape a number of organizationally relevant, social networking attitudes and behaviors such as in which class are safety drives more prevalent than efficacy drives and how do class values and attitudes shape the reaching-up process of tie formation.

**Social Class Review**

**Construct Definition**

To understand social class requires an understanding of identity. According to Brewer (1991), identity is composed of two aspects: the individuated self that distinguishes oneself from others, and social identities where one understands at least part of themselves through their membership with a group. Similarly, *social class identity* is influenced by both individual and social aspects. Individual aspects include one’s education, neighborhood, and material possessions. Social aspects include cultural preferences that are associated with membership in a class and the social comparisons that give meaning to one’s individual characteristics. Unlike many identities, social class identity is heavily influenced by others’ perceptions of one’s identity, especially through comparisons, and one’s perception of others’ perception of one’s identity (Gorman, 2000; Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013).

Although social class is generally considered one of the more “invisible identities,” unlike more noticeable attributes such as race or gender (Clair, Beatty, & MacLean, 2005), there are various signals of social class background that lead to largely accurate inference of others’ class. Examples include wealth, occupation, and education, as well as more indirect signals such as those shaped by class cultures including tastes, practices, and behavior (Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2011). Studies have shown that people can reliably judge others’ social class (Kraus & Keltner, 2009; Kraus, Park, & Tan, 2007; Coleman & Rainwater, 1979), making perceptions of
one’s own class standing vis-à-vis others relatively aligned with more objective measures of class.

From this stream of research comes several social class definitions that focus on the comparative aspect of social class (Kraus et al., 2009; Piff, 2010; Kraus et al. 2011); which has been synthesized by Côté (2001) as “a dimension of the self that is rooted in objective material resources (via income, education, and occupational prestige) and corresponding subjective perceptions of rank vis-à-vis others” (pg. 47). However, there has been a critique of the overemphasis of rank in social class research (Leavitt & Fryberg, 2013; Stephens & Townsend, 2013). While none dispute that rank plays an important role, some scholars caution that rank-based perspectives result in a “gap between in-the-moment perceptions of social class rank and more deep-seated, structural effects of social class” (Leavitt & Fryberg, 2013). Further, Stephens and Townsend (2013) argue that “the experience of social class extends far beyond rank and involves ongoing participation in a particular sociocultural context—a socially and historically constructed environment that contains a set of culture-specific ideas, practices, and institutions” (pg. 126). These authors argue for the deemphasis of rank in the consideration of social class.

Applied to a more organizationally specific domain, Gray & Kish-Gephart (2013) define social class as “the relative social rankings of organizational members based on differences in... economic capital (i.e., wealth), social capital (i.e., networks and connections), and cultural capital (i.e., tastes and practices developed through educational and personal experiences)” (pg. 671). This definition is more appropriate for the current study for several reasons. First, it represents a more stable conception of one’s class identity that is less dependent on subjective perceptions that change with in-the-moment comparison groups. Thus, it avoids the emphasis on rank that has been criticized by scholars. Second, influenced by the work of Bourdieu, who will
be discussed in greater detail below, this definition properly acknowledges the interplay between individual and cultural forces whereas the definitions from psychology place greater emphasis on the self. Third, as this study draws heavily from literature on social networking, the emphasis on capital lends itself to a successful merging of these fields. For these reasons, I utilize the Gray & Kish-Gephart definition of social class throughout my theorizing and hypotheses development.

**Distinguishing Class from Status**

Briefly, I want to address what social class is not to avoid confusion of terminology occurring in subsequent sections. Social class is distinct from status. Status involves respect and admiration from others and can be gained for many reasons, some that overlap with elements of social class like the possession of economic, cultural, and social resources, but also others that are distinct from material resources (Côté, 2011). For example, a friendly, well-liked employee may gain status through their personality, having little if anything to do with their social class background. Additionally, status can change across contexts as the comparison groups shift, whereas social class is a more enduring trait that is formed from a lifetime of experiences and a standing in society that persists across contexts. For this reason, status is non-equivalent to social class and will be discussed separately throughout this dissertation.

**Social Class Theory**

*Early Social Class Theories*

Social class is by no means a modern concept. Evidence of social class distinctions exists in the earliest of civilization across tribal, monarchic, and democratic systems of ancient Israel, Greece, and Rome, (Sperling, 2007; Cartwright, 2013; Garnsey & Saller, 2014). While these structures have been acknowledged and discussed in earlier literature, the philosophy and
theories of social class that still resonate today began to emerge in the mid- to late-1800s with foundational sociologists, Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, and Max Weber.

As one of the pioneers of class structures in society, Karl Marx began with a relatively straightforward differentiation between classes. People were categorized into two primary divisions: those who owned the means of production (bourgeoisie) and those who did not (proletariat).¹ Without ownership of material resources, the proletariat were forced to sell their labor as a process to generate sufficient income and sustain their lifestyle (Marx & Engels, 1848). As a sociological theory, Marx’s conception of class relied almost entirely on the material arrangements within society with little regard for individual psychological mechanisms.

Building on Marx’s work, Durkheim and Weber contributed new concepts to the discussion of class in society. Durkheim’s attention was given to the cohesion of class groups, while Weber shared Marx’s focus on the divisions and conflict between class groups. Durkheim theorized extensively on solidarity or social integration and their driving mechanisms. Two key concepts he introduced were a “common conscience” which represented the shared values and beliefs of a group and “the interdependence of society” that stemmed from the specialization of labor. In this way, Durkheim argued that differences in society serve to bring people together as they must rely on one another to meet their needs.

In contrast Weber, much like Marx, saw the differentiation of classes not as an integrative force but one of inherent conflict. He argued that the societal structure would lead to the creation and perpetuation of social inequality, not cohesion. According to Weber, society is in constant competition for a finite amount of resources and, as a competitive strategy to limit competition,

¹ A third class was mentioned but with less emphasis for contributing to the structure of the system; the petite bourgeoisie were those who owned sufficient means of production to avoid selling their labor, but not enough to purchase labor themselves (Marx & Engels, 1848).
groups form based on cultural characteristics to bar groups with dissimilar characteristics from valuable resources (Lamont, Pendergrass, & Pachuki, 2015). A largely subconscious process, the majority groups create defining attributes to gain entry into the privileged group. With Weber’s theorizing, status and power aspects of class and the social psychology of status differentials were introduced to social class theorizing.

**Class Beyond Sociology**

The common theme amidst these early theories is an emphasis on the external forces that, to varying degrees, shape human behavior. These approaches are generally referred to as macro or structural approaches and have been criticized for ignoring or undermining the agency of the individual (Swartz, 2012). The common counterpart to structuralism is micro or individual approaches that emphasize that the actions of a person stem in their most extreme form solely from the will of the individual. Perhaps the most starkly individual approach to social class theorizing is the culture of poverty theory from the field of anthropology.

As the name suggests, the culture of poverty theory focuses more narrowly on the lowest of social classes. While limited in scope, it contributes to the field by considering not just the structural or societal factors that contribute to class, but the psychological mechanisms of the individuals within those classes. Oscar Lewis, the first to label the phenomenon, acknowledged the extraneous factors that limited people in poverty, but also went on to suggest that this led to distinct attitudes and behaviors from childhood socialization that further inhibit individuals from escaping these conditions. An example of these belief systems, Lewis purported that those in poverty “have a strong feeling of marginality, of helplessness, or dependency, of not belonging” (Lewis, 1998). According to this theory, it is these attitudes that keep people living in poverty from engaging in behavior that might alter their circumstances, creating a self-fulfilling
prophecy. This work received much criticism, first for suggesting that the attitudes of the poor were the root of the poverty problem, essentially victim blaming. The second criticism was that it was too deterministic and did not sufficiently acknowledge the many exceptions of people who experienced mobility (Leana, Mittal, & Stiehl, 2012).

While the culture of poverty theory had its flaws, its essential notion that class heavily influences socialization of its members is shared by more recent class theorists. Indeed, many of the more common perspectives on social class attempt to acknowledge both the voluntarist and determinist components of human behavior. One of the most recognizable social class theorists, Pierre Bourdieu, attempted to bridge the micro and macro domains and sufficiently account for both the influence of the environmental structure and the individual motivations driving human behavior.

Bourdieu

Foundational Concepts

Bourdieu is best known for his description of the social world through the concepts of field, habitus, and strategy (Bourdieu, 1985). The field refers generally to the setting where individuals interact and includes their social positions in relation to others. However, fields are often used to describe more specific social settings that embody distinct norms and practices, ranks and hierarchies. As Jenkins (2014) describes, “each field, by virtue of its defining content, has a different logic and taken-for-granted structure of necessity and relevance which is both the product and producer of habitus which is specific and appropriate to the field” (pg. 84). Fields are distinct from social relationships in that the same dyadic relationship may operate under a different set of rules in different fields (Bourdieu, 1984). For instance, the social interaction patterns between a student and teacher differ in the classroom setting and a social gathering.
Whereas fields describe more macro structures, habitus encompasses individual preferences and the forces that shape them. Habitus is formed during childhood socialization where children become familiar with the external structures in which they operate. These experiences are internalized, thus forming dispositions and conceptions of what are possible and likely outcomes for people within these structures. As Swartz (2012) explains, “on the one hand, habitus sets structural limits for action. On the other hand, habitus generates perceptions, aspirations, and practices that correspond to the structuring properties of earlier socialization” (pg. 103). Due to the internalization, it is difficult to override or change the patterns from one’s habitus. In effect, habitus comes to reproduce the attitudes and actions modeled to child and perpetuates cultural norms.

Bourdieu uses the term “strategy” to infuse the influence of a macro-structure with the preferences of the micro-individual. In Jenkins (2014) analysis of Bourdieu, he describes that strategy is an “ongoing result of the interaction between the dispositions of the habitus and the constraints and possibilities which are the reality of any given social field” (pg. 83). Strategy has three elements: rational calculations, constraints, and operates in the medium to long term. In this way, Bourdieu’s depiction of social class culture is less deterministic than previous theories by acknowledging the ability of the individual to make calculations in choices, but also stresses that people make rational calculations. What is rational for members of one class may not be so for members of another, because of the distinct fields in which they operate and were socialized. As individuals move to new fields, they carry with them their history and experiences of what has previously been the standards, making it difficult but not impossible to change their rational calculations of what ought to be done, hence the final medium to long term tenet of strategy.

Social Inequality
Bourdieu had strong convictions about social inequality and how it is reproduced in society (Swartz, 2012). Like other sociologists, Bourdieu viewed the world as a social hierarchy and believed that to seek social distinction and enhance social standing was a “fundamental dimension of social life” (Bourdieu, 1987, pg. 22). It is through this desire that people form personal tastes, practices, and habits, as a means of signaling cultural superiority and status. Turner (1988) summarizes Bourdieu’s view, “social status involves practices which emphasize and exhibit cultural distinctions and differences which are a crucial feature of all social stratification” (pg. 66). For Bourdieu, classes are stratified due to an objective unequal distribution of capital (Swartz, 2012). DiMaggio (2012) provides a concise explanation of Bourdieu’s reproduction of inequality:

Bourdieu contends that families in the dominant class... use three primary forms of capital—economic, social, and cultural—to pass on their privilege to their children. Wealthy families invest in prestigious cultural forms, converting economic capital and equipping their kids with an easy familiarity with the arts, literature, and music that teachers mistake for intrinsic talent. Families who have lots of cultural capital (that is, lots of education and sophisticated tastes) but less wealth create especially enriching home environments to boost their kids’ fortunes in school. Advantaged from the start, children from dominant-class families attend the most selective institutions of higher education, acquiring additional cultural capital (including “credentialed” cultural capital, that is, prestigious degrees) that is “reconverted” to economic capital (through privileged access to good jobs) and social capital (ties to high-status friends who can help one get ahead; Bourdieu, 1985). (DiMaggio, 2012, pg. 24).

While Bourdieu’s theorizing laid the foundation for the modern theories of social class in both sociology and psychology, it has been the subject of much criticism, most often for a lack of clarity and conciseness (Jenkins, 1982; Swartz, 2012; Lebaron, 2003). However, with the groundwork laid by Bourdieu, more recent theories have been able to offer more succinct depictions of social class and the interplay between individuals and their environments.

**Sociocultural Model of Self**
The theory that best parallels Bourdieu’s perspective is the sociocultural model of self
(Stephens, Markus, & Fryberg, 2012; Oyserman & Markus, 1993). While Bourdieu sought to
infuse sociological perspectives with aspects of the individual, Markus and her colleagues sought
to take psychological concepts and properly acknowledge aspects of the environment, resulting
in many similarities and shared beliefs.

Because theories of the self stemmed from psychology which focuses on the inner
workings of individuals, many aspects of the self are considered ‘fundamental’ in that they are
fixed and do not change across context. Certainly, personality traits and preferences are enduring
and rarely altered by settings. However, to assume that the self is fully independent of situations
is short-sighted, which is why Mead (1934) argued that the self is an inherently social
phenomenon and that individuals understand themselves largely through the lens of others
(Jackson, 1998).

Building on this notion, Oyserman & Markus (1993) introduced the social or
sociocultural self to psychology literature. Their theory of sociocultural self acknowledged the
social interaction introduced by Mead and further incorporated the role of “social, cultural, and
historical contexts to the development of self” (Jackson, 1998, pg. 173). Indeed, they argue that
“one cannot be a self by one’s self” (Oyserman & Markus, 1993; pg. 188). External factors that
influence the sociocultural self begin with group-based identities such as gender, religion, race,
and class. The social aspect of those cultural identities derives from how other’s view and react
to the individuals who embody these categorizations. The cultural and historical contexts
acknowledge that from birth people find themselves in groups and collectives that provide
guidance and feedback on how to operate. Over time, these repeated experiences come to shape
individual’s perceptions of who they are, how they are to behave, and generally “how to be a
self” (Oyserman & Markus, 1993, pg. 195). In this way, the sociocultural self closely mirrors Bourdieu’s habitus.

While there are other sociocultural contexts that shape the self, social class is thought to be one of the most prominent (Stephens, Markus, & Townsend, 2007; Leavitt & Fryberg, 2013). There are two primary reasons for the strength of class in influencing perceptions of self. First, a fundamental purpose of social representations is to signal one’s place in the current context and how to proceed with behavior and interaction. As class is often rank-based, it more clearly signals one’s place in relations to others. Second, the stereotypes of class in the United States can be quite pervasive. Throughout mainstream media, the depiction of lower social class as, for example, less intelligent and lazy and the upper social class as hard working but selfish stands to influence characterizations regardless of how accurate these depictions may be for individuals (Leavitt & Fryberg, 2013). As will be discussed in the section of class values, the stereotypes to which people are subjected meaningfully shape their attitudes and behaviors. Some come to subscribe to the belief that people like themselves are indeed their stereotype as a means of reducing inconsistencies which can be frustrating or uncomfortable (Leavitt & Fryberg, 2013).

Applied to social class, the sociocultural model of self theorizes that an understanding of social class necessitates consideration of individuals, contexts, and how they influence, reinforce, or challenge one another. These “inseparable forces” that operate in a “bidirectional, ongoing cycle” have been termed mutual constitution (Stephens et al. 2012, pg. 733). As Stephens and colleagues explain:

In one direction of this cycle, individuals’ actions and psychological tendencies (e.g., attention, perception, emotion, motivation) are influenced by the structures (e.g., material resources) that make up the sociocultural contexts that they inhabit over time. In the other direction, as individuals interact with their sociocultural contexts, they play an active role in reinforcing or changing the structures of those contexts (Adams, 2012; Markus & Kitayama, 2010). (Stephens et al. 2012, pg. 733)
The benefit of this model for understanding social class is that it goes beyond what individual or contextual models alone can address. By incorporating the ongoing process of mutual constitution, it is more dynamic than psychological characteristics and more effective at answering why we observe different behaviors despite individuals being in the same context (Stephens et al., 2012).

Both Bourdieu and the sociocultural model of self provide an avenue for better understanding social class through the interplay of environments and individual attitudes and beliefs. Therefore, it is important to understand the environments of different social classes as well as the cultural values and beliefs that are often instilled and passed on to others. The next portion of this review will describe the literature of first the lower social class followed by the higher social classes.

Environment of Lower Social Classes

This section will provide an overview of research on the environments often encountered by those in the lower social class. I will begin by describing the more general conditions that define this class in terms of their access to and control of resources before focusing specifically on the characteristics of the work environment that influence this class’s culture. Next, I describe the self-construals and values that are shaped and reinforced by the environment. Finally, I will describe how this culture is perpetuated through child socialization.

Resources and Control

One of the most enduring external factors that shapes the culture of the lower social class is a lack of resources and relatedly, control (Stephens, Markus, & Townsend, 2007). The scarcity of resources is a multifaceted problem with components that reinforce one another. The positions held by those in the lower social class are commonly low-income. This very basic shortage of
monetary resources results in a range of issues including housing in low-income neighborhoods, a dearth of goods and services, including transportation challenges that in turn present new obstacles to overcome. These conditions further limit the occupational positions that members of the lower social class can find and hold, often inhibiting them from reaching higher-paying opportunities.

**Neighborhood Characteristics**

The neighborhoods in which the lower social class reside are characterized by their lack of amenities (i.e. grocery stores, access to transportation, parks, and municipal services), and the quality of the environment such as litter, air, and sound pollution (Williams & Collins, 2001). They have been described as “unstable, challenging, and dangerous” environments (Côté, 2011, pg. 52; Kusserow, 1999; Lachman & Weaver, 1998; Snibbe & Markus, 2005). Understandably, many individuals residing in these neighborhoods have greater concern for the safety and security of themselves and their families than people residing in higher social class communities.

Fear of crime has been noted as a “constant undercurrent” which is an added source of worry and stress for these inhabitants (Cattell, 2001). As a response to safety concerns, many parents require their children to become “latchkey kids,” meaning they must stay inside at all times, isolated for long afternoons, evenings, and possibly even their entire summer break from school (Williams & Boushey, 2010). Over half of parents living under the poverty line believe their neighborhoods are a bad influence on their children (Williams & Boushey, 2010). In addition to crime, some parents cite additional worry about being reported to social services by neighbors who deem your children too neglected (Cattell, 2001).

In addition, the individual homes of those in lower social classes are more likely to have ‘housing stressors,’ that is, “dampness or condensation, inadequate heat, problems with noise and
vibration from outside, the lack of space and the lack of private space, as well as the presence of environmental hazard” (Williams & Collins, 2001, pg. 410). For these parents, they lack even the most basic sense of control in maintaining custody of their children, keeping them safe both inside and outside their home, and providing for their basic needs such as clean air and water.

**Goods and Services**

A lack of monetary resources results in the inability to purchase goods and services that could improve the conditions of one’s home and neighborhood. Similarly, fewer resources also limit the ability to alleviate conflicting requirements from work and life such as childcare, eldercare, home and auto services (Barnett et al., 2013). For instance, the appliances utilized by members of the lower social class for cooking and laundry are less reliable (Fiske & Markus, 2012). Rising childcare costs, in addition to the limited hours in which formal facilities operate, requires many lower social class families to rely on friends and family to oversee children while they work. These arrangements are less steady and create an instability for both children and parents whose employment is greatly impacted when others fall through, contributing further to the feeling of lacking control.

Research shows lower income individuals are more likely to experience other “disruptive spells” such as pregnancy or illness and experience a persistence of the effects due to an absence of resources to alleviate the issue (Bane & Ellwood, 1986; Leane, Mittal, Stiehl, 2012). It is not surprising that research shows people in lower socioeconomic statuses are more greatly affected emotionally by disruptive life events (McLeod & Kessler, 1990).

**Transportation Challenges**

Next to housing, transportation costs are the highest expense for individuals in the lower social class (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017). Insufficient monetary resources means people
must navigate unreliable transportation or no transportation at all, which in turn limits the ability to pursue higher-paying positions that may require greater travel or consistency not offered by the reliance on public transportation or undependable vehicles. Neighborhoods that are centrally located to a greater range of job opportunities are often more expensive, forcing people to face either higher rent and lower transportation costs or lower rent with higher transportation costs, neither being particularly affordable. Transportation difficulties often require the withdrawal from employment, further aggravating economic concerns and a general instability (Perrons, McDowell, Fagan, Ray, & Ward, 2005). This may help explain why individuals working in low-wage positions are significantly less likely to have long job tenure, with over 75% of men and 50% of women with less than two years of job tenure. (Williams, Blair-Loy, & Berdahl, 2013; Corporate Voices, 2006).

**Work Environment**

**Flexibility Paradox**

Employment in the lower social class is not only low-income, but often unreliable, with “flexible” schedules translating to inconsistent hours and paychecks. Employers reserve the right to cut hours as business slows seasonally or send employees home on quiet days. This greatly inhibits one’s ability to budget, schedule life events, and overall undermines one’s control over life (Fischer, 2017). Ironically, these “flexible” jobs are often characterized by the lack of flexibility on the part of the employer. Employees must follow scheduling times more rigidly, and employees have less control over what and how to conduct their work tasks (Barnett et al., 2013; Lamont, 1990).

Additionally, these positions are often void of autonomy, creativity, and freedom, which leads to “a sense of mastery not permitted at work” (Lubrano, 2010, pg. 15; Rubin, 1976;
Lamont, 1990; Streib, 2015). The underdevelopment of personal mastery is one of the key factors in shaping the attitudes and values of members of the lower social class, a point I return to in the section on values. Further, policies to alleviate work-life conflict are rare, and this inability to respond to issues that arise outside of work further contributes to the sense of little control over one’s life (Barnett et al., 2003).

**Treatment at Work**

The management style common in these positions is highly authoritative, requiring deference and submission of employees to management or the risk of job loss if non-compliant. The work environments are also designed to “highlight negative exceptions (i.e. lapses) instead of positive behavior” (Leana, Mittal, & Stiehl, 2012, pg. 895). Additionally, they are characterized by less respect from management, limited advancement opportunities, and stereotyping and stigma of occupational roles (Schultheiss, 2006; Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Berg & Frost, 2005). These conditions serve to amplify the power disparities within the authority structure (Leana, Mittal, & Stiehl, 2012).

**Work Stigma**

Unfortunately, the positions held by the lower social class are more often the subject of work stigma than others. Stigma is a “social identity that is devalued in a particular context” (Johnson, Richeson, & Finkel, 2011, pg. 838; Crocker, Major & Steele, 1998). There are three broad types of stigma: physical (unsavory conditions including working with garbage, death, or danger), social (engaging with people who are themselves stigmatized or requiring one to act in servitude), and moral (occupations that are “sinful or of dubious virtue”) (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999, pg. 415). The term blue-collar jobs originates from the blue color of the work shirts worn by men in positions such as mechanics, warehouse workers, custodians, and construction
workers. These manual-labor jobs that are highly associated with the lower social class are often the subject of the physical aspects of stigma. The customer service industry, particularly the front-line employees that deal directly with customers, is also commonly associated with lower social class employees. These roles suffer from the social aspect of stigma as they must act in deference or servitude to the customers whom they are assisting. Finally, many of the occupations that are subject to moral taint, such as sex workers, are also decidedly in the lower social class.

**Ostracization**

As a result of the taint that comes from stigma, individuals in the lower social class are more likely to be ostracized by others, both within and outside the organizational setting (Leana, Mittal, & Stiehl, 2012). Within organizations, employees from a lower social class are often physically separated from other employees (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013; Lambert & Waxman, 2005; Sherman, 2007). For example, custodial staff may be asked to work during non-business hours, hospitality staff are asked to take separate elevators than guests (Sherman, 2007), and lower-level employees work on lower floors than those of high-status (Wasserman & Frenkel, 2015). Outside the organization, public depiction of lower social class roles is rarely positive in outlets such as television, movies, news, and stories (Lott, 2014). Volpato and colleagues (2017) discuss the historical tradition of this negative depiction and refer to it as the “‘prison of the longue duree’—a representation that passes down from generation to generation, perpetuating unequal relations among social groups” (pg. 194).

**Self-Construals and Values**

Social class researchers have identified many values, attitudes, and characteristics that appear to be distinct to the lower social class. These stem from a combination of qualitative
research that has observed differences in class groups as well as quantitative experiments that have successfully tested for distinctions between classes. The following section will provide an overview of these characteristics and make connections, where applicable, to the environmental conditions that likely shape, influence, or enforce these cultural values.

**Interdependence**

One of the defining characteristics of the lower social class is their sense of interdependence. Fine and Glendinning (2005) define interdependence as “the result of reciprocity between partners, exchanges between dependent actors over time, and the networking of these relations of dependence. In other words, to recognise ‘interdependence’ is not to deny but to acknowledge relations of dependence” (pg. 612). There are several psychological and pragmatic reasons for this group to operate interdependently. First, interdependence is often a necessity as they lack the resources to afford care for children, elders, or the sick, requiring the burden of care to fall on the individuals closest to them. Research has consistently shown that individuals in lower social classes spend greater time caring for others (Argyle, 1994; Williams & Boushey, 2010). People in this situation spend larger amounts of time interacting, building relationships that rely on and adjust to the needs of each other (Stephens, Markus, & Townsend, 2007). As a result, individuals in lower social classes are often more attuned to others’ socioemotional cues (Na et al., 2010; Côté, Piff, & Wheeler, 2013). Research has shown that these individuals pay more attention to others in social setting and score better on tests of empathetic accuracy (Kraus & Keltner, 2009; Kraus, Piff, & Keltner, 2011; Côté, 2011).

In addition to these more predictable life events, disruptive events are often unmanageable for individuals without the help of others. They must rely on the social support of their community to weather or cope with such obstacles (Lamont, 2000; Piff, Stancato, Martinez,
Kraus, & Keltner, 2012; Piff 2014). Thus, building interdependent networks is identified as an adaptive response to environmental threats (Côté, Piff, & Wheeler, 2013). As Piff and Robinson (2017) postulate, “affiliative tendencies might help build and sustain interdependent networks of mutual aid that are vital coping strategies among lower-class individuals” (pg. 8). Aid to others may come in the form of social support, or the sharing of information, opportunities, or financial resources (Parks-Yancy, DiTomaso, & Post, 2005; Portes & Sensebrenner, 2005).

Second, threats are thought to trigger cognitive responses that encourage attachment-related behavior (Bowlby, 1979; Taylor et al., 2000; Martinsson, Villegas-Palacio, & Wollbrant, 2015). This has been used to explain research findings that class influences cooperation and other prosocial behavior (Kraus et al., 2012). Martinsson and colleagues suggest this relationship is mediated by a reduced sense of power and status (Martinsson et al., 2015), which leads individuals to pursue power and control via the pooling or borrowing of resources to better respond to threats.

