1989

A social class and social function assessment of the equestrian sport of combined driving

Eric Lennox Grey
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Grey, Eric Lennox, "A social class and social function assessment of the equestrian sport of combined driving" (1989). *Master's Theses*. 3189.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.zyay-47bs>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/3189

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 1339615

**A social class and social function assessment of the equestrian
sport of combined driving**

Grey, Eric Lennox, M.A.

San Jose State University, 1989

U·M·I

**300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106**

**A SOCIAL CLASS AND SOCIAL FUNCTION
ASSESSMENT OF THE EQUESTRIAN
SPORT OF COMBINED DRIVING**

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Human Performance

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Eric Lennox Grey

December, 1989

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN PERFORMANCE

Dr. James Bryant

Dr. David Furst

Dr. Shirley Reekie

Dr. Bethany Shifflett

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

Serena M. Stanford

ABSTRACT

A Social Class and Social Function Assessment of the Equestrian Sport of Combined Driving

by Eric L. Grey

The equestrian sport participant is typically characterized as a member of the upper-class community. A sport that exemplifies this image of privilege is combined driving. Selected literature, however, suggests that this image is misleading. Surveys were sent to 258 drivers: They provided 154 usable surveys. The first purpose was to measure the social class level of combined drivers. The data collected demonstrate that only 31% of the drivers were classified as upper-upper class. Most of the remaining drivers were classified as middle-class; however, there was a small sample of lower-class competitors. The second purpose of this study was to complete a social function assessment. The results revealed that affiliating with others and satisfying needs unfulfilled in daily routines were some of the perceived rewards for participation in combined driving. Only about one-third of the drivers agreed that this equestrian pursuit was a way to gain social status.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project could never have been completed without a group of significant people. I want to thank my family, in particular, my mother Lu Grey and father Dr. David Grey for their endless support. From San Jose State, I want to give thanks to Dr. James Bryant, my committee chairperson. He always found a way to soothe my often frazzled nerves. The guidance and encouragement of those three people carried me through the graduate school experience. I would also like to acknowledge Drs. Bethany Shifflett, David Furst and Shirley Reekie. They contributed substantially to my education and this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem.....	2
Objectives of the Study	3
Delimitations.....	6
Limitations.....	7
Assumption.....	9
Definitions.....	10
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	18
Combined Driving	18
Introduction.....	18
Prince Philip, the FEI, and the Birth of a Sport.....	18
Combined Driving Events.....	19
Social Class Considerations of Sport.....	22
Introduction.....	22
Participation.....	23
Combined Driving and Social Class	25
The Hollingshead Index of Social Position.....	31
Social Functions of Sport.....	32
Introduction.....	32
Affiliation.....	33
Separation	34
Socialization Through Sport.....	36
Socialization Into Sport.....	38
Status and Prestige.....	39
Summary	41

Chapter	Page
III. METHODOLOGY	43
Introduction.....	43
Measurement Tools.....	43
The Hollingshead Index of Social Position.....	43
The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire.....	45
Construction.....	45
Validity.....	46
Reliability.....	47
Selection of Subjects.....	48
Pretesting Procedures.....	49
Expert Statement-Classification	49
Pilot Study	49
Procedures for the Study.....	50
Mailing the Survey	50
Interpretation of Data.....	51
Summary	53
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	55
Pilot Study.....	55
The Hollingshead Index of Social Position Data.....	55
The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire Data.....	56
Survey Adjustments Based on the Results of the Pilot Study.....	57
Primary Study.....	59
Return Rate	59
Social Function Attitude Questionnaire Statistical Analysis.....	59
Factor Analysis.....	59
Reliability.....	62
Survey Data Results and Discussion.....	65
Demographics.....	65

Chapter	Page
Hollingshead Index of Social Position Data.....	71
Education.....	72
Occupation.....	72
Social Class.....	76
Results of the first problem.....	76
Discussion of the first objective.....	77
Results and discussion of the second objective.....	79
Summary.....	81
Social Functions.....	82
Affiliation (Factor 5).....	82
Separation (Factor 2).....	84
Socialization Through Sport (Factors 4 and 7).....	86
Socialization Into Sport (Factors 3 and 8).....	87
Status and Prestige (Factors 1 and 9).....	96
Summary.....	100
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	103
Conclusions.....	103
Demographics.....	103
Social Class.....	104
Social Functions.....	105
Recommendations.....	108
Recommendations for Measurement Tools.....	108
The Hollingshead Index of Social Position.....	108
The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire.....	111
Recommendations for Further Study.....	113
REFERENCES.....	116

	Page
APPENDICES	125
Appendix A. Demographic Questionnaire	126
Appendix B. Social Function Attitude Questionnaire.....	129
Appendix C. Consent Form.....	133
Appendix D. Cover Letter.....	135
Appendix E. Reminder Letter.....	136
Appendix F. Follow-Up Cover Letter.....	137
Appendix G. Statement Correlations from Factor Analysis.....	138
Appendix H. Comparison of Results of Factor Analysis with Expert Statement- Classification.....	139
Appendix I. ANOVA Tables for the Social Functions	142
Appendix J. Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations of Social Function Attitude Questionnaire Data	144
Appendix K. The Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position.....	145
Appendix L. The Hollingshead Education Scale.....	146
Appendix M. The Hollingshead Occupation Scale.....	147
Appendix N. Combined Driving Head of Household Occupation Levels	155

	Page
Appendix O. Head of Household Occupation Levels Estimated With the Dictionary of Occupational Titles.....	159
Appendix P. Head of Household Occupation Levels Estimated by the Investigator's Judgment.....	163
Appendix Q. Social Position Score Data for Combined Driving Events.....	166
Appendix R. Statement Correlations of Pilot Study Factor Analysis.....	167

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Return Rate	59
2. Estimations of Reliability	63
3. Demographic Data: Driving Class and Level of Difficulty	67
4. Demographic Data: Hours per Week Spent With Combined Driving	68
5. Demographic Data: Amount of Money per Year Spent on Combined Driving	69
6. Demographic Data: Amount of Horses and Events per Year for Combined Driving	70
7. Education Levels for the Heads of Household	72
8. Occupation Sub-Levels for the Heads of Household	74
9. Social Class Levels and Social Position Scores for the Heads of Household	77
10. High and Low Social Class Levels of Each Driving Event	80
11. Response Frequency to the Affiliation Statements of Factor 5	83
12. Agreement Rate to the Separation Statements of Factor 2 in Percentage Form by Social Class	84
13. Response Frequency to the Socialization Through Statements of Factor 7	86

14. Average Age When Drivers Became Involved With Horses and Combined Driving.....	88
15. Response Frequency of Most Important Socializing Agents Into Horses and Combined Driving by Gender of Driver.....	89
16. Agreement Rate to Socialization Into Variables in Percentage Form by a Median Split of the Variable--Age First Active with Horses.....	91
17. Agreement Rate to the Socialization Into Statements of Factor 3 in Percentage Form by Gender and Social Class.....	93
18. Response Frequency of the Parents' Activity in Horses by Their Influence as Socializing Agents Into the World of Horses.....	94
19. Response Frequency to the Status Statements of Factor 1.....	96
20. Agreement Rate to the Status Statements of Factor 1 in Percentage Form by Gender and Social Class.....	97
21. Percentage Distribution to the Winning as Means of Achieving Esteem Statements of Factor 9.....	99

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Varying in use from the hauling of heavy loads to the important components of sport, the horse and cart have been employed for many functions in our world's history. The most popular and romantic images of the horse and cart have been that of chariots in war and sport. Other less recognized, yet conceivably more important services, have included the hauling of freight, coal, mail, and refuse (Arnold, 1979; Dossenbach & Dossenbach, 1983).

The first war-chariot probably dates from the Kassite infiltration into the Babylonian Empire in the 16th century B.C. (Tarr, 1969), while chariot racing was described in detail in Homer's Iliad (Dossenbach & Dossenbach, 1983). Tunis (1955) explained that the chariot took centuries to develop, undergoing changes in carriage, harness, and axle design, until it became a versatile and efficient vehicle. Although the use of the horse and cart has lost its industrial and agricultural value in the western world, the ancient chariot, in its various forms, survived and is now enjoyed by many people who pursue challenging and pleasurable outdoor activities. Competitive carriage driving events such as combined driving, pleasure driving, concours d'elegance, and draft horse classes have gained popularity in Europe and North America in the last 20 years, and this sporting trend has possibly saved carriages and equine driving mastership from disappearance.

This study investigates the relationship between social class and one competitive carriage driving event, combined driving.

Equestrian sports are typically defined as an upper-class activity (Aversa, 1981; Curry & Jiobu, 1984; Fussell, 1983; Veblen, 1953). The sport sociology literature that addresses the relationship between social class and sport typically define sport along social class lines (Curry & Jiobu, 1984; Eitzen & Sage, 1982; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1983). For example: motorcycle racing is defined as a lower-, or working-class sport; basketball and baseball are considered middle-working class sports; football and tennis are defined as middle-, or upper-middle class sports; and polo, yachting, and equestrian sport are defined as upper-class (Curry & Jiobu, 1984). Because combined driving is an equestrian sport, has an elegant nature, and is associated with royalty, it is perceived to be an upper-class sport. Despite this argument, there are studies suggesting that in not all circumstances are equestrian sport participants just from the upper-class (Clatworthy, 1981; Henricks, 1984). Some literature about the combined driving community implies that social class is not a requisite for driving carriages (Beem, 1982; Gladstone, 1987; Trainer, 1978). To determine the parameters of social class for combined driving, the participants' social class level was measured.

Statement of Problem

The first problem of this study was to determine the social class distribution of the drivers in combined driving by using Hollingshead's (1957) Two Factor Index of Social Position (see Appendix K). The descriptive analysis of these five social functions

of combined driving--(a) Affiliation, (b) Separation, (c) Socialization Through Sport, (d) Socialization Into Sport, and (e) Status and Prestige, adapted from Steele and Zurcher (1979)--served as a second problem.

Objectives of the Study

The first objective was to conduct a social class assessment of combined driving from the data collected from the Index of Social Position. Carriage enthusiasts claim that the millionaire image of the sport is misleading and not true. "The important thing to remember is that anyone can turn out nicely, get involved, and have fun for very little money," states a member of the driving community (Trainer, 1978, p. 62). The combined driving literature (Beem, 1982; Galbraith & Darnly-Smith, 1987; Gladstone, 1987; Trainer, 1978) suggest that (a) the opportunity to compete in combined driving is based on desire and ability, and not necessarily on money or on social class status, and (b) the drivers do cross several social classes. Thus, by establishing the social class distribution of combined drivers, the claims and testimonies of the representatives of the carriage community were tested. A social class distribution of drivers that included members of the middle-class could challenge the sporting stereotype that equestrian sport participation is an exclusive privilege for the upper-class.

The second objective was to determine if the social classes compete against each other in combined driving. The sport sociology texts which discuss sporting participation among the social classes

suggest that the upper-, middle-, and lower-classes typically prefer different sports (Curry & Jobu, 1984; Eitzen & Sage, 1982; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1983). Although some sports are shared among the social classes, Eitzen and Sage claim that social barriers commonly segregate these classes. For example, with a sport such as tennis, the upper-classes seclude themselves in country clubs, while the middle- and lower-classes use public facilities. A social class distribution of combined drivers that includes members of the middle- and upper-classes would not imply that they compete against each other; examining the distribution of driver social class position of each combined driving event makes it possible to determine if drivers of different social class position compete against each other, or compete separately at different events. Satisfying this second objective would contribute to the existing literature related to sport participation and social class.

The third objective specifically reflects the second problem of this study: to assess the social function attitudes of combined drivers. This was accomplished by using the data collected from the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire and demographic variables. There have been numerous studies in the literature attempting to explain the meaning of sport to its participants. Some of these studies have approached this problem by concentrating on the concept of "sport" rather than focusing on a particular sporting form (Anderson & Stone, 1979; Kenyon, 1983; Spreitzer & Snyder, 1975; Stone, 1976). Other work has investigated the meaning of a

particular sport to its participants (Aversa, 1981; Clatworthy, 1981; Martin & Berry, 1974; Steele & Zurcher, 1979; Viken, Krotee, & Stone, 1979; Zurcher, 1970). According to Figler (1981), trying to construct a definition as to what Americans value in sport is a difficult undertaking because of the size and cultural diversity of this country. Because of this, the values and meanings of sport may change depending upon the sporting sub-culture one is studying (Snyder & Spreitzer, 1983). The results of this study allow other scholars of sport the chance to compare the similarities and differences between combined driving and other sporting sub-cultures that have been studied--studies such as Aversa's foxhunters, Clatworthy's saddle-horse showers, Martin and Berry's motocrossers, Steele and Zurcher's bowlers, Viken et al.'s drag racers, and Zurcher's poker players. A contribution towards the body of knowledge on the meaning of sporting sub-cultures to its participants was sought with this study on combined driving.

To conclude: After a thorough search for information on combined driving, the investigator believed that the sport of combined driving, in a sociological perspective, was not represented adequately in the sport sociology or physical education literature. The objectives outlined for this study were intended to examine combined driving from a sociological perspective, and expand the body of literature on the status of equestrian sport in American society.

Delimitations

The sample population of this study was delimited to the following specifications:

1. The drivers of the carriages, who were selected as the most active participants of this sport, were the subjects. The subjects were selected from event results recorded in American Driving Society (ADS) literature (Pringle, 1988a, 1988b, 1988c), and from combined driving event programs listed in the ADS calendar of events (ADS, 1988a, 1988b).

The owners of the horses and grooms were also considered active participants, but based on the information collected from the event programs, there was adequate reason to believe that the majority of drivers were also the owners. To explain further, in the few situations in which the drivers and owners were different people, the programs identified these owners and drivers separately. Owners who did not drive the carriages, and grooms were not included in this study.

2. The drivers participated in a combined driving event in the United States.

3. The drivers had addresses in the United States.

4. From the collection of names, 298 subjects qualified for this study. After 30 were selected at random as pilot study subjects, and 10 discarded because of missing information or duplication, an N of 258 remained. An estimated minimum return rate of one-third from the N would have resulted in 86 subjects. With an estimated

minimum return rate of 10% in the follow-up procedures, a minimum target sample of $n=103$ was anticipated.

A mailed survey was the method of obtaining data for this study. This survey was delimited to the following specifications:

1. The Two Factor Index of Social Position, developed by Hollingshead (1957), was included in the first part of the survey to determine the social class distribution of the drivers of combined driving.
2. The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire, constructed with the purpose of assessing the social function attitudes of combined drivers, was the second part of the survey (see Appendix B).

Limitations

The results of this study may have been limited by these factors:

1. The subjects of this study were the drivers of the carriages who reside in the United States and who have competed in a combined driving event in the United States. These qualifications may have omitted some active members of the combined driving community.
2. From the procedures to obtain driver names and addresses (outlined in Chapter 3 under the heading Selection of Subjects), some of the qualified subjects' addresses could not be found, and therefore, could not be included in the sample population.
3. The results of this study were dependent upon the ability of the subjects to interpret the instructions and questions of the

demographic questionnaire and the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire.

4. This study relied on the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire to assess the social function attitudes of the drivers towards combined driving. This precision was dependent on the estimated validity and reliability of the questionnaire using statistical procedures. The questionnaire's validity was sought first, by sport sociology experts who were asked to classify statements into one of five social functions, second, by factor analysis, and third, by an estimation of reliability. Reliability was estimated by the intraclass R coefficient.

The Hollingshead Index of Social Position had several limitations.

1. The index was designed to study the general population: It was not known whether the subjects of this study represented the general population.
2. The research that was the basis for the index was developed in the 1940s: It was not known whether the index was a valid instrument to measure social class for the 1980s.
3. The index, especially in the upper-upper class range, did not consider other elements which would help distinguish degrees of social class status, for example, income and family lineage. The subjects who composed one social class level based on their index scores, were considered equal in social class status (Hollingshead, 1957).

4. Many of the occupations that were recorded by the subjects were not listed in Hollingshead's index. The occupational level of these unclassified occupations had to be estimated by logical comparison with occupations that were already listed in the scale (see Appendices O and P).

Assumptions

This study was conducted under the assumption of the following points:

1. Combined driving was categorized as a leisure activity and therefore Steele and Zurcher's (1979) social functions were appropriate for this study.
2. Each of the social functions could be defined and measured as separate attitudes.
3. Most drivers owned the horses that were used in competition, and therefore, these drivers were the most active participants of combined driving.
4. The participants of a sport characterize the sport as either an upper-, middle-, or lower-class activity.
5. The conclusions, which were based on this study's sample, were applicable to the total population of combined drivers in the United States.
6. The responses by the subjects to the questions constructed for this study were actual representations of the subjects' attitudes.

The Hollingshead Index of Social Position was used under the following assumptions (Hollingshead, 1957):

1. A social class hierarchy exists in the United States.
2. Education and occupation are the symbolic characteristics of status that can estimate social class levels.
3. Education and occupation could be scaled with a statistical formula, and the social class levels of the subjects in question could be determined, quickly, reliably, and meaningfully.

The investigator's Hollingshead Index of Social Position data were analyzed under the assumption that there were meaningful differences in social behavior between the members of each social class level.

Definitions

Combined Driving

American Driving Society

The American Driving Society (ADS) is a not-for-profit organization which helps promote, support, and organize driving competitions in the United States.

Combined Driving

Combined driving is one event out of several competitive carriage driving events that are sponsored by the ADS. Combined driving is the event of competitive carriage driving that has three competitions (competition A has two sections).

Competition A, section I-presentation. Presentation is the competition in which competitors, while stationary, are judged on

the overall appearance of horses, carriage, grooms, and driver. A second purpose is to check the safety of the carriage before it enters the other competitions (Gladstone, 1987).

Competition A. section II-dressage. The dressage is a test of control and accuracy of movements. The horses are driven through a predetermined pattern, and this test is held in an flat, rectangular arena. The driver is judged on the style and general command of the team (ADS, 1987, part IX).

Competition B-marathon. The marathon is the cross-country competition. The marathon typically features five sections, and each section is driven at different speeds. The final section features hazards that must be negotiated successfully (Gladstone, 1987).

Competition C-obstacle driving. Obstacle driving is this last phase of a combined driving event. The horses and carriages are driven through a series of obstacles precisely with speed. The purpose "is to test the fitness, obedience, suppleness and condition of the horses after the Marathon and the skill and competence of the competitor" (ADS, 1987, part IX, p. 29).

Driver

The person on the carriage controlling the reins and whip and driving the team of horses is the driver (ADS, 1987). The driver may at times be referred to as the competitor or participant.

Driving Class

The number of horses used in an event by a competitor is the driving class.

Four-in-hand. A team of four-in-hand is the driving of four horses. The vehicles must have four wheels and a brake. Two grooms are required (ADS, 1987).

Pair. A pair is the driving of two horses. The vehicle must have four wheels and a brake. At least one groom is required (ADS, 1987).

Single. A single is the driving of one horse. The vehicle may be two- or four-wheeled and a brake is recommended for the Marathon; grooms are optional (ADS, 1987).

Groom

The groom is the person responsible for, among other things, the care and feeding of the horses, the care of the carriage and harness, and the navigation during the marathon.

Levels of Difficulty

Each level of difficulty is composed of drivers who possess comparable experience and ability. A driver will compete against other drivers of comparable level of difficulty and driving class. For example, an intermediate single driver competes against other intermediate single drivers; an advanced pair driver competes against other advanced pair drivers.

Advanced level. The advanced level is "recommended for competitors who have completed at least four recognized Preliminary or Intermediate c. d. [combined driving] competitions.

The Advanced Level is the highest national level, offering tests of significant difficulty as a preparation for international competition" (ADS, 1987, part IX, p. 59).

Intermediate level. The intermediate level is "recommended for competitors who have completed at least three recognized c. d. events. . . .The Intermediate Level is more technically difficult than the Preliminary, requiring the horse to have more speed, boldness, obedience, and conditioning" (ADS, 1987, part IX, p. 59).

Preliminary level. The preliminary level is "recommended for drivers with some prior competition experience. . . .The Preliminary Level is a moderate examination of horse and driver in a regular training program. The tests should encourage development of the basic gaits, obedience, suppleness, and balance" (ADS, 1987, part IX, p. 58).

Training level. "The Training level is an introduction to the sport for horse and driver. The tests will acquaint competitors with the basic gaits, figures, and obstacles that are the foundation of all Combined Driving Events. The entire experience should be pleasant and encouraging to build confidence in horse and driver" (ADS, 1987, part IX, p. 58).

