

LABOR'S IMAGE OF ITS PLACE IN THE
COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE,
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Warren Louis Sauer

1958

LABOR'S IMAGE OF ITS PLACE IN THE COMMUNITY
POWER STRUCTURE: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

by

Warren Louis Sauer

A THESIS

Submitted to the College of Science and Arts
Michigan State University of Agriculture and
Applied Science in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

1958

WARREN LOUIS SAUER

ABSTRACT

Since World War II organized labor has steadily increased its participation in community organizations and activities. The present study attempted to ascertain organized labor's image of its role in local affairs. It was, therefore, necessary to gain intimate knowledge of labor's community goals and aspirations, as well as its perception of the goals and objectives of business and management.

To obtain these data, a selected sample of thirty-nine union members most influential in community affairs was interviewed. From them information was obtained on the amount of labor participation in local organizations, its motives in participating, the local problems of greatest concern, labor's role in resolving these problems, and the obstacles faced.

A number of findings may be noted. Labor has a keen interest in local affairs, and wants to broaden its participation to embrace all important community-wide organizations. This interest is motivated by the expressed desire to serve not only the needs of organized labor, but those of the public at large. Labor sees itself prevented from doing so by a rather small group of businessmen who have considerable influence and who act concertedly to resolve local issues. This group invites labor to legitimize its decisions after making them. Labor influentials do not see themselves as

WARREN LOUIS SAUER

ABSTRACT

.having significantly different community objectives than local businessmen. However, they feel that labor's objectives are somewhat broader. Moreover, labor wants to have greater representation in resolving community problems and to employ different means at arriving at their solution.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is indebted to many people. He is primarily indebted to the labor officials in Lansing who gave generously of their time and cooperation in the interviews and to the Labor and Industrial Relations Center for providing the support for this study. He is grateful to Dr. Ishino who read earlier drafts of the thesis and offered many valuable suggestions regarding its form and contents. He also wishes to express his gratitude to the other members of his committee, Dr. Hoffer and Dr. Frost, for their encouragement.

This thesis is a part of a general project on the place of labor and management in the community power structure, and a study of labor and management images of the community power structure. This study is under the sponsorship of the Labor and Industrial Relations Center and is directed by William H. Form. The author is particularly indebted to Dr. Form, whose constructive criticisms and patient guidance made the author's task much less formidable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	LABOR IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY.	1
	Historical considerations in labor's	
	community involvement	1
	Labor at the local level	4
	Pragmatic theory of Perlman	5
	"Maturationa1" theories	7
	Durkheim's theory	11
	Theoretical synthesis	14
	The Lansing case.	19
II.	THEORY AND METHODOLOGY.	24
	Theoretical significance of study	24
	Hypotheses concerning labor's image of	
	community power	31
	Suggested controls in testing hypothesis.	33
	Methods.	36
III.	LABOR'S IMAGE OF THE COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE.	42
	The sample described	42
	First hypothesis: Labor's image of	
	management power	46
	Conclusion--first hypothesis	67
	Second hypothesis: Labor's perception of	
	"cleavage" between itself and management	68

100

CHAPTER	PAGE
Conclusion--second hypothesis	83
IV. FACTORS AFFECTING LABOR'S IMAGE OF THE POWER STRUCTURE.	85
Four control factors	85
Analysis of the data	86
Relationships among the control variables .	87
Intercorrelations between responses and controls	91
Summary	100
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	102
What is labor's image.	102
Further topics for investigation	105
Contributions to theory	107
BIBLIOGRAPHY	112

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Labor Influentials Interviewed, Union Affiliation, and Votes Received	38
II. Social Characteristics of Labor Influentials in Lansing	45
III. Evaluation of Lansing as a Union Town by Top Labor Influentials	47
IV. Reasons Given for Evaluations of Lansing by Top Labor Influentials	48
V. Evaluation of Relative Power of Labor and Management in Lansing	50
VI. Labor's Image of Its Ability to Achieve Its Goals.	52
VII. Composition of Groups Making Big Community Decisions	53
VIII. Reasons Given by Labor Influentials for Non-Participation in Lansing Organizations. .	56
IX. Source of Opposition to Labor's Community Participation	58
X. Labor's Assessment of Its Influence on the Outcome of Outstanding Issues in the Community	59
XI. Influential Organizations Listed by Labor Respondents.	61
XII. Civic Leaders Chosen by Labor Influentials as Capable of Sponsoring a Community Project.	63
XIII. Distribution of Responses to Questions Dealing with Labor-Management Balance of Power. .	66
XIV. Important Community Issues Listed by Labor Influentials	71

TABLE	PAGE
XV. Labor's Assessment of Whether Management Agrees on Naming Dominant Community Issues	72
XVI. General Differences in the Community Objectives of Labor and Management as Perceived by Labor.	73
XVII. Labor's Comparison of Its and Management's Economic Stake in Community Organizations and Activities.	76
XVIII. Community Organizations and Activities in Which Labor Should Participate But Does Not	77
XIX. Community Organizations in Which Labor Should Not Participate	78
XX. Comparison of Management and Labor Interest in Community Involvement	81
XXI. Distribution of Responses to Questions Dealing With Labor-Management Cleavage.	83
XXII. Age Distribution According to Level of Influence	87
XXIII. Level of Union Position for Age Groups.	88
XXIV. Age Composition of Labor's Community Representatives	88
XXV. Position Held by the Influence Level of Labor Officials	89
XXVI. Position Level According to Organizational Representation.	90
XXVII. Organizational Representation According to Influence Level	90
XXVIII. Perception of Labor-Management Cleavage According to Influence Level of Labor Respondents.	92
XXIX. Labor-Management Cleavage Perceived by Labor Representatives According to Organizational Representation.	93

100

100

100

100

TABLE		PAGE
XXX.	Cleavage Perceived Between Labor and Management by Position Within the Union	94
XXXI.	Power Attributed to Management by Labor According to Organizational Representation	96
XXXII.	Power Attributed to Management by Level of Position Within the Union	98
XXXIII.	Power Attributed to Management by Level of Position Within the Union	99
XXXIV.	Power Attributed to Management by High and Low Influence Groups.	99

CHAPTER I

LABOR IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

Historical Considerations in Labor's Community Involvement

It is the primary objective in the present study to investigate the view or image which organized labor has of its role in the community power structure in Lansing, Michigan. As background to this problem, it seems appropriate to examine briefly some historical factors which pertain to labor's present state of involvement in community affairs generally. Until the relatively recent past, labor participation in community affairs has been the exception rather than the rule. In the present chapter an attempt will be made to explain labor's entrance into community activities by appraising the various alternatives which have been suggested to account for this phenomenon.

"Community involvement" as we are using the term refers to the formal participation of labor union officials in those local organizations and activities which are not directly related to the collective bargaining function as practiced by the unions in their dealings with employers. Thus labor representation on school or hospital boards, or labor taking a stand on such a community issue as taxation, are examples of "community involvement" or "participation."

A cursory glance at the history of the trade union movement in this country reveals a general lack of union involvement in community affairs. For the most part labor has been concerned with traditional economic aims such as increased pay, shorter hours, better working conditions, and the like. Where non-economic concerns did develop, they were mostly at the state and national levels. Perhaps the most notable of these "non-economic" concerns of labor has been an active interest in political affairs, again chiefly at the state and national levels. The various attempts to align the labor vote with a particular political party illustrate labor's continuing interest in political participation.¹ Only in a few historical instances has labor been influential on the local scene--Hartford and Milwaukee being cases in point.

Examining labor's changing role from World War I to World War II, several interesting observations may be made. There appeared to be a "marriage of convenience" between management and labor during both wars, which saw both parties cooperating jointly in various activities relative to the war effort.² Both participated in bond drives, and

¹David Henry, "One Hundred Years of Labor in Politics," in The House of Labor: Internal Operations of American Unions, edited by J. B. S. Hardman and Maurice Neufeld (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951), pp. 90-112.

²Duane Beck, An Historical Study of Organized Labor's Participation in Community Chest and Council Activities in Lansing, Michigan (unpublished Project Report, Department of Social Work, Michigan State University, 1955).

various war relief activities. Production quotas were raised to new levels through the amicable agreements which were engendered during the duration and expressed in such forms as "no-strike" pledges. Labor and management sat together on various government agencies including draft boards, pricing boards, wage stabilization boards, among others. This cooperation obviously extended from the national down to the local level. But whereas the conclusion of the first World War saw the cessation of labor participation in such varied activities, the end of World War II brought labor's endorsement of many non-economic community activities as a matter of permanent policy.³

The position of labor after the second war was obviously much more stable and secure than it was after the first conflict. The intervening years had witnessed a growth in the labor movement, the greatest impetus being provided by the New Deal administration and its labor-abetting legislation. Many sociological problems were posed by labor's new power. The extension of labor into so many diverse areas of endeavors represented a virtual realignment of power, not only at the national, but at the local level as well. The main area which this study seeks to examine is labor's self image of this new position which it now enjoys. How does labor view

³Leo Perlis, "Unions and Community Services, The CIO Community Services Program," in The House of Labor: Internal Operations of American Unions, edited by J. B. S. Hardman and Maurice Neufeld (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951), pp.333-340.

its role in the community? Does it see itself at logger-heads with management or as an equal, cooperative partner? Is labor out to dominate the community? If so, what are the goals it hopes to achieve in the name of Labor? These are some of the questions with which we will be concerned as we study labor in Lansing, Michigan. Before proceeding to this problem, however, it would be well to assess some of the factors which have affected labor's "new" orientation of community participation.

Labor at the Local Level

Labor's entrance into community affairs has apparently received scant attention in the literature. Labor historians, when writing about the "labor movement," were usually concerned with unionism per se, and, as a consequence, did not devote much attention to labor's community activities. Yet labor's influence is not only manifest on the national scene, but on the community scene as well. It may well be that the broad national programs of labor are more spectacular than its local program. However, the latter is now quite pervasive and deserves more attention than it has received in the past. A study of the national concerns of the labor movement deprive us of an understanding of the forces which have made labor concerned about community programs.

This point should become clearer when the literature is examined for specific hypotheses concerning labor's

community involvement. Although several alternative explanations may be suggested they do not deal specifically with labor in the community. Explanations must be derived from speculations dealing with labor's functional relations to other institutions in the society. These must be used for the sake of theoretical parsimony. Specifically, although the work of Durkheim was concerned with labor as part of an economic organization or "corporation," he nevertheless provided the most fruitful insights for the problem at hand. The following paragraphs will review and appraise several of the more prominent interpretations of labor's development, in the hope of providing at least a partial answer to this difficult question.

Pragmatic Theory of Perlman

An examination of Perlman's Theory of the Labor Movement⁴ reveals little that is directly relevant to the problem area which has been selected. In fact, if Perlman's theory is accepted without qualification, one is hard pressed to explain non-economic functions of unions as represented in their various community activities. Although a lengthy treatment of Perlman's thesis is not possible here, a brief resume of his work may be attempted to assert

⁴Selig Perlman, A Theory of the Labor Movement (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1928).

its relevancy to the question of why the union has adopted so many "non-traditional" functions. Labor's representation in community affairs today most certainly stands in sharp contrast to what is considered by Perlman as the chief function of unions; namely, collective bargaining. Perlman has characterized American labor as being "job conscious" with a primary concern for attaining wage and job control. The labor movement is pictured as devoid of ideological substance, having a pragmatic orientation concerned with the attainment of "here-and-now" objectives, and lacking any long-range programs that would give it ideological direction. This portrayal hardly seems adequate to account for the present situation of unions branching out into "non-job" community activities.