*Desire for Similarity*

An arguably natural outcome of strong interdependence norms, it has been suggested that lower social classes adopt “a model of agency (or one's normative beliefs about action)… emphasizing interdependence and adjustment” (Na & Chan, 2016, pg. 242). Several prominent social class researchers have described people in this culture as having a greater desire to ‘fit in’ with, adjust to, or be similar to others (Snibbe & Markus, 2005; Leana, Mittal, & Stiehl, 2012; Na & Chan, 2016). Research has shown a preference for similarity over uniqueness. Stephens and colleagues (2007) found that people in lower social classes were more likely to choose a pen that matched the color of the majority and preferred advertisements that emphasized connection to others. Further, individuals in lower social classes are more likely to define themselves by
their relationships and social roles (Piff, 2017), and to describe their motives in terms of interdependence (i.e. helping relatives or members of the community) (Stephens, Markus, Johnson, & Covarrubias, 2012).

**Desire to Help**

Relatedly, people in lower social classes frequently engage in helping behavior including loaning money and assisting others in finding employment (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). In experiments, individuals in lower social classes were more likely to offer help to a distressed confederate, donate to other participants who did not earn compensation, and display physical and neural responses when viewing others in pain than their higher class counterparts (Varnum, Blais, Hampton, & Brewer, 2015; Stellar, Manzo, Kraus, & Keltner, 2012; Piff, Kraus, Côté, Cheng, & Keltner, 2010; Piff & Robsinson, 2017). One explanation for this observance is that individuals in lower social classes are better able to detect emotions that would indicate a need for help such as sadness or anxiety, as well as contextual clues, making them better aware of opportunities to assist (Côté, 2011). Increased empathy additionally causes individuals to respond with less blame and more help (Côté, 2011).

**Family**

While the lower social class engages in broad interdependent tendencies, they are also characterized by their particularly strong interdependence and connection with family. A similar pattern to the general culture, family interdependence is at least partially motivated by a pragmatic need for relatives to provide assistance in order to weather both the daily and unexpected challenges of the lower social class environment. It would be more common in this culture to see grandparents engaging in childcare responsibilities or teenage children working part-time to contribute to the family (Barnett et al., 2003; Williams & Boushey, 2010). However,
it is also a deeply rooted value. This class expresses greater preference for and satisfaction in time spent with family, often prioritizing it above work (Lamont, 2010; Williams, Blair-Loy, & Berdahl, 2013). Lower social class families spend more time with one another, particularly extended family, compared to the higher social class (Lareau, 1987). While generally considered a positive attribute of this class, there are potential negatives to such a culture, including creating negative pressure to remain in the neighborhoods close to family, possibly at the detriment of improving work or neighborhood opportunities (Lubrano, 2010).

**Self-efficacy**

An outcome of operating in environments that offers little personal control and negative perceptions from others, many individuals in the lower social class exhibit low self-efficacy, or “judgment about [his/her] own ability to organize and execute the courses of action required to bring about a desired outcome” (Leana, Mittal, & Stiehl, 2012, pg. 894; Bandura, 1977). The influence of past experiences, “they are less likely to believe that if they try, they can succeed” (Fisher, O’Donnell, & Oyserman, 2017, pg. 63). Relatedly, the lack of autonomy and self-mastery characteristic of low-income jobs is theorized to influence the attitudes and ambition individuals have towards their employment. Believing their situation is unchangeable, individuals in lower social classes may change their attitude to one of satisfaction and contentment, because it is easier to change one’s attitudes than their conditions (Hall & Schneider, 1973; Olson & Schober, 1993; Leana, Mittal, & Stiehl, 2012).

**Work Ethic**

In addition to their pride in family, the lower social class also pride themselves their work ethic (Bowman, 2008; Lubrano, 2010). This is a value that is shared across classes, as will be described below for both the middle and upper social class. However, the aspects of work in
which to take pride are conceived differently across classes. While the upper social class values career progression and success and the middle values steady and consistent jobs, individuals in the lower social class describe a pride in doing “real work” or jobs with “greater proximity to primordial manhood” (Lubrano, 2010, pg. ch1.pg8). They perform work that is required for society to function, but others are often unwilling or unable to engage in. This class also takes pride in work as a means of providing for one’s family (Williams, 2010).

**Child Socialization**

Thus far I have discussed the environmental characteristics of the lower social class and how they influence and shape the value system of this classes’ culture. Next, I will describe research on the parenting philosophies and behaviors or the lower social class to examine how their cultural values are perpetuated through the childhood socialization process.

Many of the conditions that affect the socialization for children in lower social classes have already been touched on, including the safety concerns of their neighborhoods, factors that influence childcare, and the general instability of their environments. The neighborhood conditions often affect children by requiring them to stay indoors more often. Due to limited resources, childcare is more likely to be a mélange of friends and family with less consistency and stability than more formal childcare.

Additionally, extra-curriculars are less formal (Lareau, 1987). Parents in this class tend to subscribe to a “laissez-faire” parental style that emphasizes natural growth, as opposed to the more intentional cultivation of growth used by higher class parents (Lareau, 2003; Milkie, Kendig, Nomaguchi, & Denny, 2010). This is likely driven by a combination of a lack of resources to enroll in more formal activities, little to no excess time to attend these activities, and an issue of limited cognitive resources for parents who come home depleted and lacking the
cognitive capacity to carefully plan and orchestrate formal socialization practices (Lareau, 1987; Lubrano, 2010).

While lower social class parents take a rather informal approach to cultivation, they instill rather formal authoritative roles with their children, emphasizing obedience and respect for authority (Kusserow, 1999, Kohn & Schooler, 1983). This respect for authority is believed to develop from the place of the lower social class in the societal structure. In both formal and informal interaction, lower social class individuals are more likely to defer to those of higher status and adapt their behavior to match others (Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013). Accordingly, lower social class parents emphasize respect for authority from child to parent and exemplify their own respect when interacting with people in authority (i.e. teachers, employers).

**Childhood Educational Environments**

There are several aspects of lower social class culture that are poorly matched with the norms of formal institutions such as schools and organizations. First, the norms reinforced by schools are often more aligned with higher social class culture, resulting in a misalignment of cognitive orientation and school organization for children in lower social classes (Fiske & Markus, 2012). Second, the tendency to defer to authority often translates into a disconnection between family and school, as parents in lower social classes are more likely to feel unqualified to engage with or question educators (Lareau, 1987). This is aggravated by the more limited time and resources to become actively involved at school, one outcome being that parents are less attuned to the preferences of teachers. As a result, it is less likely that behavior matching school expectations will be taught or reinforced at home, contributing to the mismatch between the culture of home and school (Lareau, 1987). Amplified further in higher education, additional
factors such as a lack of cultural and social capital create an even greater cultural misalignment of the lower social class and institutions.

**Environment of Higher Social Classes**

This section will review the literature on higher social classes. I will follow a similar pattern to the section on the lower social class by first articulating the environmental characteristics of the higher social classes, followed by the values and preferences that develop, and the parental style employed to socialize these class differences.

One significant flaw of extant literature on social class is that the lack of distinction between classes depicted in contrast with the lower social class. Many articles detailing social class cultural differences discuss those in the lower aspects of society against those in the higher aspects of society (Stephens, Markus, & Townsend, 2007; Gorman, 2000; Kusserow, 2012), in effect reducing the middle and upper social class to a singular group. This is understandable as the challenges of the lower social class are so strong that for much theorizing, considering them against everyone else is sufficient to demonstrate the cultural distinctions of this group. However, because there are clear societal and cultural differences between the lower, middle, and upper social class, a more careful distinction between each of the three broad classes is needed. Therefore, I will end by highlighting the brief literature that identifies unique characteristics of the middle social class distinct from the upper social class.

**Resources**

In many ways, the environments of higher social classes represent the inverse of the lower social class, which is understandable as these are the characteristics that differentiate these groups. Unsurprisingly, having ample resources and a strong sense of personal control over their environments is a hallmark of higher social class cultures.
The higher social class population has many resources that surpass those in the lower social class, the most obvious and arguably most influential being economic resources. These individuals have higher-paying employment and greater wealth, allowing them to have larger, nicer homes, safer and more reliable transportation and appliances, and other items to alleviate life responsibilities (Martin, Côté, & Woodruff, 2016). They are better able to reduce their obligations through paying for services such as car and home maintenance, child and eldercare, and food preparation.

While the most obvious is economic resources, research also suggests they have superior social and cultural resources such as a supportive network and personality characteristics valued in society (McLeod & Kessler, 1990). Parks-Yancy and colleagues (2005) found that middle and upper social class individuals had earlier access to social resources in the form of social capital (Parks-Yancy, DiTomaso, & Post, 2005; Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013; Lin, 1999). Additionally, the opportunities and experiences for children in higher social classes are more highly valued by society, creating cultural capital beginning at a very young age and accumulating and perpetuating over time and through adulthood.

**Control**

Each of these resources serves to enhance the sense of control of people in this class. Resources enable them to eliminate, alleviate, or cope with obstacles that occur either consistently or unexpectedly in life. The combination of economic, social, and cultural resources aid individuals in coping and responding to “disruptive spells” or challenging life events such as illness, care issues, or job loss. Additionally, it has been theorized that the culmination of these resources affects one’s ability to accumulate identities, including cultivating hobbies or voluntarily joining groups that contribute to positive affect and a sense of self (Foy, Freeland,
Miles, Rogers, & Smith-Lovin, 2014). Generally, only those with ample monetary resources, connections, and time are able to engage in these self-affirming activities.

**Neighborhood Characteristics**

People in the upper social class often reside in neighborhoods that are considered extremely predictable and safe (Côté, 2011), many going so far as to be gated from the outside world or employ hired security. Individual properties may have their own barriers including fences, gates, or simply larger lots separating one home from another. These neighborhoods can also be described by what they do not embody. Higher social class neighborhoods have a low prevalence of crime, and accordingly parents do not live in fear of their child’s safety nor do they fear their children being removed from their home for neglect.

Homes, their structure, and conditions also differ by class. Higher social class homes often have more open, flexible spaces which may be reflective of cultural preferences, highlighted in greater detail below. Importantly, children accustomed to openness are thought to fair better in school and work environments that are similarly structured (Fiske & Markus, 2012). Homes in these classes do not have issues of housing stressors or unsatisfactory living conditions and are generally larger, allowing for more personal and private space.

**Work Environment**

**Job Characteristics**

The organizational environments of the higher social class are similarly known for their safety and comfortability. They often work in indoor, climate-controlled buildings that are protected from climate or unpredictable weather conditions. Their positions rarely ask them to engage in manual labor or potentially dangerous conditions such as environments with reduced air quality, heavy equipment and machinery, or chemicals, all of which risk both short- and long-
term physical health. Beyond the physical conditions, positions the higher social classes often allow for greater creativity, flexibility, and the ability to be self-directed in one’s work (Kohn, Naoi, Schoenbach, Schooler, & Slomczynski, 1990; Kastberg & Miller, 1996).

**Norm of Work Devotion**

While there are many benefits to these positions, they come with implicit conditions. The culture of higher social class work environments are characterized by work devotion, or the expectation to “arrange their lives to ensure unlimited availability to work unencumbered by family responsibility” (Williams, Blair-Loy, & Berdahl, 2013), particularly among the upper social class. Williams and Boushey (2010) conducted one of the few surveys that differentiated between lower, middle, and upper income participants and found that upper social class men and women worked the most hours, followed by middle, and then lower income participants. One potential downside of this expectation for work devotion is increased discontent from work (Williams & Boushey, 2010). Overall the higher social classes are known for considerable control and autonomy, however many of them feel that to challenge the cultural expectation for work devotion would result in “career suicide” (Williams & Boushey, 2010). One notable differences between classes, then, is the motivation for extended hours. While individuals in the lower social class feel they must work additional hours to simply provide at home, individuals in higher social classes who do not necessarily need the additional income view it as an advantageous career move (Emslie & Lyonette, 2009).

**Self-construals and Values**

**Self-construals**

The life experiences of the higher social class include superior levels of control over their environment with ample opportunities for achievement and success, building a strong sense of
ability and efficacy. Additionally, these individuals operate in a society that places higher values on the superior economic, social, and cultural resources of their social class members, creating enhanced status from others. Indeed, it has been theorized that individuals with high-status characteristics benefit from a “positivity bias” (Pettigrew, 1979) whereby others assume that someone with their status naturally maintains a type of legitimacy and favor (Smith, Ditomaso, Farris, & Cordero, 2001). This has been used to explain how juries tend to defer more to high-status others such as upper social class white men (York & Cornwell, 2006; Cornwell & Hans, 2011).

It is not surprising then that members of higher social classes develop attitudes and behavioral patterns that reflect these experiences including greater self-esteem (Kraus & Park, 2014), higher levels of confidence (Smith, Menon, & Thompson, 2012), entitlement (Côté, House, & Willer, 2015; Piff, 2014), narcissism (Cai, Kwan, & Sedikides, 2012; Foster, Campbell, & Twenge, 2003; Martin, Côté, Woodruff, 2016; Piff, 2017), and an overall sense of superiority (Kraus & Park, 2014; Gorman, 2000; Lamont, 2000).

Further, these findings have spurred research which has subsequently found or theorized that individuals in higher social classes are less empathetic (Kraus et al., 2010), less likely to lend help to others or act prosocially (Piff et al., 2010; Van Doesum, Tybur, & Van Lange, 2017; Côté, 2011), and give less generously (Côté, House, & Willer, 2015). It is theorized that these behaviors stem from higher social class individuals inability to understand the perspective of others, having never been in their situation themselves (Côté, 2011).

Interestingly, research has consistently shown that higher social class individuals believe their superior status is both fair and deserved (Fisher, O’Donnell, & Oyserman, 2017). One theory to explain this is that “higher-class individuals may translate feeling better off than others
into feeling better than others” (Piff, 2017). This further serves to reinforce both their tendency to feel superior and their negative treatment of those they deem less worthy.

**Autonomy**

Naturally, through the accumulation of resources and control, individuals in the higher social class develop and highly value a sense of control over their environment, whether that be in conditions of employment, neighborhood selection, or other life decisions (Snibbe & Markus, 2005; Lachman & Weaver, 1998; Côté, 2011). This control, coupled with fewer and less influential disruptive events and an emphasis on individualism, leads people in higher social classes to develop an internal, self-oriented focus (Piff, 2017).

**Social Distance**

With greater resources comes less need to depend on others, which can subsequently increase separation and isolation (Côté et al., 2013; Piff, 2014; Vohs, Mead, & Goode, 2006; Martin, Côté, & Woodruff, 2016). This distancing can be seen on a large scale in the neighborhoods and homes discussed earlier, and also in the behavioral patterns of higher social classes. Kraus and colleagues (2009, 2011) have shown that higher social class participants show greater nonverbal social disengagement, including less eye contact and fewer responsive head nods when interacting with strangers in public, and are more likely to check their phone or doodle during interaction than their lower social class counterparts (Kraus & Keltner, 2009; Kraus, Piff, Keltner, 2011). Dietze & Knowles (2016) found that higher social class subjects spend less time looking at others in depictions of street scenes, and in more explicit interaction patterns, they were more likely to look away and fidget with other objects or their phones while interacting with other participants. Similarly, Piff (2017) found that higher social class participants had less attention and sensitivity than their lower social class counterparts and were
only more likely to engage in prosocial behavior if it was self-beneficial. Lastly, simple primes of money have been demonstrated to influence people to isolate themselves in play and work scenarios and increase the physical distance between themselves and others (Vohs, Mead, and Goode, 2006).

**Distinction**

Relatedly, research has shown a greater desire for distinction in higher social class populations (Stephens et al., 2007; Piff, 2014). In one study, Piff (2017) found that higher social class participants were more likely to describe themselves by distinctive characteristics. In another, Stephens and colleagues (2007) conducted several experiments that found a preference for distinction among higher social class individuals including choosing between pens that were different from rather than similar to others and a preference for advertisements that emphasized uniqueness over connection.

**Work Implications**

Studies have shown that the different value systems and attitudes exhibited by various social classes can influence behaviors and management perception of workers. For instance, employees from higher social classes are assumed to use more voice as respect for authority is less valued by this group and they have higher self-confidence (Côté, 2011). Additionally, their desire for independence and distinction may be perceived as taking initiative and behaving more proactively, which is often valued highly by employers (Snibbe & Markus, 2005; Leana, Mittal, & Stiehl, 2012). One negative implication for organizations, individuals in higher social classes have demonstrated less ethical behavior, both in life circumstances and at work (Piff, Stancato, Côté, Mendoza-Denton, & Keltner, 2012), which is shown to be mediated by greater greed, a
reflection of the more general self-interest seeking behavior characteristic of higher social classes.

**Child Socialization**

Parents in higher social classes subscribe to a parenting method referred to as “concerted cultivation,” or “a childrearing method that emphasized parents’ direct involvement in children’s free-time activities to foster children’s talents and skills” (Milkie, Kendig, Nomaguchi, & Denny, 2010, pg. 1332; Lareau, 2003). The belief is that providing these opportunities for socialization will enable children to be more successful in later life. Adults in higher social classes experience greater self-direction in their positions, and so they impress their preferences on their children, allowing them to be more independent and self-directed (Kohn, Naoi, Schoenbach, Schooler, & Slomczynski, 1990).

A reflection of the sense of control embedded in this class, higher social class children are taught a “model of agency” to openly express their preferences for meals, clothing, and other desires (Stephens et al., 2012; Stephens, Markus, & Townsend, 2007; Na & Chan, 2016). In this way, they are being taught to have individual choices and communicate them with the expectation of them being met or granted (Bowman, 2008; Fiske & Markus, 2012). As Côté (2011) describes, “higher social class construe agency as influencing others and the environment, and lower social class construe agency as adapting to others and the environment” (pg. 48).

With ample economic and social resources, higher social class parents are also empowered to socialize their children through opportunities unattainable by the lower social class because of access or cost. It is common for higher social class children to be enrolled in a number of extracurriculars, reflective of the cultural preference for formal socialization (Lareau, 1987). These extras may also include supplemental tutoring or lessons to address any challenges
their children may encounter throughout their education and to give them an advantage with academic performance (Evans, 2004; McLloyd, 1998; Martin, Côté, & Woodruff, 2016). It also includes sports and hobbies that later serve as markers of cultural capital. Activities that have high entry-costs such as golf or polo signal higher social class to others and can be leveraged in adulthood to generate goodwill with those who value this form of capital (Rivera, 2016).

**Childhood Educational Environments**

Higher social class children are more likely to attend high quality schools from either intentional enrollment in a superior private school or from residing in wealthier neighborhoods which contain higher-caliber public schools (Fischer, et al., 1996; Sacks, 2007; Rivera & Tilcsik, 2006). Schools with superior resources are able to offer a greater range of opportunities, experiences, and lessons that offer a superior education as well as increase the cultural capital of its students (Lareau 2003; Rivera & Tilcsik 2016). These schools also boast smaller student-teacher ratios and/or more specific teacher-student attention, increasing the social resources of higher social class children (Rivera & Tilcsik, 2006). Additionally, a concentration of similarly-classed children means that the concentration of resources is perpetuated in higher social class networks by connecting groups of people who all have greater resources.

Overall, the values and behaviors taught to higher social class children are more in line with the expectations of schools, who are often run by others in higher social classes. Parents from higher social class backgrounds teach children to use a “managed emotional style” to control and channel their emotions in ways that are more accepted and valued by institutions (Streib, 2015; Kohn, 1969, Walkerdine, Lucey, & Melody, 2001). Additionally, higher social class parents are likely to communicate with schools and advocate for benefits to their child, which also serves as an example to their children on external interaction. Because this type of
involvement is encouraged and valued by academic institutions, the outcome is often that higher social class families gain “social profit” with the school (Lareau, 1987). The open line of communication provides feedback to parents about school expectations, which parents then impress upon their children, leading to perceptions by educational professional that those children have more appropriate behavior (Lareau, 1987). Such positive appraisals can serve to advantage children in the classroom.

**Differentiation of the Middle and Upper Social Class**

A limitation of social class research, many studies have not identified differences in the three broad classes thought to exist within the United States: the lower, middle, and upper social class. The middle social class has been defined as “those that fall between the owning class and the non-owning class, or between the powerful and the powerless” (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013, pg. 674). In this way, they closely resemble the proletariat class first identified by Marx. The distinction of middle and upper social classes is imperative when considering network structures and how classes are situated within global organizational systems.

The following section will highlight those that do and the differences that have been identified between the middle and upper social class. Noting the historical trends of classes over time, Williams and Boushey (2010) found that, unlike middle social class incomes, upper social class incomes have risen at a greater rate than national inflation. This has broader implications for the populations of classes and contributes to the discussion on the size and influence of both middle and upper social classes. Additionally, Williams & Boushey (2010) found that the middle social class often has a high burden for care of others as they earn too much income to qualify for assistance but too little to afford employing help. They theorized that this may lead to resentment towards the lower social class who, in the eyes of the middle social class, work less
hard and yet are given ‘hand-outs’. Other characteristics distinct to the middle social class include pride in self-regulation, work exhaustion, and a stout dedication to their families (Williams & Boushey, 2010).

Another important distinction of the middle social class is that their position within society and the status that they receive is somewhat dependent on the existence of the lower social class. Having a class below their own provides enhancement to the middle through comparison with worse-off others. Ehrenreich (1989) reasons that the middle social class highly values education as a means of protection from downward mobility (Gorman, 2000). Accordingly, the middle social class exhibits pride in holding steady and consistent jobs, as this is perceived as what separates and protects them from sliding down (Williams & Boushey, 2010; Ezzamel & Willmott, 1998; Scully & Blakebeard, 2006; Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013).

Drawing from research on social networks, several studies have identified the middle social class as occupying important positions within the network. Liu & Duff (1972) found that much of the information dispersed in a lower social class environment derived from a handful of middle-class informants. Additionally, Labov (1980) described central, innovative groups as being upper-working or lower-middle class. Finally, Huckfeldt (1983) found that clerical-service-sales employees (representative of the middle social class) were more likely to have ties with the working class than the professional-managerial employees (representative of the upper social class), and also more likely than the working class to have ties with professional-managerial employees. In the next chapter, I will build upon this foundational work to hypothesize about the structure of organizational networks and the important role of the structurally-central middle social class.

Chapter 3: Hypotheses Development and Hypotheses
Drawing from the sociocultural model of self, the following chapter will explain the relationship between childhood social class and social network dynamics and articulate hypotheses that have been derived from theoretical consideration of how these processes affect one another. As the previous chapter explained, the formative years of childhood and the class culture one gains throughout these years are thought to have pervasive effects into adulthood and the workplace. For these reasons, I explore the effects of childhood social class specifically. However, I also address the possible strength of current social class by identifying social class mobility as a potential moderator.

I will begin by discussing how childhood social class affects an individual’s overall network size, or “the total number of each individual's direct links with other actors in the network, a measure also known as degree centrality” (Mehra, 2001, pg. 132, italics added). Next, I will discuss how the childhood social class and its (dis)similarity to others influences tie formation and subsequently, the composition of ties within an ego network. I will then explore the unique position of the middle social class and how they affect not only their own network, but the cross-class networks of members from other classes. Finally, I argue that the central position of the middle social class creates high brokerage for its members.

In the preceding section of this chapter, I will introduce the mediators and moderators of these processes. I identify attitude toward networking, openness to friendship, and work identity as the mediating mechanisms for the relationship between childhood social class and degree centrality, cross-class composition, and network brokerage. I further identify social class mobility, organizational structure, and institutional agency as factors that moderate these relationships. Together, this hypothesis development is modelled as such:

-----------------------------------
Degree Centrality

Numerous studies suggest that lower social classes have smaller, denser social networks (Gans, 1962; Dennis, Henriques, & Slaughter, 1957; Milroy & Milroy, 1992; Liu & Duff, 1972; LaReau, 1987; Fiske & Markus, 2012; McDowell et al. 2013). Although many rely on qualitative observations, empirical studies have similarly suggested size differences. Pichler and Wallace (2009) used statistical modeling to estimate the differences in social capital based on occupational position and education and found that upper social class have more extensive social networks than their lower social class counterparts. They importantly note differences in both extensivity—the opportunity to meet others, and intensivity—the willingness to engage within a network (Pichler & Wallace, 2008; Smith, Menon, & Thompson, 2012).

Research on social class network size has suggested that class differences in social network size is affected by differences in both intensivity and extensivity. The sociocultural model of self would hold that different class value systems are modelled and socialized into childhood members affecting willingness to engage in new tie formation. In the lower social class, family and community loyalty have high value as it is the means by which many weather the challenging circumstances that come with being in the lower social class (Lucas, 2011). Thus, many have observed that lower social classes’ social networks are primarily composed of family ties and close friends that all concentrated in a single area (Fiske & Markus, 2012; McDowell et al., 2013; Lamont, 2000). Conversely, higher social classes place less value on family and neighborhood relationships and are more likely to value self-development and pursue new activities (Kohn, Naoi, Schoenbach, Schooler, Slomczynski, 1990; Lamont, 2010).
has demonstrated that members of higher social classes who have greater time and resources are more likely to be involved with voluntary organizations which expand the diversity and range of their ties (Putnam, 2000; Bowman, 2008). Thus, intensivity can shape the extensivity by affecting the environments in which one has an opportunity to form new ties.

One particularly important environment, higher education involvement is heavily influenced by class. Lower social class individuals are less likely to attend college (Pew Research Center, 2014). Additionally, family loyalty and financial constraints keep them from moving very far. Therefore, people within these communities do not have the diverse networks that come from college and new communities like their higher class counterparts. Argyle (1994) found the friends of the middle class were at greater geographic distances than the friends of the working class. Evidence of the pervasive effects of childhood class socialization, even when lower social class individuals do attend college, they are found to have fewer friends than their higher class classmates due to a decreased sense of belonging or connection with traditional middle class students (Rubin & Wright, 2015).

While social class literature has focused on the overall social networks of individuals across classes, we expect to see similar patterns within organizations. Indeed, there are several organizational factors that may exacerbate these general tendencies. As an example of a behavioral difference that might inform class patterns of inclusivity in organizational settings, lower status individuals tend to withdraw inwardly into their social networks during times of job threat. Smith, Menon, and Thompson (2012) labeled this behavior as ‘winnowing’ and the contrasting behavior of higher status individuals as ‘widening,’ whereby they strategically broaden their network to identify opportunities. We discuss this behavior in greater detail in the mediator section below. Additionally, members of higher social classes who have greater
stability often have greater job tenure than members of the lower social class (Williams, Blair-Loy, Berdahl, 2013), allowing more opportunity to form and strengthen ties within the organization. In addition to these behavioral tendencies being imported into the workplace, organization operations may intensify the effects of childhood social class on organizational network size. Lower social class employees encounter greater isolation within their work settings, both spatially and temporally (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013).