Social Class

Education

Hollingshead (1957) classifies education as "the amount of formal schooling" one receives (Hollingshead, 1957, pp. 2-3). At the high school level, this would include prep schools, public high

schools, trade schools, and parochial schools. Hollingshead's educational scale is based on the assumption that the college student will receive a recognized degree (B.S., M.S., Ph.D. for example).

Head of Household

The head of household is the one household member who possesses the highest Hollingshead Index of Social Position score.

Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position

The Hollingshead index is the measurement tool that uses occupation and education to determine a social position score which classifies a person into a social class level (see Appendix K).

Occupation

Occupation is a person's business, profession, trade, or calling; "one's habitual employment" (American College Dictionary, 1959, p. 838).

Social Class

Social class is "the identification of persons with other persons who share similar cultural values, attitudes, beliefs, and customs" (Hollingshead, 1958, p. 68).

Social Class Level

A social class level is one of the five social class levels defined by Hollingshead (1949).

Class 1, or upper-upper class. This class is made up of "old families" where "wealth and lineage are combined through the economic, legal and family systems in such a manner that

membership in Class 1 is more or less stabilized from one generation to another" (Hollingshead, 1949, p. 84).

Class 2, or upper-middle class. These people identify highly with Class 1 individuals but lack the family lineage. Class 2 members, especially the men, are usually professionals; and aggressive, respectable members of the business, civic, and political processes (Hollingshead, 1949).

Class 3, or lower-middle class. This class consists of white collar workers, or families, many of whom own "small businesses or farms, or are independent professionals" (Hollingshead, 1949, p. 96). Class 3 people earn good money, enough to afford basic living comforts.

Class 4, or upper-lower class. The people who compose Class 4 are, as Hollingshead states, "poor but honest, hard workers, who pay their taxes, raise their children properly, but never seem to get ahead financially" (Hollingshead, 1949, p. 103). Their income provides the essentials, but few of the luxuries in life.

Class 5, or lower-lower class. Class 5 persons are seen as down and out by other members of the community. They want all the things others have, but have little chance of getting them or gaining social mobility (Hollingshead, 1949).

Social Position Score

The score from which a person is classified into a social class level. The range of the social position scores is from a high of 11 to a low of 77 (see Appendix K).

Social Functions

Attitude

Attitude "is held to be a latent or nonobservable, complex, but relatively stable behavioral disposition reflecting both direction and intensity of feeling toward a particular object, whether it be concrete or abstract" (Kenyon, 1968, p. 567).

Social Function

Each social function reflects a separate attitude towards an activity or relationship of the individual with other people.

Affiliation. Affiliation is the act of associating with people or organizations (American College Dictionary, 1959).

Separation. Separation is the act of temporary disengagement from dominant roles and fulfillment of needs not satisfied by these dominant roles (Steele & Zurcher, 1979).

Socialization through sport. Socialization through sport is the process in which an individual participates in sport to prepare "for the requirements of. . .society" (McPherson, 1981, p. 246).

Socialization into sport. The socialization into sport is the process in which an individual learns the physical, psychological, and social skills necessary to be an athlete. This process is greatly influenced by the institutions of family and school (Snyder & Spreitzer, 1983).

Status and prestige. Status and prestige is the want of an increase in relative social class position and personal distinction in

the minds of others. A person may seek to impress others as a result of participating in sport (Steele & Zurcher, 1979).

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Combined Driving

Introduction

Within this century, the decline in use of the carriage and horse in agriculture, industry, and pleasure, was a logical result of the technical advances made in transportation methods. Several factors initiated a revival period in carriage driving in the 1970s: First, the efforts and activities of the British Driving Society, founded in 1959, paid off; the equestrian world started to pay attention to the pleasures of driving carriages. Second, the popularity in driving was fueled by nostalgia. "It was the same feeling which revived interest in . . . sidesaddle riding, and other bygone equestrian pursuits" (Grimshaw, 1982, p. 344). Next, the endorsement, organization efforts, and participation of the International Equestrian Federation (FEI) President Prince Philip, the Duke of Edinburgh, gave the sport the great publicity it lacked and needed. According to Grimshaw (1982), public interest is always elevated when royalty is involved.

Prince Philip, the FEI, and the Birth of a Sport

Philip (1982) wrote a book on combined driving to share some of his experience in the sport. Although the book focused on the intricacies of driving, his introduction offered a first-hand account of how driving carriages went from a modest leisure pleasure to an international competition.

Prince Philip was elected the president of the FEI in 1964. When it was first suggested to him that driving carriages could

make an interesting and challenging sporting form, he was unsure. But when Philip began investigating the possibility of driving carriages for sport, he became surprised at what he found. During his investigation in Europe, he discovered four-in-hand dressages and cross-country type events. At the Aachen Horse Show in Germany, he saw at least 24 four-in-hand teams and was impressed (Philip, 1982).

Philip's next step was to organize a committee to produce international rules. When the committee finished, they presented him with an outline for a three-day event. Philip then managed to push through an international four-in-hand competition at the Windsor Horse Show in 1971. At the same time, the Hungarians organized the first European Championships. Since then, the Windsor Show has continued annually, while the European and World Championships have occurred in alternate years.

In Millbrook, NY, the first major U.S. combined driving event using the FEI event format took place in 1974 (Kellogg, 1978). Every year since then, there have been numerous events in this country using an ADS event format adapted from the FEI. The FEI, at the international level, helps support and sponsor driving events. The United States Equestrian Team (USET) and ADS serve the same purpose in the United States.

Combined Driving Events

Combined driving is a sport in which a driver takes a team of one, two, or four horses through tests of esthetics, agility, style of

movement, endurance, and speed. The winner of an event is the one who accumulates the best overall score from these tests or "competitions." A combined driving event consists of three competitions:

competition A, section I-presentation

competition A, section II-dressage

competition B-marathon

competition C-obstacle driving

The relative value of each phase is 0.5 for the presentation, 3 for the dressage, 10 for the marathon, and 1 for the obstacle driving test (Philip, 1982). The driving classes are four-in-hand, pair, and single. The levels of difficulty are advanced, intermediate, preliminary, and training.

Competition A, section I, is the presentation. The purpose of the presentation, as specified in the American Driving Society Handbook (ADS, 1987), is "to judge the appearance of the driver and grooms and the cleanliness, fitness, matching and condition of the horse, harness and vehicle" (ADS, 1987, part IX, p. 18).

Both Philip (1982) and the Gladstone Equestrian Association (1987) claim that this part of the competition is to preserve the art of driving. The presentation, necessitating meticulous detail, is a method of maintaining the high standards of carriage and horse upkeep. This phase also allows the judges to check for problems before the horses and carriages are sent through the remaining competitions of the event (Dossenbach & Dossenbach, 1983). An

overall score is awarded to each contestant, ranging from 1 (very bad), to 10 (excellent).

Competition A, section II is the dressage. "The object. . .is to judge the freedom, regularity of paces, harmony, impulsion, suppleness, lightness, ease of movement and correct positioning of the horses on the move" (ADS, 1987, part IX, p. 18).

How well a team does in the dressage depends on the driving skill of the driver, the performance of the horses, and the communication between the two. The dressage competition is held in a flat, rectangular arena, and the object is to drive predetermined patterns accurately while the horses move at the correct paces. The pattern of execution depends on the level of difficulty (ADS, 1987).

Competition B is the marathon. "The object is to test the standard of fitness and stamina of the horses and the judgment of pace and horsemanship of the competitor" (ADS, 1987, part IX, p. 22). The marathon is not a race. Teams are staggered at the starting line. The 1987 Gladstone Driving Event's marathon was 24 kilometers and featured eight hazards. A hazard is usually man-made, but to make things interesting, is constructed around the course terrain so as to include trees and water. Typically, the marathon is driven cross-country, in five sections of various length, and at different paces.

The marathon is the competition that offers the true excitement of the sport for the competitor and fan. Chelberg (1985) offers one description of a marathon: "The hill attracted the sensation-seeking

crowd. . . .The legendary Gyorgy Bardos drove the hazards so quickly that his referee 'had difficulty seeing the gates'. . . .Incredibly, his teammate Juhasz also flew around the course, to thunderous applause" (Chelberg, 1985, pp. 288-289).

Competition C is the obstacle driving test. "The object. . .is to test the fitness, obedience, suppleness and condition of the horses after the Marathon and the skill and competence of the competitor" (ADS, 1987, part IX, p. 29).

For the competitor, the point of the obstacle driving test is to drive a course precisely with speed. The course is a series of gates, and each gate is made of two orange traffic cones with balls on top. The object is to go between the cones without knocking over any ball.

The purpose of the obstacle test is to test the nerve and recovery of the horses and driver after the grueling marathon. Because it is the last phase, it is often instrumental in determining over-all event winners (Gladstone, 1987).

Social Class Considerations of Sport

Introduction

The purpose of this section of the review of literature is to establish the relationship between social class and sport. The first section, Participation, examines the sporting preferences among the social classes and how that phenomenon is represented in sport sociology literature.

Because combined driving is an equestrian sport, it would be defined as an upper-class activity (Curry & Jiobu, 1984). Since there have been examples of social class discrimination in the sporting world with sports that are traditionally considered upper-class activities (Baker, 1982; Gruneau, 1975), the question of whether the combined driving community in the United States openly encourages or discourages lower-class participation is addressed in the second section Combined Driving and Social Class.

Participation

Curry and Jiobu (1984) discussed the relationship between social class and sport, and different sports were clearly defined along class lines. For example, polo and equestrian sports were defined as upper-class sports, golf was upper-middle class, and baseball was middle-working class. Snyder and Spreitzer (1983) discussed in similar terms the relationship between social class and sport. They concluded that: "The type of sport involvement is class linked" (Snyder & Spreitzer, 1983, p. 153). Eitzen and Sage (1982) also examined the relationship between social class and sport and they stated: "Research has shown that the preference for types of sport vary consistently according to socioeconomic status" (Eitzen & Sage, 1982, p. 266).

The intent was not to contest these conclusions, but as observed by Eitzen and Sage (1982), some sports, like tennis and golf, have been played by all social classes. They discussed the participatory level barriers of these common sports among the social classes--

private tennis club participation for the wealthy and public court participation for the lower-classes. From this reading, it was unknown whether the social classes mix with each other in sporting participation.

Under the accepted hypothesis that some sports have been played by numerous social classes, a problem of definition arises: How was a sport defined as either an upper-, middle-, or lower-class activity? Eitzen and Sage (1982), Snyder and Spreitzer (1983), and Curry and Jiobu (1984) seemed to have focused on the sporting preferences of each social class. Eitzen and Sage used terms such as "attracted to" to explain the upper-class preference for country club sports, and "tend to" to explain the lower-class preference for team sports. However, this did not necessarily answer the question of who actually participates in any given sport.

Polo is defined as an upper-class sport (Curry & Jiobu, 1984). Therefore: (a) Is polo an upper-class sport because members of the upper-class prefer polo over other sports? or: (b) Is polo an upper-class sport because all of those who participate are members of the upper-class? With the first question, the answer in all likelihood would be yes. If this was a study to determine the sporting preferences of the social classes, it is likely that the upper-classes would prefer combined driving to wrestling or roller derby.

With the second question--"is polo defined as an upper-class sport because all of those who participate are upper-class"--the question really should be: Which social classes are actually playing

this sport? Although it is acknowledged that historical considerations, spectator interest, and social class standards contribute to a sport's social class definition, it is assumed that to test combined driving's image as a millionaire's sport, the social class status of a sport is determined mainly by the social class status of the participants.

In the section Combined Driving and Social Class in this review of literature, there is some evidence to suggest that American Driving Society combined driving events have an open participation policy based on the desire to drive and not on social class position.

Combined Driving and Social Class

The purpose of this section of the review of literature is to discuss the social class considerations of combined driving and to put this sport into a discriminatory perspective. Before doing so, two studies are reviewed.

Clatworthy (1981) revealed that the social class characteristics of the participants in saddle-horse showing were diverse and "blurred" (Clatworthy, 1981, p. 138). She surveyed exhibitors and spectators at various horse shows in the Kentucky-Ohio-Pennsylvania area. Clatworthy found that the occupations of these horse people were varied: there were farmers, housewives, secretaries, lawyers, and insurance agents.

There were professional and amateur saddle-horse shows of various levels of competition according to Clatworthy's (1981) background information on this sport. She did not indicate which

social class was represented in each level, but she indicated various degrees of participant commitment, which may have created at the club level, as Eitzen and Sage (1982) have suggested, socio-economic barriers. For example, a competitor of modest social class may have found interest in this sport through a 4-H club, while a more wealthy individual may have become interested through a private stable. Clatworthy reported that of the 102 respondents, 33% made more than \$200,001 a year in income, 7% made between \$50,001 and 200,000 a year, 33% made between \$25,001 and 50,000 a year, and 26% made less than \$25,000 a year. With this finding, Clatworthy implied that despite the different social class origins of the competitors, they did compete against each other. Clatworthy stated that there were many wealthy people in this sport; they had finer horses, were more involved on a professional level, and attended more events. Despite this, she concluded that: "The social-class picture is no longer clearcut in the saddle-horse sport. Ability and interest are more important factors, and social class is less considered" (Clatworthy, 1981, p. 138).

Based on the amount of information Clatworthy (1981) presented, her methodology must be viewed cautiously. First, the selection of her subjects lacked control. She administered questionnaires to both exhibitors and spectators, presumably not at random. This being the case, her information on the distribution of income and occupation as an indication of the blurring of the social classes, from an objective standpoint, must be questioned. There

was, however, a strength to her study. Although Clatworthy did not indicate her involvement in the sport, she did interview 54 of the respondents and seemed to spend quite a bit of time travelling from show to show. Thus, her conclusion that the social classes were somewhat blurred in saddle-horse showing was credible in the sense that she demonstrated an effort to understand the nature of this sport's competitors.

In the conclusions of the second study, a study on drag-racers, Viken et al. (1979) hypothesized that the "increasing massness" of our society has eroded class distinctions in sport. Massness, as defined by them, is the increase in size and density of our population. This trend, along with others such as a rise in communication services, leisure time, and consumption, have resulted in people forming sub-cultures around interests such as sport. Viken et al. concluded that modern day sport may reduce the importance of social class position as an element of participatory acceptance.

The status of one's occupation outside of drag racing is rendered unimportant or irrelevant as are his class related manner of language, dress, education, group affiliation and consumption patterns to a degree that these entities are non-functional to participation in the sport (Viken et al., 1979, p. 139).

The sport of drag racing homogenized the lives of the drivers who adhered to a particular lifestyle, a lifestyle in which interest and ability in the sport were important, not social class. The authors suggested that other sports be examined to determine if this

trend of social class erosion was particular to drag racing, or if it is a general pattern in our sporting culture.

With elegant and expensive horses, detailed carriages, and participants in traditional and formal dress, the sport of combined driving at first glance would seem to be a strictly upper-class, elitist sport. The handful of articles in the popular literature reflected that image. Americana titled an article on driving "Carriage Driving: Out of a Statelier Past (Trainer, 1978); Yankee called carriage driving the "Sport of Princes" (Beem, 1982); and Town and Country titled its article "The Driving Elite" (Chelberg, 1985).

Despite this stately image, was a person of modest social class position able to compete in combined driving events? "Contestants stress that the millionaire image of the sport is misleading. 'A well-trained \$500 horse can compete against a \$15,000 Morgan'" (Beem, 1982, p. 125). Many of the events were open to anyone who has a horse and carriage and cares to participate (Trainer, 1978).

On the Scottish-produced television series Horses (Galbraith & Darnley-Smith, 1987), two people downplayed the millionaire image. Sallie Walrond, an international driving judge said: "The nice thing about driving is that anybody who's got a pony in a field can get it broken to harness and get a little vehicle and a set of harness" (videotape--no page reference). The Duchess of Roxburghe said: "I think it's catching on because. . .it's becoming more available to

people now--it's not so expensive, and people don't think it's a kind of 'smart' sport" (videotape--no page reference).

An active member of the carriage community, said that the opportunities are there for people to compete: Driving horses is not just an expensive sport for the wealthy. This member stated:

Many people participate with a pony and carriage. Their whole rig costs less than a thousand dollars. You get a small carriage and restore it yourself. You get an ordinary harness, a good little horse for two hundred dollars, and you're in. The important thing to remember is that anyone can turn out nicely, get involved, and have fun for very little money (Trainer, 1978, p. 62).

Bourdieu (1978) discusses three elements--spare time, economic capital, and cultural capital--to explain sporting preferences among the social classes. A brief examination of these elements shows, at least logically, that someone of modest socio-economic stature is in a position to compete in combined driving.

With respect to spare time, this is no longer a privilege in this country, it is something that people just have. Spare time, state Curry and Jiobu (1984), is bought by the "very rich," is a condition of the "very poor" (for lack of work), and fits into the "tight time schedule" of "other people" (Curry & Jiobu, 1984, p. 68).

With respect to economic capital, it is impossible to determine which social class, as reported (Trainer, 1978), is in fact spending less than a thousand dollars on their horse and carriage. But if money is any determinant of participation in combined driving, this amount should not be a factor. (It is recognized, though, that

clothing, travel, stable, feed, and veterinary expenses would add to this cost. It is also acknowledged that some people spend a considerable amount of money on the sport.) In contrast, Martin and Berry (1974) claim that the investment in a racing bike and equipment for a Motocrossing Racing Club member, who are "without exception working class [italics in original]. . .generally range from \$600 to over \$1600" (Martin & Berry, 1974, p. 110).

And finally, with respect to cultural capital, the use of a horse and carriage has always been in the rural lifestyle of every social class whether for pleasure by the upper-class, or for commercial use by the lower and middle-classes (Grimshaw, 1982). It can be concluded that the knowledge and ownership of horses as cultural capital, cannot necessarily be related to social class. Once again, according to Bourdieu's (1978) three elements of sporting preferences, it would seem that a person of modest social class position, who desires so, could participate in combined driving.

There was information in a combined driving program to suggest that the competitors do come from a variety of backgrounds, much like that of Clatworthy's (1981) study, and that they were not all in Hollingshead's upper-upper Class 1. In New Jersey at the 1987 Gladstone Driving Event, the competitor occupations listed in the program included a firefighter, a stockbroker, a dentist, a wife of a dairy farmer, and professional horse trainers (Gladstone, 1987).

The Hollingshead Index of Social Position

The Two Factor Index of Social Position, developed by Hollingshead (1957), is a widely used and simple measurement tool for determining social class position. By obtaining information on occupation and education, the index allows the investigator to classify people into one of five social class levels. Hollingshead (1957) claims that "this procedure assumes there are meaningful differences between the score groups. . . .The assumption of a meaningful correspondence between an estimated class position of individuals and their social behavior has been validated" (pp. 10-11). Since the index does not involve many questions, it is included in the demographic section of the survey (questions 3 through 7).

Whether occupation is a valid measurement of social class position is addressed by Warner, Meeker, and Eells (1960) in their study of social class in America. They find a very strong relationship between a person's occupation and how a person would be classified according to social class position. They conclude: "If social class were to be predicted on the basis of one status characteristic, the most accurate prediction would be obtained by basing it upon occupation" (Warner et al., 1960, p. 168).

According to Hollingshead (1957), persons of similar educational levels demonstrate similar attitudes and behavior, thus education can be a measure of social class.

To summarize social class and combined driving: The information obtained on combined driving suggests that people of

different social class participate in this sport. The first problem of this study was to determine the social class distribution of combined drivers. The application of Hollingshead's Index of Social Position to combined drivers was the primary method of accomplishing the first two objectives of this study.

Social Functions of Sport

Introduction

The second problem of this study was to examine the social functions of combined driving. In this section of the review of literature, the meaning of sport for its participants, in a social context, are described. In the study of sport, Loy, McPherson, and Kenyon (1978) defined one level of the functionalist perspective as "the social-psychological level, with an interest in the function of voluntary associations for the social participation and goal attainment of the individual" (Loy et al., 1978, p. 235). A questionnaire with Likert-type statements was constructed according to this perspective.

The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire, constructed to assess the social function attitudes of combined drivers, was sent to the drivers of combined driving. The social functions selected for this study were adapted from Steele and Zurcher (1979). They are Affiliation, Separation, Socialization Through Sport, Socialization Into Sport, and Status and Prestige.

Affiliation

Affiliation is valuable in sport, according to Steele and Zurcher (1979), for "providing the situation in which people can interact with others in a social, voluntary manner" (Steele & Zurcher, 1979, p. 276). These primary group relationships offer an individual the chance to develop a personality and identity (Neumeyer & Neumeyer, 1936).

