SOCIAL EFFECTS OF TECHNOLOGICAL UNEMPLOYMENT

by

Seymour Faber

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Sociology)
in The University of Michigan
1973

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor David R. Segal, Chairman
Professor Sydney E. Bernard
Associate Professor Robert E. Cole
Professor David Goldberg

DEDICATION

To the memory of a nice guy--my brother Marvin

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Over the years there have been so many people who have encouraged and helped me in reaching this point in my life, that I am afraid that it would be almost impossible for me to name all to whom I owe a debt.

Those I want to specifically acknowledge at this time are:

Morris Janowitz for his aid and encouragement in the initial conceptualization of this dissertation.

Harold L. Sheppard and Louis A. Ferman for a fruitful experience working with them on the Packard Study.

Ronald Haughton and the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, Wayne State University for their encouragement and financial support of the Packard Study.

Rudolph A. Helling and my colleagues in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Windsor for their encouragement in completing this dissertation.

The University of Windsor for a grant of one third of my salary for one year and the use of its computer facilities.

I especially want to thank the Chairman of my Dissertation Committee, David R. Segal, whose guidance, support and patience made this dissertation possible.

The members of my Dissertation Committee, David Goldberg, Sydney E. Bernard and Robert E. Cole for their time, effort and guidance in the writing of this dissertation.

To the numerous friends and members of my family who have aided, encouraged and helped me in completing this work. Especially Tony Blair, Bob Pinto, Marty and Jessie Glaberman, John C. Scott, Bill Friedland, Bill Simon, Ed Blakelock and Jim Rinehart, Arthur Faber, Laura Trosch.

A special acknowledgment has to be made to two very important people to me whose help and encouragement and friendship have been indispensible and without equal — Harold Strom and Helen Gilman.

Last but not least, let me thank those who typed the many versions of this manuscript. Lucy Dumouchelle, Dorene Ball, Joan Mathews and Francine Fein.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

DEFINING THE PROBLEM AND REVIEWING THE LITERATURE

Rapid and continued technological change remains a prominent feature of modern society. Such changes go on at varying rates of speed, at times slowing or accelerating as invention and the requirements and availability of capital allow. When these changes are rapid, they can and do bring severe and widespread dislocations throughout the social structure.

From the end of the second World War through the early sixties, the automobile industry underwent rapid and accelerated change that has since slowed but continues on nonetheless. It engaged in a vast project of automating, building new units to house the new automated machines and decentralizing in order to bring plants closer to consumers. This situation was initiated by the bigger companies in the industry, primarily Ford and General Motors, and in response the smaller companies undertook a process of consolidation and merger that led to their closing plants in the Detroit area and changing the "face" of the automobile industry. Hudson Motor Car Company consolidated with Nash and a new firm, American Motors, was born. As a result, the Hudson plant in Detroit was abandoned. Kaiser moved from Willow

Run to Toledo and ceased production of the Kaiser automobile, concentrating on production of the Jeep. Then, Kaiser sold this operation to American Motors and went out of the automobile business altogether. Packard Motor Car Company merged with Studebaker, moved its operations to South Bend, Indiana, and at first de-emphasized and then discontinued its production of the Packard altogether. But even this was not enough, for shortly thereafter this company was forced to close.

Within the larger firms, there had been important decisions and moves such as the Ford Motor Company's building of a new automated press plant at Buffalo, New York. This led to Ford's cancelling its long-standing contract with the Murray Body Corporation and the demise of the latter. Lincoln closed its old Detroit plant and moved to a new plant outside the city.

It was fairly obvious that these changes, too numerous to detail, would have been disruptive to the social structure of a large metropolis like Detroit. Most research done on automation had usually centered on the adjustments of the men still working in the plant. There had been some studies that had dealt with the economic consequences and job hunting experiences of people that had been affected by plant shutdown. Few had dealt with the effects of this experience on social and political attitudes.

Are there such effects and what consequences might this have had for our society?[1]

This is a study of one case of plant shutdown. The Packard Motor Car Company was one of the oldest and most respected of the automobile companies. It had a large number of older, higher seniority employees, who had been with the company as many as twenty to thirty years. Then without warning, it was announced that the Detroit plant would cease operations and these men who had, with each succeeding year, been building a basis for a secure present and future, suddenly found themselves without this security.

Noting the development of this situation, a study was initiated of former employees of the Packard Motor Car Company, in 1957-58 by Dr. Harold Sheppard in an attempt to determine its effects. As a part of this larger project, there was a desire to determine what effect the experience of plant

---

[1]Some of the studies dealing with plant shutdowns are: Adams, Leonard P. and Robert L. Aronson, Workers and Industrial Change: Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1957; Sheppard, Harold L. and James Stern, "Impact of Automation on Workers in Supplier Plants," Labor Law Journal, VIII (October 1957), p. 714-18; Wilcock, Richard C., "Impact on Workers and Community of a Plant Shutdown in a Depressed Area," Monthly Labor Review, LXXX (September 1957), p. 1047-52. There are three that have dealt with some attitudinal variables: Sheppard, Harold L., Ferman, Louis A. and Faber, Seymour, Too Old to Work, Too Young to Retire: A Case Study of Permanent Plant Shutdown. Special Report, U. S. Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, 86th Congress (1st Session Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960); Aiken, Michael, Ferman, Louis A., Sheppard, Harold L., Economic Failure, Alienation and Extremism: University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1968; Crysdale, Stewart, "Social Effects of a Factory Relocation," Canada: A Sociological Profile, edited by W. E. Mann. Copp Clark Publishing Co., Toronto, 1968.

shutdown had on the political attitudes of these men, and what modes of adjustment they adopted in response to the situation in which they found themselves. The problem of this particular dissertation is to focus on three of the many possible types of response men have adopted in deprivational situations in an attempt to determine what factors would have led them to react as they did. We are most interested in seeing what kinds of people adopted a particular response and why they did so.

The three response patterns are:

1. Anomia — a view of the world and of personal relations as fickle with little or no desire to continue to be a part of it all arising from despair and resignation.
2. Prejudice and Scapegoating — situation viewed in status threatening terms resulting in hatred for minority groups, in this case specifically Jews and Blacks.
3. Heightening of Class Consciousness — situation viewed in class terms, with the result of greater identification with the working class as their own class and a more positive attitude and greater adherence to working class organizations. In addition a desire to see a change toward increased governmental control over the economy.

We focused on these three patterns for two reasons. First, because plant shutdowns and technological unemploy-

ment were an important phenomenon in our society. The shock of plant shutdown and its attendant deprivation could result in attitudinal responses that may have consequences for the stability of our social structure. The three responses here picked for study seemed to the author to be those which most fulfilled this criterion. These, because of their social significance, were among those variables that the social sciences have endeavored to investigate most fully. Second, these were chosen for their theoretical relevance. There were large and important bodies of literature (which we discuss in the next section of this chapter) dealing with each of these three patterns of response. It was in the tradition of this literature that the framework for this dissertation was organized, in the hope that it may add to this literature by shedding some empirical light on how and why people going through deprivational situations reacted as they did.

Theoretical Orientation

Individuals vary in their reactions to experienced deprivation. The above statement may seem to be a truism, but it has the value of pointing up the important role that differential perception plays in giving a person that particular attitude which he may adopt in crises. Further, by gaining some understanding of what long term unemployment must mean to a man, it may help us in our task of determining why and how people responded as they did to this

situation. Komarovsky stated that in addition to economic need, unemployment brought at least three important changes into the lives of the unemployed which in turn colored most of their social relations.

1. Loss of Provider Role in the Family— Loss of Status in Family

Man, as the family provider, fulfills one of the most widespread role definitions existing in our culture. With a loss of employment and the inability of the man to find work, this role must go to someone else or he must let his family starve. The general effect of this situation is to cause the man extreme humiliation and frustration. Kamarovsky says rather dramatically:

> "The general impression that the interviews make is that in addition to sheer economic anxiety the man suffers humiliation. He experiences a sense of deep frustration because what is the central duty of his life, the very touchstone of his manhood— the role of family provider.
>
> The man appears bewildered and humiliated. It is as if the ground had gone from under his feet. . . Whether he had considerable authority within the family and was recognised as its head, or whether the wife's stronger personality had dominated the family, he nevertheless derived strength from his role as provider. Every purchase of the family . . . were symbols of their dependence on him. Unemployment changed it all. It is to the relief office, or to a relative, that the family now turns.[1]"

In this connection an experience of one of the interviewers of the Packard study seems most appropriate. She

---

[1] Kamarovsky, Mirra: The Unemployed Man and His Family; The Dryden Press, New York, 1940, p. 74.

related how, in the course of the interview, the man, the unemployed worker, sat dazed; and how the wife at one point volunteered that she was thinking of suing her husband for non-support because if he were in jail at least he would be fed.

Kamarovsky then stated that although the dominant reaction was fear and humiliation, there were also other reactions. There was a group of men who did not view this experience with a sense of frustration. There were some men who were always irresponsible and indifferent to the family and therefore unemployment did not affect them in this sphere. Then there were others who, although they felt their inability to support their families, were nevertheless not broken by it. She said that their dominant sentiment was economic anxiety rather than humiliation. They felt that unemployment was not their fault and gave no indication of humiliation or fear for their status.

From the above it is apparent that the role of family provider was one area of life that was affected by unemployment. But although it was thus affected, the response to its effect was different depending on the perception of who was to blame for their loss of employment and how strongly the provider was tied in with a man's self-esteem. Insofar as these factors made unemployment a strong shock to some and not to others, it also affected their reaction to it.

2. Economic failure and its prestige implications— Loss of Status in Community

Economic failure was considered before in relation to

its effects on the man's role in the family, but it had wider ramifications. It not only meant that the man's standard of living was reduced, or that his role in the family was changed with attendant strain; the very fact such a reduction was forced on him had, for some, important status implications with attendant psychological consequences.

One of the traditional ways in which a person acquires status in American society has been through occupational advancement and material acquisition. This has been an almost never-ending theme which has become firmly entrenched in American culture. The extent of its permeation of the culture was described by Merton:

> "In pulpit and in press, in fiction and in motion pictures, in the course of formal education and of informal socialization, in the various public and private communications which come to the attention of Americans, there is a comparatively marked emphasis on the moral obligation, as well as the factual possibility of striving for monetary success, and of achieving it.[1]"

Though this is and was the prevailing theme, however, it does not imply that the response to this theme is or was either universal or uniform among all layers of the society. There are a number of studies that point to the possibility that among workers the traditional notion of success may have taken secondary importance or even have

---

[1]Merton, Robert K. "Social Structure and Anomia" and "Continuities in the Theory of Social Structure and Anomia": Social Theory and Social Structure revised enlarged edition, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1957, p. 48.

been redefined. Herbert H. Hyman, in an analysis of public opinion data concluded:

> "The components of this (lower class) value system, in our judgment involve less emphasis upon the traditional high success goals, increased awareness of lack of opportunity to achieve success, and less emphasis upon the achievement of goals which in turn would be instrumental for success. To put it simply the lower class individual doesn't want as much success, knows he couldn't get it even if he wanted to and doesn't want what might help him get success.[1]"

His analysis revealed concretely that workers did not tend to value education as a vehicle for advancement as much as did people in the middle class. The data also showed that workers favored a job which provided steady employment and low income over risky but more promising jobs.

The findings of Centers on this same thesis are important. Using a national sample of white males, he found that a majority of manual workers rated a guarantee to every person of a "decent and steady job and standard of living" a more important task of government than making "certain that there were good opportunities for each person to get ahead on his own."[2]

In another study, Eli Chinoy found that workers redefined "advancement to include the goals and interests

---

[1] Hyman, Herbert H., "The Value Systems of Different Classes: a Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification": Bendix R., and Lipset, S.M. Class Status and Power, The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1953, p. 427.

[2] Centers, Richard, "The American Class Structure," Swanson, Guy E., Newcombe, Theodore M., Hartley, Eugene L. Readings in Social Psychology, Henry Holt and Company, 1952 p. 299-300.

with which they are actively concerned."[1] This re-definition included among other things:

1. The substitution of other values for economic success. Such things as "happiness and character" were mentioned often. This was not a basic rejection of the American value system but instead an attempt was made to relegate success to a lesser rank in the hierarchy.

2. A re-definition of advancement itself. Advancement was frequently defined in terms of security, the pursuit of small goals within the factory and the accumulation of personal property.

These studies, if not conclusive in themselves, clearly pointed to the possibility that among workers there was a difference in the amount of importance attached to the notion of occupational or monetary "success". It followed then that a man's reaction to unemployment was conditioned by how strongly he adhered to the traditional notion of success. His estimation of self-esteem varied depending on the particular definition of success that he held, which in turn would be an important contributing factor in determining the type of response he adopted.

The third change that Komarovsky cited will not be treated extensively here for it was not really crucial to our purpose. It was:

---

[1]Chinoy, Eli, Automobile Workers and the American Dream, Doubleday and Co., Garden City, New York, 1955, p. 124.

3. The Loss of the Daily Work Routine

"I am going crazy with so much time on my hands and nothing to do," is not an unusual response from many people who have suddenly, (because of retirement reasons), been forced to give up their daily work routine. If this was a response heard from those who were relatively free from economic anxiety, then the response of the unemployed would probably be accentuated. It seemed reasonable to the author to assume that the leisure of the unemployed was so filled with economic privation and anxiety that it was necessarily quite different from the leisure of others. Komarovsky stated this succinctly:

> "There is generally every reason to expect dislocation of life as a result of loss of work. Most men in our cases are middle-aged men whose lives for many years have been organized around their daily work, and the sheer habit would make for a feeling of loss at sudden unemployment.[1]"

This feeling of loss resulting from unemployment, coupled with economic anxiety, would be a factor in deepening the sense of deprivation and frustration felt by the unemployed. It should be stated, however, that as there were differing degrees of importance attached to work in any particular person's life, so the importance of this factor would vary among the unemployed depending on the amount of importance that was attached to steady routine and work in the person's life.

The first two of these changes were ones that had

---

[1] Kamarovsky, op. cit., p. 81.

consequences for and brought about changes in most areas of social participation engaged in by unemployed men. Changes in status in the family could result in feelings of extreme deprivation, anxiety and humiliation. Several authors have described the general nature of these changes, and their consequences.[1] Secondly, economic failure resulting from unemployment may have had ramifications in the status of the unemployed in many important areas of their lives in the community. Bakke, in particular, took note of this and showed that a man's relations with his neighbors and friends, as well as his recreational and religious practices underwent change as a consequence of unemployment.

When we reviewed the post-World War II literature on the working class, the dominant themes that seemed to emerge were those of a working class that had either solved its major economic problems or was well on the road to that solution[2]--furthermore, we were left with a view of the working class as a homogeneous mass whose most prominent

---

[1]Kamarovsky, Mirra, The Unemployed Man and His Family, The Dryden Press, New York, 1940; Angell, Robert Cooley, The Family Encounters the Depression, Charles Scribners and Sons, New York, 1936; Bakke, E. Wright, Citizens Without Work, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1940.

[2]To cite a few of the many works that deal with working class affluence: Mayer, Kurt, "The Changing Shape of the American Class Structure" in Roach, Jack; Gross, Llewellyn, Gurosslin, Orville (eds.) Social Stratification in the United States, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1969, p. 583-587. For a study of British workers, see: Zwieg, Ferdinand, The Worker in an Affluent Society. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1961. There is a fine review of some of this literature in Rinehart, James W. "Affluence and the Embourgeoisment of the Working Class: A Critical Look." Social Problems, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Fall 1971), p. 149-162.

characteristics were racism, authoritarianism and non-commitment to the norms of democracy.[1] Too often social scientists have faced social situations with forced choice theories and measuring devices in hand. Though this has made life simpler, it usually lead to a glossing over of the complexities that may have existed in particular situations undergoing study at the time. It has beclouded the possibility that the working class was not a homogenous mass either in its condition, life style or attitudes. A more fruitful approach, one for us that allowed greater understanding, was to view the working class as made up of a heterogeneous series of layers. The ensuing variation results from the fact that certain sections of the working class have reacted one way or another depending on economic conditions, background social characteristics and mobility orientation.

In addition, the response patterns under study are to be viewed as continuums. It is one of our contentions, following Leggett, that reponses as complex as the ones with which we are dealing should not be viewed as dichotomous, but rather as continuous variables. "Too often we treat class consciousness as a quality either present or absent, much as we would define a person as a Catholic or Non-Catholic

---

[1] For the most clearly stated expression of this point of view, see Lipset, Seymour Martin, Political Man, Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1960, p. 97-130.

(using a nominal scale of measurement); actually class orientation is seldom ordered in such terms; rather, it builds step by step (Ordinal) as on a continuum."[1]

What is said here about Class Consciousness applies to our two other response patterns, Prejudice and Anomia. Possible Responses — we will discuss each pattern of response and then attempt a description of the type of respondent that would adopt the particular mode of response, and the reason for doing so.

1. Anomia Resulting in Apathy and Depression

The concept of Anomia as originally developed by Durkheim referred to a condition of normlessness in a society or group. He made it clear that this concept was a property of the social structure and not of any particular individual in the society. Merton, however, in discussing this, showed that it had been found advantageous to develop what he called the "psychological" counterpart of this concept. He said: "nevertheless, as the utility of the concept for understanding diverse forms of deviant behavior become evident. It was extended to refer to a condition of individuals rather than of their environment."[2] He went on to say that the "Psychological conception of Anomia" was simultaneously formulated by R. M. MacIver and David Riesman, both of whose

---

[1]Leggett, John C., Class Race and Labor, Oxford University Press, New York, 1968, p. 16.

[2]Merton, op.cit., p. 215.

formulations were substantially alike. He quoted MacIver's definition:

> "Anomie . . . signifies the state of mind of one who has been pulled up by his moral roots, who has no longer any standards but only disconnected urges, who has no longer any sense of continuity, of folk, of obligation. This anomic man has become spiritually sterile, responsive only to himself; responsible to no one. He derides the values of other men. His only faith is the philosophy of denial. He lives on the thin line of sensation between no future and no past.[1]"

What can be deduced from the above discussion by Merton is that, though anomie as originally formulated was meant to be a state of society, it can also usefully be thought to have its reflection in the attitudes and orientations of people living in that society. In order to differentiate this concept from Durkheim's Merton had chosen another label— anomia— and in concert with him we will adopt his label. It can be fruitfully thought of as a condition of normlessness for the individual in which he no longer feels himself a part of, or restrained by, the prevailing norms, this in turn resulting in apathy and depression.