While the dearth of research differentiating between the middle and upper social class inhibits the ability to hypothesize about the differences in size, or degree centrality, between the middle and upper social class, prior research would strongly suggest that members of these higher social classes have greater extensivity and access to networking opportunities. For these reasons, I hypothesize that:

*Hypothesis 1: Individuals from a lower social class will have the less degree centrality than their middle or upper social class counterparts.*

In the following section I consider how the class of alters influence tie attraction and rejection. After reviewing the literature on cross-class interactions and its consequences, I theorize about the cross-class composition of members from different social class backgrounds.

**Cross-Class Composition**

**Same-Class Attraction**

The composition of one’s network has an important influence on a number of organizationally related outcomes. Indeed, reaching the “right” contacts can mean the difference between hearing about a low-paying job and a high-paying job, and connecting with someone who can tell you where to apply and connecting with the employer making the hiring decision. Previous research has overwhelmingly concluded that the composition of one’s network ought to be heavily influenced by social class.
While most early social network theorizing focused on homophily more broadly, several scholars suggested that within organizations, social networks were likely to be formed based on socioeconomic homophily specifically (Fischer, Jackson, Srueve, Gerson, and Jones 1977; McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1987; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). Subsequent research has added empirical support, finding a positive correlation between the social class of friends (Côté, 2017). The reasons for this are two-fold. First, the availability of heterophilous individuals, like those in other social classes, is limited when workgroups are often separated by class. Second, friendship is dependent on individual preferences for their connections (Huckfeldt, 1983). These preferences can manifest in both pursuit of ties with similar others and the avoidance or rejection of ties with dissimilar individuals.

Social class shapes the tastes, desires, and interests of its members. Research has shown that signals of class “(a) occur frequently, rapidly, and accurately in the social perception process; (b) augment group boundaries… [and] can also determine the groups an individual interacts with and belongs to” (Kraus, Park, & Tan, 2017, pgs. 422-423; Becker, Kraus, Rheinschmidt-Same, 2017). Because of the ease of social class identification, employees are likely to quickly identify members of the same class who share mutual preferences and have more in common with one another (Milkie et al., 2014). It is a core tenet of relationship studies that similarity promotes liking and tie formation (Bergeron & Zanna, 1973; Montoya, Horton, & Kirchner, 2008; Kraus, Park, & Tan, 2017). Thus, individuals from the same class can easily identify one another, are more likely to share similarities, which in turn positively influence attraction and liking.

In addition to tastes, interaction patterns also differ by class. Interacting with people similar to oneself requires less effort since those patterns are second-nature and familiar. These
experiences of easy interaction with people who share and affirm one’s own inclinations result in more positive responses that encourage further interaction and the formation or strengthening of a connection.

**Cross-Class Rejection**

Just as social similarity enhances attraction and tie formation, social dissimilarity can create tension and promote barriers for tie formation. Social class has been identified as a means of class boundaries and rejection (Huckfeldt, 1983; Becker, Kraus, Rheinschmidt-Same, 2017). However, while the factors that influence tie formation with same-class coworkers are largely the same across class, the reason for cross-class tie rejection varies for each class.

**Upper Social Class**

Broadly, research has shown that people that occupy identities that society deems as more positive, such as higher class individuals, can suffer adverse reputational effects from interacting with people who occupy negative identities, decreasing motivation to engage with people outside their class. Relatedly, high-status groups have demonstrated a greater need for distinction in order to maintain such status (DiTomaso, Cordero, and Farris, 1995; Smith, Ditomaso, Farris, Cordero, 2001). Because one of the markers of upper social class is separation from others, distinction has been described as a goal of those attempting to signal higher status to others (O’Guinn, Tanner, Maeng, 2015). Although some research has operationalized high status as factors others than social class, the need for distinction has been similarly observed in higher social classes (Stephens et al., 2007; Piff, 2014), and the outcomes of such a need should translate to class-based distinction. Distinction inherently requires separation from other groups resulting in the avoidance of tie formation between higher social class and lower social class employees.
Another motivation for distancing, Bourdieu and other subsequent researchers (Bourdieu 1984; Bourdieu and Passeron 1977; DiMaggio 1982; Lamont and Lareau 1988) argue that social distancing is a tool of the higher social class to monopolize finite resources, both tangible and cultural (O’Guinn, Tanner, Maeng, 2015). Research has shown that higher class individuals distance themselves both psychologically and spatially. The previous chapter discussed the tendency of the upper social class to isolate themselves in general. Additional research suggests that such distancing can be from the lower social class specifically. Inesi and colleagues (2012) found that high-status individuals believe they have greater psychological distance between them and people of lower-status (O’Guinn, Tanner, Maeng, 2015). More specific to class, higher social classes perceive themselves as superior morally and socioeconomically (Gorman, 2000; Lamont 1992).

There are several reasons that contribute to this perception. First, individuals in the lower social class are stigmatized while members of higher social classes are often exalted within society, sending a message of perceived value and worth. Second, the myth of meritocracy, or the belief that “the system distributes resources—especially wealth and income—according to the merit of individuals” (McNamee & Miller, 2004, pg. 1), supports feelings of supremacy. People who subscribe to this belief system attribute their better fortune to their superior individual abilities. Finally, people across all classes often engage in “legitimizing myths” which are socially shared beliefs that the current system of inequality is somehow justified and fair (Volpato, Andrighetto, Baldissarri, 2017), rather than experience the anxiety and frustration of questioning the validity of the status quo.

*Middle Social Class*
While less research has focused on the middle social class, literature suggests that they similarly distance themselves from lower social classes in order to create distinction (Gorman, 2000; Ehrenreich, 1989). Several qualitative studies have demonstrated support for this theorizing. A 1960 study on the residents of a working-class neighborhood found that the middle-class residents living there were isolated from the broader community and had little interaction with the working-class residents (Berger, 1960). Research in marketing (Berger and Heath 2007) and health (Cohen and Prinstein 2006) found that people will avoid behavior that is associated with lower status others (O’Guinn, Tanner, Maeng, 2015). It is important to note that the distinction efforts of the middle social class are directed at distinguishing themselves from the lower, but not the upper, social class.

**Lower Social Class**

Although many networking theories would suggest there are positive effects of the lower social class pursuing and maintaining ties with higher social class individuals who have greater social capital and resources, there are several reasons why lower social class employees may avoid or reject connection with people outside their class. First, Lamont (2009) found that workers are reluctant to build relationships with higher status others as they perceive that those individuals will use information gathered from their interactions to reduce worker autonomy. Second, just as higher social classes feel that lower social classes do not share the qualities they deem important, lower social classes criticize higher social classes for lacking the values they hold high, particularly a dedication to family (Gorman, 2000; Lucas, 2011; Williams, Blair-Loy, & Berdahl, 2013). Lamont (2000) observed blue-collar workers denigrating white-collar workers for being overly ambitious, to the detriment of family life. They interpreted these ambitions as narcissistic and self-centered. Lastly, interactions between higher and lower social class
individuals are thought to be positively affirming for higher social classes but can elicit shame, stigma, or stereotype threats for the lower social class (Smith, Ditomaso, Farris, Cordero, 2001; Côté, 2011; Foy et al. 2014; Kraus, Park, Tan, 2017). Research has shown that these cross-class interactions are particularly taxing for lower social class individuals, decreasing their motivation to engage in these types of relationships.

The universal tendencies for individuals to identify, attract, and pursue tie formation with similar others, coupled with each classes’ distinct motivations to avoid those from different class backgrounds, lead to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: Individuals’ social networks will be primarily composed of individuals from the same social class background.

In the following section, we will discuss cross-class interactions in greater detail with a particular focus on the detrimental effects for the lower social class.

Cross-Class Interactions

Work on the class composition of individuals’ social networks, that is, the number and percentage of same- versus cross-class ties is virtually non-existent in extant literature. Given the importance of cross-class interactions for social integration, information sharing, and mobility (Liu & Duff, 1972), research on this topic has the potential to contribute to these valuable dimensions of organizations. While the empirical findings have yet to be tested, research on cross-class interactions is quite informative for shaping predictions of social network composition. Cross-class interactions refer to the behavioral interactions between individuals from different social class backgrounds with a particular emphasis on how behavior changes in mixed- versus shared-class interaction partners (Garcia, Hallahan, & Rosenthal, 2007). At the root of cross-class interaction is social comparison. Research has shown that people frequently rely on socioeconomic signals to make social comparisons (Festinger, 1954; Taylor & Lobel,
The greater the disparity in class, the more salient this dimension of comparison becomes (Buttrick, 2017).

In the following section, I will discuss research on cross-class interactions including the emotional and affective outcomes for members of different classes, altered behavior in cross-class exchanges, and strategic class work (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013).

**Behavioral Responses to Cross-Class Interactions**

*When we avoid meeting the gaze of a homeless person, smile at an attractive upper-middle class child, or defer to a businessman in a well-tailored suit, we are interacting in ways that maintain and reinforce cultural meanings about how good, powerful, and dynamic these people are. These interactions may not evoke much thought or even feeling, but they are nonetheless rooted in affect; acting in culturally consistent ways simply feels natural.* (Foy et al., 2014, pg. 297)

The perception of class in cross-class interactions can alter behavior in several ways. It is theorized that when individuals are perceived as lower social class, others may trust them less, avoid and pity them more, and have decreased expectations for their performance (Fiske et al, 2002; Côté, 2011). Harris and Fiske (2006) showed participants pictures of people from different groups in society and those at the lowest rungs of the economic structure elicited feelings of disgust. Such judgments can manifest into behavior when people act on these evaluations by avoiding members of the lower social class, treating them with scorn, and generally dehumanizing them (Fiske, 2011; Cikara, Bruneau, & Saxe, 2011; Kraus, Park, & Tan, 2017). In organizational settings, high-status others often ignore or dismiss the contributions of low-status others (Fiske, 2010; Magee & Galinsky, 2008), leading to judgments of lower competence (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013). Exacerbating this problem, lower-status people generally defer to higher-status people, reinforcing negative stereotypes and creating self-fulfilling prophecies for individuals of lower-status such as those from the lower social class (Côté, 2011; Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013).
Another outcome of social class evaluations is strategic resource sharing (Kraus, Park, & Tan, 2017). A foundational element to societal interaction and especially resource sharing is the norm of reciprocity (Granovetter, 1973; Coleman, 1997). When people perceive that an individual will be unable to reciprocate, they have less motivation to engage in resource sharing. Alternatively, those that have greater resources will be more likely to elicit resource sharing from others because of the increased probability of personal benefit. The greater the difference in social class, the less likely that the lower social class individual will be able to reciprocate resources to the higher social class individual, reducing the incentive to create ties with lower social class individuals and subsequently, the likelihood of these exchanges occurring (Parks-Yancy, DiTomaso, Post, 2008). Côté (2011) reviews several studies that have supported this notion, finding that higher social class women are motivated to help only if they are receiving something in return (Muir & Weinstein, 1962), and boys from higher social classes were more likely to view helping as a set of exchanges (Berkowitz & Friedman, 1967).

Relatedly, Van Doesum, Tybur, and Van Lange (2017) tested how social class can affect prosocial behavior. They introduced competing hypotheses that considered whether people would act more prosocially to high-class others because of their status or low-class others because of perceptions of fairness. The results showed across four studies that participants behaved less prosocially towards high-class targets compared to their low- or middle-class counterparts.

Further, research has shown effects even when social class was manipulated. Kraus and colleagues have conducted several studies testing the effect of relative social class on various

---

2 Van Doesum, Tybur, and Van Lange (2017) additionally considered relative social class based on the homophily/similarity argument but found no relationship. They concluded that the social class of the target partner mattered more than self social class in prosocial behavior.
outcomes including adapting one’s behavior to signal higher social class leading to greater evaluations of competence. (Kraus, Park, & Tan, 2017; Kraus & Mendes, 2014; Kraus & Park, 2014). Another study found that when a participant was dressed in a suit, a manipulation to signal higher social class, they were perceived as more powerful than their interaction partner and made fewer concessions (Kraus & Mendes, 2014). Additionally, a study that manipulated participant social class found that participants in lower social class conditions were more likely to feel guilt, embarrassment, or shame (Kraus & Park, 2014).

**Affective Responses to Cross-Class Interactions**

Overall the outcomes of cross-class interactions lead to more negative outcomes for individuals in relatively lower social classes than their interaction partners. While higher social class individuals tend to leave cross-class interactions with a positive affirmation of their value and standing, those in relatively lower social classes may experience stereotype threat or have stronger experiences of stigma (Foy et al., 2014). Several studies have shown that social class can elicit stereotype threat, or “the anxiety experienced by a person who is in a position to confirm a negative stereotype about a social group to which he or she belongs” (Fiske & Markus, 2012, pg. 178; Croizet & Claire, 1998; Johnson, Richeson, & Finkel, 2011; Spencer & Castano, 2007). In these experiments, lower social class students experienced greater ego depletion compared to a control condition when reminded of their social class status.

Individuals can experience stigma from both their social class itself and the role they hold within the company (Côté, 2011; Garcia, Hallahan, Rosenthal, 2007). A common reaction to negative stereotypes and stigmatized identities is the internalization of these perceived external evaluations of the self which leads to self-blame and feeling of shame, humiliation, and disgrace (Foy et al. 2014; Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013; Scheff, 1990). In cross-class interactions, when
one’s own standing relative to society is more salient, the potential for these feelings to manifest is much greater than when surrounded by similar others. The behavioral outcomes for such feelings include self-defeating behavior, social withdrawal, and decreased investment and involvement (Foy et al., 2014; Johnson, Richeson, & Finkel, 2011). These effects may be particularly salient in America. Lamont (2009) compared attitudes toward the poor in France and the United States and found that only 7% of French white-collar respondents had a negative view of the poor, compared to 67% of white-collar Americans.

Clearly, cross-class interactions elicit a range of emotions and affective responses for participants depending on their static class background as well as their position relative to their interaction partner. The following discussion will discuss the strategic behaviors that are often undertaken to respond to the stress and anxiety that can be induced in cross-class interaction.

**Class Work**

Gray and Kish-Gephart (2013) introduced the concept of class work or the “interpretive processes and interaction rituals (Goffman, 1967) that organizational members individually and collectively take to manage cross-class encounters” (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013, pg. 671). Class work in undertaken when people interact with others in ways that make class salient. When these interactions are with individuals from another class, it can evoke judgments about the adequacy one’s own or others’ class culture. The authors theorize that roles, routines, and highly scripted interactions reduce some of the anxiety that is induced when engaging in cross-class interactions because expected behavior is less ambiguous. They additionally suggest that individuals engage in various types of “identity-protecting and -restoring behavior,” based on class (pg. 677).

Two primary strategies for the upper social class are reaching down and distancing (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013). Reaching down involves making an extra effort to be polite and helpful
to members of a lower social class, which can help reduce interactional discomfort for their interaction partners, among other benefits such as ‘status lending’ whereby higher social class can benefit lower status groups by virtue of their membership in the group. The purpose of distancing tactics is to minimize or prevent anxiety-laden encounters by keeping conversation brief and to the point or avoiding them altogether. This method allows members from higher social classes to avoid situations that cause them to face their privilege or question the validity of the meritocratic processes that they rely on to justify their status (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013).

The middle social class, being situated between the upper and lower social class, alter their class work strategy based on with which class they are interacting. When engaging with the upper social class, members of the middle social class will attempt to embody the traits of the upper social class, a behavior often referred to as ‘passing.’ Whereas when interacting with the lower social class, the middle social class will attempt to create distinction. This behavior is rooted in relative deprivation theory which holds that the middle social class’s “worth and efficacy are assured as long as there are others who are less well off” (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013, pg. 681).

Finally, individuals from the lower social class engage in their own form of passing to reduce cross-class interaction tensions. This strategy can entail simply not disclosing aspects of their identity for which they might be judged or knowingly fabricating details about themselves to gain favor in the eyes of others (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013). By attempting to pass as someone or something other than their stigmatized identity, they can avoid the stigmatization process altogether and instead put forth the identities in which they take pride. There are ample examples of passing behavior from other studies including findings that members of the lower social class alter vocal pitch to mirror more high-status individuals (Gregory & Webster, 1996),
smile at higher-power others regardless of personal affective state (Hecht and LaFrance, 1998), and practice ‘code-switching’ or alter their speech patterns to match others (Brannon & Markus, 2013; Kraus, Park, Tan, 2017).

Members of the lower social class have to ‘pass’ with much greater frequency for two primary reasons. First, they are stigmatized at a greater rate than individuals from the higher social classes and thus have more to hide. Second, individuals from the middle social class must pass only with members of the upper social class, but for individuals in the lower social class every cross-class interaction is with someone of a higher social class than their own, resulting in a greater number of interactions that require passing behavior.

While these alterations to expression may reduce the anxiety with interaction partners, they are thought to be taxing and cognitively depleting activities (Lord & Saenz, 1985; Garcia, Hallahan, & Rosenthal, 2007; Pratt, 2000; Ostrove, Stewart, Curtin, 2011). When people suppress their true or authentic self, they experience emotional exhaustion which has been tied to many negation organizational outcomes such as decreased satisfaction, commitment, self-confidence, and a greater intention to leave (Hewlin, 2003, 2009; Dumas & Sanchez-Burks, 2015).

While limited research exists on the effect of cross-class interaction on social networking behaviors, several social class researchers have noted possible effects. Because lower social class or stigmatized individuals constrain their behavior when interacting with higher-class others, it limits the ability of higher class partners to accurately perceive them (Garcia, Hallahan, & Rosenthal, 2007; Leana, Mittal, & Stiehl, 2012). This may inhibit the development of a true connection between these two groups. Additionally, those in the lower social class who may feel intimidated or more uncomfortable in cross-class interactions may avoid venturing beyond their
immediate social class as a defense mechanism to protect from feelings of stigma and shame (Smith, Menon, & Thompson, 2012). For these reasons, I hypothesize that:

**Hypothesis 3:** Individuals from a lower social class will have the least cross-class composition.

**The Role of the Middle Social Class**

The barriers presented by cross-class interactions is unfortunate given the critical role cross-class alliances can have in broadening social networks, serving as brokers between structural holes, and disseminating information beyond one’s own social class. Extant literature suggests that these critical broker roles are often filled by members of the middle social class. Liu and Duff’s (1972) study on information dispersion in urban neighborhoods found that the majority of new information was disseminated through several key middle social class actors. Huckfeldt (1983) described the middle social class as the “least introverted socially” given their propensity to have friends from their own class, the working class, and the professional class (pg. 659). They were more likely to have friends with the working class than their professional class counterparts. Similarly, they were more likely to have professional class friends than individuals in the working class.

A recent study by Côté and colleagues found that while same-class dyads had higher levels of affiliation than cross-class dyads, social class dyads at the ends of the spectrum, lower social class and upper social class, were more affiliative than average-class pairs. The authors theorized that this may be because “social class standing is more central to the identity of relatively distinctive upper- and lower-class individuals,” and it is more apparent when someone is in the upper or lower social class, making it easier to experience the similarity effect in lower and upper same-class dyads (Côté et al., 2017).
Class in society, and within organizations, is dependent on a ranking system that structurally places the middle class between the lower and upper social classes. Organizations often organize under a pyramidal structure where those with the most resources and power are situated at the top of the pyramid (Anand & Daft, 2007; Mills, 2000; Leana, Mittal, Stiehl, 2012). They issue information and direction to those below them, who issues it to those below them, until you ultimately reach the employees at the bottom of the pyramid. These degrees of separation limit contact between the lower and upper social class employees, with middle social class employees situated between them and serving as middleman. This occupational segregation is further exacerbated by other organizational factors previously discussed including the temporal and spatial separation of lower social class employees from the remaining organization (Leana, Mittal & Stiehl, 2012; Sherman, 2007).

The prestige principle, which holds that people have a “tendency to contact positions at higher status levels in the structure” (Lin, Ensel, & Vaughn, 1981, pg. 396), would suggest that higher social classes are pursued at a greater rate than members of lower social classes. While this would suggest that the lower social class could pursue ties with both the middle or the upper social class, the lower social class is likely to have greater access to the middle social class given organizational constraints that place the middle social class centrally in the overall organizational structure. Further, less cultural disparity occurs between the lower and the middle social class. For instance, the American Psychological Association notes that “the higher in socioeconomic status you are, the more independently oriented you are likely to be, while the lower in status you are, the more group-minded you are likely to be” (DeAngelis, 2015, pg. 62). These growing differences between classes make interactions between the lower and middle social class less of a cognitive strain than interaction between the lower and upper social class.
Thus, the prestige principle would suggest that the middle social class are being pursued by the lower social class and are also pursuing ties with the upper social class, potentially creating a greater number of cross-class ties given that they exist in both directions. Considering the combined effects of the organizational structure, the prestige principle, and the reduced cultural disparity between lower-middle social class dyads and upper-middle social class dyads, I theorize that:

**Hypothesis 4:** The cross-class ties of the lower and upper social class are more likely to be middle social class than upper or lower social class, respectively.

**Hypothesis 5:** Individuals from the middle social class will have the greatest cross-class composition.

Thus, given that individuals from the lower social class are thought to have the lowest cross-class composition and individuals from the middle social class, the greatest, I hypothesize that:

**Hypothesis 6:** The cross-class composition of individuals from the upper social class will be greater than the lower social class but lower than the middle social class.

**Brokerage**

The field of social networks has taken great interest in the idea of brokerage, that is, identifying the individuals who are situated between two otherwise unconnected ties in a social network (Kadushin, 2002; Burt, 1993). They are of great importance because it is only through these brokers that information and ideas can flow throughout the network. As such, the individuals who fill these roles receive strategic benefits as the sources of novel information for other actors, generating superior social capital (Prell, 2009). Extending the theorizing above regarding the prevalence of middle social class actors to have greater numbers of lower and upper social class ties, it holds that they will have the highest rates of brokerage both within the overall network and between classes. Amidst the forms of cross-class ties (i.e. lower-middle, middle-upper, and lower-upper), lower-upper cross-class ties should be the least common,
meaning that in order for information to flow between the lower and upper social class, it must likely flow through a middle social class network member who holds cross-class ties with both the lower and upper social class. For these reasons, I hypothesize that:

*Hypothesis 7: Individuals from the middle social class will have the greatest network brokerage.*

**Mediators**

The sociocultural model of self suggests that formative experiences from childhood have a meaningful impact on the attitudes and expectations of adults. As children hear and see different attitudes and perceptions about the work context expressed by people in their class culture, they form their own dispositions which often mimic the environment that has been exemplified for them. There are three such dispositions that are related to organizational social networks: the attitude toward networking, openness to friendship, and work identity. These are dynamics that are both modeled during childhood by parents and other influential working adults in one’s culture and mechanisms that relate to extensivity and intensivity in networking behavior.

First, that attitude toward networking influences the motivation to engage in conscious and intentional networking. Second, the openness to friendship influences more natural tie formation and the receptivity to making new ties in an organizational setting. Third, work identity is a more indirect component that influences how one sees oneself in the work setting which in turn can affect the strategy for tie formation. Through these mediators we can better understand how childhood social class affects individuals’ organizational social networks.

**Attitude Toward Networking**

Networking literature has identified two primary components that affect one’s attitude toward networking: utility and morality (Kuwabra, Hildebrand, Zou, 2016). Utility is related to the belief that networking can be useful and effective given one’s efforts while the morality
component pertains to whether you believe networking is “fair, honest, and appropriate” (Kuwabra, Hildebrand, Zou, 2016). Considering that individuals from the lower social class have a reduced sense of personal control (Kraus, Piff, Keltner, 2009), I theorize that they are less likely to believe in the utility of networking. This lack of personal control is further exacerbated in the organizational setting as members from the lower social class struggle with stigmatized identities and a discomfort with middle class norms often inherent in work settings. Moreover, in a working paper, Holden and Côté (w.p.) theorize that the “heightened self-reliance” of lower social class individuals contributes to their belief that networking if futile and subsequently, their willingness to network. While preliminary results support this notion, additional research is needed on both this and the morality aspect of the attitude toward networking (Smith, Menon, & Thompson, 2012).

The morality of networking is considered questionable by many (Casciaro et al. 2014, Molinsky, 2012, Ibarra et al. 2010). It has been described as “unfair, insincere, or simply ‘dirty’” (Kuwabara, Hildebrand, Zou, 2016, pg. 3). Casciaro, Gino, and Kouchaki (2014) found that professionals who experienced feelings of dirtiness from instrumental networking engaged in the practice less frequently. Other notable outcomes of this study found that these individuals also had lower job performance, and higher power individuals experienced fewer feelings of dirtiness (Casciaro et al. 2014).

Qualitative research has identified examples of negative attitudes towards networking from members of the lower social class. In Lubrano’s (2010) sample of working class people, her participants expressed a fierce self-reliance. As one person described, “I will push until the job’s done or until I fall over. I don’t understand letting others do things for you, or spending your social currency to get favors. I have a scorn for that” (pg. 19). Not only does the lower social
class have a reluctance to engage in networking, but they have disdain for those they perceive as using others to do what they ought to be able to achieve through their own hard work (Lucas, 2011). Pertinent to the attitude toward networking, Lamont’s (2000) study on working men found that roughly a third of working class men had a distrust of ambition. Thus, institutional networking to get ahead is criticized as insincere and exploitative.

Relatedly, research suggests that individuals in the higher social class are more likely to engage in unethical behavior (Dubois, Rucker, Galinsky, 2015), particularly when outcomes would be self-serving (Piff et al., 2012). Considering that initiating networking is often engaged in to make social connections for one’s own benefit and to get ahead, values that run counter to lower social class culture, I theorize that individuals in the lower social class would be more likely to see networking as morally questionable and less likely to actively engage in the practice. Conversely, higher social classes are less likely to take moral issue with networking as it was valued differently in their cultural upbringing and often encouraged.