In Steele and Zurcher's (1979) study of 190 bowlers, 86.8% acknowledged affiliation with other people as an important function of this leisure activity. Zurcher (1970) found that his poker environment offered the player a chance to maintain "a relevant group structure and interaction pattern" (Zurcher, 1970, p. 184). In Clatworthy's (1981) study of saddle-horse showing, 85% of the 102 respondents claimed that meeting people and making friends was a perceived reward.

In 1975, Anderson and Stone (1979) repeated a 1969 study to describe the changes over time in the meaning of sport to metropolitan Americans. The subjects of the 1975 study were asked to choose which of these reasons--health, comradeship, competition, or recreation--was the most important reason for participating in sport. Of the 304 subjects responding to the question, 15.1% chose comradeship. Although this may seem low statistically, the fact that comradeship was included as one of the four choices by Anderson and Stone helps validate this as a meaningful function of sport.

Kenyon (1983), in his model for characterizing physical activity, explained that meeting people and "perpetuating existing relationships" was the definition of physical activity as a social experience. This social experience was one of the six characteristics of Kenyon's socio-psychological model for physical activity (Kenyon).

Separation

Louis Zurcher has developed the concept of the "ephemeral role" in numerous works, including studies of poker players (Zurcher, 1970) and bowlers (Steele & Zurcher, 1979). Zurcher explained in his study of poker players that:

An ephemeral role is a temporary or ancillary position-related behavior pattern chosen [italics in original] by the enactor to satisfy social-psychological needs incompletely satisfied by the more dominant and lasting roles he regularly must enact in everyday life positions (Zurcher, 1970, p. 174).

It has been suggested by functional theorists that sport functions as a method of adaptation to our mechanized society (Coakley, 1982). Since there are so few ways for a person to express themselves physically within a working environment (which is often dependent on verbal expression, computers, and machinery), sport can offer its participants the opportunity to fulfill values, stay healthy, and enjoy life away from the workplace. Steele and Zurcher (1979) state that this ephemeral role serves two purposes: (a) to dissociate from dominant role obligations, and (b) to fulfill the needs not satisfied by dominant roles. There are two studies that support this hypothesis.

In his study of poker players, Zurcher (1970) reported that his poker environment "provides individuals with opportunities to demonstrate self-reliance, independence, and decision-making abilities which for some reason or other are unavailable to them in their major life roles" (Zurcher, 1970, p. 178). Separating from a dominant role to play poker, therefore, became a social function because the role of "poker player" was assumed by the participant.

Martin and Berry (1974), who studied the sub-culture of motocrossing, presented a convincing functionalist argument as to the purpose of biking in a post-industrial society. In short, motocrossing was a method in which working class males overcame the alienation of "corporatized, specialized, automated, assembly-line" (p. 114) work environments.

To the instrumental motocrosser, social interaction, as suggested by Martin and Berry (1974), was a necessary evil towards this biker's primary goal--competition. Whereas expressive riders relished the social ride and the sharing of information and stories, the instrumental rider preoccupied themselves with winning, avoiding the sharing insightful information with other riders. To the instrumental rider, the expression, or the acting out of values lacking in the work environment, values such as competition, testing of skills, success, and the expression of individualism, was the primary function of motocrossing.

Socialization Through Sport

In the literature on social sport analysis, it was agreed that sport, as well as the other institutions of family, school, and church, transmits and reinforces cultural values (Figler, 1981; Luschen, 1970; Neumeyer & Neumeyer, 1936; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1983; Sutton-Smith & Roberts, 1970). If sport provides desirable values, then participating in sport should prepare the person to adapt to the needs and uses of society.

McPherson (1981) summarized the socialization process by reviewing accepted theories. The social learning theory concerns learning through imitation, the role theory concerns the use of significant others as models of behavior, and the reference group theory, suggests people use family, peers, and other groups as a measure of their own behavior and attitudes. In each theory, the socialization process depends on the social interaction between an individual and others. "Since sport involves role playing," stated McPherson, "it is frequently considered to be a basic contributor to the socialization process" (McPherson, 1981, p. 263).

The literature offers various reasons why people believe that sport is a valuable socializing agent, but there is no consensus of terms among the profession. As Snyder and Spreitzer (1983) noted, the values that are intended as positive outcomes in sport participation may differ depending upon the group one is studying.

Snyder and Spreitzer (1983) delineated the typical functionalist orientation towards the perceived outcomes of sport participation.

Sport was believed to transmit social values, build good character, develop mental and physical fitness, facilitate social order, and encourage social mobility. Spreitzer and Snyder (1975) concluded in their study on the psycho-social functions of sport as perceived by the general population, that the attitudes expressed by their sample population seem to indicate that values such as social order, restraint, and discipline were beneficial outcomes of sporting participation in the United States.

Snyder (1972) found in his study of high school locker rooms that locker room slogans reflected certain sporting values. Values believed beneficial to the individual for participating in sport were physical fitness, mental fitness, knowledge of the game, stamina, aggressive spirit, competitive spirit, strict discipline, and subordination of self to the success of the team. He hypothesized that these locker room slogans reflected "the value orientations that are the primary objectives of the socialization process provided by sports" (Snyder, 1972, p. 90). Snyder continued by stating that these slogans were a form of social control, or socialization tools, in that they reminded the players that there was a strict code of behavior to follow if one wanted to succeed.

Fine (1979) found four values of similar sentiment emphasized in Little League. The first value defined by Fine was the importance of effort. Since the goal in sport is to win, doing your best and working hard mean success. The value of teamwork, learning how to win and lose, and sportsmanship were the three other values that

are stressed in Little League. With these values stressed and applied, the coach and the parents will believe that the children are being socialized by character building. As Fine noted, one purpose of Little League is to help children become decent citizens.

Socialization Into Sport

A child learns to be an athlete, or can become socialized into sport, by the encouragement and reinforcement of his or her behavior from significant others (Snyder & Spreitzer, 1983). Nixon (1981) defined significant others as (a) specific, such as parents and friends, and (b) generalized, "from societal values, attitudes, and norms" (Nixon, 1981, p. 85). These significant others commonly play an influential role in determining a person's involvement in sport.

As a child, the decision to choose and participate in sport will not always be in the hands of that child (McGuire & Cook, 1983). As McGuire and Cook noted, the family can be especially important in this respect. They stated, however, that there was often a "fine line" between encouragement and coercion: a child feeling pressure from parents and siblings to participate in sport will go through the motions rather than experience joy.

McPherson (1981) reported that the agents influencing an individual's involvement in sport change throughout a lifetime, and are often sport-specific. Additional variables that may have influenced the socializing process included the social class, gender, religion, race, or age of the athlete-to-be. In general, early in life

the family was the most likely agent to influence sport involvement, while later in school, coaches, physical educators, and friends will have assumed an important role of socializing an individual into sport.

How does this childhood process influence adult involvement in sport? Snyder and Spreitzer (1983) reported that a child encouraged into sport will carry that attitude into adulthood. Snyder and Spreitzer's linkage followed this pattern: parental interest in sport; parental encouragement for sport; offspring's participation in sport; offspring's perceived ability in sport; and then adult participation in sport.

In summary, the family is considered the most important socializing agent in sport involvement for the child. As an adolescent, other institutions such as peers, schools, or clubs become strong socializing agents. McPherson (1981) concludes that socializing process changes depending on many variables including age, gender, and the sport.

Status and Prestige

The classic work, The Theory of the Leisure Class, written in 1899 by Veblen (1953), is famous for its depiction of the leisure set in America in the late nineteenth century. His thesis was very clear: Veblen believed that the leisure class behavior was determined mainly by the desire to impress others (Riesman, 1953). The ways in which one impressed others consisted of "spending money, time

and effort quite uselessly in the pleasurable business of inflating the ego" (Chase, 1934, p. xiv).

Veblen (1953) argued that sport was an honorific expenditure of time because the practice of sport demonstrated several standards of higher living. Sport nicely supported two of his main concepts; conspicuous consumption (the waste of goods to demonstrate the possession of wealth), and conspicuous leisure (the waste of time to demonstrate the possession of wealth). According to Aversa (1981), an equestrian sport like modern foxhunting demonstrated both of these tendencies. First, because the use of horses, often expensive and well-bred for sport rather than for industrious and productive work, demonstrated a conspicuous display of wealth beyond the subsistence minimum, and second, the time involved in participating and training of horses showed a lack of need to work for a living. Both Lidz (1988) and Beem (1982) used the words social status and prestige in their descriptions of why people participate in combined driving.

Other authors, most notably Domhoff (1983), Fussell (1983), and Lapham (1988), explored the phenomenon of social class in America and they presented the union of the horse and the upper-class as inseparable. But the American upper-class does not have exclusive rights to the practice of conspicuous consumption. Mills (1953), an enthusiastic Veblen supporter and critic, believed that Veblen confused upper- and middle-class traits; conspicuous consumption was equally a characteristic of the nouveau-riche, not

just the upper-class. Fussell (1983) argued that the upper-middle class has "learned to ape" the upper-class' attraction to horses. Owning a horse does not imply gentility, so for those who lack "class" but have money, a horse and its trappings can suggest this privilege.

Veblen (1953) set the Leisure Class people up against the broad canvas of society. He hypothesized that the Leisure Class needed to publicly display their cultural superiority. But gaining status and prestige can also work on a smaller level, that is, a gain in status may never go beyond the gaming room. Steele and Zurcher (1979) in their study of 190 bowlers, found that only 2.6% responded favorably to inquiries concerning status and prestige. However, Steele (1971) concluded in his original unpublished master's thesis (preceding Steele and Zurcher's published report), that for "people who evaluate bowling favorably, superior performance on the lanes can result in concomitant rise in social position based on this performance" (Steele, 1971, p. 82).

Summary

This study is designed to test two hypotheses in the sport sociology literature. First, equestrian sports are defined as upper-class activities (Curry & Jobu, 1984). This study is unlikely to change that image, but a middle-class representation of combined drivers from the results of this investigation should help further the understanding of sporting participation among the social classes. Second, people of different social class, who participate in the same

sport, typically do so under different circumstances (Eitzen & Sage, 1982). Again, results of this investigation that yield a middle-class representation of drivers would help test this hypothesis. This study also tests the claim made by the carriage community that social class is not a requisite for participation.

The social function questionnaire constructed for this study is intended to give better understanding of how combined driving fits into the lives of its participants. The results of this study should help scholars of sport better understand the similarities and differences between combined driving and other sporting sub-cultures.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The first problem of this investigation was to determine the distribution of the social classes among the drivers in the sport of combined driving with the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position (see Appendix K). The second problem of this study was to assess the social function attitudes of combined drivers. Since a questionnaire measuring the social function attitudes of combined drivers did not exist, the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire (see Appendix B) was constructed specifically for this study by the investigator.

The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire was constructed as a series of Likert-type statements. Each statement reflected one of the five social functions of a leisure activity as delineated by Steele and Zurcher (1979). These social functions are: Affiliation; Separation; Socialization Through Sport; Socialization Into Sport; and Status and Prestige. Demographic information was also obtained (see Appendix A). This study was descriptive in nature, and the information was collected by mailed survey. A pilot study using 30 subjects was conducted prior to the primary study.

Measurement Tools

Hollingshead Index of Social Position

The Index of Social Position was constructed by Hollingshead (1957) to measure social class. The index divided into two scales. The first scale classified an occupation into one of seven positions,

1 was the highest level, and 7 was the lowest (see Appendix M). The second scale classified the educational level of a person into one of seven positions, 1 was the highest level, and 7 was the lowest (see Appendix L). The two numbers, the first from occupation, and the second from education, were then combined to reach a social position score. To determine the social position score, each number was multiplied by its factor weight and then the two scores were added. The factor weight for occupation was 7, and for education, 4. The continuum of social position scores range from a high of 11 to a low of 77.

If the occupation position of John or Joan Driver was 3, multiplied by its factor weight of 7, the occupation score was 21. If the education position was 3, multiplied by its factor weight of 4, the education score was 12. Added together, the occupation score (21) and education score (12) equal 33, or the social position score. The social position score of 33 determined which of Hollingshead's five social class levels (1-5) the subject represented. A 33 placed Mr. or Ms. Driver into Hollingshead's social class Level 3, or lower-middle class (Hollingshead, 1957) (see Appendix K). As suggested by Hollingshead, the data were calculated from the social position score continuum range (11-77), while to simplify the discussion of the more detailed results of Chapter 4, the social classes were grouped according to the social class level range (1-5). The Hollingshead index used head of household data to determine social position scores and social class levels.

The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire

To determine the attitudes of the drivers towards the social functions of combined driving, a questionnaire was constructed with a Likert-type format (see Appendix B). This format was chosen because it was relatively easy to construct, could measure many different attitudes, and could produce meaningful results (Nunnally, 1978).

Construction

Figler (1981) stated that values are the standards by which a person believes something is good or bad. Figler defined an attitude as "a predisposition to act, think, and feel in relation to a given value" (Figler, 1981, p. 49). Kenyon (1968) defined attitude as:

a latent or nonobservable, complex, but relatively stable behavioral disposition reflecting both direction and intensity of feeling toward a particular object, whether it be concrete or abstract (Kenyon, 1968, p. 567).

Kenyon (1968) explained that the measuring of attitudes could be accomplished through several steps. First, it was necessary to determine the "domain of the psychological object in question" (p. 567). In the case of this study, the domain was five social functions of participating in combined driving. This study used Steele and Zurcher's (1979) outline of the social functions of a leisure activity--Affiliation, Separation, Socialization Through Sport, Socialization Into Sport, and Status and Prestige. Second, each social function, or "universe of content" (p. 567), was defined. Third, it was necessary to construct "stimuli" to represent each

social function definition (p. 567). The stimuli were Likert-type statements. Statements were constructed for each of the five social functions. Several existing studies assessing sporting involvement attitudes were used as guidelines for construction of the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire (Kenyon, 1968; McCue, 1953; McPherson, 1968; Richardson, 1960; Wear, 1955; Williams & Jackson, 1981). Finally, the scale was applied to the subjects.

The Likert-type statements of the questionnaire were constructed in a strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree format.

Validity

Thomas and Nelson (1985) defined validity as "the degree to which the test, or instrument, measures what it is suppose to measure" (Thomas & Nelson, 1985, p. 253).

This study used an adaption of Steele and Zurcher's (1979) delineation of the social functions of a leisure activity. Did these five social functions--Affiliation, Separation, Socialization Through Sport, Socialization Into Sport, and Status and Prestige--define the social experience of sport? Construct validity would have been the preferred method of determining the questionnaire's validity, but this study was not designed to compare questionnaire responses to either observations of actual behavior, or to existing test standards. Since that was the case, another form of validation had to be employed.

To establish the content validity of the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire, three methods were used. First, 36 Likert-type statements were sent to experts in the field of sport sociology. They were asked to classify these statements into one of the five social functions. After this investigator's assessment of the expert statement-classification, 28 statements were kept and used for the pilot study (for details see the Pretesting Procedure section of this chapter). Factor analysis was the second step in establishing content validity. Factor analyses, on both the pilot study and primary study, were conducted using the SPSSX program. Five social functions were defined as the factors that constitute the social experience in sport. Factor analysis tested this claim statistically by clustering statements together. This computer analysis determined if more or fewer than five social functions, or factors, were being measured by the 28 questionnaire statements.

The third step in determining validity was to establish the reliability of the questionnaire. A questionnaire that is not reliable cannot be considered valid (Thomas & Nelson, 1985).

Reliability

A statistical method was selected that could determine the reliability of a test that would be only given once. The statistical method selected to determine the reliability of the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire was to estimate internal consistency using the intraclass R coefficient. This formula estimated reliability from an analysis of variance (ANOVA) table (SPSS Inc., 1986). The

investigator's SPSS^X command file was constructed to do a separate analysis of variance for each factor. The reliability coefficients, calculated from the resultant ANOVA table data, represented an estimate of the consistency of responses to similar statements within a factor.

A factor's reliability estimation which was .70 or above was considered acceptable (Safrit, 1986).

Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this study were the drivers of the carriages because they were assumed to be the most active participants of the sport. The drivers were considered qualified to be subjects of this study if:

1. They competed in an American Driving Society (ADS) combined driving event in the United States.

2. They had addresses in the United States.

The names of the subjects were obtained from two sources:

1. The combined driving event results that were posted in the official ADS publication entitled The Whip (Pringle, 1988a, 1988b, 1988c).

2. The combined driving event programs that were requested by the author and received by mail. These programs were obtained from event organizer addresses posted in the 1988 ADS calendar of events (ADS, 1988a, 1988b).

The addresses of the subjects were obtained from two sources:

1. Event programs that listed participant addresses.

2. The ADS membership roster that listed participant addresses. To obtain this roster, the author became a member of the ADS.

After the pilot study, the sample (N) for this study was 258.

Pretesting Procedures

Expert Statement-Classification

Eight experts, who were selected from the existing literature in sport sociology, were asked to classify 36 Likert-type statements constructed for this study into one of the five social functions that had been defined. Six of these evaluations were returned. Twenty-six of the 36 Likert-type statements were classified in agreement by the six experts and these statements were kept for further use. Because expert consensus only yielded three Affiliation statements, 2 of the 10 statements, which were not classified in agreement by all six experts (Q4 and Q10, both with a 66% expert agreement of Affiliation), were kept for further use. These 28 statements were believed to have content validity, and thus were used in the pilot study.

Pilot Study

A pilot study, using 30 subjects chosen at random, was conducted for this research project. The subjects of the pilot study were not included in the final study. The pilot study included a cover letter (see Appendix D), a consent form (see Appendix C), a first version of the demographic questionnaire that included the Index of Social Position (questions 3 through 7), a first version of

the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire, and a return self-addressed stamped envelope.

The purpose of the pilot study was: (a) to determine if the statements and instructions constructed for the mailed survey were appropriate, clearly worded, and understood by the subjects; (b) to determine if any Likert-type statements were answered in the same way by everyone (statements that lacked this discrimination were re-evaluated); (c) to analyze the data; and (d) to receive feedback from the subjects (Thomas & Nelson, 1985).

After the results of the pilot study factor analysis were compared with the expert statement-classification, some questionnaire statements were reworded in an attempt to cluster the five social functions' statements together for the primary study. In addition, there were changes made in the demographic questions (for detail see the Survey Adjustments Based on the Results of the Pilot Study section in Chapter 4).

After changes were made and double checked, all the survey components were copied from computer disc by laser printing, and duplicated in bulk by standard copy methods to become the primary survey.

Procedures for the Study

Mailing the Survey

The following was the schedule used for mailing the primary survey as suggested by Kirkendall, Gruber, and Johnson (1980):

1. The survey was mailed out in mid-February 1989 and its components were a cover letter (see Appendix D), a consent form (see Appendix C), a demographic questionnaire that included the Index of Social Position (questions 3 through 7) (see Appendix A), the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire (see Appendix B), and a return self-addressed stamped envelope.

2. The first reminder (see Appendix E) was sent out three weeks after the initial mailing, rather than two weeks as suggested by Kirkendall et al. (1980). By the two-week date, surveys were still arriving to the author by mail in considerable numbers; therefore, it seemed prudent to extend the second mailing date one week.

3. The follow-up procedure began five weeks after the initial mailing; a second survey was sent to those who had not yet responded. It included an updated version of the cover letter (see Appendix F).

4. The cut-off date for accepting surveys was seven weeks after the initial mailing.

Interpretation of Data

Once the surveys were returned, it was necessary to organize the data. The method of categorizing and analyzing data from the surveys was accomplished through the use of the computer program SPSS^X. This statistical tool was a simple way to expedite the process of organizing data, comparing groups, and reaching conclusions (Norusis, 1987). The investigator's SPSS^X command file was constructed to interpret a data file, representing all

demographic information and Social Function Attitude Questionnaire responses, and produce the descriptive statistics necessary to evaluate the objectives of this study.

To evaluate the first objective of this study--to do a social class assessment of combined driving--the frequencies, percentages, measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode), and measures of variability (standard deviation and range) of the subjects' social position scores were collected. These data are found in the Social Class section of Chapter 4.

To evaluate the second objective of this study--to determine if the social classes compete against each other--the range of social position scores of each events' competitors were calculated and reported (see Appendix Q). The computation of this frequency table was done by hand. Again, these data are presented in the Social Class section of Chapter 4.