The unemployed who adopted this type of response had had their self-esteem put under severe strain. They had tried to achieve prescribed goals, had been rebuffed in the process, and had "retreated from the fray" by relinquishing both the goals and the socially accepted means of achieving these goals. They may have tried to place the blame on the

---

[1]Merton, ibid., p. 216.

society; but when they saw others achieving some small measure of success, and when they made comparisons, they began to doubt their own abilities. The result was lowered self-esteem which brought with it depression and apathy. What has been discussed above probably comes closest to what Merton has called "Retreatism." He said:

> "This mode of response is found among workers who develop a state of psychic passivity in response to some discernible extent of anomie.
>
> Retreatism seems to occur in response to acute anomie, involving an abrupt break in the familiar and accepted normative framework and in established social relations, particularly when it appears to individuals subjected to it that the condition will continue indefinitely.[1]"

In addition to lowered self-esteem another important reason for this lapse into apathy was apprehension about the future. The people who adopted this response saw themselves incapable of grappling with a chaotic world and became intensely anxious about the future. Apprehension and anxiety acted thus to intensify their depression and apathy.

An example from one of Zawadski and Lazarsfeld's cases might help to clarify what is being said:

> "A carpenter about thirty years, married, unemployed for some months, but not longer than thirteen weeks, because he still gets the dole, described the morning after dismissal with the words: "Grief, tears, impulses to revenge, numbness. For a time, awakening in the morning is unbearable. The world becomes even gloomier and viler. One sees in it neither pity nor friendship." He looks for work at a labour exchange. There he gets a sarcastic answer which angers him. After one day of fruitless search for

---

[1] Merton, ibid., p. 242

> work he says, "I decided not to go anywhere anymore. And for two months, lying in the sunshine, I wait quietly for the day when my wife will tell me that she has spent the last of the money and that the grocer does not want to give us credit . . . But it lasts very long, and I ask myself how fate will finally decide." He stays inactive although previously painting was a hobby which he practiced devotedly.[1]"

2. Prejudice or Scapegoating

Those who adopt this response pattern have been described by numerous social scientists, to be cited a little later on in this section, as people who have probably experienced countless frustrations. In contradistinction to those adopting anomia, they were people who had given up neither the goal nor the means of achieving the goal but who were likely to see themselves as being robbed of their opportunity for its realization. They were likely to be the ones among our unemployed workers who still adhered to the traditional dream of "success". Even if they had given up hope of personally attaining it, they still adhered to the possibility of achieving "success" in our society. This attitude accentuated the bitterness that these men would have experienced at their own lack of progress in the fulfillment of these goals, which in turn could lead to apprehension about their future, feeling that those persons or groups that were responsible for their condition would be

---

[1] Zawadski, Bohan and Lazarsfeld, Paul, "Psychological Consequences of Unemployment." Journal of Social Psychology Clark University Press, Worcester, Mass., Volume VI, 1935, p. 224-251.

responsible for future failure. These people were probably the ones who, more often than anyone else, viewed their situation in status threatening terms and adopted this mode of response in an attempt to maintain their own self-esteem.

Those who have adopted this mode of response would have been bitter people. They would have been embittered by innumerable frustrations in their lives and would have been afraid that these frustrations resulted from their own lack of capability. They would not have been willing to admit this to themselves, and so look about for others onto whom the blame could be placed, thus maintaining their own self-esteem in the process. This is an old idea in the Social Studies, one that has been reiterated by many authors. I will cite only a few of these works. In a section called "Origins of Prejudice," Suchman, Dean, et al. state:

> 3. Prejudiced reactions to members of an outgroup may represent an aggressive response to various kinds of personal frustration.
>
> 4. For some people, outgoing prejudice appears to be a function of insecurity and the desire to build up one's self-esteem.[1]

Gordon Alport states:

> "Whenever anxiety increases, accompanied by a loss of productivity in life, people tend to define their deteriorated situations in terms of scapegoats.[2]"

---

[1]Suchman, Edward, Dean, John P., Williams, Robin M. Jr., Desegregation: Some Propositions and Research Suggestions, Anti Defamation League of Bnai Brith, New York, 1958, p. 58.

[2]Allport, Gordon W., The Nature of Prejudice, Doubleday and Co. Inc., Garden City, New York, 1958, p. 219.

Lasswell has said:

> "Anti-semitism provides a target for the discharge of the resentments arising from damaged self-esteem.[1]"

and later in the same article he states the case succinctly:

> "The self accusations which signify that aggressive impulses are turned against the self are thus no longer necessary, not the sacred ego but the Jews are to blame.[2]"

Franz Neumann has suggested a similar idea in his essay on the social sources of political anxiety which has lead individuals and groups to accepting and giving vent to ethnic and racial bigotry, and to a conspiracy theory of politics. Neumann saw social mobility as an important cause of this type of political reaction. This was the position these workers found themselves in, extreme downward social mobility and economic insecurity. He said in this connection:

> "Caesaristic identifications may play a role in history when the situation of the masses is objectively endangered, when the masses are incapable of understanding the historical process, and when the anxiety activated by the danger becomes neurotic persecutory (aggressive) anxiety . . .
>
> Just as the masses hope for deliverance from distress through absolute oneness with a person, so they ascribe their distress to certain persons who have brought this distress into the world through a conspiracy. . .[3]

---

[1] Lasswell, Harold D., "The Psychology of Hitlerism: A Response of the Lower Middle Classes to Continuing Insecurity"; in The Analysis of Political Behaviour, Routledge, Kegan Paul, London, 1948, p. 236.

[2] Lasswell, ibid., p. 236.

[3] Neumann, Franz, "Anxiety and Politics," in The Democratic and Authoritarian State, The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1957, p. 279.

> There exists a connection between loss of social status and anti-semitism. The fear of social degradation thus creates for itself a target for discharge of resentments arising from damaged self-esteem. . .[1]"

Numerous other citations from such men as Fromm,[2] Bettelhiem and Janowitz,[3] Mannhiem[4] could be offered to indicate the wide acceptance of this notion.

3. The Development of Class Consciousness

This is a mode of response that occurs when blame for this condition is laid at the doorstep of the chaotic and uncontrolled workings of the society. In contradistinction to those who adopt the scapegoat response, these people do not try to impute blame to some one person or group, but rather their hostility is vented against the social system as it is presently organized. This response entailed an attitudinal position that had long ago given up the traditional ideology of "success" and viewed it as a myth. As a consequence, sudden unemployment was not experienced as any threat to self-esteem because the condition in which they found themselves was attributed to a force over which they had no control. They were likely to be people who

---

[1]Neumann, ibid., p. 387.

[2]Fromm, Erich, Escape From Freedom, Rinehart and Co., Inc., New York, 1941.

[3]Bettelhiem, Bruno, and Janowitz, Morris, Social Change and Prejudice, The Free Press of Gengoe, A Division of the MacMillan Company, New York, 1964.

[4]Mannhiem, Karl, Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction, Harcourt Bruce and Company, New York, 1951.

identified themselves as workers and realized that their own personal fate was tied in with the general fate of workers. Identification with unions as the principle working class organization went along with identification with class.[1] Corresponding to this, they would probably tend to favor governmental control of the economy in an effort to achieve greater stability and security for themselves along with others in their condition. Some fine illustrations of workers who realize that their personal fate is tied in with the general fate of workers appear in Bakke, who had studied unemployed workers in the depression of the 1930's:

> "Hell, brother, you don't have to look far to know that there's a working class. We may not say so. But look at what we do. Work. Look at who we run around with. Workers. Look at where we live. If you can find anybody but workers in my block, I'll eat 'em. Look at how we get along. Just like every other damned worker. Hell's bells, of course, there's a working class; and it's getting more so every day. What we need to do is to work out ways to make being a worker amount to something. And when you look around you see that some things have been done along that line. But there'll be a lot more when some guys that's really got brains start workin' on the job instead of hopin' that someday they'll be bosses.[2]"

---

[1]Both John Leggett and Maurice Zeitlin point up the importance of class and union identification as ingredients of working class consciousness. Leggett, op.cit., p. 16. Zeitlin, Maurice, Revolutionary Politics and the Cuban Working Class, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1967, p. 82-88.

[2]Bakke, E. Wright, Citizens Without Work, Yale Universith Press, New Hudson, Connecticut, 1940, p. 101.

Statement of Problem

Although alluded to before, it has not yet been stated explicitly that one of the assumptions of the above discussion was that sudden unemployment and plant shutdown and its resulting deprivation were experienced by these unemployed, but the deprivation they felt was intensified when the rights, duties and obligations they felt should have accrued to them as a result of painstakingly building up seniority which was suddenly lost. These workers, whether or not they had given up hope of rising in the shop or out of it, still had invested time and a large part of their lives in working for this one company.[1] As a result of this investment in time, these workers had benefits that had accrued to them in the form of job security and pension rights. These were lost when the company moved the plant out of the Detroit area.

In this connection, Caplow said:

> "The mere accumulation of seniority represents a significant change in status.[2]
>
> . . . A contractually recognized seniority is an enforceable priority, and hence, in the broadest sense a property right in the job. Thus, employees have established an indirect form of ownership in industries in which seniority rights determine jobs, hours, wages and working conditions.[3]"

---

[1]The range in seniority is from 17 years to 54 years.

[2]Caplow, Theodore, The Sociology of Work, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1954, p. 60.

[3]Ibid., p. 70.

Granting the above, our problem unfolds as that of an attempt at examining some of the social effects of sudden unemployment, on a group of workers with high seniority, within the framework of the theoretical orientation laid out in this dissertation.

The framework of the study can be organized in the following manner:

Independent Variables	Intervening Variables	Dependent Variables
Objective (Economic) Deprivation	Mobility Orientation	Anomia
Subjective (Felt) Deprivation	Skill	Class Consciousness
	Age	Prejudice
	Race	

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Sampling Procedures and Sampling Characteristics[1]

Two samples of Packard workers were drawn in this study. The total population from which the samples were drawn was the 4,012 people who were still employed at the Packard Motor Car Co. as of June 1, 1956. Originally, we planned to work with a 5.5 per cent sample drawn from the total population of 4,012 Packard workers. The original list used was the checkoff list of workers employed by the Packard Motor Car Co. as of June 1.[2] The drawing of the 225 names (i.e. a 5.5 per cent sample) was accomplished by picking every 17th name on the checkoff list. When a name was drawn, a card was made out for that individual, giving his address, as well as his name. Later, by consulting the telephone directory, we added the telephone numbers to the cards of those workers

---

[1]This description of sampling procedures and characteristics appeared in Sheppard, H.L., Ferman, L.A., Faber, Seymour, Too Old to Work Too Young to Retire - A Case Study of a Permanent Plant Shutdown, Washington, D.C., United States Printing Office, 1960.

[2]This is a listing of employed workers used for financial records and union dues assessment. The agreement between the Packard Motor Car Co. and the union contained a union shop clause, so this list represented all blue collar workers in the plant at the time.

who had telephones. This group of 225 workers, then, made up of our 1957 sample, was interviewed in October, November and December of 1957.

Of the 225 workers in the sample, we managed to interview 185 workers, i.e., 82 per cent of our first sample was interviewed. For the 40 workers whom we did not interview, the interviewers were instructed to note on each card the reason for the non-interview. The reasons for non-interview among our 1957 respondents are shown in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1

REASONS RECORDED BY INTERVIEWERS FOR NON-INTERVIEWS IN 1957 SAMPLE[a]

Reason for Non-Interview	Per cent of Total Number of Non-Interview Cases
1. Refused	43
2. Moved away	34
3. Can't be located	16
4. Dead[1]	4
5. Ill or institutionalized	3
Total per cent	100
Total number	40

[a]Includes 1 suicide.

Whenever a non-interview was recorded as moved away, we made every effort to secure information on the new address. Matters of economy prevented us from interviewing respondents who had moved out of state or to a remote area of Michi-

gan.[1] However, we did attempt to contact all respondents who had moved to other residences within Wayne County. To each moved-away respondent we sent a follow-up letter explaining the purpose of the study and urging cooperation. Finally, we consulted the Wayne County telephone directory and Polk Directory listing of residences to see if the respondent could be located. "Refusals" and "Not at home" were handled in the following manner:

Each interviewer was urged to call back personally three times in cases where the respondents were not at home. For refusals, the interviewers were instructed to record as much background information as could be obtained from the respondent. Unfortunately, we managed to secure background information on only two refusals. Although we sent a follow-up letter to "Refusals," we had little success in overcoming the resistance to the interviews. According to our interviewers, "Refusals" were characterized by:

(a) wanting a definite guarantee that the interview would result in some employment for the interviewee or "something being done";

(b) failure to understand the purpose of the study, and

(c) language problems (e.g., difficulty in speaking English).

In February 1958, we decided to select a second sample of the 4,012 Packard workers. For our second sample we

---

[1] By "remote area," we refer to such geographical locations as the Upper Peninsula or the rural areas in Macomb and Oakland Counties.

decided to draw 10 per cent of the workers (i.e. 400 workers) from the population. In the selection of the second sample we no longer had access to the checkoff list from which our first sample was drawn. However, we did have access to a 1950 union newspaper address list. We selected 1,000 names from this list of 7,000 names (i.e. each seventh name was selected).[1] We then checked each of the 1,000 names against the Polk Directory for Residential Listings for 1956 in order to determine whether the ex-Packard worker was still employed in 1956. If he was, then a card was made out for him. We instructed the interviewer before actually beginning the interview to ask the worker whether he was employed at Packard on June 1, 1956. If he was not, the interviewer was instructed to thank the respondent for his time and to terminate the interview. Only workers employed on June 1, 1956, were interviewed.

Two decision rules were made in using the 1950 union newspaper list:

1. All personnel on the 1956 list would be on the 1950 list, since we were dealing with high seniority workers.
2. Each of the 1,000 selected would be included for survey only if it were determined that they were employed at Packard through June 1, 1956.

We reasoned that if these two assumptions were correct, the resulting list would be the same as the checkoff list

---

[1] If the seventh name was a worker already in our 1957 sample we chose the next name on the list.

used for the selection of the 1957 sample. At a later date, a former company official made a payroll list available to us for June 1956 and we found that all of the 400 workers[1] selected by the above method were employed on June 1, 1956. This gave some validity to our procedure in selecting the 400 respondents to be interviewed. Using the 1956 checkoff list as a base, the sampling fraction for the 1957 sample of 225 workers was 1 in 17, while the sampling fraction for the 1958 sample of 400 workers was 1 in 10.[2] Considering both samples, we selected one out of every six respondents from the population to be interviewed in 1957 or 1958.

Of the 400 respondents selected in 1958, we obtained completed interviews with 314 respondents (i.e. 78 per cent). As in our 1957 interviewing, interviewers were asked to record the reasons for non-interviews. The reason for non-interviews among our 1958 respondents are shown in Table 2.

In spite of the fact that we drew a larger sample in 1958, we did not decrease our sampling bias (18 per cent in 1957) but actually had a larger sampling bias in 1958 (22 per cent). When we combined the two samples and considered the sampling bias for the combined sample, we found a sampling

---

[1] The 400 names were the net balance left from the original 1,000 names drawn after 600 had been shown, through Polk listings and contact with respondents, not to have been working at Packard on June 1, 1956.

[2] 1957 sample: 225/4,012 = 1/17 sampling fraction
1958 sample: 400/4,012 = 1/10 sampling fraction
1957 and 1958 samples combined: 625/4,012 = 1/6 sampling fraction.

TABLE 2

REASONS RECORDED BY INTERVIEWERS FOR NON-INTERVIEWS IN 1958 SAMPLE

Reason for Non-Interview	Per Cent of Total Number of Non-Interview Cases
1. Refused	38
2. Moved away	31
3. Can't be located	14
4. Dead	8
5. Ill or institutionalized	9
Total per cent	100
Total number	86

bias of 20 per cent. This proportion may not be too excessive if we consider that:

(a) we were dealing with older workers with a consequent high mortality rate;

(b) we were dealing with individuals who were interested in obtaining work and who may not respond to any activity (e.g., an interview) if it did not seem to be immediately concerned with their goal; and,

(c) we were dealing with workers whose educational level and linguistic skills did not lend themselves easily to interviewing.

Combining the 1957 and 1958 Samples

In this dissertation, we combined both samples and treated them as one. We did this after having made comparisons between them. We found no significant differ-

ences. (See Table 3.) As a result, we felt confident that we could make this combination without introducing significant bias. A detailed comparison of some significant demographic characteristics for both samples is presented in Table 3 below:

TABLE 3

DELINEATION OF VARIABLES AND THEIR MEASURES
(IN PER CENT)

	1957 Sample[a]	1958 Sample[b]
Race:		
White	83	86
Negro	17	14
Total	100	100
Number of cases	182	312
Age:		
21 to 24	1	-
25 to 29	c	c
30 to 34	1	c
35 to 39	4	2
40 to 44	8	12
45 to 49	14	15
50 to 54	18	18
55 to 59	20	17
60 to 64	22	24
65 plus	12	11
Total	100	100
Number of cases	177	275
Education:		
6 or less years	22	19
7 to 8	42	35
9 to 11	23	27
12 (high school graduate)	12	13
13 plus (some college or college graduate)	1	6
Total	100	100
Number of cases	182	308

TABLE 3

(continued)

	1957 Sample[a]	1958 Sample[b]
Skill Level:		
Unskilled	16	14
Semiskilled	52	52
Skilled	27	30
White Collar	5	4
Total	100	100
Number of cases	184	311

[a]Total number of cases does not always total 185, since for each variable, there were a number of non-ascertained responses.

[b]Total number of cases does not always total 314, since for each variable, there were a number of non-ascertained responses.

[c]Less than 1 per cent.

Delineation of Variables and Their Measures

Independent Variables - Objective Deprivation

These are measures of the actual amount of economic deprivation that was experienced. There are many measures of this that attempt to attack the problem from several angles:

1. Whether or not respondent ever got a post-Packard job.
2. Number of months they were unemployed.
3. Whether they were better or worse off in savings because of being out of work.

4. Whether they were more or less in debt because of being out of work.
5. What respondent was forced to spend less on because of being out of work.

An index of objective deprivation was constructed and was used as a measure of our independent variable. How this was done will be described later, in Chapter V.

Subjective Deprivation

This was a measure that was constructed in an attempt to discover the respondent's view of the effect of the experience of plant shutdown. It consisted of three items: (out of these, an index was constructed. How this was done is described in a later chapter).

1. "Do you feel that you got a bad break because the plant closed down?"
2. "Did losing your job set you back in any way?" "In what way?"
3. "In general, do you feel better or worse off than when you worked at Packard?" "In what way?"

Intervening Variables

These variables each in their own way played the role of either cushioning or compounding the shock of an experience such as the one we were investigating. We will now discuss them separately delineating our measure of each.

1. Age — This variable was important because it could influence the respondent's estimation of his ability

to cope with his problem. Younger workers who still had about twenty to thirty years of active working life were less apt to react to this experience in a resigned and self-accusing manner, and so actively sought some solutions to the dilemma in which they found themselves within the established societal framework. If these solutions one by one, were found to fail, they would begin to look for more experimental solutions to their problem. This could lead them to Class Consciousness. Older workers would have tended to feel that they had already lived out their lives, and as a result not be conducive to adopting what would amount to a radical experiment. Not seeing the possibility of a solution for their problems, the ensuing insecurity and frustration could have resulted in apathy and depression. Such a situation was ripe either for self-accusation and feelings of anomia, or for the projection of blame on some perceived weaker groups leading to heightening of prejudice.