Further, individuals from higher social classes are more likely to value practices that can advance their own needs and goals. Drawing on earlier discussion, there is evidence of this propensity in the engagement with school networks as both parents and children from higher social classes are more likely than their lower social class counterparts to advocate for their desires and seek out help or opportunity from others to advance the child’s outcomes in an educational setting. In another example of differences in childhood socialization practices, the ample extracurriculars and diversity of opportunities in the higher social classes provides more practice in networking, normalizing the behavior as both necessary and beneficial. Applied to a work setting, this value can translate into viewing instrumental networking as an idealized
practice that furthers ambitious career prospects, another highly valued aspect of higher social class culture.

Considering the differences in the belief in networking utility, the perceived morality of networking behavior, and the subsequent willingness to engage in networking, I hypothesize:

*Hypothesis 8a-b: The relationship between childhood social class and degree centrality will be mediated by the attitude toward networking such that individuals from a lower social class background will have a less positive attitude toward networking than individuals from higher social classes, resulting in a less (a) degree centrality and (b) cross-class composition.*

**Work/Family Identity**

One of the core differences in social class culture is the prioritization of family versus career. While all classes value both family and career aspirations, the lower social class traditionally places family needs above work aspirations whereas the higher social classes are known for their norm of work devotion over and above devotion to family. One way this may manifest in organizational outcomes is in the strength of work and family identity centrality. Work identity centrality is described as “the salience of an occupational career, such as one’s identification with being a professor, a manager, a doctor, or a CEO of a Fortune 500 company” and “family identity centrality includes the degree of identification with a family role; for example, one's identification with being a parent, a sibling, a son, or a daughter” (Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, Hannum, 2012, pg. 114).

Differences in work identity between the classes has yet to be quantitatively tested. However, the research on norms within different social classes and qualitative studies discussing work identity provide strong support for the idea that individuals in higher social classes will
have a stronger work identity, that is, to have a personal identity more closely tied to their role and accomplishments at work (Sennett & Cobb, 1972).

In her study of cross-class marriages, Streib (2015) found that white-collar participants, felt an internalized need to be constantly working, a trait they felt was learned from their parents, believing it “dominate[d]” their identities. Work became their primary source of self-esteem and purpose. As Streib (2015) described, “those who grew up with white-collar parents tended to see work as part of their identity” (pg. 96). Conversely, lower social class workers are more likely to identify with their role in the family and to consider work merely as a means of providing for their family more than for personal fulfillment (Streib, 2015; Lamont, 2000; Williams 2010). Streib observed that for lower social class people, “work was something they did, even something they enjoyed, but it was not part of who they were” (Streib, p. 98).

Lower social class individuals who place greater emphasis on their family identity and consider their job more of a means than an end will be less motivated to form work ties. Alternatively, higher social class individuals who highly identify with their role and aspire to continually progress in their career, will be motivated to form ties with coworkers both because it strengthens their connection to work and instrumentally may aid them in advancement.

_Hypothesis 9a-b: The relationship between childhood social class and degree centrality will be mediated by work identity such that individuals from a higher social class background will have a stronger work identity than those from the lower social class, resulting in greater (a) degree centrality and (b) cross-class composition._

**Openness to Friendship**

Research in the field of education found that working class students were less open to friendship both within and outside the educational institutional setting (Rubin & Wright, 2015), while other studies had mixed results (Martinez, Sher, Krull, & Wood, 2009; Sandler, 2000). The literature on social class can help explain the difference in findings. For instance, the settings in
which the former results were found were inherently cross-class as educational institutions traditionally embody middle class culture. It is understandable that individuals from the lower social class would have lower openness to these cross-class friendships that induce cognitive strain, stigma, and anxiety. However, this may not be the case in same-tie situations.

The lower social class is often described as highly interdependent, with a strong sense of loyalty to their family (McDowell et al. 2013), suggesting strong tie formation within the class, although possibly at the expense of cross-class ties. Given that safety drives must be met before efficacy drives, individuals in the lower social class may be motivated by safety drives at a much greater rate than efficacy drives because of a greater need for safety in their unpredictable and less stable environments (Kadushin, 2002). The result of these safety drives is likely tie formation that is comforting and non-threatening, same-class ties. Further, there is an additional motivation for the lower social class to form same-class ties as a strategy to react to environmental threats (Lamont, 2000; Piff, Stancato, Martinez, Kraus, & Keltner, 2012; Piff 2014).

Conversely, individuals raised in higher social classes do not suffer the same stigmatization, and while members from all classes can experience cross-class anxieties, members from higher social classes experience it at a lesser rate than members of the lower social class. Thus, they may be less discouraged to engage in cross-class interactions than their lower social class counterparts.

Also, members from higher social classes experienced upbringings that exposed them to a great range of new tie formation through the variety of activities in concerted cultivation, a broader geographic range of family friends, and new opportunities through travel and higher education (Milkie, Kendig, Nomaguchi, Denny, 2010; Lareau, 2003). These experiences
socialize children to value novelty and openness to new experiences, which I argue will translate into a greater openness to friendships with dissimilar others. Therefore, I hypothesize that:

\[ \text{Hypothesis 10: The relationship between childhood social class and cross-class composition will be mediated by openness to friendship such that individuals from higher social classes background will be more open to cross-class friendship than individuals from the lower social class, which leads to greater cross-class composition.} \]

**Moderators**

There are several factors that may moderate the predicted relationships I have articulated thus far. Two of the following proposed moderators pertain to individual attributes that serve to counter the predictions regarding the influence of childhood social class on organizational social networks. The first, institutional agency, references to a role in the organization that influences tie formation through a job requirement to act in ways that may run counter to the norms of one’s socioculturally developed self. The second, social class upward mobility, challenges the predictions of the strength of childhood social class and proposes that for those that experience great upward mobility, they may come to embody the tastes, preferences, and behaviors of their current social class to a greater degree than their childhood social class. Lastly, the environment of the organization can perpetuate or breakdown class boundaries through a hierarchical or heterarchical structure, respectively. In the following section, these moderators are discussed in greater detail and their hypothesized effects on previously discussed relationships are proposed.

**Institutional Agency**

An institutional agent refers to “an agent providing an institutional service” (Cardoso & Oliveira, 2006, pg. 11) who are “well positioned to provide key forms of social and institutional support” (Stanton-Salazar, 2010, pg. 1067). While some scholars consider this to be synonymous with high-status, high-power positions that leverage their social capital to provide support to others (Stanton-Salazar, 2010), others have identified low-status actors who serve as institutional
agents such as executive’s administrative staff and hospital attendants (Mechanic, 1962). These low-status workers may lack formal authority, but still have relative power and work with a wide range of actors from diverse roles given the nature of their position. Institutional agency will thus moderate the relationship between social class and social networks such that these agents will have larger social networks, more cross-class ties, and greater brokerage, regardless of class background, due to their job requirements that obligate them to interact with a large, diverse group of employees within the organization.

*Hypothesis 11a-c*: Institutional agency will moderate the effect of childhood social class on employee social networks such that institutional agents will have more (a) overall and (b) cross-class composition and (c) networking brokerage, regardless of social class background.

**Social Class Upward Mobility**

While the sociocultural model of self and principle of habitus both suggest that childhood social class has lasting, enduring effects well into adulthood, it is possible that individuals who experience social class mobility may shed their previous class identity or strategically adapt to embody the culture of their new social class more so than their previous class identity. Other theorists have suggested that childhood and current socialization have equally important roles in affecting individual’s attitudes and behaviors (Friedman, 2013; Lahire, 2011). This may be particularly true when one has experienced mobility. As Houle (2011) describes, “class mobility reflects more than just a simple job or career change. It represents movement across broad social class divisions leading to losses (i.e., downward mobility) or gains (i.e. upward mobility) in social class position and the rewards, resources, and prestige associated with those positions.” (pg. 758).

In these situations, the predicted effects of childhood social class on work identity, attitudes towards networking, and the composition of one’s social network may be weakened.
Those who have experienced social class mobility may engender the work identity and have an attitude toward networking that more closely aligns with the higher social class attitudes than the lower social class habitus in which they were raised.

Furthermore, if an individual is trying to separate themselves from or shed their previous identity, they may not only attempt to make more ties of higher social classes as a means of further mobility, but may also actively avoid ties in their previous social class. Milkie and colleagues (2014) posited that upwardly mobility may cause the severance of ties with people from your previous networks because of a change in tastes, interests, status, and identity. Many other class theorists have noted the strain that mobility has on the upwardly mobile and their relationships with their family and former class members (Lubrano, 2000; Houle, 2011; Sorokin, 1959; Friedman, 2013; Miles et al., 2011; Aries & Seider, 2007).

For these reasons, we hypothesize that upward mobility will moderate the relationship between childhood social class and cross-class ties such that those with higher upward mobility will embody organizational attitudes and ties more characteristics of their current class than their childhood social class.

Hypothesis 12a-c: Social class mobility will moderate the relationship between (a) childhood social class and attitude toward networking, (b) childhood social class and work identity, and (c) childhood social class and openness to friendship, such that the upwardly mobile will have a stronger work identity, more openness to friendship, and more positive attitude toward networking.

Extending this theorizing, if the upwardly mobile are more likely to create ties with people in their new class, they will have a greater number of ties from a social class that does not match their childhood social class. To the extent that they retain ties from their previous class, this will also increase their brokerage within the organizational network. Thus:

Hypothesis 13a-b: Social class mobility will moderate childhood social class’s effect on (a) cross-class composition and (b) network brokerage such that the upwardly mobile
will have greater cross-class composition and thus, network brokerage than predicted by direct effects.

Organizational Structure

As highlighted in earlier sections, the structure and operations of an organization play a role in the shaping of organizational social networks. From physical space to power differentials, the organizational environment can promote or hinder tie formation for both same- and cross-class ties.

Research has already begun to theorize about the effects of organizational hierarchy on organizational social networks in a broad sense. Kenis and Knoke (2002) proposed that “as hierarchy increases among the subgroups in an organizational field’s communication network, the subsequent rate of interorganizational tie formation decelerates non-linearly toward zero” (p. 287). However, in flatter, or more heterarchical structures, “direct asymmetric ties occur between every ‘higher’ position and all the lower positions” (p. 287). Given that more hierarchical structures increase separation between ties, specifically between those with different organizational rank, I theorize that actors in organizations with a more hierarchical structure will have fewer cross-class ties. I further theorize that this will have the greatest effect on individuals in the lower social class. Actors at the high end of the hierarchy have a better view of organizational actors and increased power to access ties below them (Lin, 1999), a luxury not afforded to actors on the other end of the spectrum. Conversely, flat structures may increase cross-class ties as there are less formal structures preventing people from interacting with dissimilar organization members. Additionally, in these flatter structures the centrality of the middle social class will be reduced as actors across classes need not rely on middlemen to reach people across the organizational network. Thus, I hypothesize:
Hypothesis 14: The organizational structure will moderate the effect of childhood social class on cross-class composition such that as organizational structures become flatter, cross-class composition will increase for all employees regardless of class background.

Hypothesis 15: The organizational structure will moderate the effect of childhood social class on network brokerage such that as organizational structures become flatter, the network brokerage of the middle social class will be reduced.

Chapter 4: Methods

The following section will articulate the methods and processes used to test hypotheses 1-15. First, I will discuss the pre-test procedures that were necessary to develop the attitude toward networking scale and the key steps taken for construct development. Then I will discuss the main study details including the sample, procedure, measures, and sub-models, before explaining the specific analysis undertaken for each sub-model.

Pre-Tests for Construct Development

In order to successfully test the proposed model, a scale to measure the attitude toward networking construct required development. Per the scale development methodology suggested by DeVellis (1991), I began by defining attitude toward networking. According to Kuwabara and colleagues (2016), the attitude toward networking relates to “distinct beliefs that can independently undermine a person’s motivation to engage in different forms of networking” (p. 51). The authors proposed two primary components of the construct: the utility and morality of networking. Utility of networking involves the “marginal cost-benefit—that is, whether networking is useful or effective given one’s effort—and it ranges from positive to negative based on one’s perceived or expected performance,” while the morality component refers to perceptions of fairness, honesty, and appropriateness (Kuwabara et al., 2016, p. 53). Negative reactions towards the morality of networking include feeling fake, shallow, and believing that using others for one’s own gain is unfair. Kuwabara and colleagues (2016) theorize that people may feel conflicted about networking due to either or both the utility and morality dimensions.
Because no published scales exist to test this construct, I developed one for the purposes of this study. Methodologists have recommended between 4 and 10 scale items per dimension of the construct (Hinkin, 1995). Drawing from literature related to the attitude toward networking (Kuwabara, Hildebrand, & Zou, 2016; Holden & Côté, w.p.; Casciaro, Gino, & Kouchaki, 2014), I compiled 10 scale items for utility and 13 for morality for a total of 23 scale items for the attitude toward networking measure.

To capture the utility of networking, I included items from Holden & Côté’s (w.p.) perceived futility of professional networking scale (α=0.80), or the belief that “networking is not necessary or useful in the workplace” (pg. 2). This 7-point scale includes three items: “to me, networking is a lot of time and work for little payoff;” “in my opinion, networking is not an effective way to build a career;” and “in general, employees do not get much out of networking.” As my measure is an overall attitude toward networking, in this scale these items are considered reverse coded. Additional items developed for this scale include: “networking has a lot of benefits for one’s career;” “when I network, I get a lot out of it;” and “networking is really rewarding.” These items are reflective of the attitude toward networking scale measuring a broader opinion of networking compared to futility of networking.

To capture the perceived morality of networking I adapted aspects of Casciaro and colleagues (2014) feelings of dirtiness scale. Their measure first defined professional networking to participants as “the purposeful building and nurturing of relationships to create a system of information and support for professional and career success” before asking them which emotions they feel after engaging in professional networking (pg. 719; α=0.84). The focal emotions for their scale were dirty, ashamed, inauthentic, and uncomfortable. Moral evaluations often involve feelings and emotions (Haidt, 2008) which aid in individual’s overall appraisals and processing
of a situation or issue. Drawing from their scale, I created items pertaining to moral evaluations of networking, both affective and cognitive. Example items with a stronger affective component include: “after attending a conference or networking event, I feel a little dirty (R);” and “when I engage in networking, I feel really satisfied.” Other, more cognitively evaluative items include: “to me, professional networking seems inauthentic;” “networking is a legitimate way to conduct business;” and “networking is a respectable behavior.” The full list of items is available in Appendix A.

Pre-Test 1

For the next step in construct validation, these scale items were then reviewed by subject matter experts (SMEs) as a means of content validity.

Sample

Following the procedures put forth by MacKenzie and colleagues (1991), SMEs in the field of social class, social networks, and other management scholars were asked to participate in a queue-sorting survey through Qualtrics to identify items that measure the utility and morality dimensions of the attitude toward networking. A total of 12 SMEs completed the survey.

Procedure

SMEs were provided with a definition of the utility and morality sub-dimensions of the attitude toward networking scale and asked to classify scale items as measuring either utility, morality, or neither. To test for discriminant validity, items from similar constructs, the Need for Status, Status Aspirations, and Extraversion scales, were included as well. The order in which items appeared was randomized across participants. The procedures for Pretest 1 were approved by the University of Arkansas’ Institutional Review Board. A copy of the approval letter is available in Appendix C.
Results

For an item to be retained, it must have reached a 75% agreement index or higher; that is, 75% of SMEs must have classified an item into its intended construct. While this cannot guarantee content validity, Hinkin (1998) suggests this method can provide “content adequacy” first introduced by Schriesheim and colleagues (1993). Of the original 23 items, all but two met this criterion in that there was 75% or higher consensus that the item measured its intended construct. Only those items were retained. The average consensus for the remaining items was 92.59%. Additionally, two items were modified after receiving qualitative feedback from subject matter experts that the wording was confusing. A table of the item analysis following the SME survey results as well as the modifications is available in Appendix B.

Pre-test 2

Following the results of the SME survey, I next conducted a pilot study with 171 undergraduate students at a large, public university to perform an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) followed by a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on the newly developed attitude toward networking scale. The sample was subsequently split in order to perform both the EFA and CFA.

Procedure

Participants were invited to participate through their enrollment in various management courses and were offered extra credit in their coursework as an incentive to participate. They were provided with a link to an online survey administered through Qualtrics in which they answered questions pertaining to their demographics and various attitudes and opinions on personal and work-related measures. The procedure was approved by the University of Arkansas’ Institutional Review Board as part of the overall dissertation data collection procedures. A copy of the letter demonstrating approval is available in Appendix D.
Measures

Attitude Toward Networking. Attitude Toward Networking was measured using the modified scale following the results of the previous pretest with subject matter experts. Responses were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree with anchors provided for each response option.

Need for Social Status. Need for Status was measured using an established scale developed by Flynn and colleagues (2006; α=.82). Responses were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Example items include “I enjoy having influence over other people’s decision making;” “Being a highly valued member of my social group is important to me;” and “I would like to cultivate the admiration of my peers.” A full list of scale items is available in Appendix E.

Status Aspirations. Status Aspirations was measured using items from an established measure for Achievement Motivation (Cassidy & Lynn, 1989) by selecting the items that pertain to Status Aspirations (mean α=.71). Responses were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Example items include “I would like an important job where people look up to me;” “I like talking to people who are important;” and “I want to be an important person in the community.” A full list of scale items is available in Appendix E.

Extraversion. Extraversion was measured using the traditional Big Five measurements (John & Srivastava, 1999, grand mean α=.83) and scaling the extraversion items (α=.88). Responses were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Items all began with “I see myself as someone who…” and ended with, for
example, “is talkative;” and “is full of energy.” A full list of scale items is available in Appendix E.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis**

The EFA was used to identify the sub-dimensions of items in the attitude toward networking scale and help determine the ideal number of items to best measure the construct based on the factor loading of the individual scale items in each sub-dimension. For an EFA, researchers generally consider factor loadings of 0.4 or 0.5 or above as meaningful (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Accordingly, I adopted these standards when determining which items to retain or remove.

**Sample**

There were 79 participants in the first half of the sample, of which 36.7% were male and 88.6% white. Not surprisingly given the student population, 98.7% were between the ages of 18 and 24, and all were single.

**Results**

The outcome of the EFA revealed that all items loaded onto a single factor, deviating from the theorized two-factor model. Several items did not load with others and were subsequently removed. Indeed, the scale was refined down to 7 items, 4 from the original utility factor and 3 from the original morality factor, with a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.884. The factor loadings were all above 0.60, with an average factor loading of 0.769. The component matrix from the EFA, as well as the original scree plot and the refined scale scree plot, are available in Appendix F.

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**
A CFA was conducted to validate the results of the EFA as well as test for discriminant validity from several similar established instruments. The commonly accepted indicators of good fit include CFI ≥ .90; SRMR < .08; and RMSEA < .08 (Kline, 2005; Hooper et al., 2008).

**Sample**

The second half of the pilot sample was used to conduct a CFA. In this sample, there were 91 participants, of which 57.1% were male, 86.8% white, 90.1% were between the ages of 18 and 24, and 92.3% were single.

**Results**

Given the results of the exploratory factor analysis, the confirmatory factor analysis used a one-factor model for Attitude Toward Networking. The refined 7-item scale was tested using a CFA and fit two of the three main criteria for validity [CFI=.969; SRMR=.034; RMSEA=.144]. Although the proposed model falls just short of meeting one of the three primary criteria, the overall fit and consistently strong factor loadings for the remaining items indicate sufficient construct validity for a valid study, particularly in comparison to the original two-factor model [CFI= .359; SRMR= .140; RMSEA= .612].

To further test the validity of this model, I additionally analyzed the model with the addition of the scales for need for status, status aspirations, and extraversion to establish discriminant validity relative to similar existing constructs [CFI=.595; SRMR=.182; RMSEA=.228]. While the Attitude Toward Networking did not significantly covary with any of the three other scales (Need for Status, p<.296; Status Aspirations, p<.771; Extraversion, p<.303), Need for Status and Status Aspirations were significantly correlated (p<.033), affecting the results of the CFA. Thus, I conducted two subsequent CFAs analyzing two subgroups: 1) Attitude Toward Networking, Extraversion, and Need for Status [CFI=.783; SRMR=.161;
RMSEA=.157] and 2) Attitude Toward Networking, Extraversion, and Status Aspirations [CFI=.690; SRMR=.171; RMSEA=.216]. The overall fit of the model was not strong, but the combined results from each CFA was deemed sufficient to retain the 7-item scale of Attitude Toward Networking for the use in the primary study. A subsequent CFA performed on the study 1 data showed strong results for the 7-item one-factor model of Attitude Toward Networking [CFI=.917; SRMR=.070; RMSEA=.177], compared to the original two-factor model [CFI=.731; SRMR=.109; RMSEA=.176]. While the results did not quite fit the recommended standards for model fit, the results from all confirmatory factor analyses were strong enough to retain the 7-item scale for use in the main study.

Main Study

The purpose of study 2 was to test the proposed model using ego network analysis. Ego network analysis collects network data exclusively from the perspective of each individual participant, referred to as ego. Participants recall their ties, referred to as alters, to build their individual network. The benefit of ego network analysis is in the breadth and variety of the sample. Through this method, data will be collected from a range of organizations and occupations, increasing the generalizability of the findings.

Sample

The sample for the main study came from the online worker platform, Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (Mturk). A strength of MTurk data collection is the diversity of participants, not only in terms of class background but also by industry and geography.

Studies have found that participants from MTurk are more representative of the US population than more convenient samples such as in-person samples (Berinsky, Huber, and Lenz, 2012) and university samples (Behrend, Sharek, Meade, & Wiede, 2011; Buhrmeister, Kwang, &
Gosling, 2011; Paolocci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2011). Mturk samples have been demonstrated to be comparable to or outperform alternative samples of professional marketing research companies and student groups in terms of quality of participation and responses (Paolocci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2011; Goodman, Cryder, & Cheema, 2013; Kees, Berry, Burton, and Sheehan, 2017).

Initial responses and criteria were used to filter out poor quality respondents, as described in the section on procedures. There were 460 remaining participants in the final dataset. The sample was 64.3% female, 54.1% married, and 94.1% US-born. Age ranged from the 18-24 year old category to 65 and older. The age range with the largest representation was 25-34 year olds at 31.7% of the sample. Participants were predominantly white at 82.6%, while African Americans comprised 8.3% of the sample, and the remaining participants represented other minority groups. The majority, 91.7%, had been with their employer for over 6 months. Income levels were evenly dispersed. Participants were asked their current household income level in increments of $10,000 (e.g. $10,000-19,999; $20,000-29,999, etc). Representation in each decile up to $100,000 was no more than 11%, 16.3% of the sample was between $100,000 and $200,000, and 2.2% were over $200,000.

**Procedure**

Data was collected using a longitudinal, three-wave survey design. Surveys were approximately 15-30 minutes in length and collected 10-14 days apart to help minimize the potential for common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012). Survey 1 collected demographic, control, and the independent variables. Survey 2 collected mediators, moderators, and additional organizational information. Survey 3 collected the social network variables. Participants were asked to generate a list of employees with whom they are connected.
at their workplace. From that list, subsequent questions were asked to identify the strength and nature of these relationships and to speculate the social class background of the alters in their network. Studies have shown that people are fairly accurate judges of others’ social class (Kraus & Keltner, 2009; Kraus, Park, & Tan, 2007; Child, Pearce, & King, 1980).

To qualify for participation in this study, respondents were required to be 18 years of age or older, a citizen of the United States, and employed. Qualified participants were able to see an invitation to participate through the online worker platform, Mechanical Turk. Those that were interested in participation accepted the HIT (Human Intelligence Task) and followed a link to an online survey administered by Qualtrics. Upon successful completion, they were provided a code from Qualtrics which they then entered into the MTurk platform in order to confirm participation and receive their compensation. Survey directions explained that this was one of three surveys and asked subjects to participate only if they were confident they could complete all three. In order to encourage the completion of all three surveys, compensation was increased at each time, $0.50, $1.00, and $2.00, respectively. While compensation is generally low, it was on par with similar surveys being offered on the platform. Funding for this study was provided through a grant from the Office of Diversity and Inclusion in the Walton College of Business at the University of Arkansas.

As mentioned earlier, to ensure response quality, several measures were taken to identify and exclude poor quality data following guidance from Dennis and colleagues (2018). First, each survey included two attention check items, and respondents that failed to successfully complete attention check items were removed from analysis and not invited to participate in subsequent surveys. An example attention check item would be an item within a scale that stated “Please select strongly disagree.” Second, there were several open response items included in the
surveys. Participants who answered nonsensically, in a language other than English, or otherwise demonstrated that they were inattentive respondents were similarly removed from the analysis and not invited to participate in subsequent surveys. Lastly, data was rigorously searched for duplicate data or evidence of responses coming from data farms. To accomplish this, I investigated for duplicates in MTurk workerID numbers, IP addresses, and geolocation measures provided by Qualtrics. Of the 1000 who completed survey 1,827 were invited to take survey 2. After attrition and removal of poor quality responses, 522 participants were invited to complete the third and final survey. A total of 460 participants completed all three surveys and passed all measures of quality assurance.

In order to link the surveys, participants were asked for their MTurk worker ID, a unique identifier assigned to them by the MTurk platform, which was deleted after successful merging to ensure anonymity. No other personally identifying information was asked to maintain anonymity.

Measures

Independent Variables

Social class. Social class refers to “the relative social rankings of organizational members based on differences in... economic capital (i.e., wealth), social capital (i.e., networks and connections), and cultural capital (i.e., tastes and practices developed through educational and personal experiences)” (Gray & Kish-Gephart 2013, p. 671). For the purposes of this study, the perception of class is of paramount interest and as such, childhood social class was measured. The widely cited and validated MacArthur scale of subjective SES (Adler et al., 2000) was used, which asks participants to picture society as a ten-rung ladder representing society whereby the people who are most well off are at the top rung and those with the least resources are at the
bottom rung. An example of the MacArthur questions are available in Appendix G. Respondents select the rung of the ladder they believe best describes their family during their childhood. Similarly, participants were also instructed to select which rung they feel best represents their current social class.

Research has shown that individuals in the United States self-identify with social class groups, with over 98% of a representative sample self-selecting themselves as in either the lower, lower-middle, middle, upper-middle, or upper (Morin & Motel, 2012). Given the smaller representation of the class groups on the ends of the spectrum (i.e. only 10 from the upper social class), and in line with precedent (Kish-Gephart & Campbell, 2015; Fiske, Moya, Russell, & Bearns, 2012; Evans & Mills, 2000; Lachman & Weaver, 1998; Oakes, 1990; Altenderfer, 1941; Rowntree, 1941), I chose to investigate three broad categories of the lower, middle, and upper social classes in line with the theorizing put forth in the hypotheses. Thus, respondents who selected rungs 1-3 were categorized as lower social class, 4-7 as middle social class, and 8-10 as upper social class. Of the respondents who completed all three surveys, 136 were lower social class (30%), 277 were middle social class (60%), and 46 were upper social class (10%).