To evaluate the third objective of this study--to assess the social function attitudes of combined drivers--a frequency table was constructed for the responses to each Social Function Attitude Questionnaire statement by using the SPSS^X program. This provided the response frequencies and percentages to each statement. The assessment of the social function attitudes of combined drivers, however, necessitated further analyses beyond simple frequency tables. Demographic variables 1 (gender) and 3 through 7 (social class level) were crosstabulated with each Social Function Attitude Questionnaire statement (except where noted). These data analyses

were the basis for the results and discussion of the social functions found in Chapter 4. Only relevant information, based on the investigator's judgment, was reported.

Special attention was given to the Socialization Into function which involved more complex analysis. The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire statements of Socialization Into were crosstabulated with gender, social class level, and demographic variables 8 through 11. Demographic questions 8 through 11 were constructed to reveal the ages at which the subjects started with horses and combined driving, and the important persons who introduced the subjects to horses and combined driving. These crosstabulation data are discussed in the Socialization Into section of Chapter 4. Again, only relevant material was reported.

The data collected to evaluate each of the three objectives of this study were organized using the SPSS^X data analysis program. Social position scores were necessary for the assessment of the first two objectives, while the social function assessment--the third objective of this study--relied on the crosstabulation of the social function variables with gender and social class level variables for further analysis. Demographic questions 8 through 11 were used extensively to evaluate the Socialization Into social function.

Summary

The Hollingshead Index of Social Position was the tool used to determine the social class distribution of combined drivers. The

results of the social position scores determined the social class levels of the drivers, and whether these different social class levels competed against one another. The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire was the tool used to assess the attitudes of the combined drivers towards the social functions of combined driving. The data for this study were obtained by a mailed survey, and the results were organized and analyzed with the computer program SPSSX.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents results and discussion of the problems and objectives outlined in Chapter 1. In brief, this study was constructed as a social class and social function assessment of the equestrian sport of combined driving. All the information needed to meet the objectives of this study, following the methodology described in Chapter 3, was obtained from a series of demographic questions (see Appendix A), which included the Hollingshead Index of Social Position questions, and a Social Function Attitude Questionnaire (see Appendix B). The program SPSS^X was used to analyze the data.

Pilot Study

The results of the pilot study are presented and discussed briefly. The purposes of the pilot study were to analyze the data and make appropriate adjustments before the primary study was conducted.

The Hollingshead Index of Social Position Data

A subject classified according to the Hollingshead Index of Social Position has a high score potential of 11, representing the upper-upper class, and a low score potential of 77, representing the lower-lower class. The social position pilot study scores ($n=15$) ranged from a high score of 11 (upper-upper class) to a low score of 51 (upper-lower class). The social position mean score of 25, and median score of 26, arranged themselves in the social class Level 2,

or the upper-middle class. The social position mode score was 11, or the highest level possible on the index.

The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire Data

To simplify the discussion, the pilot study data are examined with respect to the five social functions. In general, the pilot study subjects provided a range of answers to the questionnaire statements. The responses to the Affiliation statements--Q2, Q4, Q5, Q10, and Q27 (with means of 1.67, 2.40, 1.93, 2.00, and 1.93 respectively)--were closest to the agree level of the Likert scale. The estimation of reliability for this group of statements was .64. The responses to the Separation statements--Q1, Q7, Q11, Q12, and Q28 (with means of 1.33, 2.80, 3.00, 2.60, and 3.20 respectively)--ranged from the strongly agree to the undecided level. The estimation of reliability for this group of statements was .25. A similar range of responses occurred with the Socialization Through statements. The means to Q3, Q14, Q15, Q19, Q22, and Q23 were 2.07, 2.07, 1.67, 2.40, 2.80, and 3.13 respectively. The estimation of reliability for this group of statements was .63. The responses to the Socialization Into statements--Q6, Q13, Q16, Q17, Q21, Q24, and Q25--had means that ranged from 3.07 (closest to the undecided response) to 4.33 (closest to the disagree response). The estimation of reliability for this group of statements was .70. The responses to the Status and Prestige statements--Q8, Q9, Q18, Q20, and Q26 (with means of 3.07, 3.40, 3.33, 3.73, and 2.67 respectively)--were

in the undecided and disagree range of the Likert scale. The estimation for this group of questions was .70.

Using the questionnaire responses of the 15 usable pilot study surveys, a factor analysis conducted with the SPSS^x program produced eight factors. In general, the factor analysis clustering of the 28 questionnaire statements was inconsistent with the five social functions defined for this study (see Appendix R).

Survey Adjustments Based on the Results of the Pilot Study

Based on the results of the pilot study factor analysis and estimations of reliability, 9 of the 28 Social Function Attitude Questionnaire statements were slightly changed. The statements with unexpected results--Q10 (Affiliation); Q1, Q7, Q11, Q12 (Separation); and Q3, Q14, Q19, Q23 (Socialization Through)--were reworded. The intent of this procedure was to develop a primary study questionnaire, from which a factor analysis would produce only five factors, each factor a cluster of statements reflecting one social function.

Additions and deletions were made in the demographic part of the survey before the primary study was conducted. The question "Who was the most important person to introduce you to the world of horses?" was added to the primary study so the results could be compared to a parallel question for combined driving. Its pilot study omission was concluded to be an oversight.

The demographic questions concerning how many hours a subject volunteered in the combined driving community, and how many

miscellaneous hours the subjects spent on the sport, were deleted as a result of the response rate; many left the spaces blank, or recorded a low answer such as one hour. The question "How much money, in salary, prize money, grants, and/or sponsorships, do you receive per year for competing in combined driving?" was deleted because 15 of the 15 pilot subjects recorded a zero. The questions "Do you breed and sell carriage horses?" and "Do you rely on combined driving as a source of income?" were deleted because it was believed that this information would be revealed in Hollingshead's occupation questions.

Primary Study

Return Rate

The number of subjects considered qualified for this study was 298. Ten subjects were discarded before the survey was mailed because of duplications and/or missing street addresses, and 30 subjects were used as pilot subjects. This left 258 subjects who were sent surveys. Table 1 presents the return rate.

Table 1

Return Rate

Condition	Rate
Surveys mailed:	258
Surveys "returned to sender":	6
Unusable surveys:	11
Surveys returned after deadline:	5
Usable surveys:	154
Return rate (total--170/258):	66%
Return rate (usable surveys--154/258):	60%

Social Function Attitude Questionnaire Statistical Analysis

Factor Analysis

The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire was constructed under the assumption that the social functions of sport could be defined and measured as separate attitudes. The questionnaire's statements were classified logically by sport sociology experts around these five social functions, or factor areas: Affiliation,

Separation, Socialization Through Sport, Socialization Into Sport, and Status and Prestige.

Using the questionnaire responses of the 154 usable surveys, a factor analysis conducted with the SPSS^X program produced 10 factors (see Appendix G). The factor analysis clustered statements around each of the five social functions defined for this study (Factors 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7), and produced five additional factors (Factors 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10) (see Appendix H).

Upon examination of these five additional factors, it was found that the statements of Factor 6 (Q1 and Q3) and Factor 10 (Q4 and Q6) suffered from inconsistent association and thus were considered of questionable value. They were left out of the social function analysis. Three of the factors--Factors 4, 8, and 9--were logically considered a slight variation of the main factors anticipated. For example, statements Q13, Q16, Q17, Q21, Q24, and Q25 were all anticipated to represent the Socialization Into function, yet the factor analysis separated them into one factor comprised of statements Q16, Q17, Q24 and Q25, which represent questions related to the family (Factor 3), and one factor comprised of statements Q13 and Q21, which relate to pressure and encouragement from unspecified persons (Factor 8). Although Factors 3 and 8 reflect different aspects of the process of being socialized into the sport of combined driving, the underlying issue is still logically the use of other people to facilitate the entrance into a sport. Since both Factors 3 and 8 are interpreted to logically

reflect the same function, they are discussed within the Socialization Into section of this chapter.

A similar situation existed for the Socialization Through and Status and Prestige functions. Statements Q3, Q14, Q15, Q19, Q22, and Q23 were anticipated to represent the Socialization Through function. The factor analysis separated these statements into one factor comprised of Q14, Q15, and Q23, which represent statements related to the question of character and discipline (Factor 7), and one factor comprised of Q19 and Q22, which represent statements related to values and attitudes (Factor 4). Since Factors 4 and 7 can be interpreted to reflect the same function, they are discussed within the Socialization Through section of this chapter.

For Status and Prestige, it was anticipated that statements Q8, Q9, Q18, Q20, and Q26 would represent this function. Once again, the factor analysis separated these Status and Prestige statements into one factor comprised of Q8, Q9, and Q18, which represent statements related to status, prestige, and recognition outside the sport (Factor 1), and one factor comprised of Q20 and Q26, which represent statements related to winning as a method of gaining esteem (Factor 9). Since Factors 1 and 9 can be interpreted to reflect the same function, they are discussed within the Status and Prestige section of this chapter.

While it is acknowledged that each factor produced by a factor analysis is the composite of statements that represent a different attitude, it appeared feasible to combine some of the factors and

acknowledge that further work is necessary to develop an instrument that possesses greater content validity. Therefore, following the combination of factors, the data were examined with respect to eight factors--the five anticipated, and three others.

Reliability

With the factor analysis completed, the next step was to estimate reliability, or the internal consistency of statement responses that were clustered to produce the eight factors discussed. The statistical method selected to determine reliability was to estimate internal consistency using the intraclass R coefficient. The discussion of the data was separated into the five social functions, therefore, to reflect this interpretation, one R was estimated for each social function. The estimations of R were calculated from ANOVA tables. Reliability for the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire was separated accordingly: reliability for the Affiliation function was estimated from the responses to the statements of Factor 5; reliability for the Separation function was estimated from the responses to the statements of Factor 2; reliability for the Socialization Through function was estimated from the responses to the statements of Factors 4 and 7; reliability for the Socialization Into function was estimated from the responses to the statements of Factors 3 and 8; and reliability for the Status and Prestige function was estimated from the responses to the statements of Factors 1 and 9.

The investigator's SPSS^X command file was constructed to do five separate analysis of variances, one for each social function (SPSS Inc., 1986). Table 2 provides the estimates of $\underline{R}$ for the five social functions calculated from these five ANOVA tables (the ANOVA tables are presented in Appendix I). A function's reliability estimation that was .70 or above was considered acceptable (Safrit, 1986).

Table 2

Estimations of Reliability

Social Function	Factor	$\underline{R}$
Affiliation	5	.60
Separation	2	.76
Socialization Through	4, 7	.56
Socialization Into	3, 8	.52
Status and Prestige	1, 9	.65

Note. ANOVA tables available in Appendix I.

As demonstrated, Separation (Factor 2) meets acceptable reliability levels according to Safrit (1986). The four remaining social functions' estimations were below the desired reliability levels. This in part could be explained by the quantity of statements comprising each social function; none of the estimations of reliability were calculated with more than six statements.

Upon examination of the statement means within three functions, it was observed that the means of some statements were

likely to have been responsible for lowering reliability estimates. For example, within the Status function ($R = .65$), Q20 had a mean of 3.49, Q26 and Q28 had means of 2.54 and 2.60 respectively, but Q8, Q9, and Q18 had means near 3.00. This suggests that, while the factor analysis grouped these six statements into two factors, brought together as one estimate of reliability, responses to Q20, Q26, and Q28 were not consistent with the other three statements. This indicates that Q20, Q26, and Q28 may require revision prior to their further use in order to strengthen this social function as a whole. For the Socialization Into function ($R = .52$), the means of Q13, Q16, and Q17 were approximately 4.00, while the means of Q21 (3.07), Q24 (3.12), and Q25 (2.58) were considerably different than 4.00. Again, although the factor analysis clustered these six statements into two factors, the notable difference in means between these two groups of statements when brought together as one estimate of reliability suggests that some revision of the statements within the two factors of the Socialization Into function is required in order to strengthen this function as a whole. For the Socialization Through function ($R = .56$), there was some variation in statement means as well. Statements Q19, Q22, and Q23 had means of 2.23, 2.49, and 2.34 respectively, while statements Q14 had a mean of 1.89, and Q15 had a mean of 1.55. Again, to strengthen this function, some revision among these statements may be necessary prior to their further use.

Unlike the Status and Prestige, Socialization Into, and Socialization Through functions, the statement means of the Affiliation function ($R = .60$) were consistent between statements. The means of the four Affiliation statements were between 1.75 and 1.91. Again, the reliability estimates of this function was below acceptable levels. Since the between-statement means were consistent, weak reliability may have been a result of (a) the number of items comprising the factor, or (b) the lack of variability in responses among subjects

Survey Data Results and Discussion

Demographics

The purpose of this part of Chapter 4 is to present demographic data. The results of each variable are noted, and if necessary, discussed briefly. The objectives outlined for this study are intended to examine combined driving from a sociological perspective and expand the body of literature on the status of equestrian sport in American society. It is believed that the demographic variables contribute to this examination of equestrian sport in American society by presenting a range of people as combined driving's participants, and the degree of commitment to the sport by its drivers. The participants of combined driving in this study range from the serious horseperson to the weekend participant.

Demographic question 1 provided data on gender. The 154 subjects for this study consisted of 98 females and 56 males. From

the N (258), 160 qualified subjects were female and 96 were male (the gender of 2 of the 258 subjects could not be determined). The 98 surveys returned by female drivers represented a 62% female return rate, while the 56 surveys returned by male drivers represented a 58% male return rate. These two return rates reflect the overall 60% return rate of this study. This finding assumes that the subject sample of this study is representative of the N, and therefore this study's conclusions are applicable to all the drivers that were considered qualified for this study.

Demographic question 2 provided data on the current age of the competitor. The mean driver age was 45, the median driver age was 44, and the standard deviation was 12.6. The youngest driver was 15 and the oldest driver was 73. With the mean and median placed in the mid 40's and a range of 58, it is obvious that the sport is available to people young and old. Snyder and Spreitzer (1983), in their review of age discrimination in sport, argue that, in general, older people are expected to be sedentary. Therefore when pursuing sport, older persons may experience participatory barriers based on their age. The range of combined driver age indicates that if a driver is capable and willing, then combined driving can be enjoyed throughout a lifetime.

Demographic questions 3 through 7 provided data for the Hollingshead Index of Social Position. These findings are presented and discussed in the Hollingshead Index of Social Position Data section of this chapter. Demographic questions 8 through 11

provided additional data concerning the social function of Socialization Into. These findings are presented and discussed in the Socialization Into section of this chapter.

Demographic question 12 provided data addressing the driving class and level of difficulty of the drivers. These data are presented in Table 3. Since the money and resources necessary to support one horse is considerably less than the money and resources necessary to support a team of four horses, the driving class variable response of single ($n=104$), as presented in Table 3, seems to reflect the emphasis on accessible participation that the combined driving community professes to encourage (see Chapter 2).

Table 3

Demographic Data: Driving Class and Level of Difficulty

Level of Difficulty	Driving Class		
	Four-in-hand	Pair	Single
Advanced	2	7	7
Intermediate	0	14	18
Preliminary	0	11	66
Training	1	1	13
Total ^a	3	33	104

^aMissing responses $n=14$.

Demographic question 13 provided data concerning the number of hours per week the participants spent with the sport of combined

driving. These data are presented in Table 4. It should be noted that some subjects mentioned that these hours represented the total hours they spent on the sport during the driving season. The range of hours presented in Table 4 suggests that the involvement in the sport varies greatly among the drivers.

Table 4

Demographic Data: Hours per Week Spent With Combined Driving

Variable	Mean	Median	<u>SD</u>	Range	
				Low	High
Hrs/week training horses	10	8	7.6	0	45
Hrs/week maintaining horses	9	7	8.6	0	45

Demographic question 14 concerned the amount of money spent per year on combined driving. Table 5 presents these data. This finding supplies evidence that a competitor does not have to be "rich" to compete in combined driving. As is noted by Clatworthy (1981) in Chapter 2, many wealthy people are associated with equestrian sports; however, according to the results of demographic question 14, it is possible for a participant to spend less than a thousand dollars on combined driving per year. Although the amount of one thousand dollars does not consider the initial investment, some literature, in particular Sports Illustrated (Lidz, 1988),

presents information that would lead the average reader to conclude that competing in combined driving necessitates an enormous amount of money. While it is certainly possible that someone could spend "hundreds of thousands [of dollars] a year" (Lidz, 1988, p. 112) on combined driving, this is clearly not the rule. Twenty-four percent of the competitors reported that they spent less than 1 thousand dollars a year on the sport, 55% of the competitors spent between 1 and 5 thousand dollars a year, while only 21% spent more than 5 thousand dollars a year.

Table 5

Demographic Data: Amount of Money per Year Spent on Combined Driving

Response	n^a	($n/148$)
Less than \$500	10	(7%)
\$501 to 1000	25	(17%)
\$1001 to 2500	42	(28%)
\$2501 to 5000	40	(27%)
\$5001 to 10,000	18	(12%)
More than \$10,000	13	(9%)

^aMissing responses $n=6$.

Demographic questions 15 and 16 provided data concerning the number of events that were competed in each year by the drivers, and the number of horses that were available to the drivers for the sport. These data are presented in Table 6. Again, these figures

suggest that there is a range of commitment to the sport by its participants. Although not detailed, it should be mentioned that there is some evidence that people on the east coast participate in more events per year than those on the west coast. This, however, seems logical considering most events take place on the east coast of the United States.

Table 6

Demographic Data: Number of Horses and Events per Year for Combined Driving

	Mean	Median	SD	Range	
				Low	High
Horses for c. driving	4	2	6.8	1	50
Events per year	4	4	1.7	1	10

Demographic question 17 provided data concerning whether drivers owned the horses they competed with. Eighty-nine percent, or 137 of the 154 subjects in this study, reported that they owned the horses they drove. This would support the assumption that drivers are the most active participants in combined driving.

Demographic question 18 provided data concerning whether the subject's typical day was spent primarily with combined driving. Of the 154 subjects, there were 32 who responded that they occupied a

typical day with combined driving. Demographic question 18 is discussed further in the Separation section of this chapter.

Demographic question 19 provided data on the subject's participation in other equestrian activities. Eighty-eight percent, or 136 out of 154 subjects, answered yes to this question. Other equestrian activities pursued by combined drivers included foxhunting, polo, dressage, trail riding, and jumping; other carriage activities included pleasure drives and weddings. Of the 136 subjects who indicated that they participated in other equestrian activities, 66% placed combined driving as their first preference, 23% placed combined driving as their second preference, and 11% placed combined driving as their third preference or lower.

Overall, the demographic data suggest that the sport is accessible to many people--men, women, older drivers, and younger drivers. Based on the findings of the demographic variables of number of horses available, money spent per year, events participated in per year, and hours spent per week, it is obvious that participants range from the serious horseperson to the casual participant. The demographic data are considered germane to the overall intent of this study--to expand the body of literature on the status of equitation in American society.

Hollingshead Index of Social Position Data

The Hollingshead index results for education, occupation, and social position represent data from the heads of household. Education and occupation data were collected for both a driver and

his or her spouse. The head of household is the one member, between the two, who possesses the highest Hollingshead index score.

Education. Drivers in Hollingshead's education Level 2 had a standard college degree. Sixty-five percent, or 98 of the 152 combined driving households had at least this level of education (see Table 7). This suggests that this study's sample of combined driving households is well educated.

Table 7

Education Levels for the Heads of Household

Education level	$\bar{n}^a$	($\bar{n}/152$)
1. Graduate professional training	53	(34.8%)
2. Standard college graduation	45	(29.6%)
3. Partial college training	38	(25.0%)
4. High school graduates	15	(10.0%)
5. Partial high school	1	(.6%)
6. Junior high school	0	(0%)
7. Less than seven years of school	0	(0%)

Note. See Appendix L for the Hollingshead education scale.

^aMissing responses $\bar{n}=2$.

A more detailed discussion of the affluency of combined driving households appears in the Occupation and Social Class sections of this chapter.

Occupation. The validity of the Hollingshead index relies strongly on the ability of the investigator to classify occupations into their appropriate levels. Once the surveys were returned and

examined, it was apparent that not all the subjects' occupations were on Hollingshead's occupation scale.

To manage this dilemma, the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) (United States Department of Labor, 1977) was used to estimate subject occupations not listed on Hollingshead's occupation scale. The DOT was a valuable source of job descriptions, thus, reasonable comparisons could be made between a subject occupation that was not on the Hollingshead scale, and an occupation that was on the Hollingshead scale (see Appendix O). However, some subject occupations that were not on the Hollingshead scale, also lacked a comparable Hollingshead occupation. For these cases, the investigator's judgment was used to determine appropriate Hollingshead levels (see Appendix P).