Although it may be true that American labor lacks a class consciousness in the Marxian sense and an accompanying class ideology, such an appraisal leaves a number of questions unanswered. It does not explain satisfactorily how "job consciousness" accounts for the increase in the union community activities. Presumably, a strictly "economic" orientation would exclude community involvement. Of course, a case can be developed for supporting the idea that such involvement, on the part of unions, is indeed "proof" that the unions are pragmatically-oriented and are really only furthering their economic objectives by becoming involved in local affairs. Yet if the labor movement has been

traditionally pragmatic, one must ask, why was it not sooner involved in community activities? The benefits to be derived from such involvement should have been apparent to local unions long before they actually began participating widely in civic affairs. The question inevitably arises as to why there was a labor withdrawal from local participation after World War I when labor had successfully become a community participant. No such retreat was evident after World War II. The Perlman theory does not explain the change in labor's position in society from 1920 to 1945.

It is not enough to speak only of the orientation of labor in the hope of explaining its somewhat erratic path of development. If it is accepted that labor has embraced a pragmatic value of adjusting to ever-changing conditions, then we can best understand labor's position today by examining those conditions to which it has adjusted, since they and not any "static" economic motivation would account for the change in its status over the past forty years. The question does not appear to be only one of labor ideology or lack of it. Even if, as Perlman has said, labor has always been essentially "job conscious," this fact does little to explain labor's rise to prominence in the community area.

"Maturational" Theories

This leads to a discussion of another explanation to account for labor's "development." While not necessarily

providing a complete solution to the present problem, it is more in line with sociological thinking. As exemplified in the writings of such authors as Selekman and Whitehead the "maturational approach" implies that the increased community activity of labor is partly the result of the development of union organizations to the point where they must assume additional functions beyond its primary economic function of collective bargaining in order to survive. To Selekman, unions have undergone a transition from "organization to administration."⁵ Conflict over union recognition has given way to cooperation in the bargaining process with administration of the signed agreement now being the focal point in labor-management relations. This has enabled both parties to consider the wider social ramifications of their respective economic associations. Management, unhampered by the legal struggle which characterized the development of the union, naturally "matured" more quickly, and long has been a participant in community affairs. Labor's tenuous legal status precluded such rapid maturation on its part. However, the maturation which management belatedly manifested in collective bargaining has resulted in a parallel development on the part of the unions. They, too, must now be responsible for the general welfare.

⁵Benjamin Selekman, Labor Relations and Human Relations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1947).

According to Whitehead, "the future of trade unions will depend upon the degree to which social living is made a first concern of those who are in a position to lead." Whitehead would consider not only the professed objectives of the unions, but also their "social tendencies" which are motivated by underlying social sentiments or needs, which presumably make such tendencies or activities inevitable.⁶

Such explanations enable us to understand better labor's interest in politics and public welfare. Indeed, such interests appear to be as "traditional" as the well-known bread-and-butter objectives. The fact that unions did not earlier develop a community welfare orientation is due not only to the union's "immaturity," but to the "immaturity" of the public as well. The maturational process is a reciprocal one involving the union on one side and management and the public on the other. Both sides have matured. Such an interpretation allows us to explain both the events which were manifestations of a changing attitude on the part of management and the public toward labor unions, and those which enabled unions to activate their latent social functions. Viewed in this light, labor's somewhat turbulent history is rendered more meaningful. The status of labor

⁶Thomas N. Whitehead, Leadership in a Free Society (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936).

has risen not only because of a change in labor strategy or tactics but also because of a more tolerant public view toward those tactics.

Public toleration resulted in the New Deal legislation, which at the least afforded unions legal recognition. Granted legal protection, the unions could devote more energy to non-economic pursuits previously neglected. A shift in policy from non-involvement in political and social activities to an active participation thus becomes more apparent than real when considered from this viewpoint. The fact that the unions now have a community services program seemingly was contingent more upon public recognition of labor rather than the emergence of a "new" appreciation or awareness of the value of such a program on the part of unions themselves.

Focusing as they do on the economic aspects of management and labor, the maturational theories provide little rationale for the importance which non-economic functions have assumed for such societal groups. They do explain the evolution of the collective bargaining process, but shed little light on the development of activities not directly related to labor-management relations. Why indeed have community activities engaged the attention of labor and management? Maturation at the bargaining level was a necessary but not sufficient cause for labor unions to enter community affairs. Management preceded labor into community

4

endeavors long before maturation of the collective bargaining process. Why should it have done so? What is the basis of the "social tendencies" of unions referred to by Whitehead? Are these tendencies a result of the maturation of unions per se or are they intrinsic to economic organizations in general? How can the maturational process explain the unions' long-time interest in "social" functions? Whitehead and Selekman explain the timing of the realization or activation of such functions for unions, but do not explain their origin, either for management or labor. For answers to these questions, we now turn to the work of Emile Durkheim.

Durkheim's Theory

Akin to the work of Selekman and Whitehead, but displaying a far more comprehensive grasp of the role of economic groups in society, is the writing of Emile Durkheim. In his preface to the second edition of The Division of Labor, Durkheim gives an historical description of occupational groups or "corporations" as they have developed in various societies.⁷ From his account one can clearly perceive in the light of history, that occupational groups seem destined to play a major role in any industrial society. The potential or "accretive" functions of such groups, only

⁷Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society, Translated by G. Simpson (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1949).

briefly touched upon by Selekman and Whitehead, are graphically portrayed by Durkheim. "Corporate activity," according to Durkheim, can assume the most varied forms; from furthering of economic interests, to fulfilling moral and social needs as well. Men need to live communal lives; the state alone cannot provide a sufficient environment of communalization. Other groups are needed to integrate the individual into a meaningful social life. Occupational groups, according to Durkheim are well-suited to fill this role because they tend to produce an "intellectual and moral homogeneity."

In helping to integrate the individual into society, the occupational group thus assumes many non-economic functions because of the "collective forces" which it inherently manifests. Durkheim speaks of the "functions of assistance," which can be admirably filled by "corporations," because such functions require feelings of solidarity as exemplified by corporations.

When applied to our present problem, Durkheim's theory makes the union's entrance into community affairs an inevitable consequence rather than an unanticipated development as it also explains business's entry into the community. This is in contrast to Perlman's hypothesis which renders the union's civic activity as virtually paradoxical or inimical to its primary interests. The fact that unions have always exhibited the socializing or integrative

tendencies to which Durkheim refers, seems to confirm his theory. That unions were not always successful in fulfilling their social functions was due perhaps to the "disruptive aspects" of their economic functions as viewed by other "secondary groups." As long as the union's economic tactics were considered "illegal," the union could hardly act as a socializing community agency. The union first had to be accepted as a legitimate "secondary group."

Of course the question of the functions which unions perform and/or why workers join unions has been the subject of many articles and books since Durkheim wrote.⁸ One safe conclusion that can be drawn from the literature is that the unions perform functions in addition to economic ones, whether they are variously labeled "psychological," "social," or "political."⁹ Unfortunately, most writers have seen these non-economic functions of the union as internal functions. It seems unrealistic to conclude that if the functions are important, and if they can also be provided by outside community agencies that the union will not utilize these agencies or try to affect their operations. Since an endeavor is being made here to explain the union's entrance into community affairs, the literature bears out

⁸Daisy Tagliacozzo, "Trade Union Government, Its Nature and Its Problems, A Bibliographical Review, 1944-55," American Journal of Sociology, 61 (May 1956), 554-581.

⁹William H. Form and Harry K. Dansereau, "Union Member Orientations and Patterns of Social Integration," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 11 (October 1957), 3-12.

our contention that such a development represents an inevitable or "natural" consequence of union functioning, which was given particular impetus following legal recognition.

The traditional estrangement of unions from other community groups has, indeed, reinforced the social functions which they seem destined to fulfill. If one of the inherent functions is to pull members into the "general torrent of social life," as Durkheim has insisted, then community involvement appears to be but an extension of this function. Again, the fact that this function was not more fully exercised at an earlier date is attributable to the historical "unlawfulness" of economic interests of unions.

Theoretical Synthesis

In synthesizing the various interpretations given to unions and their functions to explain their entrance into community affairs a number of salient factors stand out. Inasmuch as they all represent post-hoc explanations, they all have face validity to some degree. However, their degree of validity must be judged in terms of how plausible they appear in the light of the many historical "irregularities" which have marked the development of the American labor movement. The present state of American labor with its espousal of a community-welfare orientation stands in sharp contrast to their former "aloofness" toward community affairs. If one is to understand why such a change has come about, it is imperative to consider not only union

functions but other societal groups and their functions as well. The present chapter has dealt almost exclusively with the former.

That the unions have economic, social, and a number of other functions, does not sufficiently explain their involvement in community activities. Their exercise of these various functions is influenced by other groups with which the unions interact. From their inception, American unions have been handicapped in the exercise of their diverse functions, which accounts for the varied directions which these have taken.¹⁰

Thus the pragmatic character which many have attributed to the American labor movement becomes somewhat more meaningful, if one is aware of the tenuous relationships which the unions had established with other societal groups. Unions perforce had to be pragmatic or job-conscious until they could obtain legal recognition, which in turn would allow them to adopt a somewhat more long-range, stable orientation.

Returning once more to the Durkheimian frame of reference, the activities of corporations other than unions (for Durkheim was not restricting the term to labor unions) clearly illustrates the integrative functions which they

¹⁰A comparative study of the American unions' societal involvement with that of European unions is impossible here. In many European countries unions are often formally joined with political parties, for example, as in Great Britain.

have exercised. The position of the business firm in the American community hardly needs elaboration. In an undeniable position of strength in its bargaining relations with the unions for many decades, it would be expected that business corporations would also be the dominant socializing force in the community, with the unions running far behind. The balance of power, once it was shifted toward the unions, enabled them also to become socializing agents in the community.

It is fruitless to impute various inherent functions to the union if its dynamic relationships with other groups are to be ignored. Functions are in large measure affected by these relationships. The two factors appear almost inseparable. If one of the union's functions is the cultivation of harmonious relationships as Durkheim wrote, but such relationships are not fostered or desired by other "corporations," then the exercise of such a function is rendered extremely difficult. Such a function obviously requires acceptance by other groups to be fulfilled. In the case of American unions such acceptance was not forthcoming until the Roosevelt administration. The granting of legal recognition of the union's economic functions meant tacit approval of their socializing function. In other words, the union's task of establishing relations with other societal groups was made easier, indeed made possible, through its recognition as a collective bargaining agent for the workers!

1. The first part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who were present at the meeting. The names are listed in alphabetical order.

For purposes of analysis the unions' functions have been dichotomized into those of an economic or social character. Obviously this is an oversimplification. The union remains basically a special interest group as is any economic organization. The objection can be raised that community involvement of labor is only meant to serve their particular interests, in short, is only an extension of their economic function. This view overlooks several important factors. First, if this charge is true of labor it must also be true of other organizations. Can it not also be said that community participation serves the economic interests of business groups as well as labor? Secondly, if the unions have no social functions to perform, but have always been primarily economically oriented, why weren't they earlier involved in community affairs, inasmuch as it could have furthered their economic interests?

To be sure community participation is used by all groups to "legitimize" their own interests, and the unions are no exception. In the case of the unions this motive is reinforced by their long period of exclusion. It seems necessary to account for labor's traditional lack of community involvement in terms of this exclusion even if one accepts the "selfish" motive behind labor's participation. But if one accepts this proposition, he must be prepared to accept the further proposition that labor's exclusion might have been due to the "selfish" motives of other groups.

Rather than impute purely selfish motives to any economic group to explain community involvement, it appears more plausible to speak of a socializing function which all such groups appear to manifest at some time in the course of their development, as Durkheim insisted. In the case of labor, full realization of this function was dependent upon legal recognition of its economic function. The relatively rapid extension of union activities following such recognition adds support to such a supposition. Although non-economic activities were in evidence long before legal recognition, the expansion which took place was particularly manifest at the community level.