In line with this categorization, the analyses treated childhood social class as a mult categorical variable. Each model included three comparison groups: lower social class versus middle social class (1 vs. 2), middle social class versus upper social class (2 vs. 3), and lower social class versus upper social class (1 vs. 3). The nature of these findings are described in greater detail in the Analysis section below.

**Dependent Variables**

Degree Centrality. The most widely used centrality measure, degree centrality, is the number of ties an individual has within a specified network and indicates activity and mobility
within the network (Borgatti, Everett, and Johnson, 2013), which has implications for information flow throughout the organizational social network. A traditional name generator method (Marsden, 2003; Burt, 1984; Lin, 1999) was used in which the number of the participants’ ties, participants were first asked a series of questions involving the recall and name generation of various ties at work. This name-generation method is commonly used (Campbell-Barrett & Karen, 1991; Marsden, 2005), but susceptible to participant fatigue (Brewer, 2000; Mardsen, 2005). To reduce the possibility of these effects, participants are given an upper-limit to the number of alters requested of them (Rice et al., 2014).

They began by listing coworkers who they trust, up to 10 individuals. They next were asked to list coworkers they regard as acquaintances, up to 30 individuals. If they had more than 30 individuals, they were asked to simply list the number of other acquaintances they had in their workplace. The number were kept to 10 and 30, respectively, due to the number of follow up questions regarding each tie. Greater numbers of names generated would have made the survey too taxing to complete. From these measures, an overall degree centrality score was calculated by summing all of the ego’s trust alters, acquaintance alters, and additional number of acquaintances unnamed. Total number of network connections (at any level of relationship) is the traditional measure of network size in social network studies (Morrison, 2002; Collins & Clark, 2003; Cross & Cummings, 2004; Borgatti, Everett, Johnson, 2013).

Cross-Class Composition. As stated earlier, participants were asked to speculate the perceived social class background of their listed alters from the standard five-item measure of social class including lower, lower-middle, middle, upper-middle, and upper. Cross-class composition was determined by taking the percentage of ties from a class background other than one’s own divided by the total number of ties one has in the workplace.
Network Brokerage. The general notion of brokerage is when person A is connected to person B and person C, but person B and C are not connected (Burt, 2005). In that instance, person A serves as a bridge who connects B and C. Thus, person B and C must rely on person A in order to reach person C or B, respectively. Network brokerage is traditionally determined by calculating the frequency with which each employee falls between other pairs of employee ties on the shortest path connecting the pair. Higher frequency results in higher brokerage. An even more nuanced measure of this phenomenon, efficiency, was developed by Burt (1992) which considers the relationships that exist between all of an ego’s alters, that is, how well-connected the set of alters are to each other. To understand efficiency one must first consider the effective size of one’s network. The effective size is the number of ties one has, less the redundancy in the network. An ego who brokers the information flow between all unconnected alters holds much more power and control than an ego who brokers between alters where alter X also can broker between them. This diminishes the unconnected alters need to use ego to connect one another because they could alternatively use alter X. Efficiency is the effective size of one’s network divided by the overall size. In this way, efficiency is a measure that indicates how well an individual is setup to maximize the nonredundant information within a network where the smaller the number, the more efficient one is within their network (Burt, 1992).

In ego network analysis, ego is responsible for completing the ties within the network by indicating which alters are connected to their other alters. As this can be quite daunting, this study limited the alter-to-alter data to up to 10 alters and to whom ego felt he or she was particularly close. When participants were asked to list these “trust” alters (up to 10), those names were then repopulated into subsequent questions whereby the participant was asked how Alter 1 was acquainted with Alter 2, 3, … 10. Next, how was Alter 2 acquainted with Alter 3, 4,
and so on until a 10x10 matrix could be created with their relationships from which effective size and efficiency scores were calculated using Burt’s (1992) traditional calculation.

**Mediators**

*Attitude Toward Networking.* The measure for attitude toward networking was the 7-item scale developed in the pilot study above. While originally intended to capture two distinct dimensions of an overall attitude toward networking, utility and morality, the results of an EFA and CFA suggest that the scale is capturing a single factor. Thus, the current attitude toward networking scale ($\alpha=0.903$) is measuring a more general belief regarding the strategy of networking and the outcomes of networking behavior (Kuwabara, Hildebrand, Zou, 2016). Sample items include: “Networking is really rewarding;” “To me, networking is a lot of time and work for little payoff (R);” “The idea of building networking ties feels fake;” and “Networking to maintain relationships is insincere.”

*Work Identity.* Work identity refers to the “the salience of an occupational career, such as one's identification with being a professor, a manager, a doctor, or a CEO of a Fortune 500 company” (Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, Hannum, 2012, pg. 114). To measure this phenomenon, I began with the four-item work identity scale developed by Linkow and colleagues (2011; $\alpha=0.77$). Because the work identity scale is relatively new and therefore lacks substantial testing outside of their original models, I added two additional items from the similar *job involvement* scale (Lodahl & Keinar, 1965; $\alpha=0.73$) to increase the validity and reliability of the scale. This provided me the option to remove items that did not reach convergent validity without crippling the scale with too few of items. However, after conducting an EFA on the work identity items, the results supported retaining all items ($\alpha=.856$).
Example items from the work identity scale include “most of my interests are centered around work” and “my job/career is a major source of satisfaction to me.” Example items from the job involvement scale include: “the major [fulfillment] in my life comes from my job” and “the most important things that happen to me involve my work.” All items were measured using a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The full list of items in available in Appendix H.

*Openness to Friendship.* Openness to friendship measures the degree to which individuals feel open to making new friendships and is measured using the questions developed and used by Buote and colleagues (2006, 2007; α=0.89). This ten-item measure uses a 9-point Likert-type scale ranging from very strongly disagree to very strongly agree. Items were changed minimally to replace “university” to “work.” Example items include “I am very excited about the possibility of meeting new friends at [work];” “I feel I already have all the friends I need” (reverse coded); and “I hope to develop life-long friendships at [work].” Results of reliability analysis suggested the revisions did not negatively affect the reliability of the scale items (α=0.938). The full list of items in available in Appendix H.

*CFA on Mediators.* As an additional test for robustness of the Attitude Toward Networking scale, I performed an additional CFA with the three parallel mediators used in the analysis: Attitude Toward Networking (ATN), Work Identity (WID), and Openness to Friendship (OTF). While ATN and WID did not significantly covary (p< .248), ATN and OTF (p< .000) and WID and OTF (p< .003) did indeed covary significantly, but not so much as to indicate confounded constructs. This is unsurprising given the theoretical similarities between these scales. In is chapter on parallel mediators, Hayes (2018) states that “in most cases, the mediators are likely to be correlated. Nevertheless, the overall fit of the model is close to
acceptable standards \[CFI=.819; \text{SRMR}=.102; \text{RMSEA}=.124; \chi^2 < .001\] and, and all three mediators were used in parallel within the models.

**Moderators**

*Social Class Mobility.* Social class mobility refers to the transition (advancing or declining) from one’s social class to another and the losses or gains of “rewards, resources, and prestige associated with those positions” (Houle, 2011, p. 758). Mobility scores were calculated using the difference scores between the rungs selected for childhood and current social class from the previous MacArthur scale described above. This score represents the rise or fall in individual social class standing throughout one’s life. Individuals were categorized as experiencing either downward mobility, that is, their current social class is lower than the social class they were in during childhood; no mobility, their current social class was the same as their childhood social class; or upward mobility in which their current social class was higher than their childhood social class. This variable was treated as a categorical variable in the analysis. Being in a fixed class or experiencing no mobility is considered the control group. The results compared no mobility to the upwardly mobile (W1), and no mobility to the downwardly mobile (W2). Mobility was analyzed as these three conditions for two primary reasons. First, leaving mobility as a continuous variable would test a linear relationship with downward mobility on one of the spectrum and upward mobility on the other. However, the hypotheses seek to compare people who have not experienced mobility to the upwardly mobile. Further, it is often the mobility conditions that change the effects, upward or downward, which again, is non-linear.

*Institutional Agency.* Institutional agency was measured as a count of the employees that the participant was required to interact with as an institutional agent. To determine this number,
employees indicated ties they must interact with as a requirement of their position with the count of these ties comprises their institutional agency score.

Organizational Structure. Modeled after Pugh, Hinings, and Turner’s (1968) measure of organizational configuration, organizational structure were measured by asking respondents to think of the chain of command within their organizations including their boss, their boss’ boss, and so on as far as they are aware and list the number of chains between them and the top of their organization. Similarly, they were next asked to think of their subordinate, their subordinates’ subordinates, and so on as far as they are aware and list the number of chains between them and the most entry-level employees in the organization. These two scores were then summed to generate a total number of chains within their organizational hierarchy. Individuals with longer chains of command have higher organizational structure scores. High scores represent hierarchical structures while low scores represent heterarchical structures.

Control Variables

There were several control variables included in the analysis. In addition to more standard demographic controls, gender, age, and race, I controlled for individual factors that could influence relationships at work. First, employment status refers to whether an employee works full or part-time. The number of hours spent at work could potentially influence the ability for an individual to meet people and form relationships. Similarly, tenure within the organization could influence one’s ability to know a greater number of coworkers. Lastly, I controlled for organizational size that participants estimated which could influence the number of employees one has the potential to meet. In controlling for these factors, the effects of the proposed model can be better understood.

Analysis
The complexity of the model proposed in Figure 1 necessitated that the analysis be performed as a series of sub-models. I began by separating the portions of the model pertaining to individual factors from organizational factors. Models 1-3 test the effects of individual factors on the three dependent variables, respectively, while Models 4-6 test the effects of organizational factors on the three dependent variables, respectively. A summary table of what each model tests, including all variables, the hypotheses tested, and PROCESS model utilized is in Table 2.

Each model in the analysis uses a version of Hayes’ PROCESS Models (Hayes, 2018). PROCESS is a statistical analysis extension of other analytic software to perform regression analysis involving mediators, moderators, or the various versions of conditional processing. The full range of statistical models is available in Hayes’ book (Hayes, 2018) or online (www.processmacros.org). The benefit of using the PROCESS package is the ability to run analyses of the multiple relationships being tested simultaneously. Each model can be broken down into a conceptual diagram demonstrating the “paths” the model tests. Each path represents a “causal flow” from one variable to another. The ability for the program to run these as one output is beneficial given the complexity of the models. For instance, Model 2 tests 33 “a” paths flowing in to the three parallel mediators, 3 “b” paths from the mediators to the dependent variables, and 11 “c” paths testing for direct causal flow from the independent variable, moderators, and their interactions to the dependent variable.
PROCESS models use a bootstrapping technique whereby the cases in the original sample are resampled, in this case, 20,000 times, in order to construct an empirically derived set of coefficient distributions (Hayes, 2018). Each case is intended to represent others in the general population who would be like them and is thus intended to mimic repeating the data collection of the focal study, increasing the size and power of the sample (Hayes, 2018). While not without its limitations, bootstrapping has become a widely accepted and utilized means of analysis with the advent of powerful and accessible computing technologies. Many would argue its advantages above that of other means of hypotheses testing (MacKinnon et al., 2002; MacKinnon et al., 2004; Wood, 2005; Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

Models 1-6 all share the same independent variable, childhood social class, which contains three categories: lower, middle, and upper social class. The three comparison groups (Xs) in the analysis refer to three comparisons: 1) lower and middle social class (X1); 2) middle and upper social class (X2); and 3) lower and upper social class (X3). Significant effects suggest that the means of the two comparison groups are significantly different from one another.

Model 1 uses a PROCESS model (#7) which tests for moderated mediation on the dependent variable, in this case, degree centrality. Further, model 1 includes two parallel mediators, attitude toward networking and work identity, and a multicategorical moderator, social class mobility. Parallel mediation refers to a model with multiple mediators that are not causally related. The results of such analysis tests for the indirect effect of each mediator, holding the others constant.

Similar to childhood social class, the social class mobility moderator has three categories: downward mobility, no mobility, and upward mobility. The analysis considers two comparison groups: 1) downward mobility and no mobility; and 2) no mobility and upward mobility. A
traditional depiction of this subset of the model is shown in Figure 2, while the conceptual
diagram showing the path models being tested by the PROCESS analysis is available in Figure 3.

Insert Figures 2-3 about here

Model 2 uses a PROCESS Model (#8) which tests for moderated mediation as well as
moderation of the direct relationship between childhood social class and the dependent variable,
cross-class composition. In addition to the variables in the previous model, Model 2 includes a
third parallel mediator, Openness to Friendship. The sub-model is shown in Figure 4 and the
conceptual diagram in Figure 5.

Insert Figures 4-5 about here

Model 3 is the third and final sub-model that tests the individual factors from the
comprehensive model. It uses a PROCESS Model (#1) which tests for a single moderator, social
class mobility, in the relationship between childhood social class and network brokerage. The
sub-model is shown in Figure 6 and the conceptual diagram in Figure 7.

Insert Figures 6-7 about here

Model 4-6 are sub-models that test the effects of organizational factors on the three
dependent variables, degree centrality (Model 4), cross-class composition (Model 5), and
network brokerage (Model 6). Model 4 includes a single moderator, institutional agency, and
thus uses PROCESS Model #1. Models 5 and 6 have two moderators, organizational structure and institutional agency, and use a PROCESS Model (#2) for multiple moderators. Figure 8 summarizes these three models while Figures 9-11 show each models’ conceptual diagram.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Insert Figures 8-11 about here

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Through consideration of each of these six sub-models, the overall theoretical model can be tested in full. The results of these analyses are discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 5: Results

The aim of this dissertation is to explore the effects of one’s social class upbringing on social networks at work by investigating three key individual network outcomes: degree centrality, class composition of individual networks, and network brokerage. I will first the individual level factors followed by the organizational factors that are proposed to influence the network variables.

Individual Effects

Model 1, The Individual-Level Effects of Childhood Social Class on Degree Centrality

Model 1 tests a portion of this model by modeling individual-level factor effects on degree centrality. This model includes two mediators, attitude toward networking and work identity, and one moderator, social class mobility. In doing so, this model tests hypotheses 1, 8, and 9. Results for the moderated mediation of parallel mediators can be found in Table 15 and graphs of all Model 1 significant effect bootstrap coefficients and effects approaching significance bootstrap coefficients are in Appendix I.
Hypothesis 1 holds that individuals from a lower social class will have lower degree centrality than their middle or upper social class counterparts. In the model, X1 compares the degree centrality of lower (\(M=18.26, SD=20.85\)) and middle (\(M=20.09, SD=20.33\)) social class, while X3 compares the outcomes of lower (\(M=18.26, SD=20.85\)) and upper (\(M=16.17, SD=12.22\)) social class. The direct effects do not yet consider the effect of upward or downward mobility and thus compare individuals who did not experience mobility. Results from Column 3 of Table 15 suggest that, controlling for gender, age, race, employment status, tenure, and organizational size, there are no significant differences in degree centrality between individuals from the lower and middle \(c_1: N=427; R^2=0.033; b=-3.986; CI: -9.703, 1.731\) or lower and upper social class \(c_3: N=427; R^2=0.033; b=-6.235; CI: -10.883, 6.392\). Thus, Hypothesis 1 is not supported. Although not part of the hypothesis, I additionally tested for differences in degree centrality between the middle and upper social class, and the results were not significant.

Hypothesis 8 held that the relationship between childhood social class and degree centrality is mediated by the attitude toward networking such that individuals from the lower social class will have a less positive attitude toward networking than individuals from higher social classes, resulting in a lower degree centrality. Results from Column 1 in Table 15 demonstrate that childhood social class affects the attitude toward networking such that individuals from the middle (\(M=4.83, SD=1.30\)) but not upper (\(M=4.29, SD=1.55\)) social class had a significantly more positive attitude toward networking than their lower (\(M=4.12, SD=1.81\)) social class counterparts (\(a_1: N=427; R^2=0.067; b=0.872; CI: 0.124, 1.62\), \(a_3: \)).
Column 3 of Table 15 shows no significant relationship between attitude toward networking and degree centrality \( [b1: N=427; R^2=0.033; b= 0.824; CI: -0.879, 2.526] \). As such, hypothesis 8 is only partially supported in that individuals from the lower social had a less positive attitude toward networking than individuals from the middle social class, but it did not have a mediating effect in the relationship between childhood social class and degree centrality.

Similar to Hypothesis 8, Hypothesis 9 predicted that the relationship between childhood social class and degree centrality would be mediated by work identity such that individuals from a higher social class background would have stronger work identity, leading to higher degree centrality. Column 2 in Table 15 shows that there is no significant difference in work identity between any comparison of lower \( (M=2.61, SD=1.03) \), middle \( (M=2.73, SD=0.97) \), or upper \( (M=2.68, SD=0.79) \) social class groups.

\[
a12: [N=427; R^2=0.059; b= 0.157; CI: -0.291, 0.604] \\
a13: [N=427; R^2=0.059; b= -0.049; CI: -0.595, 0.498] \\
a14: [N=427; R^2=0.059; b= 0.108; CI: -0.529, 0.744]
\]

Further, Column 3 of Table 15 shows that work identity does not have a significant effect on degree centrality \( [b2: N=427; R^2=0.033; b= 1.314; CI: -1.561, 4.188] \). Thus, Hypothesis 9 is not supported.

Finally, Model 1 tests hypothesis 12a-b, which states that social class mobility will act as a moderator in the relationship between childhood social class and a) the attitude toward networking and b) work identity such that the upwardly mobile will have a stronger attitude toward networking and stronger work identity. Mobility is included in the model as a multicategorical variable and as such tests for differences between no mobility and upward
mobility (W1), and no mobility and downward mobility (W2). The focus of this hypothesis is on W2 specifically, although I consider the effect of downward mobility as well.

Column 1 of Table 15 shows the direct effect of upward mobility on the attitude toward networking \([a4]: N=427; R^2=0.067; b= 0.639; CI: -0.073, 1.351]\) falls just shy of reaching significance but would suggest that those who experienced upward mobility had a more positive attitude toward networking than those who did not experience mobility. Additionally, there is a significant direct effect for downward mobility \([a5]: N=427; R^2=0.067; b= -2.323; CI: -4.122, -0.523]\) such that those experiencing downward mobility had a more negative attitude toward networking than those who did not experience mobility.

Columns 4-6 show the specifics of the moderated effect in greater detail. First, I consider the differences between lower and middle social class (X1). As can be seen, childhood social class has a significant and positive relationship with attitude toward networking when mobility had not been experienced \([Effect=0.872, CI: 0.124, 1.62]\), but a weaker and non-significant effect when individuals have experienced downward mobility \([Effect=0.231, CI: -0.185, 0.648]\). Among those who experienced downward mobility, the relationship is again positive and significant \([Effect=2.781, CI: 1.081, 4.48]\).

Comparing the middle and upper social class (X2), childhood social class had negative, although non-significant relationship with attitude toward networking when individuals had remained within the same class \([Effect=-0.602, CI:-1.516, 0.312]\) and when they experienced upward mobility \([Effect=-1.2, CI: -3.271, 0.872]\). However, the relationship was positive, but again non-significant, when individuals had experienced downward mobility \([Effect=0.127, CI:-0.486, 0.739]\).
Finally, in comparing the lower and upper social class (X3), childhood social class had a positive and non-significant relationship with attitude toward networking when there was no mobility \([Effect=0.27, CI: -0.795, 1.334]\), a negative and non-significant relationship when upward mobility was experienced \([Effect=-0.968, CI=-3.041, 1.105]\), and a positive and significant effect when downward mobility had been experienced \([Effect=2.907, CI: 1.142, 4.673]\).

Thus, it can be seen in Column 1 of Table 15 that there is a significant effect of mobility for the interaction term X1xW2 \([a7: N=427; R^2=0.067; b= 1.909; CI: 0.051, 3.767]\) such that the effect of childhood social class on the attitude toward networking is amplified for individuals experiencing downward mobility. Second, we see a significant effect of mobility for the interaction term X3xW2 \([a11: N=427; R^2=0.067; b= 2.637; CI: 0.575, 4.700]\) whereby the effect of childhood social class on attitude toward networking goes from non-significantly positive to significantly positive with downward mobility. A graph of these interaction terms can be seen in Figure 12.

The remaining interaction terms are not significant. Although there were two significant interaction terms, they should be interpreted with caution because there were only 4 participants from a lower social class background who experienced downward mobility. This is unsurprising given where they began, but nevertheless limits the analysis with so few in this subgroup. Overall, there is partial support for hypothesis 12a that mobility moderates the relationship between childhood social class and the attitude toward networking.
Next, we consider mobility’s moderation of the childhood social class – work identity relationship. Column 2 of Table 15 shows no significant direct effect of mobility on work identity \([a15: \text{N}=427; R^2=0.067; b= -0.230; CI: -0.656, 0.195]; [a16: \text{N}=427; R^2=0.067; b= 0.028; CI: -1.048, 1.104]\). Further, none of the interaction terms reach significance. This is unsurprising given there is no direct relationship between childhood social class and work identity. When there are no significant conditional effects, PROCESS does not produce the additional table of conditional effects in Columns 4-6 of Table 15 as was discussed in the previous section. Overall, Hypothesis 12b is not supported.

**Model 2: The Individual-Level Effects of Childhood Social Class on Composition**

Model 2 is the second sub-model that considers individual factors’ effects, in this case, on the cross-class composition of one’s network. Similar to Model 1, Model 2 uses PROCESS (#7) analysis to test for moderated mediation of parallel mediators. However, Model 2 includes three parallel mediators and additionally tests mobility as a moderator of not just the mediators, but the direct relationship between childhood social class and cross-class composition as well. In doing so, this model tests hypotheses 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12a-c, and 13a. As in all models, I controlled for gender, age, race, employment status, tenure, and organizational size. The full results for this model can be found in Table 16 and graphs of all Model 2 significant effect bootstrap coefficients and effects approaching significance bootstrap coefficients are in Appendix J.

---------------------------------
Insert Table 16 about here
----------------------------------

Hypothesis 2 held that individual’s social networks will be primarily composed of individuals from their same social class background. The descriptive statistics from Model 2
found in Table 4 show that the mean percentage of ties from a class other than one’s own, cross-
class composition, is 63%, suggesting that individuals do not have the majority of their ties
within their class group but rather outside of it. A further breakdown of individuals class
composition can be seen in Table 17. Here, I introduce new, supplementary variables for
consideration. Rather than calculate the percentages of same- and cross-class ties, I present the
percentage of ego’s ties in the lower, middle, and upper social class. As the table reveals, the
majority of individual’s ties are from the middle social class, regardless of one’s own
class background, which contradicts and therefore does not support Hypothesis 2.

---------------------------------
Insert Table 17 about here
---------------------------------

This table can additionally address hypothesis 4 which stated that the cross-class ties of
individuals from the lower and upper social class are more likely to be middle social class than
upper or lower social class, respectively. Indeed, the results support this suggestion. Table 17
shows that individuals from the lower social class have, on average, 39.92% of ties from the
middle social class compared to just 17.46% of ties from the upper social class. Similarly,
participants from the upper social class have 51.58% of their ties from the middle social class
compared to 15.62% of ties from the lower social class. Thus, hypotheses 4 is supported.

Hypothesis 3, 5, and 6 are all related in that they propose differences in the cross-class
composition for members from different social classes. They held that the lower social class
would have the lowest cross-class composition (H3), followed by the upper social class (H6),
and that the middle social class would have the greatest cross-class composition (H5). These can
each be answered by considering the differences in cross-class composition between social class
groups. Column 4 of Table 16 shows the direct effect of childhood social class on cross-class composition, comparing the mean percentage of cross-class composition between the lower and middle (X1), middle and upper (X2), and lower and upper (X3) social class. The results show there is no significant difference in the cross-class composition of the lower (\(M=0.60, \ SD=0.23\)) and middle (\(M=0.54, \ SD=0.28\)), or lower (\(M=0.60, \ SD=0.23\)) and upper (\(M=0.71, \ SD=0.25\)) social class. However, there is a significant difference between the middle and upper social class.

\[
c1: [N=412; \ R^2=0.082; \ b=-0.028; \ CI: 0.686, -0.164]
\]

\[
c2: [N=412; \ R^2=0.082; \ b=0.183; \ CI: 0.021, 0.344]
\]

\[
c3: [N=412; \ R^2=0.082; \ b=0.155; \ CI 0.108, -0.034]
\]

Thus, the middle social class, not the lower social class, had the least cross-class composition, which is opposite from predicted by both hypothesis 3 and 5. This is likely due to the finding that individuals from all class backgrounds have the highest percentage of ties with the middle social class. This inflates the cross-class ties of the lower and upper social class egos but not the middle social class egos whose high proportion of middle-class ties are same-, not cross-class ties.

Hypothesis 6 is similarly unsupported as the cross-class composition of the upper social class is marginally greater than the lower social class, but the difference is not statistically significant. Further, their cross-class composition is not lower than the middle social class.

**Supplementary Analysis**

Because these results were skewed by the fact that the middle social class is significantly more represented, supplementary analyses were conducted to address this limitation in the way the variables were calculated. To address this issue, I first found the overall representation of each social class group in the alters listed by our participants. Of the 6,550 alters named by 459
egos, 1,941 were perceived to be from the lower social class (29.63%), 3,229 from the middle (49.29%), and 1,380 from the upper (21.07%). All things being equal, including the assumption that each social class has an equal probability of forming a tie with any other ties, the expected distribution of ties would mirror those of the sample of alters. Therefore, I then took participants’ actual percentage of lower, middle, and upper social class ties and divided it by the expected percentage to create new variables for each class group. The new calculation of cross-class composition represents how different each ego’s class representation is compared to the expected composition given the sample of alters.

This method to account for availability of ties was further extended to overall cross-class composition calculations. First, I determined the expected cross-class composition of each class group based on the average means in the sample. Namely, the lower social class would be expected to have 70.4% cross-class composition; the middle, 50.7%; and the upper, 78.9%. I then created a new variable which takes the actual cross-class composition divided by the expected to generate a difference from expected score for each participant. The results of the new variables can be found in Table 18.