The occupations of the subjects of this study, which are most frequently distributed within the two highest scale positions, demonstrate a majority of "white collar" households, while the low end of the subject occupation range (occupation Level 5) demonstrates the presence of the "blue collared" skilled manual employee. Table 8 presents the distribution of occupations among the heads of household (for detail see Appendix N).

This occupation distribution underlines two points. First, as suggested by the common stereotype of equestrians, the representative household members from the combined driving community have an occupation that typically would be perceived as prestigious. Level 1 is the most frequent driver occupation

classification: there are several executives of large corporations, several stockbrokers, and many major professionals ($n=32$) such as doctors and lawyers.

Second, as suggested by Gladstone (1987), the drivers and/or their spouses come from a broad range of occupations. The drivers' occupations include junior high school and high school teachers, nurses, secretaries, farmers, and graphic designers. This combined driving range is compatible with Clatworthy's (1981) findings on saddle-horse showing participants whom also had a variety of occupations including lawyers, farmers, and secretaries.

Table 8

Occupation Sub-Levels for the Heads of Household

Occupation level	n	($n/138$)
1a. Higher executives	8	(5.8%)
1b. Large proprietors	7	(5.1%)
1c. Major professionals	32	(23.2%)
2a. Business managers/large concerns	13	(9.4%)
2b. Proprietors of medium businesses	15	(10.9%)
2c. Lesser professionals	15	(10.9%)
3a. Administrative personnel	22	(15.9%)
3b. Small business owners	11	(8.0%)
3c. Semi-professionals	4	(2.9%)
4b. Technicians	3	(2.2%)
5. Skilled manual employees	8	(5.8%)
6. Semi-skilled employees	0	(0%)
7. Unskilled employees	0	(0%)
- Students	8	
- Could not determine	8	

Note. See Appendix M for the Hollingshead occupation scale. See Appendix N for detail of Table 8.

To illustrate this range, there are two occupation groups in two different occupation levels of particular interest in Table 8. The first level is the occupational sub-level 1c, or the major professional. This sub-level is the occupation represented most frequently in the occupation distribution ($n=32$) and is composed of professionals such as doctors, lawyers, engineers, and professors. Although they are a small group overall, the occupation classified most frequently ($n=6$) within this 1c sub-level is the veterinarian. The second occupation level of interest is Level 5, or the skilled-manual employee. Four of the eight subjects in this Level 5 are farriers (a blacksmith who shoes horses). Again, a small group, but one highlighted to demonstrate that people of various occupational status--a veterinarian at the high end, and a farrier at the lower end--within a particular occupational field (in this case, domesticated animal services) share a common sporting activity. The other subjects of this study provide a similar diversity of occupational status in their respective fields. For example, for those who participate in combined driving and are in: (a) the education field, there are professors, high school teachers, and students; (b) the business field, there are executives, sales directors, and secretaries; and (c) the medicine field, there are doctors, nurses, and pharmacists.

Although combined driving attracts more people from the high end of the occupational scale, the reason for emphasizing the range of subject occupations is to present the horse as a strong social

"magnet", that is, the horse pulls people out from the various strata of the occupational hierarchy and brings them together for a common sporting purpose. Because Hollingshead's social class levels logically reflect occupation levels, the occupation data help evaluate the first objective of this study--a social class assessment of combined driving. It would be difficult to conclude that the driver occupations of Levels 3, 4, and 5, are typical of millionaires (see Appendix N). After making this observation, these subjects present a clear conflict with the image of the sport.

Social Class

This section addresses the first problem of this study--to determine the social class distribution of the drivers in combined driving, and the first two objectives of this study--to conduct a social class assessment of combined driving from the data collected from the Index of Social Position. The basic assumption when using the Hollingshead Index of Social Position is that education and occupation are the indicators that estimate social class levels. The basic assumption when assessing social class with the Hollingshead index data is that there are meaningful social behavior differences between the social class levels.

Results of the first problem. The majority of subject social position scores, like those of education and occupation, were near the top of the Hollingshead index. The first problem of this study was to determine the social class distribution of the drivers in

combined driving. The distribution of driver social position scores and social class levels are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Social Class Levels and Social Position Scores for the Heads of Household

Social position score (level)	$\underline{n}^a$	($\underline{n}/136$)
11-17 (upper-upper)	42	(30.9%)
18-27 (upper-middle)	47	(34.6%)
28-43 (lower-middle)	40	(29.4%)
44-60 (upper-lower)	7	(5.1%)
61-77 (lower-lower)	0	(0%)

Note. See Appendix K for Index of Social Position.

$\underline{n}=136$ for head of household social position scores. There were 18 missing responses; 8 students, 8 occupations unclassified, 2 missing education responses.

Subjects with social position scores that rested between 18 and 27 were considered upper-middle class (Level 2). Both the social position score mean of 23.2, and median of 22, were placed in this level; the standard deviation was 11.6. The mode social position score was 11, or the highest social position score on the index; these drivers were considered upper-upper class (Level 1). The low score of the driver range--51--rested in social class Level 4, or the upper-lower class.

Discussion of the first objective. As demonstrated in Table 9, the driver head of household social position scores yields a 30.9%

upper-class representation. The remaining 69.1% of the drivers are classified as either upper-middle, lower-middle, or upper-middle class. This strong middle-class presence in combined driving supports the observations of Fussell (1983), who claims that the devotion to horses is an imperfect indicator of predicting upper-class standing, and Trainer (1978) and Beem (1982), who suggest that the millionaire image of the sport is misleading. The presence of wealthy competitors and a millionaire image apparently does not prevent people of modest social position from pursuing an interest in combined driving.

The first objective of this study was to do a social class assessment of combined driving. Although a 30.9% representation of upper-upper class participants seems low considering common equestrian sport stereotypes, their presence, in addition to the historical association of the upper-class with equestrian sports (as well as the assumption that this association is unlikely to dissolve), presumes that combined driving is a valid upper-class sport. The strong middle-class activity in combined driving indicates that this equestrian sport is a middle-class sport as well. Combined driving should be defined according to these observations.

It is likely that the low representation of the lower-class, overall, would be explained by the fact that equestrian sports are not activities which typically generate interest with the American proletariat (Curry & Jiobu, 1984; Eitzen & Sage, 1982; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1983). The lower-class drivers, with only a 5.1%

representation in this study's sample, are considered virtually non-existent in the competitive realm of combined driving. This is considered a significant finding. The speculation is that there are either (a) social class barriers which exist in combined driving, or (b) financial barriers, that is participation in this sport is too expensive for some members of American society. As an interesting exception, however, three of the seven upper-lower class participants are associated with horses in their occupations. This suggests that an upper-lower class combined driving participant is likely to have an occupation associated with the equestrian community.

Results and discussion of the second objective. The second objective of this study was to determine if the social classes compete against each other. By examining Table 10, it seems reasonable to interpret the data in a way that would conflict with the theory that the different social classes, which compete in the same sport, typically engage in these activities at separate locations (Eitzen & Sage, 1982). As a stereotypical example, the upper-class participate in tennis at country clubs while the middle-class participate in tennis on public courts.

The American Driving Society (ADS) events used in this study were separated, and each subject's social position score was recorded for that event. Each driving event's social position score range was then calculated.

Table 10

High and Low Social Class Levels of Each Driving Event

Event	Competitor range	
	Highest level	Lowest level
1	upper-upper	upper-lower
2	upper-upper	lower-middle
3	upper-upper	upper-lower
4	upper-upper	upper-lower
5	upper-upper	lower-middle
6	upper-upper	upper-lower
7	upper-upper	lower-middle
8	upper-upper	upper-lower
9	upper-upper	upper-lower
10	upper-upper	lower-middle
11	upper-upper	upper-lower
12	upper-upper	lower-middle
13	upper-upper	upper-lower
14	upper-upper	lower-middle

Note. See Appendix Q for detail of Table 10.

The driving event social class level ranges in Table 11 show that in 14 of the 14 driving events, there was someone in the upper-upper class competing (14 of the 14 events also had upper-middle class participants). In 6 of the 14 driving events, someone in the lower-middle class represented the lowest social class level competitor of that driving event, and in the other 8 events, someone in the upper-lower class represented the lowest social class level competitor of that driving event.

The findings presented in Table 10 do not suggest that (a) all driving events are considered equal in prestige, or (b) some competitors could be excluded from club events, or (c) the sport of combined driving is free of cliquish social class behavior. It is not within the scope of the second objective of this study to measure the social class interaction at combined driving events. The findings of the second objective, along with the findings of demographic variables of gender and age, simply suggest that combined driving is an accessible activity for those who wish to participate. Yet, based on the meager 5.1% representation of lower-class drivers, the findings of the second objective--claiming that the social classes compete against one another--can apply only to the upper-upper, upper-middle, and lower-middle class participants.

Summary. The first problem of this study is satisfied by determining the social class distribution of combined drivers. The distribution of drivers is as follows: 30.9% upper-upper class; 34.6% upper-middle class; 29.4% lower-middle class; 5.1% upper-lower class; and 0% lower-lower class.

The first objective of this study was completed with a social class assessment of combined driving. The representation of the upper-upper class participant confirms that combined driving, as an equestrian sport, is an attractive pastime for the privileged class. Considering the sum representation of upper-middle, and lower-middle class participants, it is believed that combined driving's definition as an upper-class sport should be refined to include this

substantial group of competitors. The lack of a strong lower-class representation suggests that combined driving is not easily accessible to this class. The low representation of lower-class participants leads to speculation that there are both social class and financial barriers in combined driving.

The second objective of this study is satisfied by demonstrating that upper-upper, upper-middle, and lower-middle class drivers compete against one another at driving events.

Social Functions

The remaining sections of this chapter address specifically the second problem and third objective of this study as defined in Chapter 1--the descriptive analysis of the social function attitudes of combined drivers. The results and discussion focus on the statements that cluster into Factors 5 (Affiliation), 2 (Separation), 4 and 7 (Socialization Through), 3 and 8 (Socialization Into), and 1 and 9 (Status and Prestige). The demographic variables of gender and social class level are used as well in the assessment of combined driver social function attitudes.

Affiliation (Factor 5). Affiliation statements Q2, Q5, Q10, and Q27 of Factor 5 yielded mean scores of 1.75, 1.90, 1.91, and 1.82 respectively. These means were closest to the agree level. Based on these data, combined driving can be said to serve a useful role for social affiliation for its drivers. This finding suggests that the sport of combined driving is a good way for its competitors to make friends (Q2), mingle in a "social" setting (Q5), and associate with

others (Q27). Table 11 provides the response frequency to four Affiliation statements of Factor 5. The high agreement rates support the findings of Clatworthy (1981) and Steele and Zurcher (1979), as cited in Chapter 2, who found that their sporting environments were rewarding to the participant for social affiliation.

Table 11

Response Frequency to the Affiliation Statements of Factor 5

Variable	n	Response (in n)			M
		Agreement	Undecided	Disagreement	
(Q2) Effective way to make friends	154	144	8	2	1.75
(Q5) Enjoy the social engagements	154	136	11	7	1.90
(Q10) Event organizing /identity	152	135	13	4	1.91
(Q27) Associating with others	153	142	8	3	1.82

Note. "Agreement" equals the sum of strongly agree and agree, while "disagreement" equals the sum of disagree and strongly disagree. See Appendix J.

The crosstabulation of the social class and gender variables with the Affiliation variables produced results that were consistent with the overall response rate as demonstrated in Table 11.

Separation (Factor 2). The Separation function is defined as the act of temporary disengagement from dominant roles and fulfillment of needs not satisfied by these dominant roles. As indicated in Table 12, the Separation function appears to be a more relevant concept for some participants of combined driving than for others. The agreement rates to Separation statements Q11 and Q12 were higher for the upper-middle and lower-middle class drivers than for the upper-upper class drivers (see Table 12).

Table 12

Agreement Rate to Separation Statements of Factor 2 in Percentage Form by Social Class

Variable	n	Social class		
		Up-upper	Up-middle	Low-middle
(Q7) Can test skills	126	80%	87%	87%
(Q11) Offers a challenge	129	55	81	75
(Q12) Fulfills a competitive need	128	55	64	69

Note. Each percentage equals the sum of agree and strongly agree responses divided by the total number of responses for that crosstabulation. For example, 80%, or 33 of the 41 upper-upper class participants who responded to Q7, agreed or strongly agreed.

The Separation concept assumes that the activity in question serves a secondary role in a person's life. However, it was possible that some subjects would consider combined driving a primary life

role. In response to question 18 of the demographic section, 32 of the 154 responded that they spent their typical day with the sport of combined driving. Although this question would logically invalidate the Separation responses given by these 32 subjects, this cannot be assumed because it is unknown whether demographic question 18 represents a valid measurement device to determine if combined driving is a primary role in a person's life, that is the amount of time that someone spends in an activity does not necessarily qualify it as a primary or secondary role. However, by eliminating the responses to the Separation statements of these 32 subjects, the percentage of agreement gap increases between, in particular, the upper-upper and lower-middle class. The adjusted agreement rate to statements Q11 and Q12 for the upper-upper class are 51% and 51% respectively; for the upper-middle class, 77% and 59%; and for the lower-middle class, 75% and 70%. The high agreement rate to Separation statements by the lower-middle class reflects the hypothesis of Martin and Berry (1974) as reviewed in Chapter 2. They suggest that sport participation, especially for the working classes, can satisfy needs that are unfulfilled in the work environment; this is the basic premise of the Separation function.

Since driving horses is a technical and unique skill, it can be assumed, because all three social class levels answer high in agreement to Q7, that the skills associated with combined driving are unlikely to be satisfied by daily routines.

Socialization Through Sport (Factors 4 and 7). The data support the claim that combined driving offers, or reinforces for its competitors, relevant social values (see results of Factor 7 in Table 13). Most agreed that an understanding of discipline (Q15) and a development of character (Q14) were relevant social functions to participating in the sport.

Table 13

Response Frequency to the Socialization Through Statements of Factor 7

Variable	n	Response (in n)			M
		Agreement	Undecided	Disagreement	
(Q14) Can strengthen character	154	137	12	5	1.89
(Q15) An understanding of discipline	154	148	5	1	1.55
(Q23) Enforces social behavior	154	101	37	16	2.34

Note. "Agreement" equals the sum of strongly agree and agree, while "disagreement" equals the sum of disagree and strongly disagree. See Appendix J.

The particularly high response rate to statement Q15 of may be explained by the fact that the training of horses is typically an exercise in discipline and patience for both the driver and horse. It is assumed that an understanding and development of equine

discipline is situation specific; this discipline does not necessarily transfer to other aspects of life.

The crosstabulation of the social class and gender variables with the Socialization Through variables produced results that were consistent with the overall response rate as demonstrated in Table 13.

Factor 4 is titled "Providing Relevant Values and Attitudes as a Social Function of Combined Driving," and is logically grouped into the Socialization Through social function discussion. Statement Q19 of Factor 4 is concerned with the drivers' attitude towards combined driving as a provider of values that are relevant to other aspects of life. If discipline is a value in sport (as discussed in Chapter 2), then the response rate to statement Q19 of Factor 4 suggests that the majority of drivers believe that values achieved in combined driving are applicable to other aspects of life.

The agreement frequency to statement Q19--driving carriages provides values that are relevant to other aspects of life--is reasonably high. Of the 154 subjects, 115 responded in agreement. This implies that for the majority of drivers, the values representing Factor 7 (such as discipline) which are developed in the sport of combined driving, are believed to cross into daily life.

Socialization Into Sport (Factors 3 and 8). By expert statement-classification, the social function of Socialization Into had seven statements. The four concerned with the subjects' nuclear family clustered together into Factor 3. The statements of this factor,

composed of statements Q16, Q17, Q24, and Q25, in addition to demographic questions 8 through 11, provided the primary data for the assessment of the Socialization Into social function. Factor 8 is also discussed briefly.

Before engaging in a detailed presentation of results and discussion, two tables of demographic information relevant to the Socialization Into function are presented. The first table provides the ages at which the drivers were introduced to horses and combined driving (demographic questions 8 and 10). The second table of this section shows the important socializing agents into the world of horses and combined driving (demographic questions 9 and 11).

Table 14 shows that the average age at which combined drivers began with horses was much earlier than when they began with combined driving. Again, the mean age of combined drivers was 45.

Table 14

Average Age When Drivers Became Involved With Horses and Combined Driving

Variable	Mean	Median	SD	Range	
				Low	High
Age first active with c. driving	38	38	11.9	12	67
Age first active with horses	14	10	11.6	1	60

Table 15 presents the response frequency to the demographic questions of important socializing agents for the subjects into the world of horses and combined driving (demographic questions 9 and 11).

Table 15

Response Frequency of Most Important Socializing Agents Into Horses and Combined Driving by Gender of Driver

Agent	Horses			Combined Driving		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Family						
Mother	18	6	24	3	2	5
Father	16	17	33	1	2	3
Sibling	5	1	6	1	0	1
Spouse	0	12	12	3	5	8
			<u>75</u>			<u>17</u>
Outside family						
Pro acquaint	2	0	2	16	4	20
Equine center	12	3	15	14	10	24
Friend	17	8	25	43	26	69
Other	25	6	31	16	4	20
			<u>73</u>			<u>133</u>

Note. Other responses included myself, books, literature, television, movies, and attending horse events.

As demonstrated, the socializing agents that were most involved in introducing the subjects to horses were split almost in

half, with 75 out of 148 subjects acknowledging a family member as the most important socializing agent. With respect to the combined driving data of Table 15, the severe shift away from the family indicates that someone outside the family introduced a subject to this sport. Considering the average age in which a person became actively involved in combined driving (mean and median 38), this result was not surprising.

Of interest in Table 15, there were 12 husbands who reported that they were introduced to horses by their wives, while no wives indicated that they were introduced to horses by their husbands. Although this may reflect this study's sample population split of 98 women and 56 men, this ratio still does not explain adequately the exclusion of the spouse response by the wives.

Another point of interest in Table 15 was that a father, between the parents, appeared to be a more important socializing agent into the world of horses for the male subjects (a similar pattern in data appears in Tables 16 and 17). A male subject was almost three times as likely to have the father ($n=17$), in contrast to the mother ($n=6$), as the most important socializing agent into the world of horses. The female subjects were equally as likely to have their fathers ($n=16$) and mothers ($n=18$) as the most important socializing agent into the world of horses. It should be emphasized here, however, that these results are discussed with the acknowledgement that this study's n (154) is relatively small as are each n of Table 15.

Table 16 presents a crosstabulation of a median split of the demographic question 8--how old were you when you first became actively involved with horses?--with variables concerning the social function of Socializing Into. The median age of when a subject became actively involved with horses was 10. Those who began with horses at 10 years or younger showed a higher family influence for each variable in Table 16 than did those who became involved with horses at 11 years or older.

Table 16

Agreement Rate to Socialization Into Variables in Percentage Form by a Median Split of the Variable--Age First Active With Horses

Variable	n	Age--first active w/horses	
		10 and younger	11 and older
(Q16) Mother was active with horses	149	30%	5%
(Q17) Father was active with horses	149	36	14
(Q24) Siblings supported interest	107	53	36
(Q25) Parents supported interest	142	76	45
Family as most important socializing agent into horses ^a	143	66	32

Note. Each percentage equals the sum of agree and strongly agree responses divided by the total number of responses for that crosstabulation. For example, 30%, or 25 of the 84 "10 and older participants" who responded to Q16, agreed or strongly agreed.

^aThis variable is demographic question 9. The "family" is the sum of responses 1-4. See Appendix A.

With a similar mother/father pattern that was demonstrated in Table 15, the father is presented as the more important socializing agent for the older group in (see Table 16). For those introduced to horses at 11 years or older, the father (14%) played a more active role than the mother (5%). However, it should be emphasized that these percentages are low; they are reported because it is an interesting parallel to the mother/father pattern of Table 15, as previously noted, and Table 17, which is discussed next.

In Table 17, the male drivers as children were three times as likely to have the father (36%), in contrast to the mother (11%), actively involved with horses while the female drivers as children were equally as likely to have their fathers (21%) and mothers (24%) actively involved with horses.

Again, despite the low percentages, the mother/father data that emerge in Table 17 is similar to that of the data in Table 15. This brings forth speculation that the father, between the parents, may be assuming the more important socializing role for the male subjects.