Essentially all of the foregoing explanations point to a question of power as a basis of the changes related to the union's position in the community. Whatever one posits as the function of American unions, reference must be made to the unique social setting in which the unions have developed and which has prevented or permitted the exercise of various functions. The potential behavior of unions has been covered by the various authors; their actual behavior must be explained in terms of the conditions in which this behavior was manifest. As indicated, these conditions changed and with them union functions also changed. Basically, these changes of conditional functions are all related to the legal recognition granted to unions, an event which gave them more power.

This slow integration of labor into the community power structure gives ample testimony that a question of power lay at the bottom of labor's long inactivity in the community. It is a slow, painful process as any such readjustment would necessarily be. Labor's place is still uncertain. As a newcomer, it poses a threat to the traditionally dominant groups in the community. While this situation exists, labor can hardly win the support of powerful allies, but must content itself with lesser allies as it tries to establish its position. The question of power will be dealt with more fully in the next chapter in discussing the theoretical frame of reference behind this research.

The Lansing Case

An historical study by Duane Beck of the role of labor in Community Chest activities in Lansing provides an excellent illustration of the preceding thesis.¹¹ Labor participation in Community Chest activities in Lansing was non-existent in the 1920's. Public sentiment appeared to be anti-labor and management's attitude was that Chest activities could be carried on without organized labor. For its part, labor was occupied primarily with problems of organizing, which were made especially acute by the prevailing anti-union sentiment. This difficulty was

¹¹Beck, op. cit.

compounded by the American Federation of Labor's (AFL) own inability as a craft union to organize industrial workers.

After 1933 union activity expanded on the social as well as the economic front. Overtures were made to labor to participate in Chest activities to which labor responded. The attitudes which resulted from the legal recognition of the union nationally were slowly carried over into other areas of local community life. In Lansing 1933 the Community Welfare Fund, predecessor to the Community Chest, announced its intention to secure labor representation on its Board of Trustees. This shift in thinking had a pragmatic as well as an altruistic base.

Labor at first rejected offers to participate in Chest drives. As Beck indicates this was due not to an antipathy to Chest activities, but rather to their administration, which had always been under business' control. Workers formerly had contributed to the Chest through involuntary payroll deductions.¹² With their newly acquired status, unions elected to boycott the Community Chest, even though payroll deduction was eliminated. Without union support, the Chest could hardly survive with the result that the unions were given representation on its administrative board in return for their support. In effect, the

¹²Ibid., p. 48.

100

union was usurping a function which had previously been exercised solely by management. "Welfare capitalism" was giving way to union power.

At this point, Durkheim's theory seems especially pertinent. One nascent occupational "corporation" (the union) was now acting as a socializing agent for a large segment of the community which had previously been dealt with impersonally by management. The unions could hardly fulfill this role until they had achieved a legal status as a corporation. The importance of this "social" function can hardly be underestimated, for its exercise by business in the form of "welfare capitalism" was recognized as one way of combating the growth of unions. Once the workers' own organization was granted legal recognition, it was inevitable that the union would attempt to assume various functions. Because of the "intellectual and moral homogeneity of the workers," their social and moral needs could best be channeled through the unions rather than through other "corporations."¹³

It should be noted that the social needs of the rank-and-file have not been met solely within the union itself, but by the union interacting with other groups in the community. This may be a result of the worker's lack of class

¹³C. W. M. Hart, "Industrial Relations Research and Social Theory," The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 15 (February 1949), 53-73.

consciousness (peculiar to American labor at least), which has prompted the unions to turn to other community groups in an effort to "prove" or reaffirm its classlessness. This need to join with other community segments was made especially acute by the long period of isolation of labor from other community segments. The "homogeneity" of American labor may partially lie in its ethic of classlessness. Thus unions would be defeating their own purposes if they did not turn to the community.

In the Lansing case, labor representation on the Community Chest Board was followed by representation on the boards of various member agencies. Initial representation of labor on the Community Chest Board was due to a combination of four elements according to Beck:

(1) Organized labor had become a power in the community, (2) Attitudes of both organized labor and management had changed to permit the two antagonists to work together, (3) The depression of the 1930's was ending and the two opponents could think of something besides survival, (4) Leaders of organized labor recognized that unions were part of the community and wanted to support community values.¹⁴

Among the interesting conclusions drawn in Beck's study, two have particular relevance to the present thesis.

Organized labor was invited to participate in Community Chest activities only after it became a substantial force in the community. Organized labor seems to have a priority rating for its many responsibilities. Labor could participate in the Community Chest only after its energies and resources were no longer concentrated in the economic sphere of its activity.¹⁵

¹⁴Beck, op. cit., p. 67. ¹⁵Ibid., p. 85.

1

In the attempt to account for labor's entrance into community activities, the present chapter has presented a number of points which closely parallel those in the Beck study. In this introduction, a theoretical framework for the "internal dynamics" of the union itself was given, but it remains for the next chapter to fit the union and other community participants into a wider theoretical frame of reference, embracing union development in this broader context.

CHAPTER II

THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

Each of the authors in the previous chapter dealt with labor's development at the broad societal level and for the most part failed to specify labor's relationships with other societal groups. Since the present study is concerned with labor's position in the community and its relationships with other community groups, it is necessary to invoke broader theoretical formulations which will embrace these relationships. Moreover they should be applicable to labor's historical development as were each of the foregoing explanations. Theoretical conceptions regarding power seem best to meet these demands.

Theoretical Significance of Study

It should be evident that the question of labor expansion into the community is most obviously related to a change in the distribution of power. The burgeoning of union community activities is due to an indeterminate number of factors, of which we have mentioned but a few. To adequately understand any group's "rise to power," it is necessary to consider those groups with which it interacts. As Chapter I suggested local unions had "economic" power, but this was not sufficient to guarantee them a voice in the

community. The power they lacked was "social" in nature.¹ Social power cannot be wholly derived from the resources inherent solely within a particular group. Social power, having legitimacy as its foundation, necessarily involves acceptance by other groups. Until the unions were conferred this legitimation of their economic function, their power was narrowly circumscribed. Participation in community affairs subsumed social power which the unions had long lacked. Social power involves the ability to move groups through means other than economic. As long as the union's economic power was considered illegitimate, it could not exercise social power.

The realignment of power effected by labor's entrance into the community continues to have many ramifications. The process of adjustment continues. The acquisition of power is never without consequences for all groups concerned, since one group's gains may represent another group's loss. What has been "given" to labor can be taken away. Labor's problem now appears to be one of conserving its gains and yet improving its status. Social power, so hard to achieve, can easily be lost through intemperate use of its economic power. Economic power per se was never enough to gain admittance into the community; in fact it was the main

¹Max Weber, "Class, Status, and Power," From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, Trans and Eds. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford Press, 1946), pp. 180-195.

obstacle preventing such admittance and continues to limit the full acceptance of labor. Although the difference noted between economic and social power may appear tenuous, the distinction seems valid. Naked economic power, when legitimized gave the unions "something more," enabling them to enter the community power structure, which demands honor as well as "raw" power. With legitimation of its economic function, the union acquired access to "community" problems; that is, it acquired some degree of social honor. In Weberian terminology, power is distributed between classes of the economic order, status groups of the social order, and parties of the legal order.² Labor's power was primarily restricted to the economic order until unions obtained legal recognition. Labor indeed had low status by virtue of being an illegal "party." Now as a legal party with increased status, it is attempting to exercise "social" power, by which Weber means the influencing of a communal action regardless of content. This sheds some light on labor's entrance into community activities. Power in the "community power structure" is not only economic, but social as well. The extent to which labor power has become social in character explains, in part at least, labor's newly acquired role in the community power structure.

²Ibid., p. 181.

The present study is thus concerned with the phenomenon of power and decision-making. Much has been written about the sociological concept of power. One of our objectives is to refine or duplicate the findings of other social scientists in this regard. We have paid particular attention to the work of Hunter,³ whose approach served as a guideline for the present research. Concerning the "community power structure," Hunter has made a number of statements which appear particularly relevant for research. He writes that

power involves relationships between individuals and groups, both controlled and controlling. . . . Wealth, social status, and prestige are factors in the "power constants." . . . The exercise of power is limited and directed by the formulation and extension of social policy within a framework of socially sanctioned authority. . . . Power is structured socially, in the United States, into a dual relationship between governmental and economic authorities, on national, state, and local levels.⁴

To Hunter, organizations represent "power units." Two power units of concern in the community power structure are organized labor and business and industry.

The community power structure may be thought of as those power relations existing among organizations representing two or more local institutions. It refers to the

³Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953).

⁴Ibid., pp. 6-7.

relative power that these two or more agencies have vis-a-vis each other, insofar as these relationships bear on broad, i.e. inter-institutional relations in the community. The community power structure also refers to the relative influence of these institutional organizations on broad community-wide agencies. It specifically excludes power relations within single institutional agencies such as unions, trade associations, et cetera.

The interest in labor as a relatively new power group in the community is coupled with a desire to study the structure and process of decision-making which a power unit must necessarily influence. Indeed, the ability to influence decision-making can be equated with power.⁵ To this end, the participation of labor and management organizations in representative community issues will be analyzed. Most important, however, as a new power group in the community we hope to discover the image that organized labor has of its own position and that of other groups in the community. This phase of the research with labor represents only a part of a broader study which proposes to compare the image of the community power structure held by labor with that of management. Thus it is hoped to follow up this study of labor representatives with a similar study of management representatives.

⁵James McKee, "Organized Labor and Community Decision-Making: A Study in the Sociology of Power" (unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, 1953).

There appears to be a paucity of literature concerning the "self-expressions" of labor as regards other groups in the community. Most works have been written by "third party" observers and have not had as their main focus the study of the views of labor as a group, or more specifically their expressed views. Notable exceptions are the Illini City studies,⁶ McKee's study of Steelport,⁷ and Mills' The New Men of Power.⁸ To more fully understand labor's behavior in the community context, it is first necessary to determine how it views its own role in the community. The behavior of a group may be predicated upon the image which it has of its role in relationship to other community groups. In speaking specifically of union-management relations Stagner mentions three types of perception that can be of crucial importance: namely, perception of persons, situations, and issues.⁹ The same would certainly hold true in the broader community context. Such perceptions definitely affect the functioning of the community power structure.

⁶W. C. Chalmers, M. K. Chandler, L. L. McQuitty, R. Stagner, D. E. Wray, and D. M. Derber, Labor--Management Relations in Illini City (Champaign: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, 1954).

⁷James McKee, "Status and Power in the Industrial Community," American Journal of Sociology, 58 (January 1953), 364-370.

⁸C. Wright Mills, The New Men of Power: America's Labor Leaders (New York: Harcourt, Brace Co., 1948).

⁹Ross Stagner, The Psychology of Industrial Conflict (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1956).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200

Thus if labor sees itself as essentially opposed to the interests of other groups, a policy of non-cooperation might result. Such an attitude might engender a futile or a militant outlook. Conversely, if labor looks upon itself as an equal partner in the community power structure, other behavior might be predicted. Then one could possibly look for labor alliances with other community groups in the pursuit of "community" goals.

Although a lengthy discussion of the social psychological aspects of groups is impossible here, it is obvious that to the extent that labor is a status group, it necessarily develops its own unique perceptions with regard to other groups, situations, and issues. If something can be learned of these perceptions, some of labor's overt acts will be rendered explicable. The functioning of the community power structure presupposes some type of imagery on the part of each participating group of the other groups involved. The aforementioned works of Mills, McKee, and Hunter give a general picture of the views of labor, but detailed studies are lacking. Thus, we know that labor is somewhat resentful of the traditional stewardship of business, that it resents the prestige accorded other community groups, but usually denied it. We know something of the views of the "typical" union leader.¹⁰ However, little has

¹⁰See, for example, Orme W. Phelps, "Community Recognition of Union Leaders," Industrial and Labor Relations

been done in the way of differentiating the labor members in their views, or in relating the views to action on various issues which labor helps to resolve. In the present study, consideration will be given both points at the community level. Hopefully some of the factors influencing labor's image of the community power structure may be discovered. Furthermore, we wish to relate these views to the behavior of labor in the actual resolution of issues in the community power structure. Does a hostile image necessarily mean belligerency on labor's part in dealing with other community groups, or simply a hands-off policy?