---------------------------------

Insert Table 18 about here

---------------------------------

The new means for the cross-class composition measure are lower: (M=93.19%, N=129), middle: (M=1.20%, N=265), and upper: (M=86.77%, M=45). A mean of 100% would indicate that individuals had exactly as many cross-class ties as would be expected by the alter population. At first glance, the middle social class have substantially greater than expected cross-
class ties while the lower and upper social class have fewer than expected cross-class ties, in line with hypothesis 5.

As can be seen in the class distributions, the lower and upper social class each have a much greater number of same-class ties than can be expected from the pool of alters, which lends support for hypothesis 2. Although they are not primarily composed of same-class ties due to the overrepresentation of the middle social class, they have many more same-class ties than expected and certainly than their other-class counterparts. The lower social class have fewer than expected in both middle and upper. The middle and upper both have far fewer ties to the lower than expected by the distribution, the upper social class overwhelmingly so.

Next, I reran model 2 with the new measure to test for significant effects. The results of just the new dependent variable are in Table 19. The results involving the mediators are unchanged.

---------------------------------
Insert Table 19 about here
----------------------------------

The main effects do differ from the original cross-class composition variable. Again, PROCESS calculates main effects for the control group which in this case is individuals who did not experience mobility. Comparing the lower and middle social class, there is a significant difference in the expected cross-class composition between members of the lower (M=0.772) and middle (M=1.028) social class when there is no mobility [c1: N=412; R^2=0.143; b= 0.256; CI: 0.017, 0.495], such that the middle social class have a significantly higher than expected cross-class composition than the lower social class. Between the middle (M=1.028) and upper (M=0.893) social class, there is a negative but non-significant effect [c2: N=412; R^2=0.143; b= -
Finally, in comparing the lower and upper social class, there is a positive but non-significant effect \([c3: \text{N}=412; R^2=0.143; b=0.121; CI:-0.213, 0.454]\). From these results, hypothesis 5 is partially supported.

**Model 2, Continued: The Individual-Level Effects of Childhood Social Class on Composition**

Turning back to the original Model 2, Hypothesis 8b tests the attitude toward networking as a mediator between childhood social class and cross-class composition, suggesting that individuals from the lower social class will have a less positive attitude toward networking which will result in lower cross-class composition. Column 1 of Table 16 shows the same pattern of results from Model 1 in that there is a significant difference in the attitude toward networking between members of the lower and middle social class \([a1: \text{N}=412; R^2=0.074; b=0.775; CI:0.008, 1.542]\), such that the middle social class has a more positive attitude toward networking. However, there is no significant different between the lower and upper or middle and upper social class groups \([a2: \text{N}=412; R^2=0.074; b=-0.660; CI:-1.578, 0.258]; [a3: \text{N}=412; R^2=0.074; b=0.115; CI:-0.959, 1.189}\).

Column 4 shows that the attitude toward networking is significantly related to cross-class composition \([b1: \text{N}=412; R^2=0.082; b=-0.031; CI:-0.050, -0.012]\). However, the results indicate that as attitude toward networking increases, cross-class composition decreases, which does not support hypothesis 8b. Considering the results of model 1 and 2 in conjunction, it would appear that there are indeed differences in the attitude toward networking between social class groups and that while a more positive attitude toward networking may not increase one’s total network size, it would appear to increase same-class over cross-class ties.
Hypothesis 9 tests work identity as a mediator between childhood social class and cross-class composition. As can be seen in Column 2 of Table 16, results are similar to Model 1 in that there is no significant difference in the work identity between any combination of class groups, nor is there a significant relationship between work identity and cross-class composition in Column 4 of Table 16. Therefore, hypothesis 9 is not supported.

\[ a12: [N=412; R^2=0.006; b= 0.107; CI: -0.356, 0.570] \]
\[ a13: [N=412; R^2=0.006; b= -0.069; CI: -0.623, 0.485] \]
\[ a14: [N=412; R^2=0.006; b= 0.038; CI: -0.610, 0.686] \]
\[ b2: [N=412; R^2=0.082; b= -0.003; CI: -0.032, 0.026] \]

Hypothesis 10 holds that the relationship between childhood social class and cross-class composition will be mediated by openness to friendship such that individuals from higher social classes will be more open to friendship than individuals from the lower social class, which leads to greater cross-class composition. Column 3 of Table 16 shows that the difference in openness to friendship between all combinations of lower (\(M= 5.77, SD= 1.52\)), middle (\(M= 5.59, SD = 1.55\)), upper (\(M= 4.86, SD= 1.82\)) (X2) social class groups are not significantly different.

\[ a23: [N=412; R^2=0.041; b= -0.365; CI: -1.214, 0.485] \]
\[ a24: [N=412; R^2=0.041; b= -0.702; CI: -1.719, 0.315] \]
\[ a25: [N=412; R^2=0.041; b= -1.066; CI: -2.256, 0.124] \]

Column 4 of Table 16 shows a non-significant positive effect of openness to friendship on cross-class composition [\(b3: N=412; R^2=0.082; b= 0.015; -0.002, 0.033\)], but comes quite close to reaching significance. From these results combined, hypothesis 10 is not supported.
Hypothesis 12a-c tests social class mobility as a moderator in the relationship between childhood social class and three parallel mediators, attitude toward networking, work identity, and openness to friendship. Each are considered in turn next.

Columns 5-7 of Table 16 show the specifics of the moderated effect in greater detail. First, in considering the differences between lower and middle social class (X1), childhood social class had a significant and positive relationship with attitude toward networking when individuals did not experience mobility \([Effect=0.775, CI: 0.008, 1.542]\), which was further strengthened when individuals had experienced downward mobility \([Effect= 2.76, CI: 1.065, 4.456]\). Among those who experienced downward mobility, the relationship is again positive but no longer significant \([Effect=0.256, CI: -0.167, 0.679]\).

Comparing the middle and upper social class (X2), childhood social class had a negative, although non-significant relationship with attitude toward networking when individuals had remained within the same class \([Effect=-0.66, CI:-1.5178 0.258]\) and when they experienced upward mobility \([Effect=-1.266, CI: -3.334, 0.802]\). However, the relationship was positive, but again non-significant, when individuals had experienced downward mobility \([Effect=0.267, CI:-0.354, 0.888]\). Finally, in comparing the lower and upper social class (X3), childhood social class had a positive and non-significant relationship with attitude toward networking when there was no mobility \([Effect=0.115, CI: -0.959, 1.189]\), a negative and non-significant relationship when upward mobility was experienced \([Effect=-1.01, CI=-3.078, 1.058]\), and a positive and significant effect when downward mobility had been experienced \([Effect=3.027, CI: 1.263, 4.791]\).

In column 1 of Table 16, there is a significant effect of mobility for the interaction term X1xW2 \([a7: N=412; R^2=0.075; b= 1.985; CI: 0.121, 3.849]\) such that the effect of childhood
social class on the attitude toward networking is amplified for individuals who experienced downward mobility. Second, we see a significant effect of mobility for the interaction term X3xW2 \[a7: N=412; R^2=0.075; b= 2.912; CI: 0.845, 4.980\] whereby the effect of childhood social class on attitude toward networking goes from non-significantly positive to significantly positive with downward mobility. The remaining interaction terms are not significant.

Unsurprisingly, given that this portion of the model tests the same variable relationships, these findings of the conditional effects of childhood social class on attitude toward networking are consistent with the findings in model 1. The graph of the interaction terms is the same as from Model 1 and can be seen in Figure 12. Overall, there is partial support for hypothesis 12a that mobility moderates the relationship between childhood social class and the attitude toward networking.

Turning to work identity, Column 2 of Table 16 shows no significant effect of the moderator on work identity, nor any significant interaction terms, as was the case in Model 1. As such, PROCESS does not calculate the additional output for the relative conditional effects of childhood social class on work identity, given that there does not appear to be one. Hypothesis 12b is not supported.

Finally, the bottom half of Columns 5-7 of Table 16 display the results of the conditional effect of childhood social class on openness to friendship at the three categories of social class mobility. Looking first at X1, comparing the lower and middle social class, the results show a negative, but non-significant effect for individuals who experienced no mobility \[Effect= -0.365, CI: -1.214, 0.485\]. Whereas for those who experienced upward mobility, there was a significant, positive effect \[Effect=0.592, CI: 0.124, 1.061\]. Similarly, the downwardly mobile also showed a positive effect of childhood social class but it was not significant \[Effect=0.425, CI: -1.454, 1.294\].
However, the effects for downward mobility are limited in that there were only 2 individuals from the lower social class who experienced downward mobility.

Between the middle and upper social class (X2), there was a negative effect for those who experienced no mobility [Effect= -0.702, CI: -1.719, 0.315] or upward mobility [Effect= -1.787, CI: -4.078, 0.505]. Though neither result was significant, for those that experienced downward mobility, the effect was both positive but not significant [Effect= 0.609, CI: -0.08, 1.297].

Finally, in comparing the lower and upper social class (X3), there were negative effects for both the upwardly mobile [Effect= -1.195, CI: -3.486, 1.097] and those who did not experience mobility [Effect= -1.066, CI: -2.256, 0.124], while the downwardly mobile saw positive effects [Effect= 1.034, CI: -0.921, 2.988]. However, none of these results were significant.

Turning to Column 3 of Table 16, the direct effect of upward mobility falls just shy of reaching significance [a26: N=412; R²=0.041; b= -0.697; CI: -1.504, 0.110], while downward mobility is not significant. There was one significant interaction term. The X2xW2 interaction [a31: N=412; R²=0.041; b= 1.310; CI: 0.083, 2.538] showed significant differences in no mobility and downward mobility given that the effect changes from negative to positive. Although the X3xW2 [a33: N=412; R²=0.041; b= 2.10; CI: -0.191, 4.391] was not quite significant, it reflected the same pattern as X2xW2. A graph of the interaction can be seen in Figure 13.
Considering the compilation of these results, hypothesis 12c is partially supported in that mobility does appear to moderate the relationship between childhood social class and openness to friendship. While the upwardly mobile appear to be more open to friendship when they are in the middle compared to the lower social class, the same cannot be said for the comparison between middle and upper or lower and upper social class.

Hypothesis 13a states that social class mobility will moderate childhood social class’s effect on cross-class composition that the upwardly mobile will have increased cross-class composition than predicted by direct effects. The direct effects in Column 4 of Table 16 show that upward mobility has a positive effect on cross-class composition, although it falls just short of reaching significance \[c4: N=412; R^2=0.082; b= 0.121; CI: -0.008, 0.250\]. Indeed, the mean cross-class composition for all class groups increased when the participant had experienced upward mobility.

The moderator that compared no mobility to downward mobility was not significant \[c5: N=412; R^2=0.082; b= 0.054; CI: -0.266, 0.373\]. Only one interaction term came close to reaching significance, X2xW2 [Effect= -0.189, CI: -0.385, 0.007], as a reflection of the effect of childhood social class on degree centrality changing from positive and significant for no mobility to negative and non-significant for downward mobility. The graph of this interaction can be seen in Figure 15.

As a further investigation of the moderating effect of mobility, Columns 8-10 of Table 16 show the relative conditional effects of childhood social class on cross-class composition. When
comparing the lower and middle (X1) or lower and upper social class (X3), the results show that there is no significant effect for any of the mobility conditions. However, when considering the middle and upper social class (X2), there is a significant, positive effect of childhood social class on cross-class composition when individuals did not experience mobility [$Effect = 0.183$, $CI: 0.021, 0.344$] or if they experienced upward mobility [$Effect = 0.411$, $CI: 0.047, 0.775$]. As such, the effect is strengthened from no mobility to upward mobility. When individuals experienced downward mobility, the effect becomes negative and non-significant [$Effect = -0.006$, $CI: -0.116, 0.104$].

Overall, there is marginal support for mobility as a moderator. However, as stated earlier, the results must be interpreted with caution due to the limited number of participants in the lower-downward and upper-upward conditions.

**Supplemental Analysis**

As before, additional analysis was conducted to consider cross-class composition in light of the mean class distribution. As seen in Table 19, while there were no observed effects of either downward [$c5: N=412; R^2=0.143; b= 0.256; CI: 0.017, 0.495$] or upward [$c4: N=412; R^2=0.143; b= 0.256; CI: 0.017, 0.495$] mobility, the results of the relative conditional effects of childhood social class on the new measure of cross-class composition reveal several instances in which significant differences occurred. Comparing the lower and middle social class, childhood social class had a positive and significant effect for both the upwardly mobile [$Effect = 0.267$, $CI: 0.135, 0.398$] and fixed-class [$Effect = 0.256$, $CI: 0.017, 0.495$], but not the downwardly mobile [$Effect = 0.407$, $CI: -0.124, 0.938$].

Between the middle and upper social class, childhood social class had a negative, significant effect on new cross-class composition measure for the downwardly mobile [$Effect = -$}
0.452, CI: -0.646, -0.259]. The pattern of results is similar when no mobility was experienced
[Effect= -0.135, CI: -0.419, 0.149], but the results are not significant. For those who experienced
upward mobility, the results show a non-significant positive difference in the middle and upper
social class, although, again, these results are limited in that there were only 2 individuals in the
upper social class who experienced further upward mobility. There were no significant
differences between the lower and upper social class in any mobility category.

Model 3, The Individual-Level Effects of Childhood Social Class on Brokerage

Model 3 is the last sub-model that considers individual factors. It tests the relationship
between childhood social class and network brokerage as moderated by social class mobility. In
doing so, it tests hypothesis 7 and 13b. The full results can be seen in Table 20 and graphs of all
Model 3 significant effect bootstrap coefficients and effects approaching significance bootstrap
coefficients are in Appendix K.

Hypothesis 7 states that individuals from the middle social class will have the greatest
network brokerage. Column 1 of Table 20 shows the direct effects of childhood social class on
network brokerage before accounting for mobility. Thus, the results compare the means of those
who remained in the same class as their upbringing and show there is a significant difference in
the brokerage of the middle (M=0.071, SD=0.170) and upper (M=0.213, SD=0.250) social class
[b2: N=411, R2=0.042, b= 0.150, CI: 0.044, 0.257]. However, the positive effect suggests that
the upper has greater brokerage than the middle social class.
Similarly, there is a positive and significant effect of childhood social class when comparing lower \((M=0.097, SD=0.191)\) and upper \((M=0.213, SD=0.250)\) social class \([b3: N=411, R^2=0.042, b=0.130, CI: 0.005, 0.254]\), but the difference between the lower and middle social class is not significant \([b1: N=411, R^2=0.042, b=-0.021, CI: -0.110, 0.068]\). Therefore, hypothesis 7 is not supported as it is the upper social class that have the greatest brokerage, not the middle social class.

Hypothesis 13b states that social class mobility will moderate childhood social class’s effect on network brokerage such that the upwardly mobile will have greater network brokerage. Columns 2-4 of Table 20 show that effects of mobility for each class comparison groups. As can be seen from the direct effects, when no mobility was experienced between the middle and upper social class \((X_2)\), childhood social class has a positive and significant effect on brokerage \((Effect=0.15, CI: 0.0044, 0.257)\). However, when individuals had experienced either upward \((Effect=-0.09, CI: -0.327, 0.154)\) or downward \((Effect=-0.01, CI: -0.08, 0.065)\) mobility, the effect turned negative and was no longer significant. Similarly, when comparing the lower and upper social class, when individuals had not experienced mobility, there was a positive and significant effect \((Effect=0.13, CI: 0.005, 0.254)\), but it turned negative and non-significant when individuals experienced either upward \((Effect=-0.07, CI: -0.209, 0.172)\) and downward \((Effect=0.11, CI: -0.315, 0.095)\) mobility. The effect of childhood social class on brokerage was not significant in any of the mobility conditions when comparing the lower and middle social class.

Following this pattern of results, there was one significant interaction term. \(X_2X_3\) was significant \([b9: N=411, R^2=0.042, b=-0.158, CI: -0.287, -0.029]\) in that when individuals have experienced upward or downward mobility, respectively, the effect of childhood social class changed from positive and significant to negative and non-significant. Although \(X_3X_2\) [b11:
$N=411, R^2=0.042, b=-0.239, CI: -0.479, 0.001$ did not quite reach significance, it reflected the same pattern as $X_2 W_2$. $X_2 W_1 [b= N=411, R^2=0.042, b=-0.237, CI: -0.500, 0.026]$. The graph of the interaction is available in Figure 16.

Finally, considering the direct effects of mobility, there was no significant difference in the upwardly mobile and the fixed class [$b_4: N=411, R^2=0.042, b=-0.006, CI: -0.091, 0.079$], nor was there a significant difference in the downwardly mobile and fixed-class [$b_5: N=411, R^2=0.042, b=0.084, CI: -0.125, 0.294$]. From these results combined, hypothesis 13b is not supported in that upward mobility did not significantly increase brokerage. However, it did have a moderating effect in that it diminished the direct effect of childhood social class on brokerage, at least between the middle and upper social class and the lower and upper social class.

**Organizational Effects**

The remaining models, 4-6, test organizational factors and their effect on the three dependent variables: degree centrality, cross-class composition, and network brokerage.

**Model 4, The Organizational-Level Effects of Childhood Social Class on Degree Centrality**

Model 4 tests childhood social class’s effect on degree centrality as moderated by institutional agency by using PROCESS (#4) analysis for a single moderator. The results of this analysis can be found in Table 21.
As another test of hypothesis 1, there is no direct effect of childhood social class on degree centrality, confirming the lack of support for hypothesis 1 found in Model 1.

\[ b_1: N=413, R^2=0.037, b= -3.219, CI: -13.188, 6.749 \]

\[ b_2: N=413, R^2=0.037, b= -7.905, CI: -21.474, 5.674 \]

\[ b_3: N=413, R^2=0.037, b= -11.124, CI: -26.227, 3.978 \]

Hypothesis 11a states that institutional agency will moderate the effect of childhood social class on employee social networks such that those higher in institutional agency will have more ties, i.e. higher degree centrality. The results show no significant direct effect of institutional agency, nor any significant effects of the interaction terms, leading to conclude that hypothesis 11a is not supported.

**Model 5, The Organizational-Level Effects of Childhood Social Class on Composition**

Model 5 tests the relationship between childhood social class and cross-class composition as moderated by two organizational factors, organizational structure and institutional agency. This dual-moderator design was conducted using PROCESS (#2). In this analysis, the direct effects are held at the mean of the two moderators, the result being that the mean cross-class composition of different class groups is distinct from Model 1. The results of Model 5 can be seen in Table 22 and graphs of all Model 5 significant effect bootstrap coefficients and effects approaching significance bootstrap coefficients are in Appendix L.

Insert Table 22 about here
As another test of hypotheses 3, 5, and 6, Column 1 of Table 22 show that there is a significant difference in the cross-class composition of the lower \((M=0.668)\) and middle \((M=0.604)\) social class \([b1: N=401, R^2=0.052, b=-0.156, CI: -0.271, -0.41]\). However, the difference between middle \((M=0.604)\) and upper \((M=0.669)\) social class was non-significant \([b2: N=401, R^2=0.038, b=0.034, CI: -0.130, 0.198]\), nor was the difference between lower \((M=0.668)\) and upper \((M=0.669)\) social class \([b3: N=401, R^2=0.038, b=-0.122, CI: -0.303, 0.059]\). Hypothesis 3 is again unsupported as the lower social class did not have the least cross-class composition. Hypothesis 5 is again unsupported as the middle social class had the least, not the greatest, cross-class composition. Finally, Hypothesis 6 is again unsupported as there was not a significant difference in the cross-class composition between the lower and upper social class, and the upper social class had greater cross-class composition than the middle social class.

Model 5 additionally tests hypotheses 11b and 14 regarding the moderating effects of organizational structure and institutional agency. First, Column 1 shows there is a direct effect of institutional agency \([b5: N=401, R^2=0.052, b=-0.250, CI: -0.390, -0.110]\), but not organizational structure \([b4: N=401, R^2=0.052, b=0.002, CI: -0.004, 0.008]\). Column 1 additionally shows the interaction terms for this model. As can be seen, there is one significant interaction term, \(X1 \times W2\) \([b9: N=401, R^2=0.052, b=0.231, CI: 0.061, 0.398]\), and one interaction term that falls just short of reaching significance, \(X3 \times W2\) \([b11: N=401, R^2=0.052, b=0.274, CI: -0.021, 0.569]\). Columns 2-5 of Table 22 show the conditional effects of childhood social class on cross-class composition at varying levels of the two moderators. Each moderator is displayed at one standard deviation below the mean, the mean, and one standard deviation above the mean. The resulting product is a 3x3 design that tests for differences in class groups at each of the 9 moderator combinations.
Considering the pattern of effects, at every level of organizational structure, as institutional agency rose, the effects between the lower and middle social (X1) change from negative and significant to positive and no longer significant [combinations 1 (Effect= -0.131, CI: -0.234, -0.029); 4 (Effect= -0.142, CI: -0.229, -0.056); and 7 (Effect= -0.154, CI: -0.256, -0.052)]. As institutional agency increases, that is, as the number of coworkers one is required to interact with rises, the cross-class composition of the lower social class decreases. Conversely, the cross-class composition of the middle social class is relatively stable. The result, then, is that the comparison between lower and middle social class changes from negative and non-significant to positive and non-significant. Similarly, between the lower and upper social class (X3), the relationship changes from negative to positive due to the changes in cross-class composition of the lower social class, although the effects are not significant.

These results would lend some support that institutional agency moderates the relationship between childhood social and cross-class composition but only for the lower social class. However, the effects are opposite than predicted and therefore Hypothesis 11 is not supported.

Given that there is no direct effect nor are any of the interaction terms involving organizational structure significant, there is no support for Hypothesis 14 that flatter organizational structure leads to increased cross-class composition.

*Supplementary Analysis*

As before, I additionally tested Model 5 using the alternative measure of cross-class composition as the difference from expectations based on the mean class distribution. The results of this analysis can be seen in Table 23.
Column 1 of Table 23 shows the direct effects of childhood social class on the new cross-class composition variable. Further, Columns 2-4 shows the results at the 9 combinations of the two moderators at one standard deviation below each mean, each mean, and one standard deviation above each mean. Comparing the lower and middle social class (X1), the direct results show a positive, although not significant results of childhood social class \( b_1: N=401, R^2=0.112, b= 0.116, CI: -0.088, 0.320 \) such that the middle social class has greater cross-class composition than is expected. The results at the various levels of the moderators show significant effects of childhood social class for 6 of the 9 levels, and the 3 that did not reach significance showed the same pattern and were approaching significance.

Between the middle and upper social class, the direct results were negative and significant \( b_2: N=401, R^2=0.112, b= -0.389, CI: -0.679, -0.099 \). Additionally, the results from the matrix show negative significant differences at 8 of 9 combinations, with the 9\(^{th} \) very close to significance \( [\text{Effect}= -0.304, CI: -0.609, 0.001] \).

Finally, in comparing the lower and upper social class, the direct effect in Column 1 is negative and close to significance \( b_3: N=401, R^2=0.112, b= -0.273, CI: -0.593, 0.047 \). However, none of the effects at various levels of the moderators are significant and further, they are inconsistently positive and negative.

Considering these results in tandem, there is strong support that the middle social class has significantly higher cross-class composition than their lower and upper social class counterparts. The results are suggestive of the upper social class having the least cross-class composition rather than the lower social class, supporting hypothesis 3, but the difference
between the lower and upper social did not reach significance. Overall, hypothesis 5 is supported, while hypotheses 3 and 6 are not.

In considering the effects of each moderator, Column 1 shows a significant effect of institutional agency \([b5: N=401, R2=0.112, b=-0.355, CI: -0.603, -0.107]\). Additionally, the \(X1xW2\) interaction term is significant \([b4: N=401, R2=0.12, b=0.003, CI: 0.015, 0.613]\), which is graphed in Figure 17.

As demonstrated in Columns 2-4, as institutional agency increases, the positive, significant effect of childhood social class on cross-class composition between the lower and middle social class becomes even stronger. As additional indication of an effect of institutional agency, it can also be seen that institutional agency alters the pattern of results comparing the lower and upper social class such that as institutional agency increases, the difference between the lower and upper social class changes from negative to positive. The pattern is consistent at every level of organizational structure, although each effect is not significant.

As was observed in the model using the original cross-class composition variable, as instructional agency increases, the cross-class composition of the lower social class decreases. However, in this model, cross-class composition for the middle social class is much higher than expected by the distribution resulting in positive, not negative, differences between a comparison of the lower and middle social class.

Institutional agency does moderate the proposed relationships but only appeared to have an effect on the lower social class and not in the way it was predicted. Thus, hypothesis 11 is not
supported. Organizational structure does not have a significant direct effect \([b_4: N=401, R^2=0.12, b=0.003, CI: -0.008, 0.014]\) nor does it change any of the patterns at the various levels of the moderators. Thus, hypotheses 14 and 15 are again not supported.

**Model 6, The Organizational-Level Effects of Childhood Social Class on Brokerage**

Model 6 tests the relationship between childhood social class and network brokerage as moderated by two organizational factors, organizational structure and institutional agency. As such, it was run using PROCESS (#2). It tests hypotheses 7, 11c, and 15. The results of the model can be seen in Table 2.

----------------------------------

Insert Table 2 about here

----------------------------------

Again, because the moderators differ from Model 3, the results are distinct. Here, the direct relationship between childhood social class and network brokerage and is not significant in any of the class comparison groups:

- \(b_1: [N=400, R^2=0.04, b=-0.013, CI: -0.091, 0.064]\)
- \(b_2: [N=400, R^2=0.04, b=0.044, CI: -0.066, 0.155]\)
- \(b_3: [N=400, R^2=0.04, b=0.031, CI: -0.090, 0.153]\)

Hypothesis 11c states institutional agency will moderate the childhood social class – degree centrality relationship. Table 24 shows that institutional agency has no direct effect \([N=400, R^2=0.04, b=-0.078, CI: -0.172, 0.016]\) nor were any of the interaction terms significant. As such, PROCESS does not compute the conditional effects of childhood social class at the various values of the moderators as was discussed for the mobility moderator.
Hypothesis 15 holds that organizational structure will moderate the effect of childhood social class on network brokerage such that as organizational structures become flatter, the network brokerage of the middle social class will be reduced. As Table 2 shows, there is no direct effect of organizational structure \([N=400, R^2=0.04, b=0.002, CI:\ -0.002, 0.006]\), nor were any of the interaction terms significant.

In addition to these findings not supporting the moderating effect of organizational structure, hypothesis 15 is further unsupported in that the network brokerage of the middle social class is not greater than that of the lower or upper social class to begin with.

In the following section, the results from Models 1-6 and the supplementary analyses are considered and the implications for research are discussed.