Between the social classes in Table 17, the father/mother pattern emerged only in the lower-middle class. It should be emphasized, for this point, that the social class level did not reflect the driver's family background social class position, rather, it reflected the driver's current class position.

In addition, the data indicated that the female subjects were more likely than the male subjects to have their interest in equitation supported by their parents (see Q25 in Table 17).

Table 17

Agreement Rate to the Socialization Into Statements of Factor 3 in Percentage Form by Gender and Social Class

Variable	n	Gender		
		Female	Male	Total
(Q16) Mother was active with horses	154	24%	11%	19%
(Q17) Father was active with horses	154	21	36	27
(Q24) Siblings supported interest	109	43	50	46
(Q25) Parents supported interest	145	67	51	61
		Social Class		
		Up-upper	Up-middle	Low-middle
(Q16) Mother was active with horses	129	17%	23%	7%
(Q17) Father was active with horses	129	31	25	20
(Q24) Siblings supported interest	92	53	48	45
(Q25) Parents supported interest	121	51	60	65

Note. Each percentage equals the sum of agree and strongly agree responses divided by the total number of responses for that crosstabulation. For example, 17%, or 7 of the 42 upper-upper class participants who responded to Q16, agreed or strongly agreed.

From the data shown in Tables 15 and 17, one can speculate that the father is assuming the more important socializing role for the male subjects into the world of horses. However, in Table 18, the breakdown of Q16 and Q17 data--presenting each possibility of the parents' involvement in horses--crosstabulated with demographic question 9, provides evidence that the mother and father, in some situations, are equally important as socializing agents into the world of horses. Variable 3 shows that if the mother was active with horses and the father was not, the mother was the socializing agent. Variable 4 shows that if the father was active with horses and the mother was not, the father was the socializing agent.

Table 18

Response Frequency of the Parents' Activity in Horses by their Influence as Socializing Agents Into World of Horses

Variable ^a	<u>n</u> ^b	Socializing agent into horses ^c	
		Mother	Father
1. Both parents active with/horses	14	7	4
2. Neither parent active with/horses	97	4	9
3. Mother active; father was not	16	13	0
4. Father active; mother was not	27	0	20

^aThe variables are the four cells of the crosstabulation of Q16 and Q17.

^bThe sum of the variables' n equals 154, or one variable per subject.

^cTo simplify the presentation, only the mother and father responses of demographic question 9 were reported.

The following reviews the results and discussion of the socializing agents into the world of combined driving and Factor 8. As noted from the data in Table 15, someone outside the family was more likely to introduce a person to combined driving. Of the 150 drivers who responded to demographic question 11--who was the most important person to introduce you to the sport of combined driving?--89% responded to someone outside of the family. To summarize, 11% of the drivers were introduced to combined driving by a family member, 13% by a professional acquaintance, 16% by an equine center or school, 46% by a friend, and 13% by others, which included books, ADS literature, and attending driving events.

Factor 8 is titled "Encouragement and Pressure as Socializing Agents as a Social Function of Combined Driving." The distribution of responses to statement Q21 of Factor 8--other people have strongly encouraged me to participate in this sport--was as follows: 65 in agreement, 15 undecided, and 73 in disagreement. Although the mean was 3.07 (undecided), this would not reflect the overall sentiment to the question of whether drivers competed with the strong encouragement of others. Many drivers were in agreement and many were in disagreement as to whether they compete with the strong encouragement from others.

The mean score of 3.97 (disagree) to statement Q13 of Factor 8 indicates that combined driving was pursued by its participants without outside pressure from other people.

Status and Prestige (Factors 1 and 9). As demonstrated in Table 19, the mean scores (close to 3.00) of the first three Status statements of Factor 1 represented the response undecided. However, in the distribution of responses, there was a substantial split in agreement and disagreement by the drivers. The mean scores, therefore, do not represent the overall attitude of the drivers to the question of whether driving carriages in sport was a way to gain status and prestige. With drivers positioned in both agreement and disagreement (and some undecided), the status issue as related to combined driving could be a lively topic of debate among the competitors.

Table 19

Response Frequency to the Status Statements of Factor 1

Variable	n	Response (in n)			M
		Agreement	Undecided	Disagreement	
(Q8) Recognition outside sport	154	51	37	66	3.08
(Q9) Sense of social status	152	53	38	61	3.00
(Q18) Can gain prestige	154	57	32	65	3.07

Note. "Agreement" equals the sum of strongly agree and agree, while "disagreement" equals the sum of disagree and strongly disagree. See Appendix J.

The agreement rate to the three Status questions of Factor 1 in Table 20 shows a pattern in which the female participant agreed at a higher rate than the male participant to each statement of status and prestige.

Table 20

Agreement Rate to the Status Statements of Factor 1 in Percentage Form by Gender and Social Class

Variable	n	Gender		
		Female	Male	Total
(Q8) Recognition outside sport	154	37%	27%	33%
(Q9) Sense of social status	152	36	32	35
(Q18) Can gain prestige	154	41	30	37
		Social class		
		Up-upper	Up-middle	Low-middle
(Q8) Recognition outside sport	129	33%	36%	35%
(Q9) Sense of social status	128	41	34	37
(Q18) Can gain prestige	129	40	32	50

Note. Each percentage equals the sum of agree and strongly agree responses divided by the total number of responses for that crosstabulation. For example, 33%, or 14 of the 42 upper-upper class participants who responded to Q8, agreed or strongly agreed.

Table 20 also compares the agreement rates of Status statements between the social classes, and statements Q8, Q9, and Q18 shows a relatively low total agreement rate. However, the 50% agreement rate to Q18 by the lower-middle class stands out in Table 20. Statement Q18 states that driving carriages is a way to "gain" prestige. The response rate by the lower-middle class to Q18 indicate that more drivers in the lower-middle class, as compared to the upper-middle class in particular, feel that combined driving raises their personal distinction levels in the minds of others. From this finding, one can speculate that there is an element of social mobility consciousness in the lower-middle class level. This point, however, would need further exploration.

The minority of drivers who agreed to statements Q8, Q9, and Q18 support the observations of those who have written on the subject of social class attitudes (Aversa, 1981; Domhoff, 1983; Fussell, 1983; Lapham, 1988; Veblen, 1953), and, specifically, combined driving and social class consciousness (Beem, 1982; Lidz, 1988). Quoted in Lidz, one competitor states: "In America, 90 percent of the people in the sport have no love for it. They do it for social status" (p. 112), while Beem concludes that drivers compete for "prestige and ribbons, not money" (p. 125). The drivers who disagree to statements Q8, Q9, and Q18 are clearly in opposition to those who have written of social class and sport. For these subjects, a more thorough investigation would be necessary to understand their sentiment.

Factor 9 is titled "Winning as a Means of Achieving Esteem as a Social Function of Combined Driving." The agreement rate to statement Q26 of Factor 9--people who win are held in higher esteem--was not particularly high among the 153 respondents as demonstrated in Table 21. However, more drivers responded undecided ($n=39$) than responded in disagreement ($n=27$), suggesting that only a minority of drivers do not believe that winning, as a method of achieving esteem, is a function of combined driving.

Table 21

Percentage Distribution to the Winning as Means of Achieving Esteem Statements of Factor 9.

Variable	n	Response (in %)		
		Agreement	Undecided	Disagreement
(Q20) Value winning more with awards	154	26%	13%	61%
(Q26) Winners held in high esteem	153	57	25	18

Note. "Agreement" equals the sum of strongly agree and agree, while "disagreement" equals the sum of disagree and strongly disagree. See Appendix J.

The overall 57% agreement rate to Q26 demonstrates that for the slight majority, receiving the respect of other drivers for competitive prowess is a desirable outcome of participating in combined driving. This finding corresponds with Steele's (1971)

observations as mentioned in the Review of Literature chapter. He states in his study on bowlers that for "people who evaluate bowling favorably, superior performance on the lanes can result in concomitant rise in social position based on this performance" (Steele, 1971, p. 82).

While winners are held in high esteem, winning is not valued more if recognized publicly with prizes and other awards (Q20). However, the wording of the statement may have misled the subjects, thus its value as an assessment tool is questioned. Statement Q20 reads: I value winning more if it is recognized publicly with prizes and similar awards. It could be possible that a driver values winning, but disagrees that winning is valued more with awards. In other words, a driver who may believe that winning is a valuable means of achieving esteem might disagree to statement Q20. This raises the question of what the statement is actually measuring. In addition, the wording of the statement may be biased towards people who win. If a competitor had never won an event, how would he or she respond?

Summary. The preceding section of the results and discussion section satisfies the second problem and third objective of this study--to assess the social functions of combined driving. The factor analysis of the 28 statement Social Function Attitude Questionnaire produced 10 factors. The five factors that logically reflect the five social functions used for this study are the focus of discussion.

Affiliation (Factor 5) appears to be a relevant social function to the participants of combined driving. Most drivers answered in agreement that combined driving is a source for making friends, associating with others, and enjoying social engagements.

The Separation function (Factor 2) revealed possible differences between the social classes in how combined driving is used to fulfill needs lacking in a daily routine. It is suggested that the upper-upper class drivers are less dependent on combined driving, than are the other drivers, to fulfill competitive and challenge-oriented needs. However, combined driving is a skill that is unlikely to be satisfied by the daily routine of any social class' participants.

The results of the Socialization Through function (Factor 7) support the sport sociology literature that claims sport participants believe that sport reinforces social values. The data indicate that combined drivers believe that combined driving strengthens character, develops an understanding of discipline, and enforces acceptable social behavior. It is felt by the majority of drivers as well, that values, such as understanding discipline, strengthening of character, and enforcement of social behavior, are transferred to other aspects of life.

The Socialization Into function (Factor 4 and 8), provides evidence that the family, as a socializing agent into the world of horses and combined driving, varies in intensity depending on age and gender. In summary, someone outside the family is more likely than someone within the family to introduce the subject to combined

driving. It is more likely that the group which is introduced to horses at the age of 10 or younger would be socialized into the world of horses by their family, than would the group which starts at the age of 11 or older. Between the parents, the father may be the more important socializing agent into the world of horses for the male subjects.

The Status and Prestige function (Factor 1) emerges as a debatable function to the participants of combined driving. Many drivers are in agreement, and many are in disagreement to the question of whether the sport of combined driving is a method of getting recognition outside the sport, giving a sense of social status, or gaining prestige. There is evidence to suggest that the lower-middle class, in comparison to the upper-middle class, feel stronger that combined driving is a method of gaining prestige. In addition, for many drivers, those who win driving events are held in high esteem. This suggests that to receive the respect of other drivers for competitive prowess is a desirable outcome from the participation in combined driving.

The assessment of these social functions satisfies the second problem and third objective of this study--to complete a social function assessment of combined driving. This assessment contributes to the body of literature on the place of equitation in the United States, as well as allowing scholars interested in the study of sport to draw comparison to other sporting activities.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first section of this chapter provides conclusions based on the results and discussion provided in the Results and Discussion chapter. The conclusions reflect the social class and social function assessments that are the intended objectives of this study as described in Chapter 1. The second section of this chapter discusses the recommendations for the future use of the measurement tools that were used in this study--the Hollingshead Index of Social Position, and the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire. Possibilities for further study, based on the data collected for this study, are also recommended.

Conclusions

Demographics

The demographic data contribute to the intent of this study by expanding the body of literature on the status of equestrianism in American society. It is concluded that combined driving attracts a range of people. This study sample is divided into 98 women and 56 men. The youngest driver of this study is 15 years of age and the oldest is 73.

The demographic data indicate that there are degrees of involvement by the participants of combined driving. There are drivers who obviously invest a considerable amount of time and money to the sport, while other drivers seem less committed to combined driving in this respect. Based on these observations, it is

concluded that combined driving participation for some drivers is a serious sport form, and for others, a leisure activity.

Social Class

Based on the results of the Hollingshead Index of Social Position application, there are several conclusions reflecting the first and second objectives of this study.

Combined drivers are a composite of three social classes--the upper-upper, upper-middle, and lower-middle class. Combined drivers are not significantly represented by the lower-class.

The combined drivers of the four social classes revealed in this study compete against each other at events. There is no evidence to suggest that drivers, based on their social class standing, would be denied the opportunity to compete in an American Driving Society (ADS) event. Without adequate observation techniques, however, it is impossible to know whether the whole social class picture in combined driving is blurred, as suggested by Clatworthy (1981) in her equestrian sport study. Combined driving, in a social class sense then, may simply be diverse.

Overall, it is unlikely that the results of this study can successfully challenge equestrian sports' image as an activity only for the upper-class. However, this study demonstrates evidence to question whether combined drivers, as a whole, reflect this image.

Social Functions

The following conclusions, based on the results of the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire, are specifically related to the third objective of this study.

It is concluded that affiliating with other people is a desired outcome from the participation in combined driving. The equestrian who drives a carriage competitively is in an environment that can develop and nourish relationships with family, friends, and fellow competitors. Because the sport of combined driving provides this important structure of people who share a common interest, the driver who is accepted into this sporting sub-culture is provided the chance to establish a strong group identity, and develop a favorable self-perception about his or her own social acceptability.

It is concluded that lower-middle class drivers, in comparison to the other social class groups in this study, are more likely to acknowledge that combined driving can be a method to fulfill competitive and challenge oriented needs that are not satisfied in daily routines. While some scholars, most notably Veblen (1953), believe that equestrian sport participation satisfies questionable and superficial motives, the lower-middle class drivers' apparent use of combined driving as a means for the fulfillment of competitive and challenge oriented needs demonstrates the tangible role that an equestrian sport can play to satisfy important human functions such as overcoming alienation and testing human potential.

Since most competitors believe that combined driving enforces social behavior, it is possible that combined driving, through written and unwritten codes of behavior, would weed out deviant behavior. The result would be a socially hospitable and civilized milieu that could be argued to enforce normal behavior, thus contributing to the socialization process. The data collected for the Socialization Through function of this study were gathered to elicit the attitudes of the drivers about the socialization process. Unfortunately, this study cannot make conclusions about whether combined driving actually builds character, develops an understanding of discipline, and enforces the social behavior of its competitors. Because there is considerable debate about how effectively sport contributes to the socialization process, the conclusion based on the Socialization Through data is simply that most drivers indicate that they believe combined driving provides desirable values such as character building. Again, whether combined driving actually provides an environment that nourishes and develops these values is unknown.

The Socialization Into data demonstrate that the intensity of the family as a socializing agent varies depending on the activity. It is concluded that the family is not an important socializing agent into the sport of combined driving. The friend is the most likely person to introduce the subject to combined driving. The data collected about the socialization process into combined driving seem to follow the logical associations between age and significant

others. The average age of combined drivers was 45, thus it was not surprising that 86% of the drivers had a professional acquaintance, equine center, friend, or someone else outside the family as the important socializing agent. As for being introduced to horses, it is concluded that the family is an important socializing agent into equestrianism for the combined drivers of this study, and the father demonstrates the most active role in this initiation process for the male subjects.

The image that combined driving conveys to the casual observer is difficult to challenge. Horses, carriages, and formal livery combine to transmit a message of privilege. Yet, from the response of this sport's intimate observers, the question of whether combined driving is a status sport yields a split in opinion. The majority of drivers do not agree that combined driving is a way to gain prestige and social status--but why? Unfortunately, this issue cannot be addressed here. The reasons why most of the drivers are undecided or in disagreement to the question of status are highly speculative. (The absence of prize money keeps this activity an amateur sport in its truest sense, and thus earning money by competing can be disregarded as a substitute motive.) About one-third of the drivers accept that combined driving functions, in the most moderate interpretation of the data, to raise self-esteem levels to the point of avoiding the banality of routine existence, and in the most extreme interpretation, to feed the ego and display cultural superiority in a public forum. This minority who agree to

statements of status support the equestrian sport participation motives that are characterized by authors such as Aversa (1981), Lidz (1988), and Veblen (1953). Put into a global perspective, the message which these latter combined drivers send is that obsolete equestrian activities, pursued in today's world with great spirit and self consciousness, bring to life Veblenian concepts.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Measurement Tools

The Hollingshead Index of Social Position

The first area of recommendation involves the measurement tool used to measure social class, the Hollingshead Index of Social Position. If determining the social class level of the competitor is a necessary procedure for the social class assessment of a sport, as it was for this study, then measuring the participants' social class obviously becomes a vital issue for the researcher. Hollingshead (1957) claims that his index is a valid measurement tool to estimate social class position. But after using the Hollingshead index to evaluate the social class levels of combined drivers, the investigator believes that the index's accuracy was questionable for this study.

The first problem rests in the occupation scale. This study could have benefited from a more definitive separation of occupation levels by Hollingshead (1957). It was unclear, for example, if some subjects were "business managers in large concerns" (sub-level 2a) or "section heads of large businesses" (sub-level 3a). This difficulty

in measurement also arose when estimating the occupation levels of farmers and stockbrokers (see Appendix P). To address this problem, it is recommended to construct a more precise set of questions to insure more accurate occupation placement. For example, in addition to presenting the open-ended question--would you please briefly describe this occupation? (demographic questions 5)--questions such as "What is the estimated worth of your organization?" and "Do you consider yourself in an ownership, executive, managerial, or administrative position?" could help define the occupations more accurately. In addition, classifying occupations that were not on Hollingshead's scale presented considerable concern (for details see the discussion of occupation in the Results and Discussion chapter and see also Appendices O and P).

Although many of the occupations of the combined driving households unquestionably reflect upper- and middle-class lifestyles and behaviors, the second problem concerns the accuracy of the index to measure social class. The Hollingshead index uses two indicators to predict social class, yet social class is a compound of many indicators--for example, income (earned and inherited), place of residence, participation in the community, and ancestry (Hollingshead, 1975). In addition, it is believed that social class standing is relative to the environment. A person of upper-class definition in one community may not meet the standards of another community (Fussell, 1983).

Since the upper-middle class often have the funds to mimic the upper-class (Fussell, 1983), both Fussell and Lapham (1988) find that distinguishing between "old money" and "new money" necessitates the intimate knowledge of more subtle class indicators such as manners of behavior, dress, and speech. Although Hollingshead's definitions of Class 1 (upper-upper class) and Class 2 (upper-middle class) reflect these subtle distinctions, it is questionable whether the index can actually make these distinctions. For example, a lawyer, who qualifies as Class 1, might reflect the Hollingshead Class 2 definition, or possibly the Class 3 (lower-middle class) definition. People who qualify as upper-class by the indicators chosen by the researcher to measure social class, but really are not upper-class, are considered false positive errors (Domhoff, 1983). People who do not qualify as upper-class by the indicators chosen by the researcher to measure social class, but really are upper-class, are considered false negative errors. Based on the lack of information on essential indicators of social class such as income, house size, family lineage, and subtleties of behavior, it is believed that Hollingshead's Index of Social Position may yield too many of these errors. The likelihood that the "two different kinds of errors tend to cancel each other out in group data" (Domhoff, 1983, p. 48), should not be assumed because this would not remove the concerns about the index's possible lack of accuracy in measurement.

However, since the index is standardized, it could be a valuable comparative tool, for example, between polo and combined driving participants in the United States. Because the index ignores, and cannot measure, important social class indicators, it is recommended not to use the Index of Social Position to measure social class. It is believed that a more accurate assessment of social class can be accomplished through the methodology developed by Hollingshead (1949) in Elmtown's Youth. His methodology used a system based on interviews and many social class criteria.

The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire

Since the factor analysis clustered statements that were consistent with the five social functions defined for this study (Factors 1, 2, 3, 5, and 7), it seems logical to use the statements of these factors as a base for the further development of the questionnaire.

For the Socialization Through function, close consideration should be given to modifying or eliminating some of its statements. The statements of Factor 4 (Q19 and Q22), a variation on the anticipated Socialization Through factor (Factor 7), would be the logical statements to consider. The fate of the statements of Factor 4 would depend on the intent of the questionnaire's further use. For example, if the intent was to develop the five main factors (1, 2, 3, 5 and 7), then the statements of Factor 4 would be eliminated. If the intent was to cluster the statements of Factors 4 and 7 together, then it would be necessary to modify the statements of

Factor 4. If the intent was to develop the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire as an eight-factor scale, then Factor 4 could be strengthened by the development of additional statements.

The same situation should be considered for the Socialization Into function. Prior to the questionnaire's further use, either eliminate Factor 8, modify its statements to cluster with Factor 3, or strengthen it by additional statements.