2. Skill — This variable, like age, may have acted either to cushion or compound the shock of this experience. There were many who, though old, because they possessed needed skills, found themselves still capable of easily securing re-employment or — conversely — though young, because they were unskilled, found it very difficult to secure employment.

However, the longer the skilled worker found himself

without employment, the more likely he was to feel greater frustration than the unskilled. Having invested a number of years in the acquisition of a skill, the symbol for him of both security and a productive life, the possibility that it could all have been for naught was something he would have found harder and harder to blot from his consciousness, and frustration and insecurity would have taken their toll. As in the case of the older worker, the situation was ripe for the projection of blame on some weaker perceived group. For the unskilled worker, who had less of a picture of himself as a self-reliant master of his destiny — we were likely to see him adopting anomia if he was older and if he was younger, relying more and more on government intervention to aid him in his dilemma.

3. Race — We had seventy-three Blacks in our sample. This number was not really large enough to allow for detailed comparison, but — because of the special situation that Blacks did and do find themselves in in our society, we expected that this factor would have contributed greatly to compounding deprivation — both objective and subjective — and would have lead to adopting either a response of extreme Class Consciousness or one of anomia, with age as an important determinant of which of these two was chosen.

4. Respondent's View of Possibility of Upward Mobility — The particular response adopted would have also been condi-

tioned by the respondent's view of the possibility for upward movement in the general society and his own ability to move in the structure. Those who viewed the structure as open and placed the blame on themselves for their inability to move in it, would have tended to anomia. Those who saw the same structure as open and putting the responsibility for their inability to move in it somewhere else would have tended toward scape-goating, and those who saw the structure as closed would have tended to adopt the response of Class Consciousness. This variable will be measured by constructing an index from several items measuring both the respondent's view of mobility for himself and for young people just growing up in our society: "Was there any job training that you wanted and weren't able to get?"

"Was there ever a time when you thought seriously about leaving the auto industry for some other line of work?"

"Why is it that you never gave much thought to leaving the auto industry for another kind of job?"

"Suppose a young relative just getting out of school, say your nephew or grandson, or any other young man, asked your advice, what kind of advice would you give him?"

"What kind of work would you like your children to do? (Or if children were adults) when your family was young, did you have any ideas about what you wanted your children to be?"

"What would you say you really want out of life?"

Dependent Variables

1. Development of Class Consciousness — This response entailed:
   a. A heightening of hostility toward the institutional structure of capitalism.
   b. Projection of blame in class terms.

So one would have expected a reaction that involved:

   a. A realization of the fact that:
      i) Classes existed;
      ii) Respondents were part of the working class;
      iii) Their fate was bound up with their class whose interest were in opposition to those of the upper class;
      iv) Positive attitudes towards and adherence to working class organizations;
   b. Greater acceptance of the ideology of the socialist movement even though this was not consciously connected with socialism:
      i) Thinking the government should take over and run industry — lack of regard for private property;
      ii) Suggesting necessity for basic modification in government so that the government would take steps to:
         y. Plan production so there would be assurance of employment and security for all members of society.

z. Enter into more and more areas of society in order to extend social welfare, such as:

Socialized medicine

Government housing

Government-run utilities

An index was constructed utilizing information gathered in response to questions regarding these areas in our interview. We describe the methods used to construct this index in the next Chapter.

2. Prejudice or Scapegoating — In contradistinction to the above, the scapegoating response would have been adopted by those that viewed this experience as status threatening. This would have involved a personified reaction to deprivation on the part of these workers. That was, that they would have viewed this experience as resulting not from the uncontrolled working of a hated system, as those who adopted a response of Class Consciousness would have, but rather as a result of the machinations of a small handful of people who were conspiring to deprive them of their hard won security. They would have tried to find some one person or group on whom they could have vented their hostility.

   We measured this response by utilizing social distance scales for both Jews and Blacks — first we determined the results for each ethnic group separately, and then constructed an overall measure of prejudice for each respondent.

3. Anomia — The men who adopted this mode of response were those who probably had long ago adjusted to the idea that they were not meant to participate in the "American Dream" and had formed alternate goals. Among these goals, stability and security of income must have figured prominently. Our sample consisted in the overwhelming majority of very high seniority men — so that they were probably not greatly affected by the periodic lay-offs occurring in the automobile industry and had a relatively secure and steady income which they assumed would continue until retirement. Given this perspective, they were able to view themselves as productive members of society — that is, before the shutdown. When the shutdown occurred, they suddenly found that this niche they had built for themselves had been shattered and that the forces (the union and the government) they had in the past relied on in crises, were either not doing anything or were not able to do anything to help them. All of this would have made them want to just run and hide from it all. Unlike our other two groups of respondents, they did not look to anyone or anything outside of themselves on which to place the blame for their situation. Their own guideposts had been shattered by what appeared to have been an essentially fickle world, and they seriously questioned the good of it all. We hoped to be able to measure this variable by using three items, taken from the Srole Anomie

Scale.[1] These were:

"No one is going to care much about what happens to you, when you get right down to it."

"These days a person doesn't really know whom he can depend on."

"You sometimes can't help wondering whether life is worthwhile anymore."

Hypotheses

I. General Hypotheses.

A. Hypothesis I: The more objectively deprived a worker was, the more likely he was to exhibit one of the three patterns of response.

However, no matter how deprived in an objective sense the worker may be, he may still not feel deprived, and the worker who was less objectively deprived may have seen himself as greatly deprived. It may be that the respondent's definition of his situation was more important than objective deprivation in determining whether or not he would have adopted one of the three patterns of response. So it was expected that subjective deprivation played a greater role than objective deprivation in determining whether or not our respondents adopted one of the three response patterns.

---

[1]Srole, Leo; "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, (21 December 1956), p. 709-716.

B. Hypothesis II: It was expected that the relationship between objective deprivation and our three patterns of response would have been strengthened by the addition of subjective deprivation.

II. Hypotheses related to intervening variables.

A. Age:[1]

Hypothesis I: The relationship between Class Consciousness and subjective deprivation will decrease as age increases.

Hypotheses II and III: The relationships between Anomia and subjective deprivation and between prejudice against Blacks and subjective deprivation will increase as age increases.

B. Skill:[2]

Hypothesis I: The relationship between Class Consciousness and subjective deprivation will decrease as skill increases.

Hypothesis II: The relationship between Anomia and subjective deprivation will decrease as skill increases.

Hypothesis III: The relationship between prejudice against Blacks and subjective deprivation will increase as skill increases.

---

[1]For a discussion of the general effects of age leading to these hypotheses see p. 32.

[2]For a discussion of the general effects of skill leading to these hypotheses see p. 33.

C. Race:[1]

Hypothesis I: The relationship between Class Consciousness and subjective deprivation will be higher among Black than White workers.

Hypothesis II: The relationship between Anomia and subjective deprivation will be higher among White than Black workers.

D. View of Possibility for Upward Mobility:[2]

Hypothesis I: The relationship between Class Consciousness and subjective deprivation varies inversely with the view of mobility opportunity, i.e., the relationship between Class Consciousness and subjective deprivation will decrease as the view of mobility structure as open increases.

Hypotheses II and III: Anomia and subjective deprivation and prejudice against Blacks and subjective deprivation vary directly with the view of mobility opportunity from being closed to open. The relationship between Anomia and subjective deprivation and prejudice against Blacks and subjective deprivation will increase as the view of the mobility structure as open increases.

---

[1]For a discussion of the general effects of race leading to the hypotheses see p. 34.

[2]For a discussion of the general effects of mobility orientation leading to these hypotheses see p. 34.

One last word concerning our model is in order at this time. In order for us to really know the effect of deprivation on our dependent variables, we should have set up this research in a before-after experimental design. Lacking this ideal situation, we found it necessary to make internal comparisons to see the effects of varying levels of deprivation on Class Consciousness, Anomia and Prejudice. Though our data only showed covariation, we have assumed causality in this analysis.

CHAPTER III

OPERATIONALIZING THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES

In this chapter we are going to describe the methods used to construct our dependent variables. We will then describe them and show what, if any, relationship they have to each other.

Prejudice

This variable was constructed by utilizing these social distance items for Jews and Blacks. "According to my first feeling reaction, I would willingly admit members of each of the following categories (considering them as a class and not the best or worst members I have known) to one or more of the items I have circled.":

Categories:	Marriage into your family	Membership in your favorite club	Living near you in your neighborhood
1. Jew	1	2	3
2. Negro[1]	1	2	3

Categories:	Working with you on the job	Full Citizenship in your country	Allowance of entrance into your country
1. Jew	4	5	6
2. Negro	4	5	6

[1]At the time of this study, 1958, "Negro" rather than "Black" was the accepted name of this racial grouping.

It was felt that these items[1] would reflect a continuum of prejudice from none to extreme hatred in that the individuals' attitude towards the minority would be reflected in the kinds of activities they were willing to participate in with that group. Further, it was felt that these items were probably undimensional. This was tested using the Technique for Scalogram Analysis developed by Goodenough. According to Edwards: "This method enables us to determine the Coefficient of Reproducability in such a way that the coefficient does accurately represent the degree of accuracy with which we can reproduce the responses to statements from total scores alone."[2]

We first developed these scales for Jews and Blacks separately and discovered that each of them met the criteria and formed a scale.

Blacks

For Blacks the Coefficient of Reproducability was .9577, the Minimum Marginal Reproducability was .7739 and the Coefficient of Scalability was .8128. These results are well within the guidelines set down of a Coefficient of Reproducability of .90, a Coefficient of Scalability of at least .60 and the Measure of Minimum Marginal Reproducability not being excessively high.

---

[1]Bogardus, Emory S., Immigration and Race Attitudes, D. C. Heath Co., Boston, 1928, p. 24.

[2]Edwards, Allen L., Techniques of Attitude Scale Analysis, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957, p. 184.

Jews

We found similar results when we looked at our respondents' attitudes towards Jews. The Coefficient of Reproducability was .9524, the Coefficient of Scalability was .80, and the Minimum Marginal Reproducability was .7619 which was not excessively high. Having met these rather stringent requirements, it would be permissible to call each of these a scale. Accordingly, we assigned Prejudice Against Blacks and Prejudice Against Jews scores to each respondent.

These distributed in our sample are represented in Table 4:

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF PREJUDICE AGAINST BLACKS SCORES IN TOTAL SAMPLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Frequency	57	42	57	162	51	28	52	449
Per Cent	12.7	9.4	12.7	36.1	11.3	6.2	11.6	100

DISTRIBUTION OF PREJUDICE AGAINST JEWS IN TOTAL SAMPLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Frequency	148	106	79	50	20	14	32	449
Per Cent	33.0	23.7	17.6	11.1	4.4	3.1	7.1	100

Combined Prejudice Score

We next wanted to determine if these two measures would continue to scale if we were to combine them into one large scale using all twelve items for Jews and Blacks (see Table 5). We found that both the Coefficient of Reproducability and the Coefficient of Scalability were a little below the requirement for scaling. The Coefficient of Scalability was .5249 and the Coefficient of Reproducability was .8899. The Measure of Minimum Marginal Reproducability was .7682 which is not excessively high. Though these requirements were almost met, we called our measure an Index of Prejudice and did not claim scalability for it. However, because the requirements were almost met and because the Correlation Coefficients between the items were high — we felt safe in assuming that the scores derived by this technique were an accurate reflection of our respondents' combined attitude towards Jews and Blacks and assigned them as our Prejudice Score. However, since it did not meet scalability criteria, we did not assume unidimensionality.

The resulting Index of Prejudice distributed throughout the sample is shown in Table 6.

This distribution was skewed slightly to the left with the median falling between categories four and five. We collapsed categories using the median as our dividing point; utilizing categories four and five as the medium Prejudice category, we established three categories. (See Table 7.)

TABLE 5

MATRIX OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF ITEMS COMPRISING INDEX OF COMBINED PREJUDICE AGAINST JEWS AND BLACKS IN GAMMAS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Allow Jew Marriage Into Family	1.0000	.89251	.91608	.95327	.93652	.78581	.44473	.40775	.56554	.32289	.41818	.45756
2. Allow Jew Membership In Club		1.0000	.91141	.94570	.92201	.85741	.34684	.67194	.52081	.40709	.55635	.50466
3. Allow Jew To Live in Neighborhood			1.0000	.96081	.95209	.86158	.38514	.57537	.27369	.64019	.68515	.63921
4. Allow Jew to Work on Job				1.0000	.98090	.95954	.12003	.60902	.77534	.81617	.87100	.83680
5. Allow Jew Full Citizenship					1.0000	.98880	-.21404	.40292	.62634	.80949	.93282	.86441
6. Allow Jew Entrance to Country						1.0000	-.07143	.63786	.64103	.76612	.86447	.93346
7. Allow Black Marriage Into Family							1.0000	.95365	.95149	.54228	.33151	.51973
8. Allow Black Membership In Club								1.0000	.94942	.89028	.82280	.83466
9. Allow Black To Live in Neighborhood									1.0000	.92587	.79129	.85969
10. Allow Black to Work on Job										1.0000	.95361	.93476
11. Allow Black Full Citizenship											1.0000	.99776
12. Allow Black Entrance to Country												1.0000

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF PREJUDICE SCORES
IN TOTAL SAMPLE

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Frequency	34	30	49	66	62	56	65	20
Per Cent	7.6	6.6	11.0	14.9	13.7	12.5	14.5	4.5

	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Frequency	17	10	12	3	24	449
Per Cent	3.8	2.2	2.6	0.7	5.4	100

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF COLLAPSED PREJUDICE
SCORES IN TOTAL SAMPLE

	Low Prejudice	Medium Prejudice	High Prejudice	Total
Frequency	180	118	151	449
Per Cent	40.0	26.3	33.6	100

Anomia

This variable was constructed by utilizing three items taken from Srole's Anomia Scale[1] that reflected the content

[1]Srole, Leo, "Social Integration and Certain Corrolaries: An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, December 21, 1956, p. 709-16.

that we wanted to measure:

1. Most people don't really care what happens to the next fellow.
2. These days I get the feeling I'm not a part of things.
3. You sometimes can't help wondering whether life is worthwhile.

Item 1 reflected the feelings of the respondents that they were not able to rely on personal relations any more and that people around them were unfeeling. Item 2 reflected our respondents' feeling of alienation from the world. Item 3 reflected the anxiety and despair felt by our respondents as a result of the condition in which they found themselves. Combined, these items reflected our respondents' view of their relationship to the world and their anxiety and despair arising from their inability to cope with the sudden changes in their social relations. These items were tested for scalability with the following result: Coefficient of Reproducability .8592, Coefficient of Scalability .5797, and the Measure of Minimum Marginal Reproducability was .6651 which was fairly low. Although the Measure of Minimum Marginal Reproducability and the Coefficient of Scalability fell just short of the required .90 and .60, respectively, we could not say that our Measure of Anomia met the requirements of unidimensional scaling. However, we felt, as with our Combined Prejudice Index that these items came close to meeting these requirements

and in addition, the Correlation Coefficients between the items were high; therefore, we used them as an Index of Anomia and assigned scores based on them. (See Table 8.)

The resulting Index of Anomia distributed throughout the sample is presented in Table 9.

TABLE 8

MATRIX OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF ITEMS COMPRISING INDEX OF ANOMIA IN GAMMAS

	1	2	3
1. Most people don't care	1.0000	.58864	.61425
2. Not a part of things		1.0000	.77206
3. Wonder if life is worthwhile			1.0000

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF ANOMIA SCORES IN TOTAL SAMPLE

	0	1	2	3	Total
Frequency	195	116	80	53	444
Per Cent	43.9	26.1	18.0	12.0	100

Class Consciousness

Class Consciousness was earlier defined as having three major dimensions.[1] There were items in our study measuring these dimensions.

1. One item tapping their awareness of themselves as members of the working class: "If you were asked to use one of these four names for the group you belong to, which one would you choose? The Middle Class, the Lower Class, the Working Class or the Upper Class?"

2. Another series of items sought to measure their attitude toward working class organizations and also their adherence to the same, in this case the principle one existent at the time: the Union.

    1. I regarded my union dues as a good investment. Agree/Disagree.
    2. If the majority of workers in a plant vote to have a union, the others should be required to join. Agree/Disagree.
    3. Our national union takes its share of our dues but gives us very little help. Agree/Disagree.

We tested these items for their scalability and found them to meet the requirements of unidimensional scales: Coefficient of Reproducability .9219, Coefficient of Scalability .6511 and a Measure of Minimum Marginal Reproducability of .7762 not being too high. We treated these as a scale and established scores accordingly. The resultant distribution of scores looked like this: (See Table 10)

---

[1] See Chapter I, page 4.

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF ATTITUDE TOWARD UNION SCORES IN TOTAL SAMPLE

	1	2	3	4	Total
Frequency	5	50	297	145	497
Per Cent	1.0	10.0	59.8	29.2	100

3. Another component of Class Consciousness was a desire to see greater governmental control over the economy. In this connection we had a series of items that sought to measure how far these respondents were willing to see the government intervene in situations such as the Packard shutdown. All items were Agree/Disagree.

1. The government should see to it that the Company gets more defense contracts.
2. The government should aid the employees laid off by finding them jobs in other places.
3. The government should make a loan to the company to keep it going.
4. The government should stop the company from moving by passing legislation making them stay put.
5. The government should pay the expenses of the unemployed worker in moving him to a new job location.
6. The government should take over the plant and run it.

These items run from the mild, conventional response of getting the company more contracts to the extreme of being willing to let the government run the plant. We tested to

TABLE 11

MATRIX OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR INDEX OF GOVERNMENT CONTROL IN GAMMAS

What Governments Should do in Plant Shutdowns	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Defense contracts	1.0000	.21429	.75620	.43516	.51291	.42140
2. Finding jobs for employees		1.0000	.31291	.59839	.64071	.76942
3. Make a loan to the company			1.0000	.38530	.64550	.44675
4. Pass Legislation to stop company from moving				1.0000	.69434	.71549
5. Pay expenses of workers in moving him					1.0000	.56404
6. Take over plant and run it						1.0000

see the scalability of these items and found that once again they did not quite meet the standards of a unidimensional scale. However, with a Coefficient of Reproducability of .8591, a Coefficient of Scalability of .4784 and a Measure of Minimum Marginal Reproducability not being too high of .7299 in addition to medium-to-high Correlation Coefficients, we felt justified in treating these items as an Index of Government Control and established scores accordingly (see Table 11).

The distribution of scores for this Index of Government Control is presented in Table 12.