Hypotheses Concerning Labor's Image of Community Power

Since there were few studies to serve as guidelines for the present research, the hypotheses which were formulated represent at best only hunches or "educated guesses." The fact of labor's relatively recent entrance into the community power structure would appear to have a direct bearing on the self-image which it holds. Since labor is a newcomer occupying a subordinate position, it may temper its perception accordingly. In an effort to solidify its position, to show that it has earned its place in the community, labor might be expected to reformulate some of its

Review, 7 (April, 1954), 419-433; Eli Ginzberg, The Labor Leader: An Exploratory Study (New York: Macmillan Co., 1948); Alvin W. Gouldner (ed.), Studies in Leadership (New York: Harper Bros., 1950); Leonard R. Sayles and George Strauss, The Local Union: Its Place in the Industrial Plant (New York: Harper Brothers., 1953).

economic objectives in favor of certain community aims. To influence community decisions, labor must profess general, non-sectarian goals. Conversely, realizing its subordinate position, economically and in the community power structure, labor may link the two and view the goals of management as being economic in nature, with the community power structure being used as a vehicle to foster management interests at the expense of community welfare.

In brief, labor possibly sees its role as essentially opposed to the management-dominated community power structure. This is not unexpected in view of the long struggle labor has had to become a "member in good standing" of the community. The power struggle between management and labor on the economic front should be reflected in the community power structure. Since the community power structure often deals with issues that are not always directly related to the interests of a particular organization, it is imperative for the various contestants to align their interests with those of the "public" or the "community," if they are to wield influence.¹¹ This means that one should generally find the economic motives of an organization played down or minimized in its attempts to be a spokesman for the public interest. The economic struggle between labor and management should be expressed by labor through its imputation of

¹¹Alice Cook, "Labor's Search for Its Place in the Community: The Role of a Professional Community Consultant," The Journal of Educational Sociology, 29 (December 1955), 173-183.

100

economic motives to management and a corresponding minimizing of its own economic motives. This is particularly so in view of the "illegality" attached to labor tactics for so long a period and which still are considered disreputable by many community groups. The minimal status which labor enjoys today can be increased mainly through an ever-increasing public welfare orientation.

We have formulated two hypotheses concerning organized labor and its role in the community power structure. The first hypothesis is: Labor perceives the community power structure to be composed primarily of an integrated management clique which controls the outcome of most significant community issues. As a corollary proposition, labor sees management community goals as specific and essentially economic in character. The second hypothesis is: Labor views itself as an association which is tangential to the community power structure. As a corollary proposition, labor sees its community goals as general and non-economic in character.

Suggested Controls in Testing Hypotheses

A number of factors may influence labor's attitude toward the community power structure. Several variables immediately suggest themselves. For the purpose of this study, "labor" refers to members of labor unions, members who were identified by a panel of "knowledgeables," as being most influential in getting things done in the community.

The method of selecting respondents will be described in detail below, but for now we wish to consider only controls in reference to our hypotheses.

A possible variable which may account for diverse views is the age of the labor respondent. Traditionally, age is associated with conservatism; in this instance, conservatism would presumably be manifested in a more tolerant view of the existing community power structure. That is to say, older union influentials may be expected to see the community power structure as being less management-dominated than the younger members. Having been in the community power structure longer than their younger associates, they might have "mellowing" views. Having had more dealings with business figures, they may well consider them "good guys." Consequently, we hypothesize that older members view the community power structure as less management-dominated than the younger members.

The decision was made to separate the respondents into those who represented labor on community organizations and those who did not. Labor officials working with management groups on various community agencies would presumably see the power structure as more of a "struggle of equals." In contrast, those respondents who had never worked with management would be prone to retain the imagery of hostility and subordination by virtue of this separation. It is thus hypothesized: Those labor members who represent labor in

100

1

community organizations view the community power structure as less management-dominated than those members who do not represent labor in community organizations.

A further consideration which may influence the image held of the community power structure is the position of the labor member in his union. Perhaps different views are held by higher officers than those who occupy a subordinate position. Presumably, higher officials in the union will have more detailed knowledge of the community power structure than the subordinates, and consequently different images. High officials might have greater knowledge and a feeling of "being on the inside" and having more access to power, while subordinates may view themselves as being "outside" the power structure. Of course, just the opposite situation could prevail, and those with greater knowledge may realize their lack of influence. However, we are assuming that with greater knowledge comes a feeling of greater power. Thus we hypothesize: Those in subordinate union positions view the community power structure as more management-dominated than those in higher union positions.

Finally, those members who are judged most influential in labor circles should have different images than those considered to have lesser influence. It may be that those considered to have most influence are also the high office holders, although this does not necessarily follow. However, as in the hypothesis in the preceding paragraph, the

reasoning is the same. Those who wield more influence in labor should have a feeling of greater power than the less influential. Consequently, this hypothesis reads: The more influential labor members view the community power structure as less management-dominated than the less influential members.

Methods

Labor was defined for research purposes as members of labor unions who were identified by a panel of "knowledgeables" as being most influential in getting things done in the local community. Informal interviews with five such "knowledgeables" provided a list of twenty names, which were the most frequently recurring from a total of about thirty-five names that were mentioned. Similarly, a list of general community influentials was compiled from various sources in order to determine how many, if any, labor representatives were found among them. No alternations were made in the list of labor influentials provided by the panel as a result of this procedure. Finally, a sample of community issues was compiled from various local publications, including the Lansing State Journal and several labor weeklies. This was done in order to obtain some knowledge pertaining to the role of the various community groups, including labor, in the resolution of these issues. This knowledge proved particularly useful when the labor respondents were eventually interviewed and gave their "side of the story" regarding the resolution of

a specific issue. This prior knowledge could be checked or verified against the information provided by the respondents.

Several knowledgeable were interviewed regarding the history of labor's participation in community affairs. This furnished background material as to labor's original views towards community participation and also insights into a possible evolving or changing labor philosophy regarding such endeavors.

The original twenty labor respondents when subsequently interviewed were asked to vote for the ten most influential leaders from the list of twenty and to add names of labor influentials to the list if they so desired. In this manner nineteen additional names were obtained. Actually, there was little consensus on the influence of those whose names were subsequently added to the list. Nineteen additional informants were arbitrarily selected from the thirty extra names received. Each of the last nineteen respondents were also asked to select the ten most influential men from the list compiled up to the time of their interview. Table I shows the total list of respondents and the total number of votes cast for each as a result of the foregoing procedure.

In a subsequent chapter, the relationships of degree of influence to imagery of the community power structure will be considered in detail. For the present, influence was judged by the number of votes received by each respondent.

TABLE I

LABOR INFLUENTIALS INTERVIEWED, UNION AFFILIATION,
AND VOTES RECEIVED

Name**	Union	Union Office	Votes
George Barnes	CIO	Pres.,Lansing CIO Labor Council	37
Elmer Johnson	AFL	Pres.,Lansing AFL Labor Council	33
John Porter	CIO	CIO Representative, Comm.Chest	32
Tod Benning	AFL	AFL Representative, Comm.Chest	31
Calvin Jackson	CIO	Subregional Director	30
Philip Hague	CIO	International Representative	24
Henry Hanson	CIO	Pres. Local 152	22
Sam Hunt	CIO	Servicing Representative	20
Will Cobo	CIO	Educational Director	20
Bob Ross	AFL	Community Services Council Rep.	19
Darrell Stone	CIO	Pres. Local 235	16
Arthur Cox	AFL	Pres. Local 410	15
Connie Fox	AFL	Legislative and Educational Dir.	14
Alvin Nagle	CIO	Editor, <u>Lansing Labor News</u>	9
Warren Benson	CIO	Educational Representative, Local 405	8
Gene Mintz	CIO	Financial Secretary, Local 405	8
Ray Stone	CIO	Pres. Local 514	8
Lennie Knox	CIO	Pres. Local 212	5
Peter George	CIO	Educational Director	5
Edith Park	CIO	Legislative Representative	*
Carl Sawyer	CIO	Treasurer, Local 180	*
Steve Palter	AFL	Pres. Local 119	*
Norbert Hill	CIO	Financial Secretary, Local 51	*
Melvin Miles	AFL	Business Agent, Local 95	*
Ted North	AFL	Business Agent, Local 42	*
Frank Cole	AFL	Secretary, Greater Central Labor Council	*
Grant Gale	AFL	Assistant Project Director Michigan State Employees Council	*
Olive Knowle	CIO	Pres. Local 120	*
Clint Iser	CIO	Financial Secretary, Local 130	*
Ross Cohen	CIO	Pres. Local 55	*
Alex Cotes	AFL	International Representative	*
Oliver Boss	CIO	President, Local 75.	*
Helen Morgan	CIO	Secretary,Mich.CIO State Office	*
Larry Nile	CIO	Shop Committeeman, Local 75	*
Nora Blake	CIO	Financial Secretary, Local 402	*
Paul Aarun	AFL	Business Local 65	*
Bruce Bale	AFL	AFL Representative to United Fund	*
Mike Doyle	AFL	Financial Secy. and Tres.Local 42	*
Jud Payne	AFL	Pres. Local 32	*

*Less than five votes.

**Pseudonyms are used to protect the identity of the informants. The numbers of the locals have also been changed.

The original interview schedule, pre-tested on three labor respondents, included questions only of direct relevance to the hypotheses. Subsequently, other information was added which would be of value to account for variations in perception of the community power structure. The final interview schedule obtained much more data than was necessary to test the hypotheses. Included were descriptions of various types of power structures, since the main concern of the research was to obtain labor's view of the type which existed locally. There was also presented various types of relations which labor might conceivably have in the community power structure in order to ascertain the self-image held. Along with this information, background material on the various respondents was obtained including occupational history, union career data, education, and community activity. The part played by labor in the resolution of various community issues was also studied. Some notion was gleaned concerning the position labor aspires to in the community power structure. Significant community issues from labor's point of view were obtained. Finally, labor's perception of its historical role in community affairs was revealed to some extent.

The average interview lasted about two and one-half hours. All respondents were contacted by phone at which time arrangements were made for the interview. Each was told the purpose of the study and no refusals were

encountered, although some delays were encountered in setting up appropriate interviewing times. Only two or three expressed concern over the use to which their replies would be put, but this was quickly assuaged when the project was explained and the respondents anonymity assured. Many of the respondents were quick to inform the author that they would be glad to discuss the role of organized labor in Lansing, adding that anonymity was of no concern, for what they told the interviewer, they would tell anyone else. In brief, establishing rapport was no problem. Most of the interviews took place in the office of the union official, which in most cases assured privacy. The questions were read to the respondent, the replies being taken down as completely as possible. For the most part, this seemed to act as a stimulant to the respondent, who seemed pleased that his answers were considered important enough to be recorded. In several instances, the respondents were obviously disgruntled over the length of the interview although they never explicitly complained. This resulted in several hurried interviews, which undoubtedly affected the quality of the data obtained.

The interviews which the author would judge as poor in terms of supplying direct answers to the questions asked were those with union officials who had little, if any direct contact with other groups in the community. Since many of the questions related to the union's role in the

community power structure, an informant who was ignorant of the existing relations between the union and other community groups could hardly be expected to give satisfactory answers. This simply means that a union leader who is relatively sophisticated and influential in internal union affairs may be comparatively unsophisticated (and non-influential) in union relationships within the community power structure. Thus it appears that the better interviews were supplied by those informants who were formal or informal labor representatives in community organizations. This factor assumes importance when it is introduced as a control in discussing the variations in responses obtained.