The Status function, as with the two Socialization functions, had one anticipated factor (Factor 1), and one factor that was considered a slight variation (Factor 9). The statements of Factor 9 (Q20 and Q26) should be given the same consideration as the statements of Factor 4 (Socialization Through) and the statements of Factor 8 (Socialization Into). In addition, close consideration should be given to eliminating Q28; it arranged itself unexpectedly in Factor 1.

Other statements such as Q1 and Q3 (Factor 6), and Q4 and Q6 (Factor 10) unexpectedly clustered together, and should therefore be eliminated.

The fate of the statements in question depends on which way the future investigator wishes to pursue the study, either in the development of the five primary factors (1, 2, 3, 5, and 7), or in the exploration of an eight-factor scale. Overall, the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire yielded factors that were consistent with the five social function outline, but the questionnaire, with one exception, did not demonstrate acceptable reliability levels.

Therefore, further development would be required to establish better claims of the questionnaire's validity and reliability.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study on the equestrian sport of combined driving was designed so it could be replicated on other equestrian sports in the United States and possibly the combined driving participants of other countries.

Based on the evaluation of this study's measurement tools, it is recommended that this study be replicated on other equestrian sports in the United States using the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire (after further development) and the demographic questions. The statements and questions can be reworded to reflect the sport under investigation. However, the Hollingshead Index of Social Position should be used only as a comparative tool. The education and occupation scales are considered valuable measurement tools, but a future investigator, who may wish to make a thorough social class assessment of an equestrian sport, should consider another social class measurement methodology (Hollingshead [1949] for example).

It is recommended to study combined drivers of other countries, particularly in Europe, in a sociological perspective. The Social Function Attitude Questionnaire--after modification--and the demographic questions would be appropriate measurement tools. However, the validity of the Hollingshead methodologies (1949,

1957), based on American standards, is questionable for the population of other countries.

This study revealed that persons of different social class compete against one another at combined driving events. For a more thorough investigation of these data, it is recommended that the dynamics of social class interaction at events be tested by observation techniques. For example, how do drivers, grooms, stable help, and spectators interact among one another? An adequate observation methodology could reveal possible cliquish behavior, or lack of cliquish behavior, within this sporting sub-culture.

Based on the results of the Social Function Attitude Questionnaire, it is recommended that another study be designed using more precise qualitative methodologies, such as observational techniques, which would investigate combined driving further as a status sport. The literature on social class suggests that equestrian sports are a method of gaining or maintaining prestige. The findings of this study provide evidence that more than half of the combined drivers of this study do not believe that this sport is a way to gain status and prestige. Their sentiment should be explored further. Also, it is demonstrated that female drivers have a slightly higher agreement rate than the male drivers to status statements. A further investigation testing these two previous points is encouraged.

An effort should be made as well to include geography as a equestrian sport participation variable. For example, are wealthy

suburbanites competing against lower-income rural dwellers? In addition, an exploration of east coast/west coast differences in equestrian sport participation could make an interesting topic of research.

Other areas of inquiry into combined driving could include combined driving as a vehicle for social mobility, combined driving as a "lifetime" sport, and combined driving for the physically disabled competitor.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Air Line Pilots Association. (1984). Airline pilot career information. Washington, DC: Author.
- American college dictionary. (1959). New York: Random House.
- American Driving Society (Ed.). (1987, January). The American Driving Society Handbook. (Available from The American Driving Society, P.O. Box 160, Metamora, MI 48455)
- American Driving Society. (1988a, February). The whip: Newsletter of the American Driving Society. Metamora, MI: Author.
- American Driving Society. (1988b, July). The whip: Newsletter of the American Driving Society. Metamora, MI: Author.
- Anderson, D., & Stone, G. (1979). A fifteen year analysis of socio-economic strata differences in the meaning given to sport by metropolitans. In M. L. Krotee (Ed.), The dimensions of sport sociology (pp. 167-184). West Point, NY: Leisure.
- Arnold, J. (1979). All drawn by horses. North Pomfret, VT: David & Charles.
- Aversa, A. (1981). Foxhunting: A patrician sport. Review of Sport and Leisure, 6(2), 83-110.
- Baker, W. J. (1982). Sports in the western world. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Beem, E. A. (1982, October). Sport of princes. Yankee, pp. 120-125.
- Bourdieu, P. (1978). Sport and social class. Social Science Information, 17, 819-840.

- Chase, S. (1934). Forward. In T. Veblen, The theory of the leisure class (pp. xi-xv). New York: Random House.
- Chelberg, P. T. (1985, November). The driving elite. Town and Country, pp. 194-205, 288-291.
- Clatworthy, N. M. (1981). Social-class and value factors in saddle-horse showing. Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology, 9, 135-138.
- Coakley, J. J. (1982). Sport in society: Issues and controversies (2nd ed.). St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.
- Curry, T. J., & Jiobu, R. M. (1984). Sports: A social perspective. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Domhoff, G. W. (1983). Who rules America now?: A view for the 80's. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Dossenbach, M., & Dossenbach, H. (1983). The noble horse. Boston: Hall.
- Eitzen, D. S., & Sage, G. H. (1982). Sociology of American sport (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Brown.
- Figler, S. K. (1981). Sport and play in American life. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Fine, G. A. (1979). Preadolescent socialization through organized athletics: The construction of moral meanings in little league baseball. In M. L. Krotee (Ed.), The dimensions of sport sociology (pp. 79-105). West Point, NY: Leisure.
- Fussell, P. (1983). Class. New York: Ballantine.
- Galbraith, R. (Producer), & Darnley-Smith, J. (Director). (1987). Horses [Television Series]. Scotland: Scottish Television.

- Gladstone Equestrian Association. (1987). The 1987 Gladstone driving event program. Gladstone, NJ: Author.
- Grimshaw, A. (1982). The horse: A bibliography of British books 1851-1976. London: Library Association.
- Gruneau, R. S. (1975). Sport, social differentiation and social inequality. In D. Ball & J. Loy (Eds.), Sport and social order (pp. 121-184). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Henricks, T. S. (1984). The democratization of sport in eighteenth-century England. Journal of Popular Culture, 18(3), 3-20.
- Hollingshead, A. B. (1949). Elmtown's youth. New York: John Wiley.
- Hollingshead, A. B. (1957). Two factor index of social position. (Available from A. B. Hollingshead, 1965 Yale Station, New Haven, CT).
- Hollingshead, A. B. (1958). Social class and mental illness: A community study. New York: John Wiley.
- Hollingshead, A. B. (1975). Elmtown's youth and Elmtown revisited. New York: John Wiley.
- Kellogg, C. W. (1978). Driving the horse in harness. Battleboro, VT: Stephen Greene.
- Kenyon, G. S. (1968). Six scales for assessing attitude toward physical activity. Research Quarterly, 39, 566-574.
- Kenyon, G. S. (1983). A conceptual model for characterizing physical activity. In W. N. Widmeyer (Ed.), Physical activity and the social sciences (pp. 12-21). Ithica, NY: Movement.

- Kirkendall, D. R., Gruber, J. J., & Johnson, R. E. (1980). Measurement and evaluation for physical educators. Dubuque, IA: Brown.
- Lapham, L. H. (1988). Money and class in America. New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Lidz, F. (1988, December 5). Carriages for kicks: Combined driving is a hobby of the horsey set. Sports Illustrated, pp. 110-112.
- Loy, J. W., McPherson, B. D., & Kenyon, G. (1978). Sport and social systems. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Luschen, G. (1970). Sociology of sport and the cross-cultural analysis of sport and games. In G. Luschen (Ed.), The cross-cultural analysis of sport and games (pp. 6-13). Champaign, IL: Stipes.
- Martin, T. W., & Berry, K. B. (1974). Competitive sport in post-industrial society: The case of the motocross racer. Journal of Popular Culture, 8(1), 107-120.
- McCue, B. F. (1953). Constructing an instrument for evaluating attitudes toward intensive competition in team games. Research Quarterly, 24, 205-209.
- McGuire, R. T., & Cook, D. L. (1983). The influence of others and the decision to participate in youth sports. Journal of Sport Behavior, 6, 9-16.
- McPherson, B. D. (1968). An inventory for assessing men's attitudes toward exercise and physical activity. Research Quarterly, 39, 218-220.
- McPherson, B. D. (1981). Socialization into and through sport involvement. In G. R. F. Luschen & G. H. Sage (Eds.), Handbook of social science of sport (pp. 246-273). Champaign, IL: Stipes.

- Mills, C. W. (1953). Introduction to the mentor edition. In T. Veblen, The theory of the leisure class (pp. vi-xix). New York: Macmillan.
- Neumeyer, M. H., & Neumeyer, E. S. (1936). Leisure and recreation. New York: Barnes.
- Nixon, H. L. (1981). An exploratory study of the effects of encouragement and pressure on the sports socialization of males and females. In S. Greendorfer & A. Yiannakis (Eds.), Sociology of sport: Perspectives (pp. 83-94). West Point, NY: Leisure.
- Norusis, M. J. (1987). The SPSS guide to data analysis for SPSSX. Chicago: SPSS.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Philip, Prince (1982). Competition carriage driving. Gawsorth, England: Horse Drawn Carriages.
- Pringle, A. L. (Ed.). (1988a). Official publication of the American Driving Society. The Whip, 15(1).
- Pringle, A. L. (Ed.). (1988b). Official publication of the American Driving Society. The Whip, 15(2).
- Pringle, A. L. (Ed.). (1988c). Official publication of the American Driving Society. The Whip, 15(3).
- Richardson, C. E. (1960). Thurstone scale for measuring attitudes of college students toward physical fitness and exercise. Research Quarterly, 31, 638-643.
- Riesman, D. (1953). Thorstein Veblen: A critical interpretation. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

- Safrit, M. J. (1986). Introduction to measurement in physical education and exercise science. St. Louis: Times Mirror/Mosby.
- Snyder, E. E. (1972). Athletic dressing room slogans as folklore: A means of socialization. International Review of Sport Sociology, 7, 89-100.
- Snyder, E. E., & Spreitzer, E. A. (1983). Social aspects of sport (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Speciale, S. E. (1988). Assessment of attitude differential between hispanic and anglo student-athletes toward intercollegiate athletics. Unpublished master's thesis. San Jose State University, San Jose, CA.
- Spreitzer, E., & Snyder, E. E. (1975). The psychosocial functions of sport as perceived by the general population. International Review of Sport Sociology, 10, 87-93.
- SPSS, Inc. (1986). SPSSx user's guide (2nd ed.). Chicago: SPSS.
- Steele, P. D. (1971). The social-psychological functions of game-participatory leisure activity: An exploratory study. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Texas, Austin, TX.
- Steele, P. D., & Zurcher, L. A. (1979). Leisure sports as "ephemeral roles": An exploratory study. In A. Yiannakis, T. D. McIntyre, M. J. Melnick & D. P. Hart (Eds.), Sport sociology: Contemporary themes (2nd ed.) (pp. 275-279). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Stone, G. P. (1976). Some meanings of American sport: An extended view. In M. Hart (Ed.), Sport in the sociocultural process (2nd ed.) (pp. 143-155). Dubuque, IA: Brown.

- Sutton-Smith, B., & Roberts J. M. (1970). The cross-cultural and psychological study of games. In G. Luschen (Ed.), The cross-cultural analysis of sport and games (pp. 100-108). Champaign, IL: Stipes.
- Tarr, L. (1969). The history of the carriage. New York: Arco.
- Thomas, J. R., & Nelson, J. K. (1985). Introduction to research in health, physical education, recreation, and dance. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Trainer, D. (1978). Carriage driving: Out of a statelier past. Americana, 6(5), 58-62.
- Tunis, E. (1955). Wheels: A pictorial history. Cleveland: World.
- United States Department of Agriculture (1985, August). Agricultural land values and markets: Outlook and situation report. (Document no. A. 93.29/2-4: 985). Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture; Economic Research Service.
- United States Department of Labor (1977). Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Washington, DC: United States Department of Labor; Employment and Training Administration.
- Veblen, T. (1953). The theory of the leisure class. New York: Macmillan.
- Viken, J., Krotee, M., & Stone, G. (1979). Popular culture and the erosion of class distinctions in the mass sport of drag racing. In M. L. Krotee (Ed.), The dimensions of sport sociology (pp. 127-140). West Point, NY: Leisure.
- Warner, W. L., Meeker, M., & Eells, K. (1960). Social class in America. New York: Harper & Row.
- Wear, C. L. (1955). Construction of equivalent forms of an attitude scale. Research Quarterly, 26, 113-119.

- Williams, T., & Jackson, J. (1981). Involvement in a voluntary sport organization. Journal of Sport Behavior, 4, 45-53.
- Zurher, L. A. (1970). The "friendly" poker game: A study of an ephemeral role. Social Forces, 49, 173-186.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions are intended to better understand who competes in combined driving. The intent of this study is to describe a group of people, not just one individual. The information you give is totally confidential.

To which organization would you like a one dollar donation sent?

The American Driving Society _____

United States Equestrian Team _____

Please complete the survey questions by using the space provided or by circling the appropriate number.

1. Sex: F.....1
M.....2

2. Age: In what year were you born? 19_____

Please complete the next set of questions for you, and if married, your spouse as well.

3. What level of education have you completed?

	you	your spouse
Elementary school	7	7
Junior high	6	6
Some high school	5	5
High school graduate	4	4
Some college	3	3
College graduate: B.S., B.A., etc.	2	2
Graduate training: M.S., Ph.D., M.D., etc.	1	1

4. What is your occupation or profession? (If retired, please indicate primary occupation while working.)

5. Would you please briefly describe this occupation? (size of the organization, your position within it)

6. What is/was your spouse's occupation or profession? (If retired or deceased, please indicate primary occupation while working.)

7. Would you please briefly describe this occupation? (size of the organization, his/her position within it)

This set of questions pertains to combined driving. Please try to keep your answers confined to combined driving, and not other carriage events you may participate in.

8. How old were you when you first became actively involved with horses? _____

9. Who was the most important person to introduce you to the world of horses?

Mother.....1	Professional acquaintance.....5
Father.....2	School, equine center or club....6
Sibling3	Friend7
Spouse4	Other_____

10. How old were you when you first became actively involved in combined driving?_____

11. Who was the most important person to introduce you to the sport of combined driving?

Mother.....1	Professional acquaintance.....5
Father2	School, equine center or club....6
Sibling3	Friend7
Spouse4	Other_____

12. Under which class do you most often compete, and at what level?

Four-in-hand.....1	Advanced.....1
Pair/Tandem.....2	Intermediate.....2
Single.....3	Preliminary.....3
	Training.....4

13. During an average week, how many hours do you personally dedicate to the sport of combined driving?

Training/driving horses for combined driving events _____hrs.
Maintenance of combined driving horses and carriages _____hrs.

14. In your best estimation, how much money do you invest into the sport of combined driving during a typical year?

less than \$500.....1	\$5001 to 10,000.....5
\$501 to 1000.....2	more than \$10,000.....6
\$1001 to 2500.....3	
\$2501 to 5000.....4	

15. How many combined driving events do you compete in each year? _____

16. How many horses/ponies do you have at your disposal for combined driving? _____

17. Do you typically own the horses/ponies you drive?

Yes.....1 No.....2

18. Is the sport of combined driving the primary way in which you occupy your time during a typical day? Yes.....1 No.....2

19. Do you participate in other equestrian activities?

Yes.....1 No.....2

If yes, would you list them in your order of preference? (include combined driving)

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

129-132

U·M·I

APPENDIX C**CONSENT FORM****AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
AT SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**

RESPONSIBLE INVESTIGATOR: ERIC LENNOX GREY

**TITLE OF PROTOCOL: A SOCIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE
EQUESTRIAN SPORT OF COMBINED DRIVING**

I have been asked to participate in a research study that is doing a sociological assessment of combined driving. The results of this study will help further the understanding of the relationship between sport and society. I understand that:

- 1) I will be asked to answer a 15 minute multiple choice questionnaire, without supervision, alone, and in a quiet environment.
- 2) the possible risks of this study to me are that I may feel uncomfortable revealing information about myself and my attitudes.
- 3) the possible benefits of this study to me are a better understanding of how a research project in physical education/sociology is conducted, as well as lending support towards the education of a graduate student.
- 4) there are no alternative procedures.
- 5) the results of this study may be published, but any information from this study that can be identified with me will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with my permission or as required by law.
- 6) a financial compensation of \$1 (one U.S. dollar), supplied by the author, will be donated to my choice of either the American Driving Society or the United States Equestrian Team for my returned survey.

7) any questions about my participation in this study will be answered by Eric Lennox Grey, the investigator at (415) 856-3630. Complaints about the procedures may be presented to the Head of the Department of Human Performance, Dr. James Bryant, at (408) 924-3010. For questions or complaints about research subject's rights, or in the event of research-related injury, contact Serena Stanford, Ph.D. (Associate Academic Vice President for Graduate Studies & Research) at (408) 924-2480.

8) my consent is given voluntarily without being coerced; I may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study, and I may withdraw at any time, without prejudice to my relations with SJSU.

9) I may keep one copy of this consent form for my file.
I HAVE MADE A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO PARTICIPATE. MY
SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT I HAVE READ THE INFORMATION
PROVIDED ABOVE AND THAT I HAVE DECIDED TO PARTICIPATE.

DATE

SUBJECT'S SIGNATURE

INVESTIGATORS SIGNATURE

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER

Dear Carriage Enthusiast,

Because combined driving is considered one of the relatively newer sports on the American equestrian scene, it is a sport that is unfamiliar to many people. Attached is a survey that asks you about your involvement in combined driving and some of the values that this sport offers you. The results of this investigation will help those professionals interested in the study of sport to better understand the relationship between equitation, sport, and society.

Through the Department of Human Performance at San Jose State University in San Jose, California, I have constructed a thesis related to equestrian sport to complete my Master of Arts degree. You have been selected for this study through driving event programs and American Driving Society literature. Your participation in this study is voluntary, but since combined driving has only several hundred serious competitors, you are considered an important person. I would appreciate a few minutes of your time so you may fill out the survey and return it quickly. All the data I will collect will be dealt with confidentially, and no one in this study will be identified.

This is a private study, but by helping me complete my research, you are contributing to the sport of driving carriages. To demonstrate my seriousness, I will send one dollar to your choice of either the ADS or USET for your returned survey. Please read the attached consent form carefully, sign one copy and return it with the questionnaire; you may keep the other copy. If you have any questions about this study, I would be happy to talk with you. I can be reached at (415) 856-3630. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Eric Lennox Grey
Graduate Student

APPENDIX E

REMINDER LETTER

Dear Carriage Enthusiast,

I recently sent a survey to you regarding your involvement in combined driving and have not yet heard from you. I am writing to you again because of the importance of this study to me and the need for your help--the sample of subjects I am using is small and I feel it is important that I receive your completed questionnaire.