Our next step was to determine the extent to which our three measures--Subjective Class Identification, Union Attitude and Adherence, and Government Control--correlated with each other to see if problems would develop if we used them as components of Class Consciousness.

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES FOR INDEX OF GOVERNMENTAL CONTROL

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Frequency	12	27	56	122	79	90	57	443
Per Cent	2.8	6.2	12.6	27.2	17.8	20.4	13.0	100

The negative correlations between the components of Class Consciousness to be found in Table 13 indicate that there are problems in combining them into a single measure and that they should probably be analyzed separately.[1]

TABLE 13

MATRIX OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF ITEMS COMPRISING INDEX OF CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS IN GAMMAS

1. Subjective Class Identification	1.0000	-.05288	-.01841
2. Union Attitude & Adherence		1.0000	.14148
3. Governmental Control			1.0000

[1]To aid the reader in understanding the results relating to Class Consciousness, we would like to point out what the relationships were existing between Objective and Subjective Deprivation and the components of our measure of Class Consciousness. That variable of the three components of Class Consciousness showing the highest relationship to both Objective and Subjective Deprivation was Governmental Control. The correlation between Economic Deprivation and Governmental Control was .15818, and the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Governmental Control was .26009. Class Identification showed the next highest relationship with Objective and Subjective Deprivation with correlations of .05438 for the relationship between Class Identification and Objective Deprivation, and .11115 for the relationship between Class Identification and Subjective Deprivation. The last of our three variables, Union Attitude, had an almost nonexistent relationship to Objective Deprivation, .01930 and a small negative relationship to Subjective Deprivation, -.02263.

Relationship Between Objective and Subjective Deprivation and the Components of Class Consciousness (in Gammas)

	Government Control	Class Identification	Union Attitudes
Objective Dep.	.15818	.05438	.01930
Subjective Dep.	.26009	.11115	-.02263

However, it was our feeling that the concept of Class Consciousness was a complex variable made up of many dimensions and it would be best understood if a measure were developed that attempted to utilize these dimensions. Also, we felt that there was theoretical and conceptual justification for using these particular items and combining them into a measure of Class Consciousness.

In addition, though the correlations were not high, the variable "governmental control" did attain a moderate relationship with at least one of the other variables. This, plus the more important fact that we felt that favoring governmental control was theoretically more important to our measure than either Subjective Class Identification or Union Attitude and Adhereence, made us decide to give Governmental Control greater weight in constructing our measure of Class Consciousness.

We constructed our measure of Class Consciousness by first dividing each variable by the number of categories it contained. This gave each variable equal weighting in our result. We then multiplied governmental control by two so that it got double weight over the other two variables. Then, we added up the result and gave each respondent a score of Class Consciousness.

The resultant Index of Class Consciousness distributed throughout the sample is presented in Table 14.

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS SCORES IN TOTAL SAMPLE

	1	2	3	4	Total
Frequency	42	152	287	17	498
Per Cent	8.4	30.5	57.6	3.4	100

Interrelations of Our Dependent Variables

It would be best for our purposes if we could say that there were no relationships at all between our dependent variables for then we could say that we were measuring and reporting on variables that did not have influence on one another. However, human beings being the contradictory animals that they are, we did not expect this to occur and were surprised at the results we did receive.

The results indicate moderate Gammas of .18900 for Class Consciousness and Anomia and .11388 for Class Consciousness and Combined Prejudice, and an almost nonexistent relationship between Anomia and Combined Prejudice with a Gamma of .01747. This would seem to indicate that there was a relationship existing at least between Class Consciousness and our other two dependent variables.

However, when we look at the Chi Squares for these

relationships, we find that none of them are significant at the .05 level and can only conclude that it is possible that these relationships could exist by chance.

Class Consciousness by Anomia

Chi Square = 14.61086 with 6 degrees of freedom - not significant.

Class Consciousness by Combined Prejudice

Chi Square = 7.40126 with 5 degrees of freedom - not significant.

Anomia by Combined Prejudice

Chi Square = 11.96658 with 9 degrees of freedom - not significant.

CHAPTER IV

OPERATIONALIZING THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

In this chapter, we are going to relate the techniques used to construct our independent and intervening variables; respectively, economic deprivation and subjective deprivation and then we will describe them and their interrelation.

Economic Deprivation

There were many questions in the interview schedule that sought to measure the extent of deprivation experienced by our respondents as a result of plant shutdown. Among them were five that we felt were objective measures of economic deprivation that related to each other.

1. Have you ever had a job since the Packard Plant closed down?

   Yes
   No
   Self-employed
   Retired

2. Number of months unemployed? (This was calculated from the date of the Packard layoff taking time worked into account. "Total length of unemployment here is based on the sum of weeks and months during which each respondent was out of work; laid off. . . . The term thus refers to the cumulated time during which the Packard workers were without jobs.")[1]

---

[1]Shepard, H. L., Ferman, L. A., Faber, Seymour, Too Old to Work Too Young to Retire. U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Unemployment Problems, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1960, p. 15.

3. As far as savings are concerned, would you say you are better off than you were a year ago, worse off, or about the same?

   Better_____ Worse_____ Same_____

4. As far as debts are concerned, do you owe more or less right now than you did when you were working for Packard?

   More_____ Less_____ Same_____

5. While you were out of work, you were getting less money. That probably meant that you had to cut down on things. What sort of things did you have to spend less money on?

As can be seen by looking at Table 15, the relationships between these variables range from moderate to very strong. It was decided no one variable should contribute significantly greater weight in constructing our Index of Economic Deprivation. We collapsed categories so that each of our five variables would have three categories and added up the score for each of our cases. A case could have a score from one to fifteen, the lowest amount of deprivation being equal to one and the highest with a score of fifteen.

TABLE 15

MATRIX OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF ITEMS COMPRISING INDEX OF ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION IN GAMMAS

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Ever got a job	1.0000	.84078	.24806	.10737	.18039
2. No. of months unemployed		1.0000	.42979	.14873	.37287
3. Better or worse wages			1.0000	.18238	.42962
4. Debts more or less				1.0000	.20100
5. Spent less on					1.0000

The resulting Index of Economic Deprivation distributed through the sample is presented in Table 16.

TABLE 16

DISTRIBUTION OF ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION SCORES IN TOTAL SAMPLE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Frequency	1	2	3	7	19	50	67	70
Per Cent	0.2	0.4	0.6	1.4	3.8	10.1	13.3	14.1

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total
Frequency	74	70	59	37	27	8	4	497
Per Cent	14.9	14.0	11.8	7.4	5.4	1.6	.8	100

As could have been expected, this distribution was moderately skewed to the high side of our Deprivation Index. The median fell between the eighth and ninth categories.

We next collapsed these fifteen categories into three using the median as our medium deprivation category. Categories one to seven became low Economic Deprivation, Categories eight and nine became medium Economic Deprivation, and Categories ten to fifteen became high Economic Deprivation. See Table 17.

Subjective Deprivation

We asked our respondents three questions that related

to how they viewed the effect of their experience of plant shutdown.

1. "Do you feel that you got a bad break because the plant shut down?"

   This was an open ended question that was coded in the following manner:

   Good break
   Bad break
   Neither

2. "Did losing your job set you back in any way?"

   Yes
   No

3. "In general, do you feel better or worse off than when you worked at Packard?"

   Better
   Worse
   Neither

All three of these questions were aimed at measuring the degree of deprivation felt by our respondents. We attempted to focus on the way our respondents defined their situation after having gone through an experience such as plant shutdown.

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF COLLAPSED ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION SCORES IN TOTAL SAMPLE

	Low	Medium	High	Total
Frequency	149	144	204	497
Per Cent	30.0	29.0	41.0	100

The first question focused on the experience itself, asking how they saw its effect on them. The second question focused on the same subject matter using another device for achieving this end. The last question asked our respondents to compare how they felt at the time of the interview with when they worked at Packard.

A combination of these three questions would have been a fairly good indicator of our respondents' feelings about their experience and the situation in which they had found themselves as a result of that experience.

After having examined the content and the marginals of these questions, we felt that there was a good possibility that they might meet the demands of unidimensional scales.

These items were then subjected to a test to determine their scalability, and we found they had a Coefficient of Reproducability of .8593, a Coefficient of Scalability of .5622 and a fairly low Measure of Minimum Marginal Reproducability of .6787. Although the Minimum Marginal Reproducability is sufficiently low to meet the requirements of scaling, both the Coefficients of Reproducability and Scalability fell just short of the .90 and .60 needed respectively and we could not call them scales. However, in view of the fact that these items came close to meeting this demand, and in view of the high Correlation Coefficients between the items, we felt justified in developing an Index of Subjective Deprivation from these

items and assigning them scores accordingly (see Table 18).

TABLE 18

MATRIX OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF ITEMS COMPRISING INDEX OF SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION IN GAMMAS

		1	2	3
1.	Good or bad break	1.0000	.75051	.69404
2.	Set you back in any way		1.0000	.76668
3.	Feel better or worse			1.0000

We reasoned that a neutral response in the case of the first and third items would have been equivalent to a positive response and collapsed these two categories into one. We then assigned scores adding one for every deprivational response so that we ended with our respondents with low feelings of deprivation having received a score of zero and respondents with high deprivation having received a score of three.

The Index of Subjective Deprivation distributed itself in our sample as shown in Table 19.

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION SCORES IN TOTAL SAMPLE

	0	1	2	3	Total
Frequency	63	81	107	195	446
Per Cent	14.1	18.2	24.0	43.7	

This distribution was skewed to the right or high deprivation with the median falling in category two. We collapsed categories zero and one to form our measure of low deprivation. Category two became medium deprivation and category three became high deprivation. See Table 20.

TABLE 20

DISTRIBUTION OF COLLAPSED SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION SCORES IN TOTAL SAMPLE

	Low	Medium	High	Total
Frequency	144	107	195	446
Per Cent	32.3	24.0	43.7	100

Interrelation of Independent and Intervening Variables

As can be expected, our Measures of Economic and Subjective Deprivation were highly related with a Gamma of .45156. Although our error reduction in estimation in one variable having knowledge of the other was almost half, this was not sufficient for us to say that they were measuring the same phenomenon. We had two measures highly intercorrelated as could have been expected when we were dealing with objective deprivation and subjective reaction to that deprivation. However, there was independent variation that arose from differential perception and reaction to economic deprivation itself.

TABLE 21

ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION

Economic Deprivation	Subjective Deprivation: Low N	Low %	Medium N	Medium %	High N	High %
Low	70	(49.0)	36	(33.6)	33	(16.9)
Medium	41	(28.6)	34	(31.7)	52	(26.7)
High	32	(22.4)	37	(34.6)	110	(56.4)
Total	132	(100)	107	(100)	195	(100)

Gamma = .45156

CHAPTER V

TESTING THE MAJOR HYPOTHESES

We are now ready to test some of the hypotheses that were developed previously in Chapter II. Specifically in this chapter, we are going to look at our General Hypotheses: Hypotheses One and Two. These are:

Hypothesis One: The more objectively deprived a worker was the more likely he was to exhibit one of the three patterns of response.

However, no matter how deprived in an objective sense the worker may be, he may still not feel deprived, and the worker who was less objectively deprived may have seen himself as greatly deprived. It may be that the respondent's definition of his situation was more important than objective deprivation in determining whether or not he would have adopted one of the three patterns of response. So, it was expected that subjective deprivation played a greater role than objective deprivation in determining whether or not our respondents adopted one of the three response patterns.

Hypothesis Two: It was expected that the relationship between objective deprivation and our three patterns of response would have been strengthened by the addition of subjective deprivation.

We found that for two of our dependent variables, Class Consciousness and Anomia, these hypothesized relationships were validated, but not for the third, Combined Prejudice. We would now like to discuss these findings in greater detail.

Class Consciousness

When economic deprivation by itself was related to our measure of Class Consciousness we found a low positive relationship between them with a Gamma of .12711 (See Table 22). Knowing only economic deprivation for our respondents we reduced our error in estimating Class Consciousness by .12711. But when we related subjective deprivation with our measure of Class Consciousness we had a much stronger relationship with a Gamma of .33481 (see Table 23).

TABLE 22

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS BY ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION (IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness	Economic Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High
Low	7.4	11.2	7.3
Medium Low	36.5	28.0	27.3
Medium High	54.7	57.3	60.5
High	1.4	3.5	4.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	148	143	205
	Gamma = .12711		
	N = 496		

TABLE 23

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION (IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness	Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High
Low	3.5	1.9	1.0
Medium Low	39.6	35.5	19.5
Medium High	54.2	58.9	74.9
High	2.7	3.7	4.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	144	107	195

Gamma = .33481

N = 446

When we related Economic Deprivation and Class Consiousness and added Subjective Deprivation to the model, we got correlations that suggested that Subjective Deprivation may be more important in the adoption of this response pattern (see Table 24). This was further verified when we looked at the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness for varying levels of Economic Deprivation (see Table 25). Subjective Deprivation played a larger role than did Economic Deprivation in our respondents adopting a Class Conscious response.

Anomia

When Economic Deprivation was related to Anomia we got a relationship of Gamma = .24918 (see Table 26), and when

TABLE 24

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS BY ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION AND SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION (IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness	Subjective Deprivation: Low — Economic Deprivation: Low	Low — Medium	Low — High	Medium — Low	Medium — Medium	Medium — High	High — Low	High — Medium	High — High
Low	2.9	4.9	3.1	2.8	2.9	0.0	3.0	1.9	0.0
Medium Low	45.7	31.7	34.4	41.7	32.4	32.4	15.2	23.1	19.1
Medium High	50.0	61.0	56.3	52.8	58.8	64.9	81.8	71.2	74.5
High	1.4	2.4	6.2	2.7	5.9	2.7	0.0	3.8	6.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=70	N=41	N=32	N=36	N=34	N=37	N=33	N=52	N=110
	Gamma = .17923			Gamma = .15533			Gamma = .13107		
	N = 143			N = 107			N = 195		

TABLE 25

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION (IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness	Economic Deprivation: Low — Subjective Deprivation			Economic Deprivation: Medium — Subjective Deprivation			Economic Deprivation: High — Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	2.9	2.8	3.0	4.9	2.9	1.9	3.1	0.0	0.0
Medium Low	45.7	41.7	15.2	31.7	32.4	23.1	34.4	32.4	19.1
Medium High	50.0	52.8	81.8	61.0	58.8	71.2	56.3	64.9	74.5
High	1.4	2.7	0.0	2.4	5.9	3.8	6.2	2.7	6.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=70	N=36	N=33	N=41	N=34	N=52	N=32	N=37	N=110
	Gamma = .32955			Gamma = .17765			Gamma = .30563		
	N = 139			N = 127			N = 179		

Subjective Deprivation was related to Anomia we had a Gamma equal to .25720 (see Table 27). This seemed to suggest that both Economic Deprivation and Subjective Deprivation were playing roles in the adoption of this mode of response.

TABLE 26

ANOMIA BY ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Anomia	Economic Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High
Low	56.5	41.9	35.0
Medium Low	24.6	26.6	26.7
Medium High	10.2	19.4	23.3
High	8.7	12.1	15.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	138	124	180

Gamma = .24918

N = 442

TABLE 27

ANOMIA BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Anomia	Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High
Low	54.9	41.0	36.6
Medium Low	26.8	29.5	23.7
Medium High	12.0	17.1	23.2
High	6.3	12.4	16.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	142	105	194

Gamma = .25720

N = 441

This conclusion was strengthened when we looked at the relationships between Economic Deprivation and Anomia with Subjective Deprivation added and Subjective Deprivation and Anomia with Economic Deprivation added to the model (see Tables 28 and 29). The previous relationship found for Economic Deprivation was substantially reduced in both Economic and Subjective Deprivation's low categories with Subjective Deprivation showing a slightly larger relation. In the medium category it was Economic Deprivation that played the more important role and in the high categories once more Subjective Deprivation played a little more important role. One can only conclude that these two variables covaried in producing this response with Subjective Deprivation being slightly more important than Economic Deprivation because of the slightly larger relationship found in its high category.

Prejudice

Combined Prejudice Against Blacks and Jews did not have any relationship to either Economic Deprivation or Subjective Deprivation and we concluded that this was not a response that was adopted by these workers in this situation. The relationships found were either negative or too low to allow us to conclude otherwise. Economic Deprivation and Combined Prejudice was .06823 (see Table 30) and Subjective Deprivation and Combined Prejudice showed a relationship of Gamma = -.00938 (see Table 31).

TABLE 28

ANOMIA BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION (IN PERCENTAGES)

	Economic Deprivation								
	Low			Medium			High		
Anomia	Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	58.0	54.3	54.5	50.0	36.4	39.2	56.3	32.4	30.0
Medium Low	24.6	25.7	24.2	25.0	33.3	23.5	31.3	29.7	23.6
Medium High	11.6	8.6	9.2	17.5	21.2	19.6	6.2	21.6	29.1
High	5.8	11.4	12.1	7.5	9.1	17.7	6.2	16.3	17.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=69	N=35	N=33	N=40	N=33	N=51	N=32	N=37	N=110
	Gamma = .06884			Gamma = .15976			Gamma = .30162		
	N = 137			N = 124			N = 170		

TABLE 29

ANOMIA BY ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION AND SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION (IN PERCENTAGES)

Anomia	Subjective Deprivation: Low — Economic Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation: Medium — Economic Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation: High — Economic Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	58.0	50.0	56.3	54.3	36.4	32.4	54.5	39.2	30.0
Medium Low	24.6	25.0	31.3	25.7	33.3	29.7	24.2	23.5	23.6
Medium High	11.6	17.5	6.2	8.6	21.2	21.6	9.1	19.6	29.1
High	5.8	7.5	6.2	11.4	9.1	16.2	12.1	17.7	17.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=69	N=40	N=32	N=35	N=33	N=37	N=33	N=51	N=110
	Gamma = .03354			Gamma = .24220			Gamma = .23807		
	N = 141			N = 105			N = 194		

TABLE 30

COMBINED PREJUDICE BY ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION-WHITES ONLY (IN PERCENTAGES)

Combined Prejudice	Economic Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High
Low	34.7	33.9	33.3
Medium	33.1	32.1	25.9
High	32.2	33.9	40.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	121	109	147

Gamma = .06931

N = 377

TABLE 31

COMBINED PREJUDICE BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION-WHITES ONLY (IN PERCENTAGES)

Combined Prejudice	Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High
Low	30.3	38.1	35.0
Medium	31.9	38.1	24.8
High	37.8	23.8	40.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	135	84	157

Gamma = -.00902

N = 376

When we looked at the two components of our prejudice score separately we found small negative relationships between both Economic and Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice against Jews: -.02688 for Prejudice against Jews and Economic Deprivation, and -.05599 for Economic Deprivation and Prejudice against Jews.