**Chapter 6: Discussion**

While many hypotheses were ultimately not supported, overall, the results indicate that childhood social class and social class mobility indeed have an influence on the network structures of organizations, particularly as it pertains to network composition and the individuals that broker between other employees. The differences observed by childhood social class lend support for the theory of habitus and the sociocultural model of self (Bourdieu 1984; Stephens, Markus, & Fryberg, 2014). Indeed, this study is yet another instance of the pervasiveness of one’s cultural upbringing. Childhood social class meaningfully influenced one’s attitudes within the workplace and, in turn, network outcomes in the organizational setting. Further, these findings appear to be distinct from the more general personal social networks often tested in network research. This confirms the call for targeted research to be conducted within the organizational setting. Table 25 provides a summary of the hypotheses and their level of support.
I discuss the effects of each of the proposed variables below.

**Summary of Effects**

**Attitude Toward Networking**

As theorized, the middle social class had a more positive attitude toward networking than their lower social class counterparts. I posit that this difference is reflective of the different value systems held by members of the lower social class who are more likely to view networking as in violation with their pursuit of self-reliance and/or a violation in the moral pursuit to not use others instrumentally (Holden & Côté, w.p.; Lubrano, 2010; Casciaro et al. 2014).

In contrast with the hypothesis, this relationship was not linear in the sample studied in that the trend did not continue to the upper social class having a still more positive attitude toward networking than the middle social class. Rather, the upper social class had a less positive attitude toward networking than the middle social class. Although contrary to the hypothesis, this is in line with earlier theorizing that discussed the upper social class tendency to be exclusive in their need for distinction (DiTomaso, Cordero, and Farris, 1995; Smith, Ditomaso, Farris, Cordero, 2001; O’Guinn, Tanner, Maeng, 2015). It is unsurprising that individuals seeking separation from others would be less inclined to engage in networking behavior.

The upper social class may have a positive attitude toward networking with other members of the upper social class exclusively. As was noted in the supplemental analysis, there was an underrepresentation of the upper social class in organizations compared to the other class groups. Perhaps then, the upper social class had a less positive attitude toward networking given the study’s focus on one’s coworkers specifically. It may be that people who are employed in
top-level positions in their workplace are more interested in networking with other top-level employees in their industry more so than their subordinates or employees in lower-ranking positions within their own organization. Future studies may investigate this phenomenon deeper by more carefully considering an organization's overall class composition and the availability of desired ties. Additionally, subsequent research could more specifically consider tie formation strategies and with whom people are motivated to form connections both within and outside of their specific workplace while still considering their role as an employee as opposed to more general societal connections.

Downward mobility had a significant effect on the attitude toward networking. It caused a moderate decrease in the middle social class, a significant decrease in the lower social class, and an increase in the upper social class. These findings are in line with previous theorizing from Smith, Menon, and Thompson (2012) who found that under job threat, lower status individuals engage in a winnowing response, or withdrawing into their existing network, while higher status individuals engage in a widening response by attempting to broaden their social network. Downward mobility is similar to job threat in that it represents a threat to one’s well-being. The responses observed here match these previous findings for the lower and upper social class. However, Smith and colleagues (2012) theorized that the middle social class would be more likely to widen than winnow, while here we observe the middle social class to decrease their attitude toward networking much like the lower social class and unlike the upper social class.

As for the attitude toward networking’s mediation of the direct relationship between childhood social class and network outcomes, results supported a mediating effect of childhood social class’s effect on cross-class composition but not degree centrality. However, attitude toward networking had a negative, not the hypothesized positive, effect on cross-class
composition; that is, as the attitude toward networking became more positive, cross-class composition decreased. Individuals with a more positive attitude toward networking were more likely to have same-class ties and less likely to have cross-class ties. Thus, while a more positive attitude toward networking does not appear to promote acquiring more ties, it does seem to encourage tie formation of ties within one’s same class, at least for the sample studied. Further research is needed to better understand these observed effects.

**Work Identity**

Despite its theoretical underpinnings in social class values (Sennett & Cobb, 1972; Streib, 2015; Lamont, 2000; Williams, 2010), there was no effect of childhood social class on work identity, nor did it have a mediating effect in childhood social class’s relationship with the network outcomes. As a further robustness test, identical models were run replacing work identity with family identity. Work identity and family identity are not two ends of a continuum (Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, Hannum, 2012; Lobel & St. Clair, 1991), and thus require separate testing. Theories of social class values would suggest that the lower social class have stronger family identities (Streib, 2015; Lamont, 2000; Williams 2010). While work identity varied little by class, I sought to test whether family identity instead would show significant differences that in turn influence networking within organization. However, there were similarly no observed differences in family identity between the different class groups nor did it have a significant effect on the network variables.

These scales measured the perceived centrality of work or family identities and thus were limited in that they did not capture more outward expressions of work or family prioritization. Therefore, further research is needed to test whether the theorized differences in values may still hold, not in this aspect of identity, but in an alternative display of values.
**Openness to Friendship**

Overall, openness to friendship did not reach significance in its effect on cross-class composition. Given that it was originally developed for an educational setting, it may be that one’s openness to friendship is less applicable inside a workplace setting that puts far more constraints on the interactions one is required to engage in. Further, within organizations, people may be less motivated to form *friendships* as they are to form other types of more instrumental relationships observed in the workplace. Future research could specifically investigate what types of relationships people seek at work. These results would suggest that friendships are of relatively equal priority to employees across the class spectrum.

**Degree Centrality**

The hypotheses regarding degree centrality, or network size, were not supported. There were not significant differences in degree centrality for different social class groups even after accounting for the various mediators and moderators. Thus, it would seem that one’s social class background does not significantly affect the size of one’s network at work. It may be that the organizational setting is too strong a situation for the differences in values or attitudes to manifest in the number of ties. Interaction with others often comprises a significant portion of any job. On average in this sample, 44% of alters were someone with whom ego was required to interact. The interaction requirements of an organizational setting seem to trump individual differences towards relationships.

This, in and of itself, is a novel finding in that it is at odds with current theorizing that suggest the lower social class have smaller, denser networks (Gans, 1962; Dennis, Henriques, & Slaughter, 1957; Milroy & Milroy, 1992; Liu & Duff, 1972; LaReau, 1987; Fiske & Markus,
2012; McDowell et al. 2013). This supports the notion that organizational social networks are distinct from general social networks and merit careful consideration in future research.

**Cross-Class Composition**

Unlike degree centrality, there were significant results for network composition. While people are required to interact with many others at work limiting variance in *how many* people employees interact with, class differences instead manifest in *what types* of people employees choose to interact with when seeking information, coordination, and general interaction.

Across classes, the majority of ties were to alters from the middle social class. Although the middle social class does not show a high percentage of ties outside of their class, if you consider the class composition of the lower and upper social class you will see that it is comprised of a strong majority of ties in the middle social class, with very few ties in the upper and lower social class, respectively. This would support the notion that the middle social class plays an important role in cross-class alliances and bridging the upper and lower social class.

Indeed, the middle social class was largely overrepresented in the sample. In this way, theorizing that the majority of one’s ties would be within-class was challenged. In light of these results, I conducted supplemental analysis that accounted for class representation in the sample and found that, across classes, people had more within-class ties than would be expected based on the class distribution, which provides some support for the majority same-class representation prediction.

When accounting for representation, the results were robust in showing the middle social class as having the greatest cross-class composition. The differences in cross-class composition between the lower and upper social class were too minimal to be significant but suggested that the upper social class had the least cross-class composition, as opposed to the hypothesized
lower social class. Again, this is in line with theories of social distancing and distinction work observed in the upper social class in social class literature (DiTomaso, Cordero, and Farris, 1995; Smith, Ditomaso, Farris, Cordero, 2001; Stephens et al., 2007; Piff, 2014; O’Guinn, Tanner, Maeng, 2015).

Further, the lower social class show many fewer ties than expected with both middle and upper social class which is fitting given theorizing discussed earlier regarding the barriers the lower social class face in identifying, attracting, and pursuing ties with individuals in higher social classes. Interactions with higher-class counterparts can be taxing and take a psychological toll on the lower social class (Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013; Smith, Ditomaso, Farris, Cordero, 2001; Côté, 2011; Foy et al. 2014; Kraus, Park, Tan, 2017). Additionally, higher class individuals may have low motivation or reluctance to build ties with lower social class coworkers. There is support for this notion within the social class literature regarding negative perceptions of lower class others (Fiske, 2010; Magee & Galinsky, 2008), as well as in social network literature that takes a more economic view that lower social class employees have fewer resources to motivate tie formation (Granovetter, 1973; Coleman, 1997; Kraus, Park, & Tan, 2017). These effects are particularly apparent in networks of the upper social class who have roughly half the ties to the lower social class than would be expected by the class distribution.

The effect of childhood social class on cross-class composition was moderated by two of the three proposed moderators. While organizational structure did not have an effect, institutional agency and social class mobility both showed significant moderating effects. First, institutional agency had an effect on the lower social class wherein as the number of employees they were required to interact with increased, the cross-class composition decreased. It may be that the coworkers the lower social class are required to interact with are primarily within their same
Thus, as that number increases, so too do same-class ties, in effect lowering cross-class composition. Second, mobility moderated these effects such that upward mobility appeared to increase cross-class composition with the original measure, although not with cross-class composition compared to expected. Due to the limitations in representation of certain class-mobility combinations, further research is needed to validate the results found here, but overall there is strong indication that mobility is has a notable effect on individual’s attitudes and behavior toward networking.

Network Brokerage

The findings pertaining to network brokerage were mixed. Model 3 indicated that, for people who did not experience mobility, childhood social class did indeed have an effect on network brokerage and suggested that the upper social class had higher brokerage scores than the other class groups. However, Model 6, which analyzed the data of all individuals together regardless of mobility experience, saw no significant effects of childhood social class on network brokerage. This points to the influential role of social class mobility but overall, these results are limited in several ways.

First, due to limitations in the data collection, the brokerage score was derived only from ego’s trust alters, of which the average was fewer than five individuals, reducing the opportunity for brokerage. Using trust alters is also limiting because one’s trusted friends are more likely to be at least acquainted with one another than one’s acquaintances, so considering only trusted friends would lead to low brokerage scores. Indeed, the social network literature suggests that most brokerage occurs through “weak” ties as opposed to “strong” ties (Granovetter, 1973; Aral, 2016; Oh & Kilduff, 2008). Further research is needed to draw any meaningful conclusions about childhood social class’s effect on network brokerage. Importantly, gathering brokerage
information from an acquaintance network would align more closely with social network theorizing. Although ego data collection makes this difficult, alternative network data collection could accomplish this measure which account for both a greater range and number of ties. One such study is articulated later in this section.

**Theoretical & Practical Implications**

Overall, the results point to the significant role of the childhood social class in organizational social networks. Therefore, this study has meaningful theoretical implications for many areas of research. First, this study adds to the discussion on the competing theories of tie formation, the prestige principle and theory of homophily. The literature on homophily suggests that socioeconomic homophily has a strong influence on one’s network to promote same-class ties (Fischer, Jackson, Srueve, Gerson, and Jones 1977; McPherson & Smith-Lovin, 1987; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). Indeed, there is supportive evidence of this in workplace networks in that the lower and upper social class each had a higher percentage of lower and upper social class ties, respectively, than the other class groups.

However, despite the assumption that spatial and temporal segregation of class groups within organizations (Gay & Kish-Gephart, 2013) would lead to a higher availability to form ties within-class, this study shows that employees’ networks in this sample were primarily composed of people from the middle social class regardless of ego’s social class background. Further, the middle social class was more connected to the lower social class than was the upper social class to lower as well as the reverse, the middle social class was more connected to the upper social class than the lower social class was to the upper. This finding complements earlier qualitative work that suggested the centrality of the middle social class (Liu & Duff, 1972; Huckfeldt,
I theorize that this outcome is reflective of two primary components, access and similarity.

Given the structure of organizational hierarchies where individuals from the upper social class are more likely to be at the top of the pyramid, the lower social class at the bottom of the pyramid, and the middle social class is situated between them, the upper and lower social class are more likely to encounter the middle social class than the lower and upper social class, respectively. Further, class distinctions are most pronounced at the ends of the social class spectrum (Côté et al., 2017). The middle social class is culturally more similar to the lower and upper social class than they are to each other, facilitating easier connections and tie development (Bergeron & Zanna, 1973; Montoya, Horton, & Kirchner, 2008; Kraus, Park, & Tan, 2017). Thus, the findings of this study would suggest that socioeconomic homophily is either not as motivating as previously thought or that the context of the organization is too strong a situation to manifest in differences in class composition.

The second networking theory considered is the prestige principle, which suggests that individuals are motivated to seek ties with individuals in higher status positions within the organization (Lin, Ensel, & Vaughn, 1981). Applied to this setting, it would be expected, then, that the middle social class have a greater percentage of ties with the upper social class than the lower social class. On the one hand, considering the cross-class composition relative to the mean distribution, the middle social class had nearly as many upper social class as expected (99.5%), but fewer than expected lower social class ties (87.5%). Yet the original measure of cross-class composition shows that the middle social class averaged more ties with the lower social class (25.9%) than the upper social class (20.96%). Again, this may be reflective of the theoretical underpinnings from distinction work (Stephens et al., 2007; Piff, 2014) and social distancing
tendencies (O’Guinn, Tanner, Maeng, 2015; Inesi et al., 2012; Gorman, 2000) that are often observed in the upper social class whereby they may isolate themselves from other classes.

This is perhaps most pronounced when considering the connections between the lower and upper social class which were by far the lowest of any class group combination. The lack of cross-class connection between the lower and upper has great implications in that it likely perpetuates the status of the lower social class who have limited opportunity to benefit from the capital that the upper social class holds and the arguably better information to which they have access.

As discussed earlier, a significant limitation of the field is the lack of specific investigation of the middle social class (exceptions include Stephens, Markus, & Townsend, 2007 and Kish-Gephart & Campbell, 2015). Thus, the findings that the middle social class play a central role in organizational social networks has implications as well. One area in which this has particular importance is the burgeoning area of cross-class alliances (Fiske, Moya, Russell, & Bearns, 2012; Gray & Kish-Gephart, 2013; Lawless, 2016). The middle social class would appear to play a critical role in connecting different classes, if not directly, through one or two degrees of separation. Knowledge of their central position has important implications for strategizing about increasing cross-class alliances within organizations, both by organizations and by individuals.

One way in which organizations could benefit is by using this information to structure mentorship programs, which is suggested as a key remedy for socioeconomic inequality (Scully, Blakebeard, Felicio, & O’Neill, 2017). One method would be to leverage the role of the middle social class by encouraging them to facilitate new tie formation between their disparate class ties, that is, intentionally introducing different class groups to one another. Another method that could
address the lack of lower and upper social class connections would be to tailor a mentorship program that specifically introduces ties between these two groups or to put a conscious effort into inclusive practices that bring together employees from all class backgrounds. In forging new cross-class alliances, ideally organizations would recognize benefits such as enhanced communication, creativity, and efficiency, and greater psychological benefits for their employees such as an improved sense of belonging (Scully, Blakebeard, Felicio, & O’Neill, 2017).

Strategic interventions may have further benefits for the lower social class. Literature on social class mobility emphasizes the importance of forming ties with individuals higher in social class (Houle, 2011; Milkie et al., 2010) as a means of access to better information which can enable one to rise as they become aware of better opportunities, foster champions in influential positions, and generally come to understand the habitus of higher class groups of which they are often expected to interact under in professional settings. Naturally, future research is needed to best understand the implications of these interventions.

Another area for which these findings have implications is diversity management which seeks to “create greater inclusion of all individuals into informal social networks and formal company programs” (Gilbert, Stead, & Ivancevich, 1999, pg. 61). By better understanding barriers to inclusion, in this case, differing social class backgrounds, diversity management scholars and practitioners alike can consider methods to overcome them. Future studies might examine how these observed differences in network attitudes and characteristics affect feelings of inclusion and belonging in the workplace. Further, organizations can investigate how class background affects participation in company programs and consider strategies that address both willingness and opportunity for such participation.

Limitations and Future Direction
While this study resulted in several interesting findings, there are several limitations that need to be considered. One such limitation is establishing the direction of causality for some of the hypothesized relationships. Naturally, childhood social class precedes adult network characteristics. However, the mediators included in this study are at greater risk of limiting causal conclusions. For instance, I hypothesized that childhood social class shapes one’s attitude toward networking which in turn influences network outcomes, and there was indeed support for this through the results of this analysis. But it could also be reasoned that one’s networking position influences their attitude toward networking. A well-connected individual may find that networking has served them quite well and thus feel positively about the practice. Therefore, our understanding of sociocultural background on networking behavior would greatly benefit from future, longitudinal studies. One such study might examine young adults entering the workforce which could capture initial attitudes before being influenced by the organizational setting as well as preempt the effects of mobility and subsequent changes to one’s habitus.

Second, another limitation was in the availability of data to better understand the effects of social class mobility. There were only four individuals from the lower social class who experienced downward mobility in adulthood and similarly, only two individuals from the upper social class who experienced further upward mobility. Initial results from this limited sample suggest that these outliers had distinct experiences compared to their more fixed-class counterparts and thus require further investigation from a larger sample size.

Third, as noted in the Methods section, the use of MTurk workers could introduce issues into the generalizability of the findings. The main concerns expressed in previous research are the “heterogeneous treatment effect, subject attentiveness, and the prevalence of habitual survey takers” (Berinsky et al., 2012, pg. 352). The demographic results suggest that this sample is quite
diverse but does still fall short of being truly representative of the United States workforce in that minority races were underrepresented, and the data came from individuals who self-selected to engage in survey research online. Additionally, while there were many preventative data collection techniques used to minimize the occurrence of inattentiveness and multiple responses from a single participant, motivated individuals could find ways to circumvent or evade their detection. For these reasons, future research on samples recruited outside of MTurk would allow for replication and increase the generalizability of these findings.

Fourth, this study does not fully capture the complexity that is human relationships. The results of this study can inform theorizing regarding information flow and cooperation within organizations from the existence of ties, but future studies can investigate more deeply the nature of relationships and how they affect workplace behavior and organizational workflow. For instance, social network analysis often considers distinct networks such as information sharing, problem solving, and support networks (Kogovšek, Ferligoj, Coenders, & Saris, 2002; Marsden, 2011). It may be that certain types of relationships are more influential on networking characteristics than others. In this way, qualitative research may be of particular importance for the advancement of this field as researchers seek to understand the nuance of ties at work and how they influence both organizational outcomes and individuals’ well-being.

Finally, the use of ego network analysis has several limitations. First, this method relies completely on a single individual to provide the details of a social network and is thus limited by their ability to accurately convey information. They may be mistaken in their recall, affected by survey fatigue, or perceive relationships differently than their alters would. For instance, individuals may more easily recall recent relationships and interactions and neglect to remember other relationships that are not as current. Second, ego network analysis inherently cannot
capture the ties an ego does *not* have within his or her workplace, which is of particular importance when considering brokerage. Additionally, this study was only able to test ego’s brokerage within a small network of his or her trusted coworkers. Other network data collection methods (i.e. global network analysis) would be able to calculate individual’s brokerage scores between all alters within the network. Given these limitations, a second study using global network analysis is being conducted.

**Follow-Up Global Study**

While ego network analysis collects data from a single individual about their connections in a social setting, a global network analysis collects data from all members of a group about their ties to all other members of the group. The benefit of using a global network analysis is the depth and validation of collecting data across a group of interconnected actors. By surveying all actors, dyads can be confirmed by both organizational partners. Additionally, this method allows for a more accurate collection of childhood social class. Instead of relying on an ego to speculate the class of alters, each actor provides their own childhood social class perceptions.

Organizations naturally lend themselves to global network analysis because they contain predefined subgroups (i.e., department or teams). As such, organizational partners can enable global network data collection by providing a comprehensive list of employees that fall within the group of interest. This is beneficial as the list of employees in the global network does not rely on the recall of participants, who inherently cannot list people with whom they are not acquainted. Understanding where the network lacks connections; that is, where structural holes exist; is just as important as understanding who is tied to whom.

Global network data will be collected from two distinct organizational research sites. The first site consists of 68 employees from a technology company in the Southern United States,
while the second organization is in the healthcare industry and has 36 employees across two locations in the United States and a third international office. In both cases, the organizational partner will provide a list of all employees within the organization to generate the network surveys. Employees will be contacted via email with an invitation to participate in this two-survey design. To reduce participant fatigue, the three surveys from study 1 will be condensed and refined to two surveys.

Global network analysis requires a very high response rate in order to meaningfully interpret the data. Too few respondents would leave gaps in the overall social network that could be misinterpreted as lack of ties, density, and cohesion. As an incentive to encourage many employees to participate, a drawing will be held within each organization for three $500 gift cards to the participant’s choice of retail organization.

Each survey will be administered via Qualtrics and take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Employee names will be used to link surveys 1 and 2 and then changed to pseudonyms after data collection to protect the anonymity of participants. Survey 2 will be administered approximately 2 weeks after Survey 1 to minimize the effects of common method bias.

The measures used in this second study will mirror those of study 1 with a few exceptions. First, organizational structure will be removed from the model given that all participants within each sample have the same organizational structure. Further, the results of the ego network analysis indicated that organizational structure does not have a significant effect. Second, network brokerage will be significantly broadened in that one’s efficiency is measured within the entire network whereas study 1 only considered efficiency within one’s trust alters. This method is more in line with theoretical considerations of brokerage as it is often through weaker ties that one fills structural holes and has non-redundant ties.
Given the findings of the study conducted in this dissertation, the follow-up study will focus specifically on the effects that were significant including the attitude toward networking, institutional agency, and social class mobility. Also, based on the varying class composition of actors from different social class backgrounds, this next study will consider a new network characteristic of density. This moves beyond individual-level characteristics into group-level phenomena to consider whether individuals from the same social class background 1) cluster together and 2) display different degrees of density. Lastly, because cross-class ties were shown the be significantly different by class, the next study will also consider bidirectionality or the reciprocity of ties. In doing so, this study can consider if cross-class dyads view the nature of their relationship in the same way.

Overall, conducting global network analysis can address many of the limitations in study 1, test for replication of many of the observed effects, and consider new network characteristics of interest. Through these two, complementary social network analysis techniques, I hope to contribute to the conversation on social class and organizational social networks. The initial findings already suggest several important considerations.

Summary

The cross-class composition of individuals’ social networks within this study support the notion that organizations are indeed a primary venue whereby individuals from different class backgrounds meet and interact. In a time when many theorize that cross-class interactions are diminishing due to socioeconomically segregated neighborhoods, school districts, hobbies, and recreational pursuits (Putnam, 2000; Musterd & Ostendorf, 2005; Altonji & Mansfield, 2011; Lareau, 1987), organizations may be one of the remaining sites where cross-class alliances can be forged.
In further support of organizations as necessary and distinct research sites, the lack of variance in degree centrality points to the unique nature of employee networks which were at odds with traditional expectations in the general social networking literature, supporting the need to better understand organizational social networks and how cultural factors influence their characteristics.

I proposed sociocultural upbringing as one such influence and found yet another instance of the pervasiveness of childhood social class on workplace outcomes. Class background influences how people feel about connecting to others at work, which in turn influences with whom they connect.

**Conclusion**

As economic inequality continues to rise to unprecedented levels and the barriers to social mobility grow, understanding how individuals from unequal economic positions interact becomes increasingly important, not only for individuals and organizations, but for society as well. Indeed, because social mobility is often a product of these interactions, the study of this phenomenon is necessary if any change is to be recognized. This study is one small step towards understanding how class influences interactions within organizations and how social networks operate. My hope is that by advancing this research, organizational practices can be developed that begin to enable meaningful advances to cross-class alliances and improved conditions for the economically disadvantaged.
References


Altenderfer, Marion E. "Relationship between per capita income and mortality in the cities of 100,000 or more population." Public Health Reports 62.48 (1947): 1681-91.


Buote, Vanessa. “‘If I Wasn’t Friends with These People, I Probably Wouldn’t Have Adjusted Too Well’: Friendship Development and University Adjustment among First-Year University Students,” 2006.