CHAPTER III

LABOR'S IMAGE OF THE COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE

The Sample Described

Although the size of the sample does not permit any conclusive statements regarding the "typical" labor leader, a brief description will acquaint the reader with some of the general characteristics of the group interviewed. The general portrait derived from the literature usually paints the union official as one having little formal schooling, having spent considerable time in the union hierarchy, and as being suspicious of the businessman and his views regarding unions.¹ Certainly the thirty-nine informants interviewed exhibited the latter two characteristics if not the first.

Almost half of the informants were forty-eight years old or over; the youngest being twenty-six, the oldest sixty-seven. Two-fifths were affiliated with the AFL, and three-fifths with the CIO. This distribution is not unexpected in view of the industrial composition of Lansing, which includes several large automobile production plants.

¹Orme W. Phelps, "Community Recognition and Union Leaders," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 7 (April, 1954), 419-433.

Three-quarters of the informants were natives of Michigan. Other states represented included Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, New York, Kentucky, and Massachusetts. Almost one-half of the leaders had lived in the Lansing area twenty-five years or longer, and only three had lived in Lansing less than five years.

The educational range of the group is rather wide. Ten per cent had only grade school education, while three-fifths had some high school or were high school graduates. Almost one-fifth had some junior college work, and about a tenth had at least a bachelor's degree. One-half had been union officials for fifteen years or longer, only one-tenth had served less than five years.

Over two-fifths of the informants were official labor labor representatives in various community organizations. These included seven on the Community Chest board and its various drive committees, eight on private health and welfare agencies, eight on city or county governmental committees and agencies. Three were representatives on state governmental agencies.

Almost nine-tenths of the respondents had held two or more union positions including committee memberships. The remaining held but a single position. Two-fifths served in four or more positions concurrently. The occupational histories of the interviewees revealed a familiar blue-collar pattern. Seven-tenths had worked in factories at

one time or another. Among the fifteen AFL representatives the most recurring trades were painting, construction, and carpentry. Among the white-collar jobs held at various times by informants were school teacher, accountant, college instructor, store manager, reporter, and newspaper editor. One informant had spent his entire life in the union hierarchy. All of the twelve respondents who lacked factory experience were currently holding white-collar positions, if full-time union posts are included as white-collar. Three-tenths of the twenty-seven with factory experience were currently working the plant while holding their union positions.

Finally, the main union positions represented in the sample included ten local presidents, five financial secretaries, four business representatives, one international representative, five regional or district international representatives, six legislative and educational representatives, one president city labor council, two labor representatives on the Community Chest, one union newspaper editor, and one shop committeeman.

The characteristics of the sample coupled with the exploratory nature of the present study should serve to remind the reader that interpretations given the data which follow apply only to the labor influentials in Lansing, and not to the rank-and-file or the labor movement as a whole. (See Table II.)

TABLE II
SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LABOR INFLUENTIALS
IN LANSING, 1957

Characteristic	Number	Per Cent
Date of birth:		
1904 or earlier	12	31
1905-1914	12	31
1915-	15	38
TOTAL	39	100
Years in Lansing area:		
0-14 years	14	36
15-25 years	7	18
Over 25 years	18	46
TOTAL	39	100
Education:		
Eight years or less	4	10
Nine to twelve years	24	62
Thirteen and fourteen years	5	13
College graduate	3	7
Post graduate	2	5
Not ascertained	1	3
TOTAL	39	100
Community representation:		
Yes	17	44
No	22	56
TOTAL	39	100
Union affiliation:		
AFL	15	38
CIO	24	62
TOTAL	39	100
Union position:		
Regional district, or International representative	12	31
Local officer	20	51
Other	7	18
TOTAL	39	100

100

100

First Hypothesis: Labor's Image of Management Power

The first hypothesis is concerned with labor's image of the community power structure. To get at the different dimensions of power which labor informants perceived two methods of questioning were employed. Three questions elicited from the respondent a blanket comparison of labor versus management power and attempted to polarize his general impression of the community power structure. Four questions were aimed at getting the respondent's view of the community power structure "in action," wherein the problem of comparative power is related to specific ongoing issues and those organizations concerned with them. All questions were concerned with labor's self-image as well as the image they held of other groups, but the questions varied in the directness with which they posed power problems to the informant. Although the problem of "who has the power" underlies each question, some questions were more situational, in the sense that the respondent was called upon to compare labor's power with those of other groups in the community in the resolution of particular issues. Here the imagery was less diffuse with regard to labor's conception of its own power and that of other groups.

To establish labor's general evaluation of Lansing as a "labor" town, the question was posed early in the interview, "What kind of a uniontown is Lansing?" Although not of direct relevance to our hypothesis, the question was

asked to see to what extent the replies would evoke responses concerning the community power structure. The question is raised whether the respondents would view Lansing as a "good" union town and yet see the community power structure as management-dominated. The responses to the question are presented in Table III.

TABLE III
EVALUATION OF LANSING AS A UNION TOWN BY
TOP LABOR INFLUENTIALS

Evaluation of Lansing	Number	Per Cent
Highly positive	25	64
Average	7	18
Poor or ambivalent	3	8
Other	2	5
Don't know or no response	2	5
TOTAL	39	100

From the above it is apparent that Lansing was generally considered as good or better than other cities with which it was compared. Only one respondent pointed a negative picture of Lansing.

The reasons given for the various responses are presented in Table IV. There is nothing which suggests that Lansing rejects organized labor or that labor leaders feel that they are marginal groups in the community. As a matter of fact almost one-third of those elaborating their evaluations indicated that organized labor was accepted in

TABLE IV
REASONS GIVEN FOR EVALUATIONS OF LANSING
BY TOP LABOR INFLUENTIALS

Reasons	Number of Times Mentioned	Per Cent
Labor is well organized in unions in Lansing	9	23
Community acceptance of organ- ized labor	6	16
Labor is well represented in community associations	3	8
Good union-management relations	3	8
Union has made gains, but much remains to be done	1	3
Other reasons	5	13
No reasons given for evaluating Lansing	14	36
No evaluation of Lansing given	2	5

the community and was given representation in various organizations. The most common response to the question evaluating Lansing as a labor town was in terms of labor's own organizational success--i.e., Lansing is an organized town. Typical of others who saw Lansing as a good union town were such comments as the following:

"The majority of the workers are organized."

"Labor is active in politics and community affairs."

"There is stabilized unionism in Lansing."

"Lansing is better than some other towns where they have open shops."

"Labor is favorably accepted by the majority of people."

"There are good relations existing between the unions and employers."

Those who rated Lansing as an "average" town saw room for "more organization," or stressed some other factor on which Lansing would rate below some other cities in the state. One interviewee expressed it as follows: "Lansing is not too well organized in comparison to other cities, for example, in Muskegon bartenders and waitresses are organized but not in Lansing."

Another respondent rated Lansing third behind Detroit and Flint in terms of organization of workers. One leader said: "It's really not a union town like Detroit; fewer numbers are involved in community activities."

It does not necessarily follow that even though the respondents had a favorable opinion of Lansing as a "labor" city that they would hold a similar view of the community power structure. Here the distinction between social and economic power may assume particular relevance. Just because unions in Lansing enjoy economic power does not guarantee that they are (or consider themselves to be) influential in the community power structure. The first hypothesis indeed asserts that labor influentials have a "negative" view of the community power structure; they acknowledge labor's lack of social power and at the same time decry management's dominance presumably based upon economic superiority.

Respondents were asked directly to evaluate the relative power of management and labor. "How would you compare the relative influence of management and labor in

community affairs in Lansing?" Data in Table V reveals that about three-quarters thought that management wielded greater influence in the community and that about one-eighth thought that labor had equal or greater power. The question evoked a number of informative comments.

"Management has a stronger voice than we do.
Maybe if we used our votes better we could
offset the influence of those dollars."

"Management has stronger influence but labor's
influence is growing and it will keep growing
as we keep developing better leadership."

"Business does a better public relations job than
we do."

"Management has more money to express their views,
and put their ideas before the public."

"Management has greater influence because of its
control of the press and radio."

TABLE V
EVALUATION OF RELATIVE POWER OF LABOR
AND MANAGEMENT IN LANSING

Evaluation	Number	Per Cent
Management has greater influence than labor	29	74
Management and labor have equal influences	2	5
Labor has greater influence than management	3	8
Amount of influence depends upon issues, decisions, or persons involved	2	5
Not ascertained	3	8
TOTAL	39	100



10

11

12

One of the respondents who thought labor had more influence said that, "management is not as well organized; labor is more homogeneous." Another remarked, "Labor has more influence because they represent more people."

Evidence throughout the interview indicated that labor was concerned with community activities and had a community program. If labor perceived its power to be strong one may assume that it could achieve its community goals without the aid of management. That is, labor's feeling of independence is based upon its self-conception of power. The question was asked, "To what extent do you feel that organized labor can realize its community objectives without the help of management and other groups?"

If the first hypothesis is substantiated, it is not likely that the respondents would express a high degree of optimism concerning labor's ability to achieve its aims without the help of management. In view of the evaluation of labor-management influence in the community, the distribution in Table VI is hardly surprising. Only two respondents felt that labor was capable of achieving its community objectives independently of other community groups. Three qualified their answers by saying that labor could achieve some objectives alone, but that others could only be accomplished through close cooperation with other groups. They felt that labor lacked the power in and of itself to "go it alone." About half emphatically stated that while labor needed help, so too did other groups.

TABLE VI
LABOR'S IMAGE OF ITS ABILITY TO ACHIEVE ITS GOALS

Image	Number	Per Cent
Labor needs help of management and other groups	28	72
Labor needs help from others on some community objectives	3	8
Labor does <u>not</u> need help	2	5
Other	1	3
Don't know	1	3
Not ascertained	4	10
TOTAL	39	100

"We've got to have management, contractors, and labor organizations working together. They got to have us and we need them."

"It is hard for one group to act on issues; it takes everyone."

"No one group can gain their objectives without the help of all."

Another question which probed for a blanket comparison between management and labor power was, "In your judgment, do you feel that big community decisions in Lansing tend to be made by the same small 'crowd' of people working together or do these people change according to the issue confronting the community?" It was assumed that if the idea of a ruling management clique existed in the mind of labor, they would reply that a small crowd makes community decisions. If respondents did not comment about the composition of the "crowd" it was assumed to be a management group. If

respondents saw the group changing according to issues, it was assumed that labor conceived of its power as more nearly equal to that of management. Table VII presents the responses obtained.

TABLE VII
COMPOSITION OF GROUPS MAKING BIG COMMUNITY DECISIONS

Composition	Number	Per Cent
Same group, no comment about composition	17	43
Same group, explicitly comprised of businessmen	5	13
Same group, labor not included	1	3
Same group, labor included	3	8
Group changes, according to issues and problems	9	23
Other	1	3
Don't know	2	4
Not ascertained	1	3
TOTAL	39	100

A number of salient factors stand out in the distribution in Table VII. Two-thirds of the respondents perceived a ruling clique, and of these only ten per cent saw labor as included in this clique. Although two-fifths of the respondents made no comment about the composition of the group, it was quite obvious that labor was not thought to be included.

One respondent said that he had heard that there was a small group running things, but that he did not know from

first-hand experience who they were. Another replied simply: "Every town has a small clique running it." Another was slightly more specific, saying, "A handful of people run things, with X being the leader." Still another generalized from his experience stating that in any group, "Religious, community, or union, there is a smaller clique within, actively running things."

The three who included labor in the ruling group were equally vague. One elaborated, "You go to various governmental board meetings and see the same faces; labor is included in this small group usually."

Those who thought that influentials involved in important community decisions changed according to issues were unclear as to the composition of the influential group, but again it seemed that labor was not generally included. Most comments ran in a similar vein. "They change according to issue and over a period of time." Who "they" were was not explained. Another said, "I think the group changes according to what the problems are; officers change in government and in the Community Chest." Several did give labor a role among the community decision-makers. One replied, "People change according to the issue in both management and labor," indicating that he felt that there was labor participation in community decision-making. Similar comments were elicited from only one or two other respondents, however.

