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Theoretical considerations

...[T]hose who deny any significant relationship between culture and welfare policy take a lonely position. (...) [T]his does not mean, however, that at present the relationship between culture and welfare state has developed into an adequately theorized coherent field of study (Van Oorschot, Opielka, & Pfau-Effinger, 2008).

My suggestion is an integrated measure of social stratification and values.
Point of departure

Values $\Rightarrow$ political attitudes

Kulin and Svallfors (2013) show that higher classes have stronger value-attitude links compared to lower classes.

Simultaneously, social groups are relevant for lay conceptualization of political attitudes (Staerklé, 2009; Staerklé, Likki, & Scheidegger, 2012).

Is it plausible to assume that value mechanisms work similar across societal groups? Or could values be a mean for distinction?
Social class: Traditions

Social class is a concept of social stratification with two traditions:

Marxist: Overarching conflict between capital and labor inflicting all life spheres. Class members share economic living conditions and class consciousness.

Weberian: "class situations" based on property and employment situations constitute life chances (Scott, 2002). Social class is only one dimension of strata and is defined exclusively by economic circumstances (Breen, 2005).
Measurement of social class

Occupation is the most common measure for social class, e.g.:

- Wright developed a 3+9-level class scheme in the Marxist tradition based on power, authority and skill with strong emphasis on exploitation (Wright, 2000; Rose & Harrison, 2009).

- EGP/CASMIN/NS-SEC scheme combines market (chances to generate income, economic security and career opportunities) and working (autonomy and authority) situation (Erikson, Goldthorpe, & Porto-carero, 2010).
Criticism on social class

The general critique:

- Beck (1986) suggest that groups lose importance as formative factors for individual behavior.
- Lifestyle researchers (Otte, 2008; Rössel, 2007) see the variety of living conditions not reflected.

The measurement critique (EGP scheme):

- Too abstract from job conditions (Grusky & Weeden, 2001).
- Oesch (2006) introduced a new class scheme based on working conditions and work logic.
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BBC’s 2011 Great British Class Survey (Savage et al., 2013, p. 230)

Table 6. Seven latent classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elite</th>
<th>Established middle class</th>
<th>Technical middle class</th>
<th>New affluent workers</th>
<th>Traditional working class</th>
<th>Emergent service workers</th>
<th>Precariat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>£89,082</td>
<td>£47,184</td>
<td>£37,428</td>
<td>£29,252</td>
<td>£13,305</td>
<td>£21,048</td>
<td>£8,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household savings</td>
<td>£142,458</td>
<td>£26,090</td>
<td>£65,844</td>
<td>£4,918</td>
<td>£9,500</td>
<td>£1,138</td>
<td>£793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House value</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>£176,834</td>
<td>£163,362</td>
<td>£128,639</td>
<td>£127,174</td>
<td>£17,968</td>
<td>£26,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contact score</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contact number</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbrow cultural capital</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging cultural capital</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GfK nationally representative survey (with GBCS respondents included and weighted at 161,400th of a case).
Stratification and Values?

- Social class needs some revision beyond occupation still applicable for cross-sectional research.

- Most critique on the social concept is based on the lack of accountability for individualism.

- Values as subjective measure of evaluation could revitalize the idea of heterogeneous groups in societies.

- Combining the objective and subjective measure leads to a measure of distinction/group defined cleavages.
Aim of the measurement / hypotheses

Capturing a two-dimensional space of stratification (status) and subjective motivations (values) to explain variance inside countries across groups and similarities across countries along similar groups.

H1  The number of groups extracted is expected to be similar across all samples.

H2  The constitution of the patterns along values and ISEI is expected to be similar across different societies.

H3  These patterns are not random but show a stability in their relative position over time.
Data and method

ESS 1-5 including all (124) samples available (33 different countries).

obj.: International Socio-Economic Index (ISEI) of occupation status (Ganzeboom, De Graaf, Treiman, & Graaf, 1992). (min=16 to max=88)

subj.: Parts of the Human Value Scale (HVS, see Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004) - namely, Hedonism, Openness to Change and Conservation (12 items)

Latent class analysis (LCA) in R version 3.0.2 with the package poLCA by Linzer and Lewis (2011).
Strategy

1. Run for each of the 124 samples multiple LCAs under the condition of 1-8 classes. Each of the 8 models per sample was estimated 10 times to avoid local minima.