Prejudice against Blacks, however, did show some minor results. There was a small negative relationship between Economic Deprivation and Prejudice against Blacks (see Table 32), but there was a small positive relationship of .12115 between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice against Blacks (see Table 33).

TABLE 32

PREJUDICE AGAINST BLACKS BY ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION-WHITES ONLY
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Prejudice Against Blacks	Economic Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High
Low	24.0	27.5	27.9
High	76.0	72.5	72.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	121	109	147

Gamma = -.06694

N = 377

TABLE 33

PREJUDICE AGAINST BLACKS BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION-WHITES ONLY (IN PERCENTAGES)

Prejudice Against Blacks	Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High
Low	28.1	33.3	21.7
High	71.9	66.7	78.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	135	84	157
	Gamma = .12817		
	N = 376		

When we examined the relationship of Economic Deprivation and Prejudice against Blacks, adding Subjective Deprivation, the negative relationship for these two variables increased (see Table 34). However, when we turned our attention in the opposite direction, and examined the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice against Blacks adding Economic Deprivation we found a much strengthened relationship in each level of Deprivation (see Table 35).

Discussion

Hamilton has pointed out that past studies on the working class and unemployment "have focused on the radicalizing effect of unemployment, others, on the contrary, have found just the opposite, apathy and general demoralization." He then

TABLE 34

PREJUDICE AGAINST BLACKS BY ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION AND SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION-WHITES ONLY (IN PERCENTAGES)

Prejudice Against Blacks	Subjective Deprivation: Low — Economic Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation: Medium — Economic Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation: High — Economic Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	25.4	35.1	26.7	25.9	31.0	42.9	19.2	18.6	23.9
High	74.6	64.9	73.3	74.1	69.0	57.1	80.8	81.4	76.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=67	N=37	N=30	N=27	N=29	N=28	N=26	N=43	N=88
	Gamma =-.07532			Gamma =-.25000			Gamma =-.12469		
	N = .34			N = 84			N = 157		

TABLE 35

PREJUDICE AGAINST BLACKS BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION-WHITES ONLY (IN PERCENTAGES)

Prejudice Against Blacks	Economic Deprivation: Low — Subjective Deprivation			Economic Deprivation: Medium — Subjective Deprivation			Economic Deprivation: High — Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	25.4	25.9	19.2	35.1	31.0	18.6	26.7	42.9	23.9
High	74.6	74.1	80.8	64.9	69.0	81.4	73.3	57.1	76.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=67	N=27	N=26	N=37	N=29	N=43	N=30	N=28	N=88
	Gamma = .09326			Gamma = .28911			Gamma = .16047		
	N = 120			N = 109			N = 146		

goes on to say that "Further attempts to support one or another of these opposed findings, or to explore, the sources of the differing responses are hindered by the nearly complete absence of appropriate questions."[1]

With the results that have just been reported, we have begun to answer some questions about the sources of these responses. They indicated that anxiety and depression or Anomia had greater links to economic condition than either Class Consciousness or Prejudice as responses to plant shutdown. Both Class Consciousness and Prejudice against Blacks were responses that correlated more with our respondents' view of their condition than the actual condition itself. Indeed, among both low and high economically deprived workers, there was a strong relationship between Class Consciousness and Subjective Deprivation. Having experienced sudden insecurity these workers' actual economic condition was not as important in adopting this mode of response as the initial experience of plant shutdown itself. They were put in a frame of mind of adopting a stance that would seem to them to aim at a solution of their problem. So we saw them tending toward greater class solidarity and a desire for increased governmental control.

Anxiety and depression on the other hand, for these respondents, were reactions that had more direct linkage to

---

[1]Hamilton, Richard F., Affluence and the French Worker in the Fourth Republic, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1967, p. 186.

actual economic condition with both Economic and Subjective Deprivation co-varying in their influence on the adoption of Anomia. Subjective Deprivation had a slightly stronger influence than Economic Deprivation.

Though the correlations were small and probably not statistically significant they were in the direction of allowing us to say that those workers who adopted a response of Prejudice did so only in relation to Blacks. Though the relationships were not as strong as they were for the other two response patterns, the fact that they showed up as they did said something about the relative effects of Economic and Subjective Deprivation and also indicated something about the visibility as targets for blame that these two groups possessed to our respondents.

First, the small negative correlation between Economic Deprivation and Prejudice Against Blacks was strengthened when Subjective Deprivation was added. Conversely, the moderately low positive correlation between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice against Blacks was strengthened in the medium and high categories when levels of Economic Deprivation were added. This indicated that Economic Deprivation had little or no effect on our respondents who adopted this mode of response. Like class conscious workers, the principle influence on our highly prejudiced respondents was their definition of their situation with the actual economic situation playing little or no role in their prejudiced reaction.

Secondly, Anti-Semitism was a less acceptable attitudinal stance than Prejudice Against Blacks for our respondents. Three-quarters (74.5 per cent) of them said that at least they would accept them as neighbors and one-third (33.2 per cent) said they would have even accepted marriage into their families with Jews. This was contrasted with only a little over a quarter (26.5 per cent) of our White respondents who indicated they wouldn't mind Blacks moving into their neighborhoods, and only 2.4 per cent of them indicated they would accept marriage into their families.

The finding that our respondents exhibited more Prejudice Against Blacks than Anti-Semitism was hardly surprising — what was interesting though was the magnitude of the differences. Almost thirty per cent (29.8 per cent) more of our respondents indicated they would allow Jews to marry into their families than would allow Blacks to do so. In addition, forty eight per cent more of them said they would allow Jews to move into their neighborhoods than would allow Blacks the same privilege.

It is well known that skin color alone makes Blacks a more highly visible target for hostility than other ethnic minorities but does this by itself explain these large differences? We think not. Another plausible explanation would be that these white respondents who in addition to suddenly having lost all the security they had built up over the years found themselves job hunting in a depressed labor market. Interviewing in our study took place in the middle

of the recession (1957-1958) with high unemployment existing at the time. This made for fierce competition for the few scarce jobs available and a larger number of those who became prejudiced found Blacks a more suitable target for hostility because of the direct competition with them for jobs. Blacks were perceived to be more of a direct threat than Jews.

We will have some further evidence relating to this proposition when we take up the effects of skill in our sixth chapter to which we will now turn.

CHAPTER VI

AGE, SKILL AND RACE

It is now time for us to consider the effects of such factors as Age, Race and Skill on the relationships discussed in the previous chapter. These variables could have influenced our respondents in this situation in a number of ways. These were covered in Chapter II. If you will recall, one of the more important of these influences was that the effect of these variables would have been to act to either cushion or compound the shock resulting from plant shutdown. In this way it may have influenced some respondents more than others to adopt particular response patterns.

In view of this we developed some special hypotheses about the effects of each of them. We would now like to turn our attention to a discussion of these findings.

Age and Subjective Deprivation

Hypothesis 1: The relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness would decrease as Age increases.

Hypotheses 2 and 3: The relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia and Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice would increase as Age increases.

Results

Our analysis produced some interesting results, not so much because it confirmed our Hypotheses as much as that it did not. In order to better understand the underlying dynamics, we thought it might be helpful to look at the relationship between our Dependent Variables and the particular intervening variable being studied at the time before looking at the effect of the intervening variable on the relationship between the Dependent Variable and Subjective Deprivation. In this particular instance we examined the relationship between Class Consciousness and Age and found that it was the older workers who were the most class conscious, the young the least. 11.8 per cent more older workers were medium high - high in Class Consciousness than younger workers. Only 5.3 per cent more older workers were medium high - high class conscious than middle aged workers (see Table 36).

TABLE 36

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS BY AGE
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness		Young		Age Middle	Old	
Low	47.1	5.9	39.5	11.0	8.0	35.3
Medium Low		41.2		29.5	27.3	
Medium High	52.9	52.9	59.5	56.8	59.7	64.7
High		0.0		2.7	5.0	
		100.0		100.0	100.0	
		N = 68		N=146	N=238	

Subjective Deprivation, Class Consciousness and Age

Our results indicated that all three age groups manifested Class Consciousness as a response to sudden unemployment. Although this was so it was neither the young nor the old that showed the greatest tendency toward this response, but rather it was those between the ages of forty-five to fifty-four, that age group called middle aged in our social structure. The respective correlations for Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness were: young = .23242, middle aged = .44801, and old = .20384. It was in the middle aged category that we found a much higher relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness with the younger and older workers having approximately the same relationship (see Table 37).

Anomia and Age

There were no discernible differences between Age categories in relation to Anomia. All Age categories were low in Anomia. Approximately 70.0 per cent of each category were low-medium-low in Anomia (see Table 38).

Subjective Deprivation, Anomia and Age

Once again, we found it was in the middle aged category of our sample of ex-Packard Motor Car Company workers that we found the highest relationship between Subjective

TABLE 37

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND AGE (IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness	Young			Middle			Old		
	Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	0.0	7.7	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	1.9	2.1
Medium Low	50.0	38.5	33.3	42.5	36.7	15.3	31.8	33.3	19.0
Medium High	50.0	53.8	66.7	51.5	60.0	81.4	60.6	59.3	72.7
High	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.3	3.4	4.5	5.5	6.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=26	N=13	N=24	N=33	N=30	N=59	N=66	N=54	N=99
	Gamma = .23242			Gamma = .44801			Gamma = .20384		
	N = 63			N = 122			N = 217		

Deprivation and Anomia with a correlation of .36896. The young workers were next highest with a correlation of .23296 and the older workers were the lowest with a correlation of .17104. There was a shift from no differences between Age groups for Anomia when examined alone to important differences between Age groups when Anomia was related to Subjective Deprivation (see Table 39).

TABLE 38

ANOMIA BY AGE (IN PERCENTAGES)

Anomia	Age		
	Young	Middle	Old
Low	47.6	46.3	43.3
Medium Low	22.2	24.0	26.5
Medium High	12.7	16.5	19.5
High	17.5	13.2	10.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number =	63	121	215

Prejudice Against Blacks and Age

Examining Prejudice against Blacks and Age, we found no real differences between age groups, with only a 6.5 per cent difference between young and older workers. Though differences were not large, they went in the direction of indicating proportionally less prejudice for

TABLE 39

ANOMIA BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND AGE (IN PERCENTAGES)

	Age								
	Young			Middle			Old		
Anomia	Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	50.0	53.8	41.7	62.5	55.2	32.2	55.4	34.0	40.6
Medium Low	30.8	23.1	12.5	25.0	17.2	27.1	23.0	34.0	24.0
Medium High	7.7	23.1	12.5	9.4	6.9	25.4	15.4	18.9	22.9
High	11.5	0.0	33.3	3.1	20.7	15.3	6.2	13.1	12.5
	100.0 N=26	100.0 N=13	100.0 N=24	100.0 N=32	100.0 N=29	100.0 N=59	100.0 N=65	100.0 N=53	100.0 N=96
		Gamma = .23269			Gamma = .36896			Gamma = .17104	
		N = 63			N = 120			N = 214	

younger workers and proportionally more for older workers (see Table 40).

TABLE 40

PREJUDICE AGAINST BLACKS BY AGE
WHITES ONLY (IN PERCENTAGES)

Prejudice	Age		
	Young	Middle	Old
Low	28.8	25.2	22.3
High	71.2	74.8	77.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number =	52	107	184

Prejudice Against Blacks By Subjective Deprivation and Age

Examining the relationship between Prejudice against Blacks by Subjective Deprivation and Age, we found that for young workers there was a negative relationship between these two variables of -.18919, a small positive relationship of .09583 for middle aged workers and the yet higher relationship of .15319 for older workers (see Table 41).

TABLE 41

PREJUDICE AGAINST BLACKS BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND AGE-WHITES ONLY (IN PERCENTAGES)

Prejudice Against Blacks	Age: Young			Age: Middle			Age: Old		
	Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	19.2	71.5	26.3	28.1	25.0	23.9	24.2	29.3	17.5
High	80.8	28.5	73.7	71.9	75.0	76.1	75.8	70.7	82.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=26	N=7	N=19	N=32	N=28	N=46	N=62	N=41	N=80
	Gamma = .18919			Gamma = .07461			Gamma = .15319		
	N = 52			N = 106			N = 183		

Discussion

The results just revealed did not allow us to say that any of our hypothesized relationships had been confirmed. One, however, was in the direction of the predicted relationship; the relationship between Subjective Deprivation controlled for Age and Prejudice Against Blacks. The moderate relationship of .15319 for older workers led us to say that the linkage between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice against Blacks tended toward importance only in this Age category.

Prejudice against Blacks was high in all Age categories with approximately a three to one ratio of high to low Prejudice. In the young and middle aged groupings Prejudice was high no matter the category of Subjective Deprivation. The single exception seemed to be in the medium Subjective Deprivation category for younger workers. This may be questionable because of the small numbers in the cells of this category. It was only among the older workers that Subjective Deprivation had a moderate relationship to Prejudice.

There was one other facet of our problem that should be discussed. As mentioned earlier, a high percentage of our sample fell in the high Prejudice category. 73.5 per cent of the white workers were high in Prejudice. One of the social distance questions we had asked had to do with our respondents allowing Blacks to live in the same neighborhood as they did. Bettleheim and Janowitz report: "In 1942 two thirds of the population objected to the idea of

living in the same block with a Negro. But by 1956 a majority did not object and in 1958, 56 per cent answered "no" to the question "If colored people came to live next door would you move?"[1] (Parenthetically, 1958 was the year the interviewing was performed in the present study.) Though the two results were not exactly equivalent, we compared them and found that relative to the national average the ex-Packard workers exhibited much more prejudice than was found in the national polls at the time.

Why this was so we are not in any position to say but can only speculate that either we are dealing with a group of people who seem to be unusually Prejudice against Blacks or that plant shutdown, the experience they all had in common, had in some way acted to push many of them toward prejudice--regardless of deprivational feelings or age.

Class Consciousness and Anomia

Our discussion of the effects of Age on Class Consciousness in Chapter II began with the expectation that that section of the working class that was most mobile would also be that grouping that would be most flexible in regard to social experimentation. This led us to the expectation that highly deprived young workers would have been most prone to manifesting a Class Conscious response pattern.

---

[1]Bettleheim, Bruno and Janowitz, Morris, Social Change and Prejudice, The Free Press, New York, 1964, p. 12.

Older workers, on the other hand, because of advancing years would have been much more traditional in their orientation to life and society and would have been less conducive to favoring change and experimentation. This led to the expectation that they would be that grouping of our highly deprived that would be most prone to either Anomia or Prejudice. Our results indicated that though Prejudice seemed to go in this direction, these expectations were too simple for both Class Consciousness and Anomia.

The relationships between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness and Subjective Deprivation and Anomia were found to be highest in the Middle Aged Category. In attempting to explain these results we looked at the relationships between Economic Deprivation and Age and Subjective Deprivation and Age and discovered that the older workers in our sample experience greater Economic Deprivation with a 16.4 percent difference between young and old highly deprived and a 10.7 percent difference between middle aged and old highly deprived. (See Table 42.)

Though this was so, it was the middle aged that tended in the direction of expressing the most felt deprivation.[1] The difference between the young and middle aged was 10.3 percent and the difference between the middle aged and the old grouping was 3.7 percent. Though this difference was

---

[1]The difference here are small and probably not statistically significant between the middle aged and old. That is why we speak of the tendency of direction.

small, the direction of these findings was interesting. That there was a large difference between Age groupings on Economic Deprivation and such a small difference on Subjective Deprivation, plus the fact that 36.8 percent of the middle aged experienced high Economic Deprivation and 48.4 percent of them expressed high felt Deprivation suggests that the amount of felt deprivation amongst the middle aged in our sample was out of proportion to the actual Economic Deprivation they experienced (see Tables 42 and 43).

TABLE 42

ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION BY AGE
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Economic Deprivation	Age Young	Middle	Old
Low	39.7	37.5	21.8
Medium	29.4	25.7	30.7
High	30.9	36.8	45.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N = 68	N = 144	N = 238

TABLE 43

SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION BY AGE
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Subjective Deprivation	Age Young	Middle	Old
Low	41.3	27.0	30.4
Medium	20.6	24.6	24.9
High	38.1	48.4	44.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N = 63	N = 122	N = 217

This is explainable in view of the special position the middle aged occupied in the job market. They still had from 10 to 20 years left of active working life and it was this age grouping that first experienced the effect of Age on their ability to secure long term employment. Employers would have looked askance at hiring them feeling their age a deterrent to their ability to perform. Last, but not least, they had not yet begun to think in terms of retiring, as older workers approaching retirement age would have,and were not able to secure employment with the ease of a younger man. This would have led to greater felt deprivation.

Age, then, it appeared was not acting as a determinant of which of these response patterns was adopted but rather it influenced the amount of felt deprivation in the situation. It was felt deprivation that led them to manifest a response pattern. Which response was manifested was influenced by factors other than age. Let us now continue our discussion by looking at the role others of our intervening variables played in this situation.

Subjective Deprivation and Skill

Our hypotheses regarding Skill, our Dependent Variables and Subjective Deprivation were:

Hypothesis 1: The relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness would decrease as Skill increased.

Hypothesis 2: The relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice would increase as Skill increased.

Results

Class Consciousness and Skill

When we examined the relationship between Class Consciousness and Skill alone, we discovered that there was a small (4.9 per cent) difference between the unskilled and semi-skilled workers in the combined medium high and high categories of Class Consciousness. However, there was an 11.2 per cent difference between semi-skilled and skilled and an even greater 16.1 per cent difference between the unskilled and skilled in Class Consciousness (see Table 44).

The unskilled and semi-skilled were more Class Conscious than the skilled. Over two-thirds (69.9 per cent) of the unskilled and a little under two-thirds (64.7 per cent) of the semi-skilled workers exhibited medium high and high Class Consciousness. In contrast, just a little over half (53.5 per cent) of the skilled workers exhibited medium high and high Class Consciousness (see Table 44).

Subjective Deprivation, Class Consciousness and Skill

We then looked at the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness for each level of skill

and got some rather startling results. In contrast to our just reported finding for Class Consciousness and Skill alone, there was a very small negative relationship of -.01695 between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness for the unskilled. A moderate relationship of .19203 exists for the semi-skilled and a large relationship of .50534 exists for the skilled (see Table 45). Class Consciousness varied inversely with skill level, but the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness was highest among skilled workers. The small negative relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness found among unskilled workers did not indicate that these workers were workers were not Class Conscious. Approximately four-fifths of these unskilled workers were medium high - high in Class Consciousness in all categories of Subjective Deprivation. What it does indicate is that unskilled workers were proportionally higher Class Conscious regardless of the level of Subjective Deprivation.