One method of measuring a group's self-image of power in the community is to determine the extent to which it feels it has access to those organizations and activities which comprise the complicated network making up the community power structure. The community power structure consists not only of special interest economic organizations, but also of other "multi-partisan" organizations such as Community Chest boards, hospital boards, school boards, and the like. These latter are staffed by representatives from various economic organizations. The question then becomes whether or not labor feels it is playing an adequate policy role in these multi-partisan organizations, either through direct representation or by other means. Lack of participation would seemingly indicate a lack of power on their part.

In answer to the question, "Are there organizations or activities in the Lansing area in which you feel labor should participate, but does not?" almost three-fifths answered in the affirmative. The organizations and activities mentioned in which labor presumably was excluded were: political parties, hospital boards, Boards of Water and Electric Light, Business--Industry--Education Day, The Council of Churches, the school board, health and welfare organizations, local governmental agencies and commissions, board of pharmacy, and Chamber of Commerce. The reasons for labor's non-participation in these organizations are provided in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

REASONS GIVEN BY LABOR INFLUENTIALS FOR NON-
PARTICIPATION IN LANSING ORGANIZATIONS

Reason	Number	Per Cent
Labor is participating	17	44
Conscious resistance to labor representation	6	16
Labor not aggressive in demanding representation	4	10
Labor not invited	5	13
Labor was weak at the inception of organization or activity	1	3
Labor hasn't as yet concerned itself with the organization or activity	3	8
Don't know why labor isn't participating	1	3
Question not answered	5	13

While over half the respondents felt that labor was "left out" of many activities and organizations, about two-fifths disagreed. There seemed to be some ambivalence regarding labor's ability or desire to enter certain areas of participation. Most of the reasons pointed, however, to either an explicit lack of power on labor's part or a corresponding opposing power which labor has not as yet confronted, because of uncertainty regarding its own strength. For example, replies that labor had not been "aggressive" in demanding representation and that labor had not as yet concerned itself with a particular organization or activity indicated a lack of assurance of its power.

Respondents were asked if they saw any specific groups opposing labor's entrance into these organizations. In line with the first hypothesis, it was expected that management would merge as the chief opponent.

The results in Table IX are hardly conclusive. When pressed to name "the opposition" only about thirty per cent of the respondents actually pointed to management groups as opposing their greater participation in community affairs. To be sure management groups were the only ones mentioned, for municipal agencies or officials were considered management in the eyes of labor, as was brought in numerous ways during the course of the interviews. As a matter of fact, local governmental agencies and commissions were mentioned frequently as opposing labor participation.² These were seen as almost entirely staffed by business and industrial figures, appointed by the mayor. The difficulty of getting a labor representative on the parking authority was mentioned by a number of informants who resented its being "packed" with business men.

The exercise of power is most clearly evidenced in the resolution of community issues. Those groups that influence the course of action taken or decisions made with regard to community problems may properly be labeled "powerful." To render more specific labor imagery of the community power structure, respondents were asked to list current community issues and to give their opinions

² See Lansing State Journal, November 5, 1957.

TABLE IX
SOURCE OF OPPOSITION TO LABOR'S
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Sources	Number of Times Mentioned	Per Cent of Respondents
No opposition	21	55
Mayor and governmental bodies	4	10
Business and management groups	5	13
Newspaper	1	3
Groups cannot be specified	3	8

regarding labor's affect on their ultimate resolution. In this procedure, the focus was solely on labor's view of its own power and not on a comparison of labor-management strength. Though the previous questions have indicated management as being dominant in the community power structure, there is a tendency to underestimate labor's power if concentration is limited to direct comparison of management-labor strength. By giving the respondents an opportunity to express their views of labor influence in specific instances, perhaps a more realistic picture of their self-image is obtained.

Each respondent was asked to list the most important issues currently facing the city of Lansing. Parking accommodations, public transportation, annexation, and school improvement, in the order named were the most frequently mentioned issued. Other issues named included payroll tax, civic improvements, city tax structure, and improved housing.

The list ran from one to four issues. The respondents were then asked if labor would affect the outcome of the issues they had listed. Table X gives the results with respect to the first two issues listed. Since most respondents did not list a third or fourth issue, the results for these are not presented. Though the issues are not homogeneous, i.e., issues varied from respondent to respondent, some assessment of labor's self-imagery of power can be obtained by a blanket comparison of the answers regardless of the issue concerned.

TABLE X
LABOR'S ASSESSMENT OF ITS INFLUENCE ON THE
OUTCOME OF OUTSTANDING ISSUES IN
THE COMMUNITY

Assessment	Issue No. 1		Issue No. 2	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Will not affect issue outcome	3	8	2	5
Will affect issue outcome	23	58	19	48
Will partially affect outcome	1	3	1	3
Uncertain or don't know	3	8	5	13
Other	2	5	-	-
No issues in Lansing	1	3	-	-
Not ascertained	6	15	12	31
TOTAL	39	100	39	100

It is clear from the above table that labor does not feel devoid of influence. Although conceding greater power

to management, labor sees itself as influencing the resolution of community issues to some degree. Again, it may be noted that the two distributions suggest a lack of self-assuredness. Only about half explicitly declared that labor has an influence. On the other hand, only a very few indicated that labor has no influence. Whether or not labor actually has influence is another matter. The above data indicate that labor itself is unsure of its own potential power. The responses to some extent reflect labor's difficult period of adjustment as a new member of the community power structure, in which its initial attempts at wielding power have been frequently rebuffed.

Two concluding questions concerned with the first hypothesis had the respondents list the most influential organizations and individuals in the community. The frequency with which labor organizations and officials appeared on these lists presumably would indicate roughly where labor ranked itself in the hierarchy of the community power structure. Whereas labor's power has been compared with that of management in several of the preceding questions, the goal in this section was to determine the relative power by giving the respondents an opportunity to explicitly designate the individuals and organizations making up the community power structure. The term "management" tended to present an oversimplified picture of the community power structure to the respondent in the sense that it encouraged him to lump

10

11

together many diverse groups as opposing labor. In so doing, labor's power may have been unwittingly minimized by the respondent. In these two questions, the respondents were given an opportunity to present their own, more diffused (and perhaps more realistic) picture of the community power structure, wherein labor is not automatically confronted with "management." Table XI presents the frequencies with which various organizations were mentioned.

TABLE XI
INFLUENTIAL ORGANIZATIONS LISTED BY
LABOR RESPONDENTS

Organization	Number of Times Mentioned	Per Cent of Respondents
Chamber of Commerce	28	73
Labor unions and organizations (CIO, AFL, Labor Council, COPE, etc.)	28	73
Board of Realtors	10	26
State Journal and radio station	10	26
General Motors and specific industries	7	18
Service clubs (Kiwanis, Rotary)	6	16
Religious and church groups	6	16
Downtown Businessmen's Assoc.	5	13
National Association of Manufacturers	3	8
Community Chest	3	8
City Council	2	5
Parent-Teachers Association	2	5
Medical groups	2	5
Veteran organizations	2	5

In this question, labor is clearly expressing power on its behalf. As expected, the respondents themselves

more or less bi-polarized community power between labor and management. However, where no blanket comparison of power is asked for, labor views itself in a more favorable position, with respect to management. Yet the image of management dominance continues to prevail even in this distribution, if the different types of groups are considered. Most of the organizations are obviously "management" organizations. In an additive sense, management again emerges as superior to labor. Almost three-tenths of the respondents left labor organizations off their list, although all of them mentioned business organizations. The lack of influence attributed to governmental agencies is also significant and is perhaps due to their being viewed as business vehicles. The relative infrequency with which General Motors was listed as an influential organization belies the observation that unions see the city as a "company" town. It is not paradoxical for labor to consider itself the equal in power to any other single organization but still see the community power structure as management-dominated. It is apparent from the above that labor's view of community power is made up of labor, plus an alliance of different management groups.

The image of management dominance is again confirmed in the distribution of community influentials listed by the respondents. Table XII presents this list with the votes given to each individual.

TABLE XII

CIVIC LEADERS CHOSEN BY LABOR INFLUENTIALS AS
CAPABLE OF SPONSORING A COMMUNITY PROJECT

Business Names*	Votes
Martin Karnas, Publisher	24
John Wilby, General Manager, Automobile Company	10
Fred Miller, Manager, Department Store	10
Melville Cole, President, Automotive Supplier Plant	7
Bob Meeker, Director Industrial Relations, Automobile Company	6
Henry Stuck, President, Local Bank	5
Ted Miles, Auto Dealer	4
Sam Langor, President, Metal Manufacturing Co.	3
Harold Hogen, Director Industrial Relations, Automobile Company	3
Peter Larson, Real Estate Broker	2
Thomas Costin, President, Contracting Firm	2
Other names mentioned	11
Business and Industrial affiliation given but no name	9
No business representation given	2
Labor Names	Votes
Elmer Johnson, President AFL Labor Council	17
George Barnes, President CIO Labor Council	14
Calvin Jackson, Sub-Regional Director, CIO	5
Henry Hanson, President of CIO Local	3
Steve Palter, President of AFL Local	3
Will Cobo, Educational Director, CIO	2
Ted Benning, AFL Representative, Community Chest	2
"Union Leaders," no specific names mentioned	3
Other names in Labor	7
No labor representation given	15

*All names are psuedonyms.

A significant observation from Table XII is that two-fifths of the respondents failed to give labor representation, while only two failed to include business. Nearly twice as many business names appear as labor. Furthermore, one-quarter of the respondents names business organizations, although failing to give names of specific businessmen, while unions were given representation by only three who failed to give specific names of labor people. These findings indicate that "things get done" largely through the sponsorship of management influentials, at least in the eyes of labor. Labor influentials relegate themselves to a secondary although not entirely insignificant role in sponsoring community projects.

Studying the number of votes received by the various figures, labor apparently feels it has two of the most influential individuals in the community, but neither one is named as frequently as a business spokesman. It is a matter of conjecture, whether these men are actually influential in the community power structure, since the respondents may simply be projecting the influence which these two wield within labor ranks onto the community. The fact that labor feels it has only a few spokesmen in the community appears substantiated by Table XII. The preponderance of management names indicates that labor sees itself as out-numbered in the ranks of community influentials. It is highly significant also that such a large proportion (almost

two-fifths) see labor as devoid of community-wide influence. The disparity of views again points out labor's ambivalence regarding its power potential. Hardly a substantial number attributed power to labor and those that did were conservative in their estimates.

By way of summarizing the responses to the questions on the power balance between labor and management as perceived by the informants, an arbitrary technique was developed which weighted each answer. Those answers which indicated a power balance favorable to labor were given a plus one; those indicating management supremacy a minus one; and other responses were given a zero. Since there were nine questions relative to the first hypothesis, a respondent's score could range from a plus nine to a minus nine. Table XIII presents the responses to the nine questions and the total score frequencies.

Extreme caution should be exercised in interpreting the results in this table since no analysis has been made of the specific responses which resulted in the total score. Each score represents merely the sum of the responses to nine questions. Thus, numerically equivalent scores could have been achieved through a diverse combinations of responses. Such a procedure provides a crude impression of the over-all directions of the responses.