2. Define the preliminary best fitting model by the minimum BIC across the estimated models per sample.

3. Assess profile plots to interpret patterns

4. Further steps:
   - Invariance across samples
   - Testing predictive power
# Results of latent class analysis

Table 1: Groups by ESS round based on minimum BIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups by round</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESS1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Share in %)</td>
<td>(.8)</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
<td>(32.3)</td>
<td>(52.4)</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
<td>(.8)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HVS wording Openness to change and Hedonism

HE10 Having a good time is important to him. He likes to ”spoil” himself.

HE21 He seeks every chance he can to have fun. It is important to him to do things that give him pleasure.

ST6 He likes surprises and is always looking for new things to do. He thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life.

ST15 He looks for adventures and likes to take risks. He wants to have an exciting life.

SD1 Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to him. He likes to do things in his own original way.

SD11 It is important to him to make his own decisions about what he does. He likes to be free and not depend on others.
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HVS wording Conservation

TR9    It is important to him to be humble and modest. He tries not to draw attention to himself.

TR20   Tradition is important to him. He tries to follow the customs handed down by his religion or his family.

CO7    He believes that people should do what they’re told. He thinks people should follow rules at all times, even when no-one is watching.

CO16   It is important to him always to behave properly. He wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.

SEC5   It is important to him to live in secure surroundings. He avoids anything that might endanger his safety.

SEC14  It is important to him that the government ensures his safety against all threats. He wants the state to be strong so it can defend its citizens.
Results I/III

Single Case: Austria ESS 1-3
Assessment of profile plots ESS1-AT (H2)
Assessment of profile plots ESS2-AT (H2)
Assessment of profile plots ESS3-AT (H2)
Stratification and values - as integrated measure of societal position?

Lessons from the Austrian case

Good news

- There seems to be some stable pattern.
- Two clearly identifiable groups: Material deprived & progressive performers.
- A group of rationalists?!

Problems

- The middle groups are less clear cut.
- ISEI as anchor is not always perfect.
Results II/III

Single Classes across Countries for ESS 1
Assessment of profile plots across countries (H2)
Assessment of profile plots across countries (H2)

Profile Plot ESS1 and ISEI4

Mean score of group

not at all like me/ high ISEI

very much like me/ low ISEI

ISEI  HE10  HE21  ST6  ST15  SD1  SD11  TR9  TR20  CO7  CO16  SEC5  SEC14
Assessment of profile plots across countries (H2)
Assessment of profile plots across countries (H2)
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Assessment of profile plots across countries (H2)

Profile Plot ESS1 and ISEI1

Mean score of group

very much like me/ low ISEI

not at all like me/ high ISEI
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Lessons from cross-country differences

Good news

- The different group patterns seem to reproduce in a good share of countries

Problems

- The variance across countries is partially (HE) very high.
- Exclude countries or consider alternative pattern in modeling?
Single Class across time (ISEI 1)
Assessment of profile plots across time (H3)
Assessment of profile plots across time (H3)

Profile Plot ESS2 and ISEI1

Mean score of group

not at all like me/ high ISEI

very much like me/ low ISEI

ISEI   HE10   HE21   ST6   ST15   SD1   SD11   TR9   TR20   CO7   CO16   SEC5   SEC14
Assessment of profile plots across time (H3)
Assessment of profile plots across time (H3)

Profile Plot ESS4 and ISEI1

Mean score of group

very much like me/
low ISEI

not at all like me/
high ISEI

ISEI  HE10  HE21  ST6  ST15  SD1  SD11  TR9  TR20  CO7  CO16  SEC5  SEC14
Assessment of profile plots across time (H3)

Profile Plot ESS5 and ISEI1

Mean score of group

very much like me/low ISEI

not at all like me/high ISEI

ISEI HE10 HE21 ST6 ST15 SD1 SD11 TR9 TR20 CO7 CO16 SEC5 SEC14
Lessons from about cross-time differences

Good news

• The pattern seems stable over time for a majority of countries.

Problems

• Again a few outliers (excluding vs. modeling).
Conclusions

• Solid evidence that strata and value patterns go hand in hand.

• The patterns seem reproducible across time and a majority of countries.

• Anchoring needs an alternative mechanism besides ISEI.

• Further steps are necessary to validate the findings (socio-demographics for groups, explanatory power).
Thank you for your attention & any comments are welcome!
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