APPENDICES

Figure 1

Comprehensive Model
Figure 2

Individual Factors
Model 1
Figure 4

Individual Factors
Model 2

Childhood Social Class

Social Class Mobility

Attitude Towards Networking

Work Identity

Openness to Friendship

Cross-Class Composition
Figure 5

Model 2

Cross-Class Composition (Y)

Childhood Social Class

W1, W2

Social Class Mobility (W)

Attitude Toward Networking

M1

D1, D2, D3

Work Identity

M2

a1, a2, a3, a4, a5, a6, a7, a8, a9, a10, a11

Openness to Friendship

M3

a12, a13, a14, a15, a16, a17, a18, a19, a20, a21, a22

M1

a23, a24, a25, a26, a27, a28, a29, a30, a31, a32

M2

a33, a34, a35, a36, a37, a38, a39, a40, a41, a42

M3

b1, b2, b3

Model 2

c1, c2, c3, c4, c5, c6, c7, c8, c9, c10, c11

D1W1, D1W2, D2W1, D2W2, D3W1, D3W2

XW
Figure 6

Individual Factors
Model 3

Childhood Social Class

Social Class Mobility

Network Brokerage
Figure 7

Individual Factors

Model 4

Childhood Social Class → Degree Centrality

Institutional Agency

Model 5

Childhood Social Class → Cross-Class Composition

Organizational Structure → Institutional Agency

Model 6

Childhood Social Class → Network brokerage

Organizational Structure → Institutional Agency
Figure 9

Model 4
Figure 11

Model 6

Organizational Structure

Childhood Social Class

Institutional Agency

Network Brokerage

\[ Y \]
Figure 12. Model 1 Interaction of Mobility & Childhood Social Class on the Attitude Toward Networking
Figure 13. Model 2 Interaction of Upward Mobility & Childhood Social Class on the Openness to Friendship

Upward Mobility

Figure 14. Model 2 Interaction of Downward Mobility & Childhood Social Class on the Openness to Friendship
Figure 15. Model 2 Interaction of Mobility & Childhood Social Class on the Cross-Class Composition
Figure 16. Model 3 Interaction of Downward Mobility & Childhood Social Class on the Network Brokerage
Figure 17. Model 5 Interaction of Institutional Agency & Childhood Social Class on the Cross-Class Composition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1</strong></td>
<td>Individuals from a lower social class will have the less degree centrality than their middle or upper social class counterparts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2</strong></td>
<td>Individuals’ social networks will be primarily composed of individuals from the same social class background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 3</strong></td>
<td>Individuals from a lower social class will have the least cross-class composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 4</strong></td>
<td>The cross-class ties of the lower and upper social class are more likely to be middle social class than upper or lower social class, respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 5</strong></td>
<td>Individuals from the middle social class will have the greatest cross-class composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 6</strong></td>
<td>The cross-class composition of individuals from the upper social class will be greater than the lower social class but lower than the middle social class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 7</strong></td>
<td>Individuals from the middle social class will have the greatest network brokerage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 8a-b</strong></td>
<td>The relationship between childhood social class and degree centrality will be mediated by the attitude toward networking such that individuals from a lower social class background will have a less positive attitude toward networking than individuals from higher social classes, resulting in a less (a) degree centrality and (b) cross-class composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 9a-b</strong></td>
<td>The relationship between childhood social class and degree centrality will be mediated by work identity such that individuals from a higher social class background will have a stronger work identity than those from the lower social class, resulting in greater (a) degree centrality and (b) cross-class composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 10</strong></td>
<td>The relationship between childhood social class and cross-class composition will be mediated by openness to friendship such that individuals from higher social classes background will be more open to cross-class friendship than individuals from the lower social class, which leads to greater cross-class composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 11a-c</strong></td>
<td>Institutional agency will moderate the effect of childhood social class on employee social networks such that institutional agents will have more (a) overall and (b) cross-class composition and (c) networking brokerage, regardless of social class background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a-c</td>
<td>Social class mobility will moderate the relationship between (a) childhood social class and work identity, (b) childhood social class and openness to friendship, and (c) childhood social class and attitude toward networking, such that the upwardly mobile will have a stronger work identity, more openness to friendship, and more positive attitude toward networking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a-b</td>
<td>Social class mobility will moderate childhood social class’s effect on (a) cross-class composition and (b) network brokerage such that the upwardly mobile will have increased cross-class composition and thus, network brokerage than predicted by direct effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The organizational structure will moderate the effect of childhood social class on cross-class composition such that as organizational structures become flatter, cross-class composition will increase for all employees regardless of class background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The organizational structure will moderate the effect of childhood social class on network brokerage such that as organizational structures become flatter, the network brokerage of the middle social class will be reduced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Analytic Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mediators</th>
<th>Moderators</th>
<th>Hypotheses Tested</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>Degree Centrality</td>
<td>Attitude Toward Networking</td>
<td>Social Mobility</td>
<td>H1, H8, H9, H12a-b</td>
<td>PROCESS Model #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>Cross-Class Composition</td>
<td>Attitude Toward Networking</td>
<td>Social Mobility</td>
<td>H2, H3, H5, H6, H8, H9, H10, H12a-c, H13a</td>
<td>PROCESS Model #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>Network Brokerage</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Social Mobility</td>
<td>H7, H13b</td>
<td>PROCESS Model #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>Degree Centrality</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>H11a</td>
<td>PROCESS Model #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5</td>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>Cross-Class Composition</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Organizational Structure, Institutional Agency</td>
<td>H2, H3, H5, H6, H11b, H14</td>
<td>PROCESS Model #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 6</td>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>Network Brokerage</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Organizational Structure, Institutional Agency</td>
<td>H7, H11c, H15</td>
<td>PROCESS Model #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3

Model 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>352.54</td>
<td>1314.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Networking</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Identity</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class Mobility</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Centrality [total]</td>
<td>22.90</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>352.54</td>
<td>1314.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Networking</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Identity</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Friendship</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class Mobility</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Class Composition</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
### TABLE 5

**Model 3: Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach’s Alpha**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>352.54</td>
<td>1314.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class Mobility</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Brokerage</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
### TABLE 6

**Model 4: Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach’s Alpha**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>352.54</td>
<td>1314.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Centrality</td>
<td>22.90</td>
<td>26.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
# TABLE 7

## Model 5: Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>352.54</td>
<td>1314.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>231.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Class Composition</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
### Table 8

#### Model 6: Mean, Standard Deviation, and Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>352.54</td>
<td>1314.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>231.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Brokerage</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
## TABLE 9

Table 9
Model 1: Bivariate Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.112**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>.404**</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.210**</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>.147**</td>
<td>.181**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Networking</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>.085*</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>.100*</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Identity</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-.101*</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>.103*</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class Mobility</td>
<td>-.511**</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>.084*</td>
<td>.094**</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Centrality</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>.094*</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>.117*</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>.096*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05; ** p<.01;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.112**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.404**</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.210**</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.300**</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.147**</td>
<td>0.181**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Networking</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.085*</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.100*</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Identity</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.101*</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Friendship</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.403**</td>
<td>0.229**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class Mobility</td>
<td>-0.511**</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.084*</td>
<td>0.094**</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Class</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.138**</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05; ** p<.01;
## TABLE 11

Table 11
Model 3: Bivariate Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.112**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.210**</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.300**</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.181**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class Mobility</td>
<td>0.285**</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.072*</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Brokerage</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.141**</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05; ** p<.01;
TABLE 12

Table 12
Model 4: Bivariate Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  Gender</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Age</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Race</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.112**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Marital Status</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.404**</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Employment Status</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.210**</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Tenure</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.300**</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.147**</td>
<td>0.181**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Organization Size</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Institutional Agency</td>
<td>-0.098*</td>
<td>0.136**</td>
<td>-0.135**</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Degree Centrality</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.094*</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.117*</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05; ** p<.01;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gender</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Age</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Race</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.112**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Employment Status</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.210**</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Tenure</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.300**</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.181**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Organization Size</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Institutional Agency</td>
<td>-0.98*</td>
<td>0.136**</td>
<td>-0.135**</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Organizational Structure</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Cross-Class Composition</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.110*</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05; ** p<.01;
TABLE 14

Table 14
Model 4: Bivariate Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Social Class</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-112**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-210**</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.300**</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.181**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Size</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>-102*</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>-0.098*</td>
<td>0.136**</td>
<td>-135*</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Brokerage</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.141**</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.105*</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05; ** p<.01;
### Table 15

**Model 1: Parallel Moderated Mediation for Childhood Social class to Degree Centrality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Networking</th>
<th>Work Identity</th>
<th>Degree Centrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unstandardized b</td>
<td>Unstandardized b</td>
<td>Unstandardized b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>2.709</td>
<td>2.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.108*</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.036**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl. Status</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Size</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 (1 vs 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 (2 vs 3)</td>
<td>a2</td>
<td>-6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 (1 vs 3)</td>
<td>a3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderators</strong></td>
<td>a4</td>
<td>0.639*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 (0 vs -1)</td>
<td>a5</td>
<td><strong>-2.323</strong>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactions</strong></td>
<td>a6</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 x W1</td>
<td>a7</td>
<td><strong>1.909</strong>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 x W1</td>
<td>a8</td>
<td>-0.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 x W2</td>
<td>a9</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 x W1</td>
<td>a10</td>
<td>-1.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 x W2</td>
<td>a11</td>
<td><strong>2.637</strong>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
N= 427

* p<.10; ** p<.05; *** p<.001
TABLE 15, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditional Effect of SC on ATN</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator: No Mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td><strong>0.124</strong></td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.602</td>
<td>-1.516</td>
<td>0.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.795</td>
<td>1.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator: Upward Mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td><strong>-0.185</strong></td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-3.271</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.968</td>
<td>-3.041</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator: Downward Mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>2.781</td>
<td><strong>1.081</strong></td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>-0.486</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>2.907</td>
<td><strong>1.142</strong></td>
<td>4.673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Direct Effect of SC on DC</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>-3.986</td>
<td>-9.703</td>
<td>1.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-2.248</td>
<td>-10.886</td>
<td>6.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-6.235</td>
<td>-15.546</td>
<td>3.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bootstrap Coefficients for Significant Effects or Effects Approaching Significance are displayed in Appendix I*
### Table 16
Model 2: Parallel Moderated Mediation for Childhood Social class to Cross-Class Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Effect on Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Conditional Effect of SC on ATN</th>
<th>Relative Conditional Direct Effect of SC on CC Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Networking</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>LLCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Class Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Control Variables

- Constant: 2.855
- Tenure: 0.054
- Empl Status: 0.133
- VT: 0.022
- Race: 0.113

#### Predictors

- X1 (1 vs 2) a1 = **0.775**
- X2 (2 vs 3) a2 = -0.66
- X3 (1 vs 3) a3 = 0.115
- Org Size: 0

#### Moderators

- W1 (0 vs 1) a4 = 0.517
- W2 (0 vs -1) a5 = **2.472**

#### Interactions

- X1 x W1 a6 = -0.519
- X1 x W2 a7 = **1.985**
- X2 x W1 a8 = -0.605
- X2 x W2 a9 = 0.927
- X3 x W1 a10 = -1.125
- X3 x W2 a11 = **2.912**

#### Mediators

- ATN: -
- WID: -
- OTF: -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.855</td>
<td>2.676</td>
<td>5.843</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A1: *p<.10; **p<.05; ***p<.001

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
N= 412
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childhood Social Class</th>
<th>% in Lower</th>
<th>% in Middle</th>
<th>% in Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>0.3741</td>
<td>0.3992</td>
<td>0.1746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.2594</td>
<td>0.4971</td>
<td>0.2096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>0.1562</td>
<td>0.5158</td>
<td>0.2466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**TABLE 18**

Table 18

Mean Percentages in Each Class Group as Compared to Mean Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childhood Social Class</th>
<th>% in Lower</th>
<th>% in Middle</th>
<th>% in Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1.2624</td>
<td>0.8098</td>
<td>0.8287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0.8754</td>
<td>1.0084</td>
<td>0.9949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>0.5271</td>
<td>1.0463</td>
<td>1.1702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross-Class Composition as Compared to Expected by Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childhood Social Class</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>0.9319</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.38257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1.2033</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.50702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>0.8677</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.32855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 19
Table 19

Model 2: Parallel Moderated Mediation for Childhood Social class to Cross-Class Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Class Composition / Mean Distribution</th>
<th>Relative Conditional Direct Effect of SC on CC Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.049**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ Status</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Size</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 (1 vs 2)</td>
<td><strong>.256</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 (2 vs 3)</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 (1 vs 3)</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 (0 vs 1)</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 (0 vs -1)</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 x W1</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 x W2</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 x W1</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 x W2</td>
<td>-.317*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 x W1</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 x W2</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATN</td>
<td><strong>-.052</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WID</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTF</td>
<td><strong>.028</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward

N= 412
* p<.10; ** p<.05; *** p<.001
### TABLE 20

**Model 3: Moderation Analysis of Childhood Social Class to Network Brokerage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl Status</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td><strong>-0.015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Size</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1 (1 vs 2) b1</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 (2 vs 3) b2</td>
<td><strong>0.150</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 (1 vs 3) b3</td>
<td><strong>0.130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderators</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1 (0 vs. 1) b4</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 (0 vs. -1) b5</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactions</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1 x W1 b6</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 x W2 b7</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 x W1 b8</td>
<td><strong>-0.237</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 x W2 b9</td>
<td><strong>-0.158</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 x W1 b10</td>
<td>-0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 x W2 b11</td>
<td><strong>-0.239</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R² | 0.042 |

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward

N= 411

* p<.10; ** p<.05; *** p<.001
# TABLE 20, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator: No Mobility</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
<th>Mean Cross-Class Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>L 0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>M 0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>U 0.224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator: Upward Mobility</th>
<th>Mean Cross-Class Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.018 -0.031 0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.09 -0.327 0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.07 -0.309 0.172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator: Downward Mobility</th>
<th>Mean Cross-Class Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>-0.1 -0.299 0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.01 -0.08 0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.11 -0.315 0.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bootstrap Coefficients for Significant Effects or Effects Approaching Significance are displayed in Appendix K*
### Table 21

#### Model 4: Moderation Analysis of Childhood Social Class to Degree Centrality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degree Centrality</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 (1 vs 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 (2 vs 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 (1 vs 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-11.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W (InstAgn)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 x W</td>
<td></td>
<td>b5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 x W</td>
<td></td>
<td>b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 x W</td>
<td></td>
<td>b7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
N= 413
* p<.10; ** p<.05; *** p<.001
Table 22

Model 5: Moderation Analysis of Childhood Social Class to Cross-Class Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Class Composition</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Variables

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl Status</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Size</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictors

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1 (1 vs 2)</td>
<td>b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 (2 vs 3)</td>
<td>b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 (1 vs 3)</td>
<td>b3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1 (OrgStr)</td>
<td>b4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 (InstAgn)</td>
<td>b5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1 x W1</td>
<td>b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 x W1</td>
<td>b7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 x W1</td>
<td>b8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 x W2</td>
<td>b9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 x W2</td>
<td>b10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 x W2</td>
<td>b11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R2

0.052

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
N= 401

* p<.10; ** p<.05; *** p<.001

Bootstrap Coefficients for Significant Effects or Effects Approaching Significance are displayed in Appendix L
Table 22, Continued

Conditional Effects of the Childhood Social Class at Values of Organizational Structure and Institutional Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator Values</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
<th>Mean Cross-Class Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combination #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>-0.234 -0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.108 0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.253 0.069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
<td>Mean Cross-Class Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.133 0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>-0.077 0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.138 0.141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
<td>Mean Cross-Class Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>6.918</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.07 0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.107 0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.087 0.277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
<td>Mean Cross-Class Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>6.918</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>-0.142</td>
<td>-0.229 -0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.07 0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.227 0.042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
<td>Mean Cross-Class Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>6.918</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>-0.122 -0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.024 0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.095 0.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
<td>Mean Cross-Class Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>6.918</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.062 0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.059 0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.049 0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
<td>Mean Cross-Class Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>13.729</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>-0.256 -0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>-0.109 0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.274 0.089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
<td>Mean Cross-Class Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>13.729</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.153 0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>-0.067 0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.147 0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
<td>Mean Cross-Class Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>13.729</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.089 0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>-0.081 0.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.082 0.273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
<td>Mean Cross-Class Comp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 23

#### Model 5: Moderation Analysis of Childhood Social Class to Cross-Class Composition

#### Cross-Class Composition / Mean Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empl Status</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Size</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Predictors

- X1 (1 vs 2) \( b_1 \) 0.116
- X2 (2 vs 3) \( b_2 \) **-0.389***
- X3 (1 vs 3) \( b_3 \) **-0.273***

#### Moderators

- W1 (OrgStr) \( b_4 \) 0.0031
- W2 (InstAgn) \( b_5 \) **-0.355***

#### Interactions

- X1 x W1 \( b_6 \) -0.002
- X2 x W1 \( b_7 \) 0.002
- X3 x W1 \( b_8 \) 0
- X1 x W2 \( b_9 \) **.314**
- X2 x W2 \( b_{10} \) 0.074
- X3 x W2 \( b_{11} \) 0.387

**R²** 0.112

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
N= 401

* p<.10; ** p<.05; *** p<.001
Table 23, Continued

Conditional Effects of the Childhood Social Class at Values of Org. Structure and Institutional Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator Values</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
<th>Mean Cross-Class Comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combination #1</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #2</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #3</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #4</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>6.918</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #5</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>6.918</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #6</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>6.918</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #7</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>13.729</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #8</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>13.729</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination #9</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org Structure</td>
<td>13.729</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Agency</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

Model 6: Moderation Analysis of Childhood Social class to Network Brokerage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Network Brokerage</th>
<th>Unstandardized b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 (1 vs 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b1 -0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 (2 vs 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b2 0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 (1 vs 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b3 0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 (OrgStr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b4 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2 (InstAgn)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b5 -0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 x W1</td>
<td></td>
<td>b6 -0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 x W1</td>
<td></td>
<td>b7 0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 x W1</td>
<td></td>
<td>b8 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 x W2</td>
<td></td>
<td>b9 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 x W2</td>
<td></td>
<td>b10 0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3 x W2</td>
<td></td>
<td>b11 -0.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ 0.04

Childhood Social Class: 1 = Lower; 2 = Middle; 3 = Upper
Social Class Mobility: -1 = Downward; 0 = None; 1 = Upward
N= 400
* p<.10; ** p<.05; *** p<.001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Summary of Hypotheses</th>
<th>Supported Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>Individuals from a lower social class will have the less degree centrality than their middle or upper social class counterparts.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>Individuals’ social networks will be primarily composed of individuals from the same social class background.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>Individuals from a lower social class will have the least cross-class composition.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>The cross-class ties of the lower and upper social class are more likely to be middle social class than upper or lower social class, respectively.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
<td>Individuals from the middle social class will have the greatest cross-class composition.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6</td>
<td>The cross-class composition of individuals from the upper social class will be greater than the lower social class but lower than the middle social class.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
<td>Individuals from the middle social class will have the greatest network brokerage.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8a-b</td>
<td>The relationship between childhood social class and degree centrality will be mediated by the attitude toward networking such that individuals from a lower social class background will have a less positive attitude toward networking than individuals from higher social classes, resulting in a less (a) degree centrality and (b) cross-class composition.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 9a-b</td>
<td>The relationship between childhood social class and degree centrality will be mediated by work identity such that individuals from a higher social class background will have a stronger work identity than those from the lower social class, resulting in greater (a) degree centrality and (b) cross-class composition.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 10</td>
<td>The relationship between childhood social class and cross-class degree centrality will be mediated by openness to friendship such that individuals from higher social classes background will be more open to cross-class friendship than individuals from the lower social class, which leads to greater cross-class composition.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 11a-c</td>
<td>Institutional agency will moderate the effect of childhood social class on employee social networks such that institutional agents will have more (a) degree centrality, (b) cross-class composition, and (c) networking brokerage, regardless of social class background.</td>
<td>11a &amp; 11c Not Supported; 11b Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 12a-c</td>
<td>Social class mobility will moderate the relationship between (a) childhood social class and work identity, (b) childhood social class and openness to friendship, and (c) childhood social class and attitude toward networking, such that the upwardly mobile will have a stronger work identity, more openness to friendship, and more positive attitude toward networking.</td>
<td>12a &amp; 12c Partially Supported; 12b Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 25, CONT’D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 13a-b</th>
<th>Social class mobility will moderate childhood social class’s effect on (a) cross-class composition and (b) network brokerage such that the upwardly mobile will have increased cross-class composition and thus, network brokerage than predicted by direct effects.</th>
<th>Not Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 14</td>
<td>The organizational structure will moderate the effect of childhood social class on cross-class degree centrality such that as organizational structures become flatter, cross-class composition will increase for all employees regardless of class background.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 15</td>
<td>The organizational structure will moderate the effect of childhood social class on network brokerage such that as organizational structures become flatter, the network brokerage of the middle social class will be reduced.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Original Attitude Toward Networking Scale. (7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree)

Professional networking is the purposeful building and nurturing of relationships to create a system of information and support for professional and career success.

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

1. To me, networking is a lot of time and work for little payoff. (R)
2. In my opinion, networking is not an effective way to build a career. (R)
3. In general, employees do not get much out of networking. (R)
4. I find networking to be pretty pointless. (R)
5. Networking has a lot of benefits for one’s career.
6. When I network, I get a lot out of it.
7. Networking is really rewarding.
8. Engaging in networking can really pay off.
9. Networking to build new ties is futile and threatening. (R)
10. Networking to leverage resources is futile and threatening. (R)
11. When I engage in professional networking, I feel guilty. (R)
12. People who network frequently are very self-interested. (R)
13. After attending a conference or networking event, I feel a little dirty. (R)
14. To me, professional networking seems inauthentic. (R)
15. Having to network with others makes me a little uncomfortable. (R)
16. Networking is a legitimate way to conduct business.
17. Networking is a respectable behavior.
18. When I engage in networking, I feel really satisfied.
19. The idea of building networking ties feels fake. (R)
20. Networking signifies using others to get ahead. (R)
21. Networking to build new ties is unfair. (R)
22. Networking to maintain relationships is insincere. (R)
23. Networking to leverage resources is exploitative. (R)
### Appendix B

#### Results of Subject Matter Expert Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on Attitude Toward Networking Scale</th>
<th>Consensus</th>
<th>Action to be Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To me, networking is a lot of time and work for little payoff. (R)</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion, networking is not an effective way to build a career. (R)</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, employees do not get much out of networking. (R)</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find networking to be pretty pointless. (R)</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking has a lot of benefits for one’s career.</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I network, I get a lot out of it.</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking is really rewarding.</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in networking can really pay off.</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Networking to build new ties is futile and threatening. (R) | 83.33% | Modifying to remove "and threatening"
| Networking to leverage resources is futile and threatening. (R) | 75.00% | Modifying to remove "and threatening"
| When I engage in professional networking, I feel guilty. (R) | 91.67% | |
| People who network frequently are very self-interested. (R) | 91.67% | |
| After attending a conference or networking event, I feel a little dirty. (R) | 91.67% | |
| To me, professional networking seems inauthentic. (R) | 91.67% | |
| Having to network with others makes me a little uncomfortable. (R) | 58.33% | Removal of item
| Networking is a legitimate way to conduct business. | 83.33% | |
| Networking is a respectable behavior. | 91.67% | |
| When I engage in networking, I feel really satisfied. | 16.67% | Removal of item
| The idea of building networking ties feels fake. (R) | 91.67% | |
| Networking signifies using others to get ahead. (R) | 91.67% | |
| Networking to build new ties is unfair. (R) | 100.00% | |
| Networking to maintain relationships is insincere. (R) | 91.67% | |
| Networking to leverage resources is exploitative. (R) | 91.67% | |
Appendix C

To: Jacqueline Tilton Tilton  
    BELL 4188  

From: Douglas James Adams, Chair  
       IRB Committee  

Date: 10/05/2018  

Action: Exemption Granted  

Action Date: 10/05/2018  

Protocol #: 1808141058  

Study Title: Attitude Toward Networking Scale  

The above-referenced protocol has been determined to be exempt.  

If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol that may affect the level of risk to your participants, you must seek approval prior to implementing those changes. All modifications must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.  

If you have any questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact the IRB Coordinator at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.  

cc: Jonathan Johnson, Investigator
Appendix D

To: Jacqueline Tilton Tilbn  
    BELL 4188  
From: Douglas James Adams, Chair  
       IRB Committee  
Date: 10/12/2018  
Action: Exemption Granted  
Action Date: 10/12/2018  
Protocol #: 1804119369  
Study Title: Organizational Social Networks  

The above-referenced protocol has been determined to be exempt.

If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol that may affect the level of risk to your participants, you must seek approval prior to implementing those changes. All modifications must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have any questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact the IRB Coordinator at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2209, or irb@uark.edu.

cc: Jonathan Johnson, Investigator
Appendix E
Measures for Discriminant Validity, Pretest 3

Need for Social Status Scale. (7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree)

1. I enjoy having influence over other people’s decision making.
2. Being a highly valued member of my social group is important to me.
3. I would like to cultivate the admiration of my peers.
4. I want my peers to respect me and hold me in high esteem.
5. I care about how positively others view me.
6. It would please me to have a position of prestige and social standing.
7. I don’t care whether others view me with respect and hold me in esteem. (R)
8. I am not concerned with my status amount my peers. (R)

Status Aspirations Scale. (7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree)

1. I would like an important job where people look up to me.
2. I like talking to people who are important.
3. I want to be an important person in the community.
4. I like to be admired for my achievements.
5. I dislike being the center of attention. (R)
6. I like to have people come to me for advice.
7. I find satisfaction in having influence over others because of my position in the community.

Extraversion Scale. (5-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree)

I see myself as someone who…

1. Is talkative
2. Is reserved (R)
3. Is full of energy
4. Generates a lot of enthusiasm
5. Tends to be quiet (R)
6. Has an assertive personality
7. Is sometimes shy, inhibited (R)
8. Is outgoing, sociable
Appendix F
Component Matrix from Exploratory Factor Analysis, Pretest 2

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To me, networking is a lot of time and work for little payoff. (R)</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking is really rewarding.</td>
<td>0.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking to leverage resources is futile (R)</td>
<td>0.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The idea of building networking ties feels fake. (R)</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking signifies using others to get ahead. (R)</td>
<td>0.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking to maintain relationships is insincere. (R)</td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking to leverage resources is futile (R)</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To me, networking is a lot of time and work for little payoff. (R)</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking is really rewarding.</td>
<td>0.705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original Scree Plot from Exploratory Factor Analysis, Pretest 2

Refined Scale Scree Plot from Exploratory Factor Analysis, Pretest 2
Appendix G
Measures for Childhood and Current Social Class Using MacArthur Scale of Subjective SES Method

The following question asks about your standing in society. Think of the ladder below as representing where people stand in our society. At the top of the ladder are the people who are best off, those who have the most money, most education, and best jobs. At the bottom are the people who are worst off, those who have the least money, least education, and worst jobs or no job.

Select the rung that best describes where you currently stand on the ladder.

The following is similar to the previous question, but asks about your standing in society during your childhood rather than your current standing.

Think of the ladder as representing where people stand in our society. At the top of the ladder are the people who are best off, those who have the most money, most education, and best jobs. At the bottom are the people who are worst off, those who have the least money, least education, and worst jobs or no job.

Select the rung that best describes where your family stood on the ladder during your childhood.
Appendix H
Mediator Measures for Study 1

Work Identity Scale. (5-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree)
1. My personal/family life is only a small part of who I am.
2. Most of my interests are centered around my work.
3. Most of my personal life goals are work-oriented.
4. My job/career is a major source of satisfaction to me.
5. The major [fulfillment] in my life comes from my job.
6. The most important things that happen to me involve my work.

Openness to Friendship Scale. (9-point Likert-type scale ranging from very strongly disagree to very strongly agree)
1. I am excited at the possibility of meeting new friends at work.
2. I am looking forward to getting to know many new people at work.
3. I want to meet new people of different backgrounds than my own.
4. I feel I already have all the friends I need. (R)
5. I hope I can meet a wide variety of people at work.
6. Making new friendships is one of the things I look forward to the most when I think about work.
7. I hope to develop life-long friendships at work.
8. I hope to get involved with many activities at work so I can meet a lot of new people.
9. It doesn’t matter much if I meet a lot of new people when I get to work. (R)
10. I already have a lot of good friends, so making new friends at work isn’t all that important to me. (R)
Appendix I
Model 1 Significant or Moderately Significant Bootstrap Coefficients
Appendix J
Model 2 Significant or Moderately Significant Bootstrap Coefficients
Appendix J
Model 2 Significant or Moderately Significant Bootstrap Coefficients, Continued
Appendix K
Model 3 Significant or Moderately Significant Bootstrap Coefficients
Appendix L
Model 5 Significant or Moderately Significant Bootstrap Coefficients
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