TABLE 44

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS BY SKILL
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness	Skill					
	Unskilled		Semi-Skilled		Skill	
Low	30.4	8.7	35.3	8.6	46.5	7.7
Medium Low		21.7		26.7		38.8
Medium High	69.6	63.8	64.7	60.8	53.5	52.1
High		5.8		3.9		1.4
		100.0		100.0		100.0
	N = 69		N = 255		N = 142	

TABLE 45

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND SKILL (IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness	Skill: Unskilled — Subjective Deprivation			Skill: Semi-Skilled — Subjective Deprivation			Skill: Skilled — Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	0.0	5.3	0.0	1.6	1.9	0.9	6.8	0.0	0.0
Medium Low	18.2	15.8	20.0	30.0	35.0	35.0	49.2	46.4	18.6
Medium High	72.7	73.7	73.3	65.6	58.9	74.1	44.0	46.4	81.4
High	9.1	5.2	6.7	4.8	1.2	5.0	0.0	7.2	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=11	N=19	N=30	N=64	N=56	N=108	N=59	N=28	N=43
	Gamma = -.01695			Gamma = .19203			Gamma = .50554		
	N = 60			N = 228			N = 130		

Anomia and Skill

Once again, we first examined the relationship between the dependent variable, in this case Anomia, and Skill. First, we found a lower incidence of Anomia in each Skill level than we did Class Consciousness. Second, the skilled showed 20.4 per cent less medium high - high Anomia than the skilled and 11.4 per cent less medium high - high Anomia than did the semi-skilled (see Table 46).

TABLE 46

ANOMIA BY SKILL (IN PERCENTAGES

Anomia	Skill		
	Unskilled	Semi-Skilled	Skilled
Low	35.6	40.4	40.5
	57.6	66.6	69.0
Medium Low	22.0	26.2	28.5
Medium High	27.1	18.7	15.4
	42.4	33.4	22.0
High	15.3	14.7	7.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N = 59	N = 225	N = 130

Subjective Deprivation, Anomia and Skill Level

We then looked at the relationship between Anomia and Subjective Deprivation for each level of Skill and found that although there was a moderate relationship between

these two variables for each Skill level by far the greatest relationship was in the skilled category. Once more, as was the case for Class Consciousness and Skill level Anomia varied inversely with Skill level but the relationship between Anomia and Subjective Deprivation was highest among skilled workers. The respective correlations between Anomia and Subjective Deprivation were: .19490 for the unskilled, .16533 for the semi-skilled, and .36142 for the skilled (see Table 47).

Prejudice Against Blacks and Skill Level

We examined the relationship between Prejudice Against Blacks and Skill and discovered that although the differences were small, they were in the direction of allowing us to say that though all Skill levels showed high levels of Prejudice, the skilled showed the least. The differences between Skill levels were 9.1 per cent between unskilled and skilled and only 6.6 per cent between semi-skilled and skilled (see Table 48).

Subjective Deprivation, Prejudice Against Blacks and Skill Level

We next examined the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice Against Blacks for each Skill level. First, we discovered that relationships we found for Class Consciousness and Anomia did not occur for

TABLE 47

ANOMIA BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND SKILL (IN PERCENTAGES)

	Skill								
	Unskilled			Semi-Skilled			Skilled		
Anomia	Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	54.5	33.3	30.3	44.4	43.6	36.4	62.1	35.7	39.5
Medium Low	27.3	16.7	23.3	28.6	30.9	22.4	27.6	35.7	23.3
Medium High	18.2	22.2	13.3	17.5	14.6	21.6	6.9	21.4	23.2
High	0.0	27.8	13.4	9.5	10.9	19.6	3.4	7.2	14.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=11	N=18	N=30	N=63	N=55	N=107	N=58	N=28	N=43
	Gamma = .19490			Gamma = .16533			Gamma = .36142		
	N = 59			N = 225			N = 129		

Prejudice against Blacks. We then found that the unskilled and semi-skilled showed moderate relationships between felt deprivation and Prejudice and the skilled showed a negative relationship between these two variables. The respective correlations were: Gamma = .23005 for the unskilled, Gamma = .25296 for the semi-skilled, and Gamma = .15007 for the skilled (see Table 49).

TABLE 48

PREJUDICE AGAINST BLACKS BY SKILL
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Prejudice	Skill		
	Unskilled	Semi-Skilled	Skilled
Low	22.0	24.5	31.1
Medium	78.0	75.5	68.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N = 41	N = 188	N = 122

Discussion

The Dependent Variables and Skill Level

The findings just reported indicated that Skill level alone was inversely related to the dependent variables: Class Consciousness, Anomia, and Prejudice against Blacks. In the case of both Class Consciousness and Anomia, there

TABLE 49

PREJUDICE AGAINST BLACKS BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND SKILL-WHITES ONLY (IN PERCENTAGES)

Prejudice Against Blacks	Skill: Unskilled			Skill: Semi-Skilled			Skill: Skilled		
	Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	10.0	54.5	10.0	32.2	25.0	18.6	25.0	40.0	32.5
High	90.0	45.5	90.0	67.8	75.0	81.4	75.0	60.0	67.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=10	N=11	N=20	N=59	N=44	N=86	N=56	N=25	N=40
	Gamma = .23005			Gamma = .25813			Gamma = -.15007		
	N = 41			N = 189			N = 121		

were clear relationships and large differences between the unskilled, the semi-skilled and the skilled, indicating that proportionally more unskilled and semi-skilled than skilled had become Class Conscious and Anomic. Proportionally fewer skilled workers, on the other hand, exhibited medium high and high Anomia than they did either medium high - high Class Consciousness and high Prejudice.

Additional generalizations about Skill and our dependent variables were:

1. The unskilled exhibited the most Class Consciousness; the skilled, the least.

2. A much larger proportion of these workers exhibited medium high to high Class Consciousness than did medium high to high Anomia in all Skill categories.

3. The skilled workers exhibited the least Anomia with only 22.0 per cent in the medium high and high categories; the unskilled workers, the most.

4. All Skill categories exhibited a high proportion of Prejudice.

5. The unskilled and semi-skilled were the most Prejudiced.

We next looked at the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and our Dependent Variables controlling for each level of Skill and got results that led us to conclude that none of our Hypotheses could be confirmed. We could only conclude that in most cases the effect of plant shutdown worked in an opposite direction than was expected from a perusal of prior literature. This had important implications and it is to this discussion that we would now like to turn for each of our Dependent Variables.

Subjective Deprivation, Class Consciousness, Anomia and Skill

Subjective Deprivation, Anomia and Skill

The predicted relationship for Subjective Deprivation and Anomia for each Skill level arose out of our reasoning that the unskilled with the smallest reserve resources would have been that grouping to express the greatest proportion of felt deprivation and hence respond to plant shutdown in a manner that would show resignation.

In time this would have led to greater anxiety and despair as no solution was found for their condition and Anomia had set in. Unskilled workers did express Anomia. However, the greatest influence of felt deprivation in evoking the response was seen at work in the skilled group.

The proportion of each Skill level in adopting this response was much smaller than those who adopted Class Consciousness or Prejudice. However, skill played the role of compounding felt deprivation and, contrary to our expecta-

tion, it was the skilled workers who exhibited the highest relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia. Why this occurred will be discussed along with our exposition of Subjective Deprivation, Class Consciousness and Skill Level.

Class Consciousness and Skill

Our hypotheses on the effect of skill level on Class Consciousness were influenced by a large body of literature, most of it speculative, that assumed that skilled workers were the most conservative members of the working class. In addition to greater income and security many factors were cited as influencing this political orientation. Some of these included greater control over the pace of work and corollary to that greater creativity and satisfaction in work. In addition, skilled workers were cited as having much greater contact with management and better chances for promotion, leading to orientations that were conservative and "class collaborationist" in nature.

Frederick Engels describes the skilled as a "working class aristocracy" that had succeeded in creating a "relatively comfortable position for themselves leading to them becoming 'model workingmen' and very nice people to deal with, for any sensible capitalist in particular and for the whole capitalist class in general."[1]

[1]Engels, Frederick, The Condition of the Working Class in England, trans. by W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner, (Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell, 1958), p. 368.

Roberto Michels said that the difference between skilled and unskilled with time "becomes transformed into a veritable class distinction. The skilled and better paid workers hold aloof from the unskilled and worse paid laborers."[1]

Lenin, in his analysis of the Second International's support of World War I, concluded that the social base of this body had shifted to a "stratum of the 'labor aristocracy' or of workers who had become quite petty bourgeois in their mode of life, in their earnings and in their outlook, serves as the principal bulwark of the Second International and in our day the principle social ... support of the bourgeoisie."[2]

Many contemporary sociologists have followed this line of argument, saying that skilled workers were a moderate or conservative force in working class politics. What little research that had been done on this thesis indicated contradictory results with its not being supported almost as frequently as it had been. Lipset and Bendix report: "In Germany and Sweden the skilled workers are more radical than the semi and unskilled; in America, Britain and Australia the skilled workers are more conservative."[3] Hamilton, in

---

[1]Michels, Roberto, Political Parties, The Free Press, 1949, p. 292.

[2]Lenin, V.I., Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Selected Works, Volume V, International Publishers, New York, p. 12.

[3]Lipset, S.M., Bendix, R., Social Mobility in Industrial Societies, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1959, p. 67-8.

research on this theme in the United States and France, found that in the U.S. when foremen were removed from the skilled workers category, there was no difference in Republican voting or identification among skill levels.[1] In France, he found that skilled workers were less likely to be pro-socialist or revolutionary than unskilled.[2] However, in trying to account for this finding, he found that neither differences in income nor work satisfaction could explain it.

The inevitable conclusion from the speculative literature, if not the research, was that response to an experience as deprivational in context as plant shutdown would have been to accentuate the relationships found previously for Class Consciousness and Skill Level. We expected the unskilled and semi-skilled to become proportionally more Class Conscious or Anomic in orientation with the skilled the least.

This expectation was reinforced when we looked at the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Skill Level and discovered that a greater proportion of unskilled and semi-skilled expressed higher felt deprivation than the

---

[1]Hamilton, Richard F., "Skill Level and Politics" Public Opinion Quarterly XXIV Fall of 1965. P. 309-99.

[2]Hamilton, Richard F., Affluence and the French Worker in the Fourth Republic. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1967, Chapter 7.

skilled. 16.9 per cent more unskilled and 14.3 per cent more semi-skilled did so than skilled workers. (See Table 50.) However, there was a negative relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness for unskilled workers, a moderate one for semi-skilled workers and very high relationship for the skilled workers. Why then did we find such a large relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness for skilled workers?

Looking for an answer to this question, we compared Economic Deprivation by Skill Level and Subjective Deprivation by Skill Level. We discovered that there were 8 per cent more unskilled who experienced high Economic Deprivation than expressed high Subjective Deprivation. 2.9 per cent more of our semi-skilled workers expressed high felt deprivation than experienced high Economic Deprivation. But 11.6 per cent more of our skilled workers expressed high felt deprivation than experienced High Economic Deprivation (see Tables 50 and 51).

TABLE 50

SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION BY SKILL LEVEL
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Subjective Deprivation	Skill		
	Unskilled	Semi-Skilled	Skilled
Low	18.3	28.1	45.4
Medium	31.7	24.5	21.5
High	50.0	47.4	33.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N = 60	N = 228	N = 130

TABLE 51

ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION BY SKILL LEVEL (IN PERCENTAGES)

Economic Deprivation	Skill		
	Unskilled	Semi-Skilled	Skilled
Low	24.6	23.8	37.6
Medium	17.4	31.6	31.9
High	58.0	44.6	21.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N = 69	N = 256	N = 142

This suggested that though skilled workers didn't experience as great Economic Deprivation the experience of plant shutdown itself was of greater consequence to them than to other skill groups. The depth of deprivation felt by the skilled was greater regardless of experienced Economic Deprivation.[1] The opposite was the case for the unskilled. Among semi-skilled workers the same proportion expressed high felt deprivation as experienced high Economic Deprivation. Though Skill did cushion economic deprivation it played the role of compounding felt deprivation rather than softening the blow as had been predicted.

[1]We are introducing another dimension and suggesting these findings as indirect evidence for the proposition that though the unskilled and semi-skilled workers had a larger proportion in the high felt deprivation category this was more consistent with the actual Economic Deprivation they experienced. The lack of coherence between Objective and Subjective Deprivation expressed by skilled workers with much more expressed high felt deprivation indicates an intensity of feeling not found in other groups.

A plausible explanation of this could be that before the shutdown the skilled workers in our sample were the ones that felt most secure. The skills they possessed were thought to be a buffer to insecurity in that as long as the Packard Motor Car Company existed, it needed these skills and these workers too because it is much more expensive to replace a skilled worker than either an unskilled or a semi-skilled worker. When the shutdown occurred, it must have been as though lightening had struck and insecurity suddenly replaced security leading to more intensely felt deprivation among skilled workers.

Prejudice Against Blacks, Subjective Deprivation and Skill Level

In our previous discussion of prejudice and its causes in modern society, we pointed up the importance of prejudice as a reaction to status frustration. This was an important cause of prejudice cited in the literature. In developing Hypothesis Three relating to prejudice, we reasoned that the skill group that would be most prone to status frustration would be the skilled because of the special position they held in terms of income, job satisfaction and greater prestige in the total society relative to other categories of workers.[1]

These workers, we reasoned, in consonance with the

[1]See Chapter II, pp. 33-34.

aristocracy of labor thesis were most prone to status frustration. It would be expressed in finding the highest relationship between Prejudice Against Blacks and Subjective Deprivation among skilled workers. Our results were such as to demonstrate that at least for this group of workers status frustration was not an important determinant of prejudice.

Though the proportion of prejudiced workers was high in all skill groups, it was lowest among the skilled workers. When we compared skill categories along the dimensions of felt deprivation and prejudice, we discovered skilled workers exhibited a negative relationship between these two variables (-.15007). The other two skill categories exhibited moderate positive relationships (.23005 for the unskilled, .25813 for the semi-skilled). This did not mean that skilled workers were not prejudiced for 68.9 per cent of them were high in prejudice--only that deprivation did not appear to be related to this prejudice.

This evidence plus the fact that most Blacks were in the unskilled and semi-skilled categories gives further support to the argument we posed previously in discussing Prejudice and Subjective Deprivation--that felt deprivation would combine with competition for jobs in a depressed labor market and tend to make these workers more hostile to that group with whom they were contesting for these scarce jobs.

Race

This social characteristic had always been a volatile factor in American society. As such, it had to be taken into account in that it should have important bearing on our respondents manifesting the response patterns. The hypotheses developed were:

1. The relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness would be higher among Black workers than Whites.
2. The relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia would be higher among White workers than Black workers.

Results

When we looked at the relationship between Race and our dependent variables, we found Blacks had 11.2 percent more medium high-high class consciousness than Whites (see Table 53), and Blacks had 9 percent more medium high-high Anomia than Whites (see Table 52).

When we looked at Subjective Deprivation by these two dependent variables controlling for Race, we found a greater relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness and Subjective Deprivation and Anomia for Whites than we did for Blacks (see Tables 54 and 55). The respective correlations were:

Class Consciousness by Subjective Deprivation for Whites = .28882

Class Consciousness by Subjective Deprivation For Blacks =	.06127
Anomia by Subjective Deprivation For Whites =	.32138
Anomia by Subjective Deprivation For Blacks =	.20076

Discussion

Subjective Deprivation, Anomia and Race

The results reported indicated that the expected relation had developed and our hypothesis that Whites would exhibit a greater relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia than Blacks had been confirmed.

Subjective Deprivation, Class Consciousness and Race

John Leggett gave evidence pointing up the importance of race in influencing the development of class consciousness among Blacks in Detroit in the late fifties.[1] Other sociologists had pointed to the importance of this variable in developing a militant or radical stance among minority racial groupings.

One would thus have assumed that economic insecurity and sudden unemployment had acted to accentuate the development of class consciousness. Our findings when looking at our dependent variables and Race alone suggested that the Black workers who experienced the Packard Motor

[1]Leggett, John, Class, Race and Labor, Oxford University Press, 1968, p. 13.

TABLE 52

ANOMIA BY RACE (IN PERCENTAGES)

Anomia		Race: White	Race: Black	
Low		45.5	34.4	
Medium Low		25.9	28.0	
Medium High	28.6	17.6	18.8	37.6
High		11.0	18.8	
		100.0	100.0	
		N = 374	N = 64	

Gamma = .19532

TABLE 53

CLASS CONSIOUSNESS BY RACE (IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness		Race: White	Race: Black	
Low	40.0	8.6	5.5	28.8
Medium Low		31.4	23.3	
Medium High	60.0	57.8	61.6	71.2
High		2.2	9.6	
		100.0	100.0	
		N = 376	N = 64	

Gamma = .25578

TABLE 54

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND RACE (IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness	Race: White — Subjective Deprivation			Race: Black — Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	3.7	1.2	0.6	0.0	0.0	2.6
Medium Low	39.3	39.3	21.0	33.3	20.0	13.2
Medium High	54.8	57.1	75.8	50.0	75.0	71.0
High	2.2	2.4	2.6	16.7	5.0	13.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=135	N=84	N=157	N=6	N=20	N=38
	Gamma = .32138			Gamma = .20076		
	N = 376			N = 64		

TABLE 55

ANOMIA BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION
AND RACE (IN PERCENTAGES)

	Race					
	White			Black		
Anomia	Subjective Deprivation			Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	57.9	40.2	37.2	16.7	40.0	34.2
Medium Low	24.8	32.9	23.0	66.7	20.0	26.3
Medium High	11.3	15.9	24.4	16.6	20.0	18.4
High	6.0	11.0	15.4	0.0	20.0	21.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=133	N=82	N=156	N=6	N=20	N=38
	Gamma = .28882			Gamma = .6127		
	N = 371			N = 64		

Car Company shutdown were more class conscious than were White workers. It also suggested that Black workers were a little more prone to expressing Anomia than were White workers.

We then examined the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia and Race, and Subjective Deprivation Class Consciousness and Race and discovered that there was a greater relationship for Whites than for Blacks between Subjective Deprivation and these two dependent variables.

This said that plant shutdown and its attendent felt deprivation moved Whites more so than Blacks towards increased Class Consciousness and Anomia. Leggett found unemployed Whites to be more Class Conscious than employed Whites. However, unemployed Blacks were a little less Class Conscious than employed Blacks and from this he concluded that "considered by itself, unemployment does not serve as an important source of Class Consciousness for Negroes."[1]

Though this was not exactly true of our ex-Packard Black workers; what can be said was that they did not seem as affected as White ex-Packard workers by this particular experience, though they did show a moderate relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness. One explanation for the fact that Whites exhibited a higher relationship between felt deprivation and Class Conscious-

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 81.

ness could have stemmed from the long history of deprivation that Blacks had experienced in the United States. This was just one, albeit an important one, in the history of deprivations that these Black workers had experienced so that the impact of the experience and felt deprivation arising from it would have had greater effect on White than on Black ex-Packard workers. Though the incidence of Class Consciousness was greater among Blacks, those Whites who had become Class Conscious did so in more direct response to this experience than did Blacks.