I am hoping that you have been on vacation or have been busy and have not had a chance to complete the survey. Again, for your returned survey, one dollar will be sent to your choice of either the American Driving Society or the United States Equestrian Team. If you could give 15 minutes of your time to express your attitudes, I would be grateful. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Eric Lennox Grey
Graduate Student

APPENDIX F

FOLLOW-UP COVER LETTER

Hello,

I have contacted you twice to ask if you would participate in a study on combined driving and have not heard from you yet. The questionnaire was sent during the winter months, so it is possible that you may have been away. I also enclosed another copy, however, just in case I mistakenly didn't get one to you the first time. It would be most helpful if you could place the questionnaire in the mail by April 4th. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Eric Lennox Grey
Graduate Student

APPENDIX G

STATEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM FACTOR ANALYSIS

Statement	Factor									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Q8	.651	.174	.066	.043	-.086	.297	.045	-.273	-.037	.111
Q9	.736	.147	-.103	.115	.016	-.121	.028	.239	.106	-.005
Q18	.732	.079	.098	.130	-.080	-.042	.112	.086	.217	-.091
Q28	.500	.255	.086	-.171	.196	.269	.181	.036	-.126	-.146
Q7	.152	.863	-.007	.028	-.015	.035	-.012	-.107	-.015	.130
Q11	.204	.857	-.035	-.037	.036	.113	.037	.025	.070	.078
Q12	.088	.642	.028	.152	.204	.055	.095	-.014	.344	-.164
Q16	.150	-.059	.760	.169	.012	.060	-.188	-.087	.102	-.027
Q17	-.029	-.040	.671	-.042	-.390	.087	-.017	.040	-.110	.159
Q24	-.179	.114	.594	-.138	.072	-.177	.112	.345	-.219	.012
Q25	.054	.008	.677	.020	.302	-.083	.202	.130	-.021	-.047
Q19	.067	.136	.074	.796	.055	-.039	.086	.081	.043	.007
Q22	.044	-.162	-.028	.735	.122	.264	.117	.034	.058	.211
Q2	-.003	.017	-.140	-.146	.529	.471	.376	-.040	-.078	.061
Q5	-.004	-.013	.127	-.031	.617	.134	.341	-.136	.090	.369
Q10	.274	.265	-.187	.349	.558	-.156	-.019	.079	-.149	-.097
Q27	-.107	.065	.120	.208	.678	.214	-.078	.075	.053	-.035
Q1	-.071	.190	-.120	.036	.118	.761	.183	-.024	.026	-.120
Q3	.106	-.005	.076	.170	.067	.704	-.068	.003	-.003	.093
Q14	.116	.173	.013	.433	.146	.285	.496	-.119	.114	-.184
Q15	.042	.218	.128	.336	.108	.180	.477	.030	-.268	-.318
Q23	.226	-.023	-.008	.108	.021	.001	.773	.050	.052	.202
Q13	.101	-.022	-.022	-.021	-.066	.091	-.145	.821	-.052	.111
Q21	.050	-.077	.227	.140	.086	-.107	.170	.672	.009	.023
Q20	.139	.147	-.069	.089	-.009	.050	-.045	-.073	.783	.008
Q26	.517	.107	-.010	-.027	.118	-.081	.162	.020	.536	.056
Q4	.322	.013	.086	.343	.217	.176	-.035	-.213	-.382	.466
Q6	-.087	.111	.025	.080	.012	-.029	.080	.176	.026	.789

APPENDIX H

COMPARISON OF FACTOR ANALYSIS WITH
EXPERT STATEMENT-CLASSIFICATION

Statement	Factor Loading	Experts' Classification
Factor 1: Status and Prestige as a Social Function of Combined Driving		
Q8	.651	Status
Q9	.736	Status
Q18	.732	Status
Q28	.500	Separation
Factor 2: Separating from a Daily Routine to Fulfill Needs Not Satisfied by the Dominant Role in Life as a Social Function of Combined Driving		
Q7	.863	Separation
Q11	.857	Separation
Q12	.642	Separation
Factor 3: The Nuclear Family as a Socializing Agent Into Equestrianism as a Social Function of Combined Driving		
Q16	.760	Socialization Into
Q17	.671	Socialization Into
Q24	.594	Socialization Into
Q25	.677	Socialization Into
Factor 4: Providing Relevant Values and Attitudes as a Social Function of Combined Driving		
Q19	.796	Socialization Through
Q22	.735	Socialization Through

Statement	Factor Loading	Experts' Classification
Factor 5: Affiliating With Others as a Social Function of Combined Driving		
Q2	.529	Affiliation
Q5	.617	Affiliation
Q10	.558	Affiliation
Q27	.678	Affiliation
Factor 6: Breaking from a Daily Routine to Make Friends in a Healthy Environment as a Social Function of Combined Driving		
Q1	.761	Separation
Q3	.704	Socialization Through
Factor 7: Socializing the Driver Through Sport as a Social Function of Combined Driving		
Q14	.496	Socialization Through
Q15	.477	Socialization Through
Q23	.773	Socialization Through
Factor 8: Encouragement and Pressure as Socializing Agents as a Social Function of Combined Driving		
Q13	.821	Socialization Into
Q21	.672	Socialization Into
Factor 9: Winning as a Means of Achieving Esteem as a Social Function of Combined Driving		
Q20	.783	Status
Q26	.536	Status

Statement	Factor Loading	Experts' Classification
Factor 10: The Driving Community and Equestrian Centers as Socializing Agents as a Social Function of Combined Driving		
Q4	.466	Affiliation
Q6	.789	Socialization Into

APPENDIX I

ANOVA TABLES FOR THE SOCIAL FUNCTIONS

$$R = \frac{\text{Mean Square (Between People)} - \text{Mean Square (Within People)}}{\text{Mean Square (Between People)}}$$

Affiliation (Factor 5: Q2, Q5, Q10, and Q27)

Source	df	Sum Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	R
Between People	150	120.9868	.8066		
Within People	453	145.0000	.3201		
Between Measures	3	2.3179	.7726	2.4368	
Residual	450	142.6821	.3171		
Total	603	265.9868	.4411		.60

Separation (Factor 2: Q7, Q11, and Q12)

Source	df	Sum Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	R
Between People	149	378.0911	2.5375		
Within People	300	184.0000	.6133		
Between Measures	2	23.3644	11.6822	22.3119	
Residual	298	160.0356	.5370		
Total	449	562.0911	1.2519		.76

Socialization Through (Factor 4: Q19 and Q22; Factor 7: Q14, Q15, and Q23)

Source	df	Sum Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	R
Between People	153	190.4987	1.2451		
Within People	616	339.6000	.5513		
Between Measures	4	88.5922	22.1481	54.0007	
Residual	612	251.0078	.4101		
Total	769	530.0987	.6893		
					.56

Socialization Into (Factor 3: Q16, Q17, Q24, and Q25; Factor 8: Q13 and Q21)

Source	df	Sum Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	R
Between People	108	345.4924	3.1990		
Within People	545	827.3333	1.5180		
Between Measures	5	208.5688	41.7138	36.4039	
Residual	540	618.7645	1.1459		
Total	653	1172.8257	1.7961		
					.52

Status and Prestige (Factor 1: Q8, Q9, Q18, and Q28; Factor 9: Q20 and Q26)

Source	df	Sum Squares	Mean Squares	F ratio	R
Between People	150	402.2649	2.6818		
Within People	755	702.5000	.9305		
Between Measures	5	89.0960	17.8192	21.7873	
Residual	750	613.4040	.8179		
Total	905	1104.7649	1.2207		
					.65

APPENDIX J

FREQUENCIES, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF
SOCIAL FUNCTION ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

	Response						<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Q1	74	68	6	5	-	1	1.62	.72
Q2	52	92	8	1	1	-	1.75	.64
Q3	22	74	35	23	-	-	2.38	.90
Q4	16	75	39	24	-	-	2.46	.88
Q5	42	94	11	6	1	-	1.90	.74
Q6	20	41	5	65	21	2	3.17	1.33
Q7	56	70	10	14	1	3	1.90	.93
Q8	12	39	37	56	10	-	3.08	1.09
Q9	11	42	38	58	3	2	3.00	1.01
Q10	35	100	13	4	-	2	1.91	.64
Q11	44	62	14	32	2	-	2.26	1.12
Q12	36	59	14	40	4	1	2.46	1.19
Q13	1	16	7	92	38	-	3.97	.88
Q14	39	98	12	5	-	-	1.89	.67
Q15	76	72	5	1	-	-	1.55	.56
Q16	12	18	-	40	84	-	4.08	1.31
Q17	13	28	2	38	73	-	3.84	1.40
Q18	7	50	32	55	10	-	3.07	1.06
Q19	22	93	22	16	1	-	2.23	.84
Q20	5	35	20	68	26	-	3.49	1.12
Q21	10	55	15	60	13	1	3.07	1.16
Q22	13	75	43	23	-	-	2.49	.85
Q23	16	85	37	16	-	-	2.34	.80
Q24	7	43	7	34	18	45	3.12	1.27
Q25	26	63	13	32	11	9	2.58	1.23
Q26	11	76	39	27	-	1	2.54	.87
Q27	41	101	8	3	-	1	1.82	.61
Q28	32	53	16	48	4	1	2.60	1.20

Note. Responses range from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree); column 6 equals missing responses.

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

145-154

U·M·I

APPENDIX N

COMBINED DRIVING HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OCCUPATION LEVELS

1a: Higher Executives

Administrative Director/CFO (large concern)
 CEO International Title and Mapping Company (2400 agents)
 Director of Administrative Services (municipal gov't)
 Engineer/V P Construction Company (national)
 Executive V P (worldwide organization)
 President (and spouse) Rope Making Company (1500 employees)
 V P Leather Tannery (900 employees)

1b: Large Proprietors

Investment Advisor
 Investment Broker
 Securities Broker
 Stockbroker (4)

1c: Major Professionals

Airline Pilot (2)
 Associate Professor
 Attorney (5)
 Chemical Engineer
 Civil Engineer (2)
 CPA
 Dentist
 Economist
 Electrical Engineer
 Episcopal Priest
 Inventory Control Auditor
 Physician (3)
 Physicist (2)
 Professor of Chemistry
 Scientist (biological drug discovery)
 Statistical Analyst
 Surgeon
 Veterinarian (6)

2a: Business Managers in Large Concerns

Cattle Breeder/Ranch Manager
Corporate Supervisor (management position in large concern)
Department Head (large Organization)
Deputy Director of Planning (large southwest city)
Estate Manager (2)
Farm Manager
Gentleman Farmer
Manager Personnel Resources (6500 employees)
Sales Director (large concern)
Senior Sales Position (large concern)

2b: Proprietors of Medium Businesses

Building Contractor (3)
Farmer (220 Minnesota acres; sheep and horses)
Farmer (70 Massachusetts acres; horses)
Grain Trader
Horse Broker
Landscape Contractor
Manufacturer's Representative (2)
Owner--Printing Co. (30 employees)
Owner--Two Auto Dealerships (45 employees)
President--Truck Transportation (25 cabs)
Real Estate Developer (2)

2c: Lesser Professionals

Accountant-non CPA (2)
Air Force Officer
Air Traffic Controller
Elementary School Teacher
English Teacher
High School Teacher (2)
Junior High School Teacher (2)
Nurse (2)
Pharmacist (2)
Social Worker

3a: Administrative Personnel

Administrator of Computer Systems/Computer Center (junior college)
Administrative Assistant (hospital)
Advertising Accountant/Salesperson
Barn Manager
Captain Fire Department
Construction Supervisor (state)
Data Base Manager (zoo)
Department Head--Grounds and Maintenance (county)
Horse Breeder (manages 50 horses)
Insurance Agent
Manager of Driving/Training Center
Manager Riding Stable
Manager Small Moving and Storage Co.
Manager Small Organization
Operator Horse Training Facility
Production Planner (medium sized concern)
Sales Agent
Secretary (3)
Stable Manager (2)

3b: Small Business Owners

Antique Dealer/Restoration (2 shops; 2 employees)
Co-Partner Rural Heating Co.
Flourist
Glass and Plastics Company
Music Store
Small Cheese Company
Resturant
Tack Shop
Owner/Operator Board and Train Horses (24 Wisconsin acres)
Real Estate Sales (owner)

3c: Semi-Professionals

Clinical Audiologist
 Graphic Designer (2)
 Prosthetist

4b: Technicians

Dental Technician
 Riding Instructor
 Technical Assistant (animal management)

5a: Skilled Manual Employees

Assistant General Foreman (mechanics)
 Blacksmith/Welder
 Carpenter
 Farrier (4)
 Process Planner (machine shop)

--: Could Not Determine

Animal Specialist
 Business Owner
 Dog Show Handler
 Horse Trainer/owner/manager
 Importer of Sailboat Hardware
 Kennel Manager/Stable Owner
 President Small Business Importers
 President Small Closely Held Corporation
 Student (8)

Note. Numerals in parentheses indicate quantity of subjects with that occupation.

APPENDIX O

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OCCUPATION LEVELS ESTIMATED
WITH THE DICTIONARY OF OCCUPATIONAL TITLES

The Dictionary of Occupational Titles, published by the United States Department of Labor, Employment, and Training Administration (1977 [most current edition]), classifies occupations by using a nine digit code (the first six being the most important). These digits describe an occupation in the following manner:

- 1st digit: primary occupational category
- 2nd digit: division within occupational category
- 3rd digit: group within division
- 4th, 5th, 6th digits: worker functions (with respect to data, people, and things)

Subject Occupation	DOT Occupation and Description	Comparable Hollingshead Occupation and Level
Audiologist		Physio-therapists (3c)
	<u>Audiologist</u> (076.101) professional, technical, managerial/occupations in medicine and health/therapist/coordinating (data)/speaking-signalling (people)/precision working (things)	
Captain Fire Department		Administrative Personnel (3a)
	<u>Captain Fire Department</u> (373.134) service occupations/protective services/fire fighters/coordinating (Data)/supervising (people)/manipulating (things)	
Data Base Manager		Administrative Personnel (3a)
	<u>Manager, Electronic Data Processing</u> (169.167) professional, technical, managerial/occupations in administrative specializations/miscellaneous/coordinating (data)/speaking-signalling (people)/handling (things)	

Subject Occupation	DOT Occupation and Description	Comparable Hollingshead Occupation and Level
Deputy City Planner		Executive Assistants/Managers (2a)
	<u>City Planning Aide</u> (199.364) professional, technical, managerial/miscellaneous/miscellaneous/compiling (data)/speaking-signalling (people)/manipulating (things)	
Grain Trader		Purchasing Managers (2b)
	<u>Broker-and-Operator--Grain Trader</u> (162.157) professional, technical, managerial/administrative specializations/purchasing management/coordinating (data)/persuading (people)/handling (things)	
Graphic Designer		Artists, Commercial (3c)
	<u>Graphic Designers</u> (141.061) professional, technical, managerial/occupations in art/commercial artists, designers, and illustrators, graphic arts/synthesizing (data)/speaking-signalling (people)/precision working (things)	
Inventory Control Auditor		Accountants (1c)
	<u>Auditor, Internal</u> (160.167) professional, technical, managerial/administrative specializations/accounts and auditors/coordinating (data)/speaking-signalling (people)/handling (things)	

Subject Occupation	DOT Occupation and Description	Comparable Hollingshead Occupation and Level
Landscape/Building Contractor		Contractors (2b)
	<u>Contractor</u> (182.167) professional, technical, managerial/managers and officials/construction industry/coordinating (data)/speaking-signalling (people)/handling (things)	
Process Planner/ Machine Shop Blueprint Reader		Machinists (5)
	<u>Machine, Experimental</u> (600.280) machine trades/metal machining/machinist/analyzing (data)/taking instructions-helping (people)/setting up (things)	
Production Planner (medium sized co.)		Administrative Personnel, Section Heads (Industry) (3a)
	<u>Production Planner</u> (012.167) professional, technical, managerial/architecture, engineering, and surveying/industrial engineering/coordinating (data)/speaking-signalling (people)/handling (things)	
Prosthetist		Oral Hygienist (3c)
	<u>Prosthetist</u> (078.261) professional, technical, managerial/medicine and health/medical and dental technicians/analyzing (data)/speaking-signalling (people)/precision working (things)	

Subject Occupation	DOT Occupation and Description	Comparable Hollingshead Occupation and Level
Real Estate Developer		Real Estate (2b)
	<u>Manager, Land Development/Real Estate Brokers</u> (186.117) professional, technical, managerial/managers and officials/finance, insurance, and real estate managers/ coordinating (data)/negotiating (people)/handling (things)	
Stable/Barn/ Driving Center Manager		Administrative Personnel (3a)
	<u>Barn Boss</u> (410.131) agricultural and related areas/animal farming/domestic animal farming/coordinating (data)/supervising (people)/precision working (things)	
Statistical Analyst		Actuary (1c)
	<u>Statistician, Applied</u> (020.167) professional, technical, managerial/occupations in mathematics and physical sciences/coordinating (data)/speaking-signalling (people)/handling (things)	

APPENDIX P

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD OCCUPATION LEVELS ESTIMATED BY
THE INVESTIGATOR'S JUDGMENT

Subject Occupation	Comparable Hollingshead Occupation and Level
Occupation Description	
Airline Pilot	none (1c)
<p>There was no comparable occupation to airline pilot in the Hollingshead scale. However, this occupation was logically narrowed down to either a major professional (1c), or lesser professional (2c). According to the Air Line Pilots Association (1984), a pilot must have an intimate knowledge of mathematics, aeronautics, navigation, and meteorology. In addition, their judgment is responsible for hundreds of lives and millions of dollars of equipment. Under these circumstances, it was concluded that this occupation is nothing less than "major."</p>	
Air Traffic Controller	none (2c)
<p>According to information by the Air Line Pilots Association (1984) and the DOT, an air traffic controller is, technically, a radio and radar technician. Although not classified in the Hollingshead scale, this occupation under normal circumstances would likely fall under technician (4b). But taking into consideration other factors, such as mental and physical stress, and responsibility and judgment, this occupation was given a 2c rating, or lesser professional. It was assumed that this occupation would be higher than than a "technician" (4b), but lower than a "major professional" (for example airline pilot).</p>	

Subject Occupation	Comparable Hollingshead Occupation and Level
Occupation Description	
Corporate Supervisor, Department Head (large organization), Manager Personnel Resources	Business managers large concerns (2a)

It was unknown whether these individuals were "business managers in large concerns" (2a) or "section heads of large businesses and industries" (3a). There was no information to justify putting them in either level, so they were given the benefit of the doubt and classified as 2a.

Farmer	Farmer (2b, 3b)
--------	-----------------

Since farmers are in each one of the seven Hollingshead occupation levels, the basic issues concerning farms and farmers are size, and ownership. According to the U S Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service (1985), the average price per acre of land varies according to location. The estimated farm land values for the three subjects of this study were: 220 acres in Minnesota at \$823 (average) per acre equals \$181,060 (livestock and equipment not included)--classified as a business of medium size (2b); 70 acres in Massachusetts at \$2,372 (average) per acre equals \$166,040 (livestock and equipment not included)--classified as a business of medium size (2b); and 24 acres in Wisconsin at \$847 (average) per acre equals \$20,328 (not including livestock and equipment). This last farm would classify as 4d, but since the subject ran a business on the farm, it was classified as 3b.

Subject Occupation	Comparable Hollingshead Occupation and Level
Occupation Description	
Riding Instructor/horse trainer	none (4b)

According to the DOT, a horse trainer is in a separate agricultural category and is not grouped logically with any other occupation. A horse trainer analyzes data, instructs people, and manipulates things, and thus could be considered either a teacher (2c), or instructor (4b). It was finally concluded that the education of our country's youth probably has more relevancy in the social structure than someone who trains horses and it's riders for pleasurable use, thus, a riding instructor was classified as 4b.

Stockbroker, Investment Advisor/Broker; Securities Broker	Broker (1b)
---	-------------

According to the DOT, a stockbroker/securities advisor (broker) is technically a salesman. These subjects could have been considered either "Brokers" (1b) or "Brokerage Salesmen" (2a), but were given the higher rating and the benefit of the doubt as it is assumed that a person in the world of finance would hold a relatively high degree of distinction. As described in Domhoff (1983), "by far the most frequent preoccupation of men of the upper class is business and finance" (p. 37).

APPENDIX Q

SOCIAL POSITION SCORE DATA FOR COMBINED DRIVING EVENTS

Event	Location	n ^a	Mean	Median	Range	
					High	Low
1	New Jersey	30	23	27.5	11	51
2	Massachusetts	23	22	22	11	37
3	New Jersey	16	27	29	11	47
4	New Hamp.	14	25	20.5	11	51
5	New Jersey	7	20	15	11	37
6	Maryland	19	26	29	11	47
7	California	8	18	16.5	11	33
8	Maryland	13	28	29	11	47
9	Michigan	6	25	20	15	47
10	Virginia	7	22	22	11	37
11	Colorado	13	22	22	11	51
12	Arizona	6	22	24	11	29
13	Texas	12	21	15	11	51
14	California	5	20	18	11	33

^an represents the number of usable subjects, not the total number of competitors in the event.

APPENDIX R

STATEMENT CORRELATIONS FROM PILOT STUDY FACTOR ANALYSIS

Factor	Statement	Factor Loading	Experts' Classification
1	Q6	.658	Socialization Into
	Q10	.500	Affiliation
	Q13	.898	Socialization Into
	Q18	.579	Status
	Q21	.904	Socialization Into
2	Q2	.820	Affiliation
	Q4	.599	Affiliation
	Q5	.870	Affiliation
	Q27	.912	Affiliation
	Q28	.546	Separation
3	Q16	.871	Socialization Into
	Q17	.896	Socialization Into
	Q24	.844	Socialization Into
	Q25	.702	Socialization Into
4	Q7	.873	Separation
	Q9	.484	Status
	Q12	.318	Separation
	Q14	.750	Socialization Through
	Q23	.764	Socialization Through
5	Q11	.516	Separation
	Q15	.737	Socialization Through
	Q22	.819	Socialization Through
	Q26	.611	Status
6	Q20	.934	Status
7	Q3	.807	Socialization Through
	Q8	.842	Status
	Q19	.594	Socialization Through
8	Q1	.788	Separation