About three-fifths of the respondents were in the range from negative two to positive two, a perception that

TABLE XIII

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS DEALING
WITH LABOR-MANAGEMENT BALANCE OF POWER

Number of Responses Indicating Labor Power	Not Ascertained	Number of Responses Indicating Management Power	Score	Number of Cases
6	2	1	+5	1
6	-	3	+3	2
5	1	3	+2	2
4	2	3	+1	3
5	-	4	+1	2
3	3	3	0	3
4	1	4	0	1
4	-	5	-1	3
3	2	4	-1	4
2	4	3	-1	2
2	3	4	-2	3
-	6	3	-3	1
3	-	6	-3	3
2	2	5	-3	4
1	4	4	-3	1
2	1	6	-4	1
-	4	5	-5	1
-	2	7	-7	1

management and labor are more or less equally balanced in power. However, less than one-tenth were in the plus three to five range while over three-tenths were in the negative three to negative seven range. Significantly, only one-quarter saw labor having power equal to or exceeding that of management, while over six-tenths had negative scores, indicating management superiority in the community power structure. These figures give added support to the first hypothesis.

Conclusions--first hypothesis. The preceding discussion has presented ample evidence in support of the first hypothesis. Both in composition and execution, the community power structure is seen by labor as management-dominated. The community power structure consists primarily of management organizations and their representatives. As a result, labor feels excluded from many activities carried on within the community. In those areas where it does participate, labor does see itself as wielding some influence. For example, in what it considers community issues, labor expressed some feeling of power. It does view itself as an influential group in the community, however. This image of power is not incompatible with the corresponding view of management supremacy, for although labor credits itself with power, it is not able to give convincing examples of where this power is manifest. When compared with management, labor clearly recognizes its subordinate position of community influence.

Labor does not consider itself unimportant in the community power structure, but the power which it does yield is seen as limited both in scope and substance. Management holds the upper-hand with the resultant curtailment of labor influence.

Second Hypothesis: Labor's Perception of "Cleavage" Between Itself and Management

In testing the second hypothesis, namely, that labor views itself as tangential to the community power structure, a number of assumptions have been made by the investigator regarding the relevancy of certain factors to the problem posed. The phrase "tangential association" needs amplification in this connection. By this term is meant that an organization, in this case labor, perceives itself as being "outside" the community power structure. This cleavage is thought to be reflected in a number of ways. To some extent, the image of tangentiality was demonstrated in testing the first hypothesis, whereby labor saw itself as being on the periphery in terms of the power which it possessed. This consideration of the community power structure assumed a commonality of goals between management and labor, the emphasis being on the power of each contestant relative to achieving these goals. As the evidence indicated, labor minimized its own role in achieving these goals and thus in this sense viewed itself as tangential to the community power structure. The second hypothesis pursues

the image of cleavage not only with respect to the power differential, but focuses also on the degree to which labor perceives its goals as being different from or opposed to those of management.

Labor can see itself apart from the community power structure, not only in terms of available means to common ends, but also as having ends divergent from those of management. If the ends are contrary to those of management, then the question of a power struggle again becomes important, with labor trying to sustain its objectives against the opposition of management. If labor envisions different but not opposing goals, then the question is whether labor possesses enough resources in its own right to attain them. This too would be evidence of power, but not in the sense that it refers to influence over other groups within the community power structure.

Thus labor may see the community power structure as outside its main field of interest as well as area of influence. Although some indication of labor's cooperation with other groups in the community power structure was given in dealing with the first hypothesis, it cannot be assumed that labor identifies all of its community goals with those of management. Most of the questions relating to the first hypothesis were concerned with general community issues and labor's influence in these. Only in one question was labor's own objectives considered when the respondents were asked

about labor's ability to achieve its objectives. It will be recalled that labor indicated a dependence upon management in achieving its community objectives. However, this question revealed nothing as to the nature of these objectives.

The term "objectives" here broadly refers to labor's perception of community issues, activities, and organizations, as they pertain to labor interests. It may be that the "community" issues are divorced from labor's interests as the second hypothesis assumes. Community activities and organizations may be viewed as only incidental to labor's welfare since they are management-dominated anyway. If this proves to be the case, then the second hypothesis will be substantiated. What is being posited is a multi-dimensional image of power on the part of labor. It is not to be inferred that labor considers participation in the community power structure as unimportant. Such participation gives evidence of "social" power on the part of the participants, which labor is definitely striving to obtain. The supposition underlying the second hypothesis is that labor conceives of its more "traditional" functions as being outside the area of general community participation. The degree to which it can successfully exercise these is also indicative of power, although perhaps in a more limited, specific sense. Of concern here is whether labor has a priority of interests, which relegates community

participation to a relatively minor role, or indeed places a premium on such participation.

To obtain labor's perception of issues in Lansing, the respondents were asked to list the issues which they considered to be the most important. Data in Table XIV presents the various issues which were reported. Parking, public transportation, and annexation problems were mentioned most frequently. These issues have received considerable public attention and appear to be of a community-wide nature. Only two issues, payroll tax and full employment, reflect specific labor interests and these were not at the top of the list. Tentative conclusions from these findings suggest that labor identifies the dominant community problems as being also of primary concern to labor.

TABLE XIV

IMPORTANT COMMUNITY ISSUES LISTED BY LABOR INFLUENTIALS

Issues	Number of Times Mentioned	Per Cent of Respondents
Parking accommodations	26	68
Public transportation	18	47
Annexation	14	36
School improvement	9	23
Civic improvement	8	21
Payroll tax	8	21
Medical facilities	5	13
Full employment	4	10
Retirement program	4	10

Does labor feel that these issues are of specific importance to management? Table XV gives at least a partial answer to this question. Almost eight-tenths of the

TABLE XV

LABOR'S ASSESSMENT OF WHETHER MANAGEMENT AGREES
ON NAMING DOMINANT COMMUNITY ISSUES

Assessment	Number	Per Cent
Management disagrees on community issues	5	13
Management agrees on community issues	27	69
Partially agrees on community issues	4	10
Don't know	1	3
Not ascertained	2	5
TOTAL	39	100

respondents indicated full or partial agreement with management on the problems facing Lansing. At least from these results, labor seems to be speaking as involved in the power structure and not as a tangential association, since it is expressing an interest in issues of importance to management and other groups in the community.

In order to compare specifically the differences between labor and management, the respondents were asked, "What are the general differences, if any, in the community objectives of labor and management?" The respondents were again given an opportunity to place labor outside the community power structure, by naming objectives which might not

be of concern ~~at~~ any other groups. Different objectives are not necessarily the same as "opposing" objectives, although both may be of concern for the community power structure. Table XVI presents further evidence regarding labor's image of itself as a tangential association.

TABLE XVI
GENERAL DIFFERENCES IN THE COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES
OF LABOR AND MANAGEMENT AS PERCEIVED BY LABOR

Differences	Number of Times Mentioned	Per Cent of Respondents
No differences in community objectives	10	25
Differences in methods of achieving identical goals	9	23
Depends on the issue involved	6	16
Governmental objectives differ	4	10
Industry and labor have different tax policies	5	13
Other	3	8
No response to question	2	5

About half of the thirty-nine informants actually perceive no differences at all in community objectives of labor and management, except in "methods" of achieving the objectives. Since the remaining half have to do with the special interests of management and labor/which are in opposition, they must be resolved within the community power structure. It is evident from the responses that the differences perceived often had an economic base. Thus, in mentioning a difference in method, a respondent would remark

that the bone of contention was who was to finance an agreed-upon project.

Some of the other categories listed above evoked such comments as the following:

"Labor would judge any program on its effects on the lower income groups; management retains its attitude of privilege."

"Management wants low taxes; labor has an economic stake also, but they want equal assessment."

"Management wants a payroll tax, labor doesn't."

"Labor is against subsidy of city parking."

One respondent who stated that the difference centered on gaining control of the city government brought in the question of finances, "Generally speaking, it is just natural for industry to have different views on city government. Anything the government does costs money and then taxes go up. Industry is not paying its fair share of taxes."

The altruistic aims of labor were expressed by one leader as follows: "Labor is for everyone--they work for things that benefit the whole community and not for the benefit of just one small group. Management leans toward those things that will help them and others that have a broad education and the necessities of life."

Pursuing the question of "economics" still further on the assumption that perhaps on this point labor was tangential to the power structure, the respondents were asked to compare the economic stakes of labor and management in community participation. It was hypothesized that if labor saw

its goals as converging with those of management (with management being dominant in the power structure), labor might minimize those goals which management was more successful in achieving. Thus, though holding the same goals, labor would emphasize its non-economic objectives while attributing to management economic goals. In short, labor might view itself as outside of the power structure, since its main non-economic objectives could not be furthered within the community power structure. In brief, labor would be a tangential association by virtue of its different goal priority.

Table XVII presents the responses obtained relative to the question of economic stakes. Three-tenths indicated management had a greater economic stake, one-quarter saw labor's stake as greater, and two-fifths saw the stakes as equal. One cannot readily conclude from this distribution that labor minimizes its economic goals in community participation. There is acknowledgment that both labor and management have economic interests to pursue locally. Some comments may be illustrative.

"Management and labor have equal stakes."

"Participation is equally important to both. Management needs happy workers or they won't produce."

"Management has a smaller stake. The working people are the biggest segment of the population."

The question evoked rather general replies which did reveal vaguely why the respondents thought as they did.

TABLE XVII
LABOR'S COMPARISON OF ITS AND MANAGEMENT'S
ECONOMIC STAKE IN COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS
AND ACTIVITIES

Comparison	Number	Per Cent
Management has greater economic stake	12	31
Stakes are equal	9	23
Labor has greater economic stakes	10	25
Stakes are relative to issue	1	3
Don't know	4	10
Not ascertained	3	8
TOTAL	39	100

"They have more invested, but they have no greater stake."

"There is a management anomaly; they have greater influence, but a smaller stake."

"They [management] have more money invested; they have to have the money so that labor can survive."

"Labor has more at stake; if things didn't go to suit labor, then labor has a bigger loss than management."

Over-all it appeared that those who said that management had a greater economic stake had the most difficulty in "defending" their answers. The replies were based upon a general halo of thought which somehow viewed management actions as being intrinsically motivated by economic considerations.

A question briefly dealt with in regard to the first hypothesis was also thought as important in testing the

second hypothesis. This question was, "Are there organizations or activities in the Lansing area in which you feel labor should participate, but does not?" If labor regarded itself as a tangential association, it was assumed that most of the replies would be negative. As such, a broadening of community participation would not be expressed as a labor objective. Conversely, a related question would reveal labor's desire to stay out of various community associations. It was, "Are there organizations or types of organizations in Lansing in which labor should not participate, including organizations in which they now have representation?" The following two tables, Table XVIII and Table XIX, shed much light on this point.

TABLE XVIII

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS OR ACTIVITIES IN WHICH
LABOR SHOULD PARTICIPATE BUT DOES NOT

Organization or Activity	Number of Times Mentioned	Per Cent of Respondents
Labor already participating	17	44
Local governmental agencies & commissions (police, fire commission, etc.)	13	33
Health and welfare organiza- tions	6	16
Business organizations (Chamber of Commerce)	3	8
School board and educational agencies	3	8
Business--Industry--Education Day	2	5
Council of Churches	2	5
Political party	1	3

1

1

2

3

4

5

TABLE XIX
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH LABOR
SHOULD NOT PARTICIPATE

Organization	Number of Times Mentioned	Per Cent of Respondents
No limit on labor participation	28	73
Chamber of Commerce	8	21
N. A. M. and other business organizations	4	10
Welfare activities	3	8
Religious organizations	1	3
Communist Party	1	3

With regard to Table XVIII, it may be observed that over half of the respondents felt that labor should expand its community activities. Most of the remaining were apparently satisfied with the status quo, in which labor is represented in a long list of community organizations. The total responses are not those of a group which views itself as tangential. However, a relative large proportion (one-third) feel that labor is excluded from governmental agencies, bodies which certainly constitute an integral part of the community power structure. On the other hand, Table XIX reveals little desire on the part of labor to restrict its present program of community participation; only three-tenths of the respondents mentioned organizations they regarded as "off limits" to labor. Thus, an over-all view justifies the conclusion that labor considers it feasible to participate actively in community affairs.