CHAPTER VII

MOBILITY ORIENTATION

"... some discontented individuals attempt to better their lot within the existing economic system by working their way up the ladder of success. If such a possibility seems to exist, there will be a corresponding reduction in collective efforts at social change such as the support of unions and leftist parties."[1] This quote from Seymour Martin Lipset aptly summarizes the effect we expected open mobility orientation to have on the adoption of one of the response patterns.

In Chapter II we stated that these workers' response to sudden deprivation would be affected by their attitude toward the possibility of mobility and especially the view they held of their own possibility for movement in the occupational structure. We concluded that deprived workers who saw an open mobility structure and blamed themselves for their inability to move would tend toward Anomia. Deprived workers who saw the structure as closed would tend toward increased Class Consciousness. Deprived workers who saw the social structure as open and blamed others for their

---

[1]Lipset, S.M., Political Man, Doubleday and Co. Inc., Garden City, New York, 1960. p. 253.

condition would become more prejudiced. These statements when put in the form of hypotheses looked like this:

Hypothesis 1: The relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness varies inversely with views of mobility opportunity, i.e. the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness would decrease as the view of the mobility structure as open increased.

Hypotheses 2 and 3: Subjective Deprivation and Anomia and Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice vary directly with views of mobility opportunity from being closed to being open. The relationship of Subjective Deprivation to Anomia and Prejudice would increase as the view of the mobility structure as open increased.

Construction of Mobility Attitude Measure

Originally our intention was to use five questions from the interview schedule that dealt directly with the respondents' view of mobility opportunity for himself, his children and other young people in society. We discovered that there were unfortunate deficiencies in using these questions arising either from lack of response to them or problems in the way the questions were coded.

Instead, two items were picked from this interview schedule that had to do with these workers' unfulfilled desires in the job market. One asked directly: "Was there any job training you wanted and weren't able to get?" "yes/no" Another question ascertained the extent to which these ex-Packard workers desired or thought of going into some other kind of work: "Have you ever thought of leaving the auto industry for some other line of work?" "yes/no" A test was applied to see what relationship there was between these two questions and found them to be highly related with a gamma of .39332. With such a high correlation we felt we could use them as an Index of Attitude Toward Mobility Opportunity.

In order to develop this measure we reasoned that if these workers were to answer "yes" there was training they wanted and were unable to get; then they were more apt to think of the opportunity structure as being closed to themselves. The same could be said of those saying "no" they never thought of leaving the auto industry. If the responses to these two questions were in this manner, we said that they looked at the mobility structure as closed and categorized them in this way. If they answered in the opposite direction, we said they had an attitude toward this structure as being open for movement and so categorized them. All those in between were labeled medium in their attitude. We assigned scores by adding the responses together giving equal weight to each response. The resulting Index of Attitude Toward

Mobility Opportunity distributed throughout the Sample in the following manner:

TABLE 56

DISTRIBUTION OF ATTITUDE TOWARD MOBILITY OPPORTUNITY SCORES IN THE TOTAL SAMPLE

	Closed	Medium	Open	Total
Frequency	89	312	84	485
Percent	18.4	64.3	17.3	100

Results

When we looked at mobility orientation by our Dependent Variables alone, we discovered that there were no differences between workers having a closed and those having an open view of mobility opportunity for either Anomia, Class Consciousness, or Prejudice against Blacks.

Class Consciousness by Mobility Opportunity

We found little relationship between Mobility Orientation and Class Consciousness with a correlation coefficient of -.03769 (see Table 57).

There were only 3.4 percent more of those who were open than those who were closed in perception of mobility opportunity for medium high - high Class Consciousness. There were 9.2 percent more workers who had an open than those who have a medium view of the opportunity structures who were medium high - high in Class Consciousness. There were 5.8 percent more workers whose view of the opportunity struc-

ture was that it was closed than those with medium perception of the opportunity structure who were medium high - high in Class Consciousness (See Table 57).

TABLE 57

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS BY MOBILITY ORIENTATION
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness	Mobility Orientation Open		Medium		Closed	
Low	2.4		9.9		6.7	
		32.5		41.6		35.9
Medium Low	20.1		31.7		29.2	
Medium High	65.1		54.6		60.7	
		67.5		58.4		64.1
High	2.4		3.8		3.4	
	100.0		100.0		100.0	
	N = 83		N = 312		N = 89	

Gamma = -.03769

Anomia and Mobility Opportunity

We found little relationship between Mobility Orientation and Anomia with a correlation coefficient of .08557 (see Table 58).

When we looked at Anomia by Attitude toward Mobility Opportunity, we once again found small differences between Mobility Opportunity Attitudes and Anomia. 5.2 per cent more of those who saw the opportunity structures as closed than those who saw it as open were proportionally higher in Anomia. There were only 7 per cent more whose view of the structure was that it was open than those with a medium perspective toward the opportunity structure that were high in Anomia. Between two thirds and three quarters of re-

spondents in all categories were in the low-medium - low categories of Anomia (see Table 58).

TABLE 58

ANOMIA BY MOBILITY ORIENTATION
(IN PERCENTAGES)

Anomia	Mobility Orientation Open		Medium		Closed	
Low	40.7		48.0		32.5	
		71.6		72.0		63.8
Medium Low	30.9		24.0		31.3	
Medium High	17.3		18.0		20.0	
High	11.1		10.0		16.2	
	100.0		100.0		100.0	
	N = 81		N = 271		N = 80	

Gamma = .08557

Prejudice Against Blacks by Mobility Orientation

We found little relationship between Mobility Orientation and Prejudice against Blacks with a correlation coefficient of .08188 (see Table 59).

Again there were only small differences between the categories of Mobility Opportunity in relation to Prejudice against Blacks. 5.6 per cent more of those who had a view of the mobility structure as closed than those who saw it as open were high in Prejudice. Over two thirds to three quarters of each category of mobility orientation was high in Prejudice.

TABLE 59

PREJUDICE AGAINST BLACKS BY MOBILITY ORIENTATION
WHITES ONLY (IN PERCENTAGES)

Prejudice Against Blacks	Mobility Orientation		
	Open	Medium	Closed
Low	30.6	26.2	25.0
High	69.4	73.8	75.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Gamma = .08188	N=72	N=237	N=60

Subjective Deprivation, Class Consciousness and Mobility Orientation

We had found no relationship between Mobility Orientation and Class Consciousness. However, when we looked at the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness for levels of Mobility Orientation, we got some positive results that indicated that there were moderate to strong relationships between these variables for each level of Mobility Orientation (see Table 60). The correlation coefficients were:

View of the Mobility Structure as Closed = .44546

In Between (Medium) View of Mobility Structure = .31903

Open View of Mobility Structure = .22984

TABLE 60

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND MOBILITY ORIENTATION (IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness	Mobility Orientation: Open			Medium			Closed		
	Subjective Deprivation: Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Medium Low	42.9	21.1	26.5	37.6	40.0	18.6	42.1	40.0	19.0
Medium High	53.6	78.9	70.6	53.8	53.8	75.2	57.9	60.0	73.8
High	3.5	0.0	2.9	3.2	6.2	4.4	0.0	0.0	7.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.00	100.00	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=28	N=19	N=34	N=93	N=65	N=113	N=19	N=20	N=42
	Gamma = .22984			Gamma = .31903			Gamma = .44546		
	N = 81			N = 271			N = 81		

Subjective Deprivation, Anomia and Mobility Orientation

There are moderate relationships between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia in each category of mobility opportunity. Though the differences between categories were not large, they ran in the opposite direction to that which we found for Class Consciousness (see Table 61). The relationships expressed in correlation coefficients were:

View of Mobility Structure as Closed	=	.10369
In Between (Medium) View of Mobility Structure	=	.29513
Open View of Mobility Structure	=	.24024

Subjective Deprivation, Prejudice Against Blacks And Mobility Orientation

The relationship between felt deprivation and Black prejudice was moderate for both closed and medium, and negative for open mobility orientation (see Table 62). The respective correlations were:

Closed Mobility	=	.22222
Medium Mobility	=	.20169
Open Mobility	=	.12676

Discussion

The results just reported showed that even with an imprecise measure, Mobility Orientation had important bearing

TABLE 61

ANOMIA BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION BY MOBILITY ORIENTATION (IN PERCENTAGES)

Class Consciousness	Mobility Orientation: Open — Subjective Deprivation			Medium — Subjective Deprivation			Closed — Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	53.6	31.6	35.2	59.3	47.7	38.4	36.8	26.3	33.3
Medium Low	35.7	21.1	32.4	23.1	27.7	22.3	36.8	42.1	23.8
Medium High	7.1	26.3	20.6	13.2	16.9	23.2	15.8	10.5	26.2
High	3.6	21.0	11.8	4.4	7.7	16.1	10.6	21.1	16.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=28	N=17	N=34	N=91	N=65	N=112	N=19	N=19	N=42
	Gamma = .24024			Gamma = .29513			Gamma = .10369		
	N = 81			N = 268			N = 80		

TABLE 62

PREJUDICE AGAINST BLACKS BY SUBJECTIVE DEPRIVATION AND MOBILITY ORIENTATION-WHITES ONLY (IN PERCENTAGES)

Prejudice Against Blacks	Mobility Orientation: Open — Subjective Deprivation			Medium — Subjective Deprivation			Closed — Subjective Deprivation		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Low	25.9	33.3	33.3	29.9	34.0	19.1	27.8	35.7	17.9
High	74.1	66.7	66.7	70.1	66.0	80.9	72.2	64.3	82.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=27	N=15	N=30	N=87	N=53	N=94	N=18	N=14	N=28
	Gamma = .12676			Gamma = .20169			Gamma = .22222		
	N = 72			N = 234			N = 60		

on the problem under study. There were clearly visible effects that this variable had on our highly deprived respondents manifestating at least two of our response patterns and some probable effects in the case of the third. It is to this discussion that we will now turn.

Subjective Deprivation, Class Consciousness and Mobility Orientation

Earlier we stated that the effect of sudden Economic Deprivation and resulting high Subjective Deprivation would be to heighten Class Consciousness among those who viewed their own opportunity for Mobility as limited in our social structure. Specifically, the Hypothesis developed was: the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness varies inversely with the view of Mobility Opportunity, i.e., the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness would decrease as the view of the mobility structure as open increased.

When we examined the results of our survey of ex-Packard workers, we concluded that this Hypothesis had been validated. Though we found at least moderate correlations between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness for all categories of Mobility Orientation, by far the strongest of them all was for those who had had a closed Mobility Orientation. Further, we found a strengthened relationship

when we compared the correlation of .3348 found for Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness alone with the correlation of .44546 for these two variables controlling for a closed Mobility Orientation.

These findings showed that an orientation toward limited Mobility Opportunity prepared the foundation for the rejection of existing social relationships. Their view of their own limited opportunity led these workers to say that the existing social structure was organized to their detriment and that it rather than they was to blame for their deprived situation. This led to increased awareness of their position in that social structure, increased solidarity with others in the same position, greater identification with the organizations and groups which they saw as representative of those who were in their position and adherence and support for those programs and persons they saw as working for a solution of their plight.

In this particular situation this took the form of increased identification with their own social class (the working class), identification with and adherence to the major organized grouping of the working class, the union, and a desire to see greater governmental control and intervention over the economy for this they thought was the way in which their problem was to be solved. Those who viewed their own Mobility Opportunity as open or medium tended to react to high subjective deprivation by manifesting other of the response patterns that we have been studying in this dissertation.

Subjective Deprivation, Anomia and Mobility Orientation

Those who manifested Anomia were those workers who though they still adhered to the notion of success, had adjusted to the idea that they themselves were not going to participate in the "American Dream" and had formed alternate goals. Security figured prominently as one of these goals. This, of course, was before the shutdown. When the shutdown occurred even their alternate goals were shattered. Because of this adherence to the "ideology of success" they could only blame themselves for their situation. This experience shattered their guideposts and gradually led them to question the good of trying to remain a part of the world and resulted in their wanting to run and hide from it all. Those manifesting Anomia were then men who had allowed their anxiety and depression to take over. Resulting from these assumptions we developed the following Hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: The relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia will increase as the view of the social structure as open increases.

The results reported earlier showed that those who held an open view of the mobility structure exhibited a greater relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia than those who held a closed view. Those with an open and medium view had approximately the same strength of relationship. Though the differences between the categories of Mobility Orientation were not large enough to allow us to declare that the Hypothesis had been confirmed, the correlations

were in the predicted direction and so lent credence to the theoretical proposition outlined above.

Subjective Deprivation, Prejudice Against Blacks and Mobility Orientation

Our Hypothesis about the relationship between these variables was: the relationship of Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice against Blacks will increase as the view of the Mobility Structure as Open increases.

This Hypothesis stemmed from a vast body of literature that viewed increased prejudice and scapegoating as a mechanism by which those experiencing status threatening situations reacted by projecting blame on persons or groups perceived by the scapegoater as weaker.

Using this literature as a base we reasoned that workers undergoing deprivation who had an open view of the opportunity structure would be most prone to seeing this situation in status threatening terms. If there was an open mobility structure they wouldn't be able to place the blame on society as could those with a view of closed mobility; so the choice they were presented with was to either lay blame on themselves or someone else.

The results of our survey of ex-Packard workers indicated that if they used scapegoating as a mechanism for ego defense it was not used against Blacks. There was a great deal of prejudice exhibited against Blacks by these workers. However, when we found a moderate negative relation between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice for those workers who

held an open view of the mobility structure, it indicated that the reason these workers had become prejudiced did not stem from their concern with status or that they viewed this particular situation in status threatening terms.

We found moderate relationships for Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice in the closed and medium Mobility Orientation categories. These relationships were a little stronger than the relationships for Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice alone that was reported earlier in Chapter V. This gave further support to the alternate Hypothesis developed earlier: that Prejudice Against Blacks found amongst these workers increased because of their image of Blacks as unwanted competitors in the job market in the struggle for security.

Status is one of the more subtle forces at work in influencing behavior and attitudes. Its effects are said to be clearest in times of prosperity when the more elemental problems of life relating to subsistence have been satisfactorily resolved.[1] Differential prestige and the subtle kinds of relationships developed from concern with its acquisition and maintenance would hardly seem an appropriate explanatory device for workers in a situation of deprivation. It would seem that those in the situation of these ex-Packard workers experiencing the shock and insecurity

---

[1]Bell, Daniel "Status Politics and New Anxieties" in The End of Ideology, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1960, p. 102. Leggett, John C., op. cit. p. 34.

deriving from Plant shutdown and unemployment would have as a prime concern to at least achieve the level of security they had enjoyed before the shutdown. Then, and only then, could the subtle distinctions introduced by a concern with status become important to them.

A large part of re-establishing security, one might even say its foundation, would be finding another job, and experiences encountered in this job hunt would seem to us to have increased importance in molding attitudes at this time.

We thought it would be reasonable to assume that workers whose job horizons were limited would be those experiencing the greatest difficulty in the job search. Those not having had the training they desired and those whose horizons were limited to the auto industry were most likely to be among those workers that had experienced difficulty finding a job and who experienced competition with Blacks in the job market. These are the characteristics that define a closed mobility stance in this study and was a reasonable explanation for finding a higher relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice against Blacks for this category of workers.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This discussion will be presented in four sections: the findings on Class Consciousness, Anomia and Prejudice first and then followed by a section dealing with some of the implications of these findings.

Part I - Class Consciousness

Class Consciousness was one of the expected responses to plant shutdown and we found that a large majority of these ex-Packard workers manifested this attitudinal stance. Moreover, we expected that these workers' perception of their deprivation would be of greater importance than the degree of Economic Deprivation they had actually experienced in their becoming Class Conscious.

We found there was only a moderate relationship bebween Economic Deprivation and Class Consciousness and an even greater relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness indicating that this expectation had been correct.

This finding pointed up the important role plant shutdown itself played in this situation. These workers responded to the experience of plant shutdown and perceived

themselves as deprived because of it. It was this perception of deprivation, more than the amount of economic deprivation they had experienced, that was highly related to Class Consciousness.

Contrary to the expected relationship, we found that older workers were higher in Class Consciousness than other age groups. But when we examined the relationship of Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness for each age category, it was the middle aged that had the highest relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness. This indicated that there were proportionally more middle aged who responded to the experience of plant shutdown by becoming medium high - high in Class Consciousness than other age groups.

When we looked at skill groups to see what effect this variable may have had in this situation, we found that the unskilled were proportionally more Class Conscious and the skilled the least. However, when we examined Subjective Deprivation by Class Consciousness for levels of skill, we found the highest relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness among the skilled workers--once again the effect of plant shutdown was evident. Skilled workers were the least economically deprived of any skill category. Yet, contrary to our expectations, they showed the highest relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness. The Class Consciousness exhibited by the skilled workers was interpreted to be a more direct

response to plant shutdown than was to be found among the other skill groups.

The same type of relationships was found for black and white workers when we looked at the effect of Race. When we examined the relationship of Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness controlling for Race, contrary to our expectations, white workers had a higher relationship between these two variables than black workers. This indicated that Class Consciousness among white workers was more directly related to felt deprivation than it was for black workers. From this we concluded that plant shutdown effects were felt proportionally more by white workers than black workers.

When the relationship of Class Consciousness and Mobility Orientation was examined, we found that there were no differences between any of the Mobility categories for Class Consciousness. However, when we looked at the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness for each category of Mobility Orientation, we found as we had expected from prior literature that those who viewed the Mobility structure as limited in opportunity were the ones with the highest relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness. Those viewing the Mobility structure as fairly open were lowest, and those medium in Mobility Orientation were also in the mid-

dle in the relationship of Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness.[1]

Part II - Anomia

We found fewer workers manifested Anomia than Class Consciousness as a result of plant shutdown. Also, it was not clear as it was for Class Consciousness, whether experienced Economic Deprivation or their perception of the experience as Deprivational was of greater importance in effecting their becoming Anomic. Both in this situation covaried to produce Anomia, though Subjective Deprivation did have a slightly larger relationship to Anomia than did Economic Deprivation.

Speculating on the dynamics of this situation, it seemed to us that both the plant shutdown itself and their perception of their situation as Deprivational were acting initially to stimulate this type of response and as they experienced greater Economic Deprivation this intensified the shock and the tendency to be Anomic.

---

[1]Previously, we found that strong relationships existed between Class Consciousness and Subjective Deprivation for the skilled, middle aged and those workers whose view of Mobility was that it was closed. It seemed to us that a pattern was emerging in that it was these three types that were the ones that more felt the effects of plant shutdown. If this were so, a combination of these types should strengthen the relationship for Class Consciousness and Subjective Deprivation to the point where they in combination would be explaining most of the variance. The relationship between Class Consciousness and Subjective Deprivation for ex-Packard workers who were skilled, middle aged and had a closed Mobility Orientation was .77778, which indicated that the three variables in combination had the effect of strengthening the relationship. However, this finding is only based on seven cases so that its plausibility is not beyond question.

As we had found for Class Consciousness, age acted as a determinant of the depth of felt Deprivation. We found no differences between age groups when we examined the relationship between Anomia and age alone. However, when we examined the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia for each age category we found, as we had for Class Consciousness, that the middle aged were the ones with the highest relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia. This was an unexpected finding for we had hypothesized that it would have been the older workers who would have responded to plant shutdown by adopting Anomia.

In explaining this result and also the finding that middle aged workers had the highest relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness, we spoke of the possibility that having been suddenly thrown out on the job market had combined with traumatic job hunting experiences and led these workers toward proportionally greater Subjective Deprivation with a majority becoming Class Conscious and a minority Anomic. The reason for most of them becoming Class Conscious and some Anomic was not necessarily related to age but rather to the relative effects of Economic and Subjective Deprivation on their attitudinal stance.

When we examined the relationship between Anomia and Skill groupings we discovered that the skilled workers were the least Anomic and the unskilled the most, with the semi-

skilled workers in between. However, when we related Anomia to Subjective Deprivation for each skill group, we found the highest relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia was in the skilled workers category with no difference to speak of between unskilled and semi-skilled categories.

This finding was explained by pointing to the greater proportion of Subjective Deprivation found in the skilled category in comparison with the low proportion of Economic Deprivation they had experienced. Being a skilled worker played the role of compounding felt Deprivation because having spent time and effort in learning a skill these workers must have felt more secure than other workers. When the shutdown occurred, completely unexpected as it was, it must have been a greater shock to them to suddenly learn that they were as open to insecurity as all the other workers.

When we examined the relationship between Anomia and Race, we found black workers to be slightly more Anomic than white workers. However, when we looked at the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia controlling for Race, we found as we had previously for Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness that white workers had a higher relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia than black workers.

In explaining this finding, and also the one for Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness, we pointed out that what was at work here, was that this particular deprivational situation was of greater consequence to white workers because of the history of Deprivation that blacks had experienced.

There was little difference between the categories of Mobility Orientation when it was related to Anomia. However, when we examined the relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia, we found weak - moderate to strong - moderate relationships between the categories of Mobility opportunity. Though the differences between the categories were not large, they ran in the opposite direction to that found for Subjective Deprivation and Class Consciousness controlling for Mobility Orientation, as hypothesized.

Workers whose view of Mobility opportunity was that it was either open or medium in our social structure had the highest relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia, and those with a view of the Mobility structure as closed or limited had the lowest relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Anomia.

Part III - Prejudice

Having built our Measure of Prejudice from social distances items relating to Jews and Blacks, we discovered that there was no relationship between our Prejudice Measure

and either Subjective or Economic Deprivation. Examining this more closely, we found that Prejudice Against Blacks showed a low and probably not statistically significant relationship to Deprivation. Prejudice Against Jews did not. The overwhelming majority of our sample was highly prejudiced against Blacks whereas the opposite was the situation in relation to Prejudice Against Jews.

Because of this, we then decided to drop our Combined Prejudice Measure and only work with our measure of Prejudice Against Blacks.

Economic Deprivation was found to be negatively related to Prejudice Against Blacks, but there was a moderate positive relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice Against Blacks. All of this indicated that first, plant shutdown and the perception these respondents had of their Deprivation was more highly related to their being Prejudiced Against Blacks than the actual Economic Deprivation they had experienced. Secondly, the relationship found for Jews and Blacks said something about the relative visibility as targets for blame these two groups possessed for these ex-Packard workers. Anti-Semitism seemed to be much less acceptable to our respondents than Prejudice Against Blacks.

That there was more Prejudice Against Blacks than Jews among these workers is hardly surprising--what was impressive was the magnitude of the difference. There were so many more Prejudiced Against Blacks than Jews that we began

wondering if there wasn't some special relationship or interaction going on here that would make for this difference.

At this point we advanced an alternative hypothesis to the one advanced in Chapter II. The previous hypothesis was developed from the literature that saw prejudice as a response to status frustration and scapegoating. The new hypothesis was that the prejudice these workers exhibited stemmed in large part from their viewing Blacks as competitors in their job search in a depressed labor market.

We reasoned that if the prejudice these workers exhibited stemmed from their perception of Blacks as unwanted competitors in the job market, then prejudice should be highest within the unskilled and semi-skilled categories. This was so because these skill levels would be the ones in which Blacks were most numerous and consequently where the greatest competition was to be found for the available jobs.

When we looked at Prejudice Against Blacks by Skill Level, we found that though the differences were small they were in the direction of allowing us to say that though all categories of skill expressed prejudice--the unskilled were proportionally the greatest, the skilled the least with the semi-skilled workers in between.

When we looked at the relationship between Subjective Deprivation by Prejudice Against Blacks for Skill Levels, we found what would have been expected from the competition

hypothesis. Unskilled and semi-skilled workers exhibited moderate positive relationships and the skilled workers exhibited negative relationship between these variables.

Additional evidence was found for this alternative hypothesis when we looked at the influence of Mobility Orientation and found that those with limited or closed and those with a medium Mobility Orientation had a moderate positive relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice Against Blacks. Those with an open Mobility Orientation had a moderate negative relationship between these two variables.

In explaining this finding, we reasoned that Status and the kinds of distinctions made arising out of a concern with status, rise in importance only when the basic problems of subsistance and security have been solved. Status then could not have been of prime concern to these ex-Packard workers who were in the middle of a struggle to re-establish lost security.

Those with a limited view of the possibility of Mobility were also those to experience the greatest difficulty in this struggle for security. They would have looked unkindly at competition from whatever source--let alone from a source that was perceived as an alien and inferior minority.

The results from an examination of Subjective Deprivation by Prejudice Against Blacks for age categories indicated that the prejudice that was found among young white

workers was not related to the Deprivation that they felt stemming from their exposure to plant shutdown, because there was a negative correlation between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice Against Blacks for young workers. The older workers exhibited a low moderate relationship between Subjective Deprivation and Prejudice Against Blacks, middle aged workers were in between.

These differences between age categories were not large enough to allow us to say categorically that the hypothesis had been confirmed. It was, however, in the predicted direction.

Part IV - Implications

Bettleheim and Janowitz speculate in their recent Social Change and Prejudice: "Estimates of the impact of automation on the occupational structure indicate new sources of downward social mobility for displaced workers along with higher levels of skill being required for other segments. We cannot estimate the magnitude of these trends from available data. But one can speculate that their effects on attitudes toward ethnic minorities are likely to be felt despite the generally higher levels of education in the society."[1]

The results summarized above pointed to the conclusion that Deprivation arising from plant shutdown for displaced

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 36.

workers did have the ramifications that they talk about. But it was less true of the level of prejudice to be found in a society than of Class Consciousness and Anomia.

The order of priority for displaced workers appeared to be that most of them adopted Class Consciousness as a response and only some of them became Anomic. Though there is a very high degree of prejudice to be found among these workers; there were low relationships to be found for it and Subjective Deprivation--and then only against blacks.

If we could generalize from these results, the ramifications for our social structure become apparent. Widespread dislocations would result in large portions of the affected workers turning toward increased class solidarity and desiring to see greater governmental control. Some of them would become anxious and desperate, leading to Anomia. A smaller group would react to the problems they face with increased prejudice, if they came into competitive contact with a minority group.

There are many other conclusions that should be drawn having bearing on our knowledge of the complexities of attitude formation and change in Deprivational situations.

1. The fact that perception of Deprivation was more important than economic situation in determining attitudinal response allowed us to say that a simple economic determinist model of human behavior and attitudes make prediction and understanding nearly impossible.

In order to predict we have to understand the complexities of the underlying dynamic interplay between the objective situation and the perceptions of that situation as it is affected by countless background situational and attitudinal variables.

In this dissertation we have only begun the task of undertaking this investigation. Future work with larger samples could center on the effects combination of these background variables have as well as the effects of others, not covered in this dissertation.

2. Perception of Deprivation and actual economic situation had a closer relationship to each other for those of our workers adopting Anomia as a response. It seemed as though despair and resignation was a response that was adopted under the pressure of hard reality as these workers lost hope of overcoming their problems.

Class Consciousness was a response that had economic underpinning in that all experienced insecurity, but the workers adopting this response felt much more deprived than their concrete economic reality indicated they should.

These findings suggest a developmental approach that might lead to fruitful research in the future. It is that workers experiencing Deprivation react first by looking for conventional solutions to their problems. If these are found to be inadequate, they become more experimental in their approach and Class Consciousness results. This takes the

form of expressing solidarity with their class and its organizations and looking to greater governmental intervention and control. This, they feel, would help solve the problems they face. If after a time this is discovered to be inadequate and there doesn't seem to be any real solution, these workers with harsh economic reality pressing in on them would begin to despair and become anxious leading to Anomia.

3. The findings in regard to Mobility Orientation tend to confirm the prior literature in regard to the role this variable plays in affecting Class Conscious and Anomic responses.

The sole exception to this generalization has to do with status frustration. One important problem discussed previously had to do with the importance of status and status concerns in the hierarchy of values of blue collar workers. Our findings suggested that status and those concerns stemming from a preoccupation with status were not high in the hierarchy of values of displaced blue collar workers. Security was much more important.

This conclusion suggests another avenue for future research: exploration of the relative importance of status and security as values and verification of the alternate hypotheses developed before about Prejudice Against Blacks stemming from competition with blacks in a scarce job market.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

SIGNIFICANT PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCES
AT THE .05 LEVEL

For P_u = .5	N_1				
	50	100	150	200	250
N_2					
50	19.6	17.0	15.9	15.6	13.9
100		13.9	12.7	12.1	11.6
150			11.2	10.7	10.0
200				9.8	9.2
250					8.8

For P_u = .3 or .7	N_1				
	50	100	150	200	250
N_2					
50	18.0	15.6	14.7	14.3	13.9
100		12.7	11.6	11.1	10.6
150			10.4	9.8	9.2
200				9.0	8.5
250					8.1

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Leonard P. and Robert L. Aronson. Workers and Industrial Change. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1957.

Aiken, Michael; Ferman, Louis A.; Sheppard, Harold L. Economic Failure, Alienation and Extremism. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1968.

Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1958.

Avineri, Shlomo. The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx. London: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Bakke, E. Wright. Citizens Without Work. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1940.

Bakke, E. Wright. The Unemployed Man. New York: E. P. Dalton and Co., 1934.

Bell, Daniel. "Status Politics and New Anxieties." The End of Ideology. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.

Bettleheim, Bruno and Morris Janowitz. Social Change and Prejudice. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1964.

Blalock, Hubert M. Jr. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

Bogardus, Emory S. Immigration and Race Attitudes. Boston: D. C. Heath Co., 1928.

Caplow, Theodore. The Sociology of Work. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1954.

Centers, Richard. "The American Class Structure." Swanson, Guy E.; Newcombe, Theodore M.; Hartley, Eugene L. Readings in Social Psychology. Henry Holt and Co., 1952.

Chinoy, Eli. Automobile Workers and the American Dream. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1955.

Clinard, Marshall B. Ed. Anomie and Deviant Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Crysdale, Stewart. "Social Effects of a Factory Relocation." A Sociological Profile. Edited by W. E. Mann. Copp Clark Publishing Co., 1968.

Durkhiem, Emile. Suicide. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1951.

Edwards, Allen L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Analysis. New York: Appleton Century Crafts, 1957.

Engels, Frederick. The Condition of the Working Classes in England. Translated and edited by W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell, 1958.

Engels, Frederick. "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific." The Marx-Engels Reader. Edited by Robert C. Tucker. New York: W. W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1972.

Faber, Seymour. "When the Recession Came to Michigan." Dissent. Summer 1959.

Ferman, Louis A. Death of a Newspaper: The Story of the Detroit Times. Kalamazoo, Michigan: The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1963.

Festinger, Leon and Daniel Katz, editors. Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences. New York: The Dryden Press, 1953.

Fromm, Erich. Escape from Freedom. New York: Rinehart and Co. Inc., 1941.

Haber, William; McKean, Eugene C.; Taylor, Harold C. The Michigan Economy: Its Potential and its Problems. Kalamazoo, Michigan: The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1959.

Haber, William; Ferman, Louis; Hudson, John. The Impact of Technological Change. Kalamazoo, Michigan: The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1963.

Hamilton, Richard F. "Skill Levels and Politics." Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIV, Fall, 1963.

Hamilton, Richard F. Affluence and the French Worker in the Fourth Republic. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Hyman, Herbert H. "The Value Systems of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification." Bendix R., and Lipset, S. M. Class Status and Power. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1953.

Hyman, Herbert H. Survey Design and Analysis. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

Kamarovsky, Mirra. The Unemployed Man and His Family. New York: The Dryden Press, 1940.

Leggett, John C. Class,Race and Labor. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Lasswell, Harold D."The Psychology of Hitlerism: A Response of the Lower Middle Classes to Continuing Insecurity." The Analysis of Political Behaviour. London: Kegar Paul Routledge, 1948.

Lenin, V. I. Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism. Selected Works, Volume V. New York: International Publishers.

Lipset, S.M. and R. Bendix. Social Mobility in Industrial Societies. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959.

Lipset, S.M. Political Man. New York: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1960.

Mannhiem, Karl. Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1951.

Marx, Karl and Frederich Engels. The German Ideology. New York: International Publishers, Inc., 1939.

Marx, Karl and Frederich Engels. "The Communist Manifesto." The Marx-Engels Reader. Edited by Robert C. Tucker. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1972.

Marx, Karl. "Wage Labor and Capital." The Marx-Engels Reader. Edited by Robert C. Tucker. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1972.

Mayer, Kurt. "The Changing Shape of the American Class Structure." Social Stratification in the United States. Edited by Roach, Jack; Gross, Llewellyn; Gurosslin, Orville. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1969.

Merton, Robert K. "Social Structure and Anomia." and "Continuities in the Theory of Social Structure and Anomia." Social Theory and Social Structure. Revised, enlarged edition. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Michels, Roberto. Political Parties. The Free Press, 1949.

Neumann, Franz. "Anxiety and Politics." The Democratic and Authoritarian State. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Nie, Norman; Bent, Dale H.; Hall, C. Hadai. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Rinehart, James W. "Affluence and the Embourgeoisement of the Working Class: A Critical Look." Social Problems, Volume 19, No. 2, Fall 1971.

Runciman, W. G. Relative Deprivation and Social Justice. Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1966.

Seligman, Ben B. Most Notorious Victory. New York: Free Press, 1966.

Sheppard, Harold L. and James Stern. "Impact of Automation on Workers in Supplier Plants." Labor Law Journal, VIII (October 1957).

Sheppard, Harold L.; Ferman, L. A.; Faber, Seymour. Too Old to Work, Too Young to Retire — A Case Study of a Permanent Plant Shutdown. Washington, D.C.: United States Printing Office, 1960.

Shostak, Arthur B. Blue Collar Life. New York: Random House, 1969.

Slote, Alfred. Termination: The Closing at Baker Plant. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1969.

Srole, Leo. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study." American Sociological Review, (21 December 1956).

Suchman, Edward; Dean, John P.; Williams, Robin M. Jr. Desegregation: Some Propositions and Research Suggestions. New York: Anti Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1958.

Wilcock, Richard C. "Impact on Workers and Community of a Plant Shutdown in a Depressed Area." Monthly Labor Review, LXXX (September, 1957).

Zawadski, Bohan and Paul Lazarsfeld. "Psychological Consequences of Unemployment." Journal of Social Psychology. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press, 1935.

Zeitlin, Maurice. Revolutionary Politics and the Cuban Working Class. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Zweig, Ferdinand. The Worker in an Affluent Society. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.

ABSTRACT

SOCIAL EFFECTS OF TECHNOLOGICAL UNEMPLOYMENT

by

Seymour Faber

Chairman: David R. Segal

This study was a part of a larger survey conducted in 1958, focusing on the effects of plant shutdown on a sample of 499 out of a population of 4,012 former employees of the Packard Motor Car Company. In addition to other things, there was a desire to determine what effect this deprivational experience would have on their political attitudes and what modes of adjustment they might adopt in response to their situation. The problem of this particular dissertation was to focus on three of the many possible types of response men may adopt in deprivational situations in an attempt to determine what factors would have lead them to react as they did.

The response patterns studied were:

1. Class consciousness: situation viewed in class terms with the result of greater identification with the working class and greater adherence to working class organizations. In addition, a desire to see greater governmental control over the economy.

2. Anomia: a view of the world and personal relations as fickle with little or no desire to continue to be a part of it all arising from despair and resignation.

3. Prejudice against Jews and Blacks.

A before and after research design was not available to us so we found it necessary to make internal comparisons to see the effects of varying levels of deprivation on our dependent variables. Although our data only showed covariation we assumed causality in this situation.

Class consciousness

A large majority of these workers manifested this attitudinal stance. In addition, we found their perception of their deprivation (subjective deprivation) was of greater importance than the degree of economic deprivation they had actually experienced in their becoming class conscious.

We next looked at the effects of our intervening variables and found that the middle aged, the skilled, the white workers and those who viewed the mobility structure as limited in opportunity were those who exhibited the highest relationship between class consciousness and subjective deprivation.

Anomia

Fewer workers manifested anomia than class consciousness. Also, it was not clear whether objective or subjective deprivation was of greater importance in their becoming anomic. Both covaried to produce anomia. Speculating, it seemed to us that both the plant shutdown itself and the workers' perception of their situation as deprivational were acting initially to stimulate this type of response and as they experienced greater economic deprivation this intensified the shock and the tendency to be anomic.

We next looked at the effects of our intervening variables and found that the middle aged, the skilled, and the white workers showed the highest relationship between anomia and subjective deprivation. Though there weren't large differences between categories, we found workers whose view of the mobility structure was open exhibited the highest relationship between anomia and subjective deprivation.

Prejudice

Combined prejudice against Jews and Blacks showed no relationship to either objective or subjective deprivation. Examining this more closely, we found that prejudice against Blacks showed a negative relationship to economic deprivation and, some, though probably not statistically significant relationship to subjective deprivation. Prejudice against Jews was negatively related to both objective and subjective deprivation. The overwhelming majority of our sample was prejudiced against Blacks whereas the opposite was the situation in relation to prejudice against Jews. We, therefore, dropped our combined measure and worked only with our measure of prejudice against Blacks.

Examining the effects of our intervening variables, we found that older workers, unskilled and semi-skilled workers and those with a closed and medium mobility orientation showed a positive relationship between prejudice against Blacks and subjective deprivation.