Considering the organizations listed in the two questions, labor appears to differentiate sharply between "management" and "community" organizations. Labor largely evinced a negative attitude to enter management organizations. Table XIX denotes some agreement that labor should stay out of such organizations as the Chamber of Commerce. Perhaps labor resists the claim that certain organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce are legitimate community associations, as management often claims. With respect to such "community" organizations as hospital and school boards, the view is largely expressed that labor participation should, if anything, increase. Labor has been successful in penetrating these organizations to a degree and is not anxious to relinquish what it has achieved. Rather it hopes to accomplish even more in the way of securing additional representation. In these "community" organizations, labor perhaps feels it has a greater chance in its power struggle with management, since power is often diffused among a number of partisan groups with the result that labor can occasionally secure allies. The important point is that labor does not see itself divorced from these organizations which are as much a part of the community power structure as is such a group as the Chamber of Commerce.

Finally, one other general or summarizing question was employed with the aim of obtaining labor's over-all view with regard to community participation. Is labor fundamentally

interested in community participation? A tangential group would presumably see no profit in being a member of the community power structure, since its "different" objectives could not be attained through such participation. Since the preceding results show that labor included itself within the power structure, it would be reasonable to assume that it would be interested in community participation. However, one complicating factor, labor's perceived lack of power, could engender a feeling of futility and subsequent apathy towards community affairs.

Table XX presents the results of this inquiry into labor's interest in community involvement. The largest proportion, four-fifths, believed that labor and management were equally interested in community involvement. Three-tenths thought management had more interest and two-tenths indicated labor had a greater interest. However, it was found that even when management was said to have greater interest, some rationalization for this was provided. Management's interest was pictured as the result of its greater power and the desire to maintain that power. The comments are particularly illuminating.

"Management has a greater interest because they are naturally set for meetings. Management is all dressed up to go to meetings. Labor has the problem of picking men to place on these boards, who can speak well and mix well."

"Only insofar as it affects themselves, does management evince a greater interest. Management is more aware of the importance of particular issues in many cases."

TABLE XX
COMPARISON OF MANAGEMENT AND LABOR INTEREST
IN COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Comparison	Number	Per Cent
Management has greater interest	12	31
Management and labor have equal interest	15	38
Labor has greater interest	8	20
Other	2	5
Don't know	1	3
Not ascertained	1	3
TOTAL	39	100

"Management has accepted labor more than formerly, but management has greater interest. Labor has't the machinery to originate policy."

The economic-power motive attributed to management is obvious in the following remarks:

"They have a greater interest because of finances; they have more to gain or lose financially. They have a bigger investment."

"They have ways and means to get more interest."

The general impression received from these responses is that labor interest in community participation is high and would be higher, but for management supremacy in the community power structure. The apathy toward community involvement implied in the second hypothesis did not reveal itself, although labor's perceived lack of power did seemingly lower its interest to a degree. Labor has again revealed its image as a member of the community power

structure, by citing this interest-power link with which a tangential association would hardly be concerned.

Again by way of summary, the six questions dealing with cleavage were weighted by the response given to each question and total cleavage scores were computed for each respondent. A score of plus one was given for a "non-cleavage" response, a minus one for a perception of cleavage; zero for undecided responses or those not ascertained. As in the case with the first hypothesis, no analysis was made of specific responses comprising the total scores. Thus, equivalent scores do not necessarily indicate identical answers to the same questions. The theoretical range of scores could be from plus six to a minus six. In fact, however, they ranged from a plus four to a minus four.

The randomness of the responses concerning cleavage is clearly evidenced by the distribution in Table XXI. The plus and minus scores each composed two-fifths of the cases, and zero scores composed one-fifth of the cases. If scores ranging from plus two to minus two may be interpreted as evidencing moderate integration or cleavage, almost seven-tenths of the respondents saw a small degree of integration or cleavage between management and labor. Only three-tenths then perceived a high degree of integration of cleavage; i.e. scores of plus three to four and minus three to minus four. Thus, as a whole, the group cannot be said to have a clear image of a gulf between labor and management in the community power structure, if the questions are valid.

TABLE XXI
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS DEALING
WITH LABOR-MANAGEMENT CLEAVAGE

Number of Responses			Scores	Number of Cases
Non-Cleavage Response	Not Ascertained	Cleavage Responses		
4	2	-	+4	1
5	-	-1	+4	4
4	1	-1	+3	1
4	-	-2	+2	5
3	1	-2	+1	4
3	-	-3	0	7
2	2	2	0	1
2	1	-3	-1	2
2	-	-4	-2	7
1	2	-3	-2	1
1	1	-4	-3	2
1	-	-5	-4	3

Conclusion--second hypothesis. The evidence presented clearly does not support the second hypothesis. Labor and management have common as well as opposing goals. Labor feels it can attain its goals by participating within the present community power structure. Labor acknowledges its

own goals, as well as those of management, to be largely "economic" in character. To further its interests, labor would extend its community participation, rather than "pull out" or reduce its activity. It does not perceive itself as tangential because it has enjoyed a modicum of success, enough at least to see itself as a participating, albeit a subordinate member, desirous of continuing as such.

CHAPTER IV

FACTORS AFFECTING LABOR'S IMAGE OF THE
POWER STRUCTURE

Four Control Factors

It will be recalled that four factors were hypothesized as influencing the respondents' image of the community power structure, namely: age, union position, influence, and organizational representation. With each factor except position, the sample was dichotomized. Thus with respect to age, the categories were "old" and "young," representing those born in 1909 or earlier and those after that date. This resulted in eighteen "old" and twenty-one "young" respondents. Influence categories were determined by the number of votes each respondent received from his colleagues. Those receiving eight or more were classified as having "high" influence, all others as "low," resulting in seventeen and twenty-two in their respective categories. With respect to organizational representation, the respondents were classified simply as officially representing labor in any community organization or not. Seventeen were representatives and twenty-two were not.

The sample was divided into three groups in terms of the union position held. International representatives

regional, legislative, and educational representatives were "high," as were labor representatives on the Community Chest and the head of the city CIO labor council. All presidents of locals (with the exception of two who headed the largest locals in the city and were classified as "high") were placed in the "median" category. Also included here was the editor of the Lansing Labor News. All others, such as financial secretaries or business agents were classified as "low." This procedure resulted in eighteen "high," thirteen "medium," and eight "low."

Analysis of the Data

The Chi-Square test was used to analyze the data in terms of these selected controls.¹ A relationship was considered "significant," if the probability of the Chi-Square was .10 or lower. Each factor was run against all the questions used in testing the two hypotheses. In addition, each control was run against the other three, in an effort to determine their degree of association. Chi-Square tests were converted into contingency coefficients to ascertain the degree of correlation among the controls. A decision

¹The procedure for determining Chi-Square $\chi^2 = \sum \frac{f - f'}{f'}$ (where f = observed frequency, f' = expected frequency)^f followed that described by G. Udny Yule and M. G. Kendall, An Introduction to the Theory of Statistics (13th edition, revised; London: Charles Griffin, 1948), pp. 413-433.

was made to retain each control, if they were not correlated above .80 (corrected contingency coefficient).²

Relationships Among the Control Variables

All the controls were retained because in each instance \bar{c} was less than .80. However, some high associations were found. Older representatives received significantly more votes than did the younger men (Table XXII). As might be expected, a reputation usually takes considerable time to develop. However, as Table XXIII indicates, there was no association between age and position. Of some significance is the comparatively low percentage of high influentials occupying low positions. Like influence, advances in the union hierarchy require time to be realized.

TABLE XXII

AGE DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF INFLUENCE

Age Level	Influence Level		
	High	Low	Total
Old	65%	32%	46%
Young	35	68	54
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	17	22	39
$\chi^2 = 4.3$	$p = .05 - .02$	$c = .31$	$\bar{c} = .49$

²The formula used for computing c was $c = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}}$.
The correction for \bar{c} was $c = \frac{c}{t_r t_c}$.

Both formulas are taken from Thomas C. McCormick, Elementary Social Statistics (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1941), pp.206-207. The use of \bar{c} was arbitrary since there were not enough cells for a true conversion to c .

TABLE XXIII
LEVEL OF UNION POSITION FOR AGE GROUPS

Age Level	Position			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Old	44%	54%	38%	46%
Young	56	46	62	54
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	18	13	8	39
$\chi^2 = .57$	$p = .70-.80$	$c = .12$	$\bar{c} = .17$	

Table XXIV demonstrates no relationship is indicated between age and representation in community organizations. Both young and old men appear as community representatives of labor. Table XXV reveals a significant positive relationship between union position and votes received as a labor influential. As expected, influence attends the higher position.

TABLE XXIV
AGE COMPOSITION OF LABOR'S COMMUNITY
REPRESENTATIVES

Age Level	Representatives	Non-Representatives	Total
Old	53%	41%	46%
Young	47	59	54
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	17	22	39
$\chi^2 = .60$	$p = .50-.30$	$c = .12$	$\bar{c} = .14$

TABLE XXV
POSITION HELD BY THE INFLUENCE LEVEL
OF LABOR OFFICIALS

Influence Level	Position Level			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
High	72%	23%	13%	44%
Low	28	67	87	56
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	18	13	8	39
$\chi^2 = 11.7$	$p < .01$	$c = .48$	$\bar{c} = .70$	

A slight positive association between position and organizational representation is revealed in Table XXVI, with organizational representation increasing from the low to the high position. Community spokesmen for labor, in short, are often drawn from the upper echelon of the union hierarchy.

Also, as Table XXVII shows, a strong position association exists between organizational representation and influence, with the high influentials representing the bulk of labor's community representatives. Influence thus appears to be a function of three factors: age, position, and organizational representation.

TABLE XXVI
POSITION LEVEL ACCORDING TO ORGANIZATIONAL
REPRESENTATION

Organizational Representative	Position Level			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Yes	61%	31%	25%	44%
No	39	69	75	56
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	18	13	8	39
$\chi^2 = 4.3$	$p = .20-.10$		$c = .31$	$\bar{c} = .46$

TABLE XXVII
ORGANIZATIONAL REPRESENTATION ACCORDING
TO INFLUENCE LEVEL

Influence Level	Organizational Representative		Total
	Yes	No	
High	76%	22%	44%
Low	24	78	56
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	17	22	39
$\chi^2 = 13.3$	$p < .01$	$c = .504$	$\bar{c} = .79$

Intercorrelations Between Responses and Controls

The hypothesis will be recalled that the older, the more influential, the high position holders, and the representatives in community organizations would view the community power structure as less management-dominated than their counterparts. Carrying this line of reasoning over into the second hypothesis, these four groups would tend to see labor as being within the power structure, while the younger, the low influentials, the low position holders, and the non-representatives would view labor as a tangential association. The following tables present those questions where a control was apparently operating to influence the response obtained to some degree; i.e. where it affected the perception of power or cleavage. The responses are labeled as showing either the presence or absence of cleavage and in the case of power, whether management or labor power is indicated.

Cleavage was revealed in answer to two questions asked of the respondents. One concerned organizations or activities in which the respondent felt labor should participate, but in which it was currently inactive. The other concerned management-labor agreement as to what were the important community issues. In both questions, perception of cleavage was significantly associated with a particular control variable. The findings indicate that more cleavage was perceived by the high influential, the high position-holders, and the organizational representatives, contrary to the various hypotheses formulated.

The results of Table XXVIII run contrary to the hypothesis that "high" influentials would see less cleavage than "low" influentials. Indeed, the reverse tendency appears to be true, for the "high" influentials more often than "low" influentials perceived labor as a tangential association. In answer to the question of what organizations labor should be participating in but is not, the high groups named organizations much more frequently than did the low group.

TABLE XXVIII
PERCEPTION OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT CLEAVAGE
ACCORDING TO INFLUENCE LEVEL OF
LABOR RESPONDENTS

Perception	Influence Level		Total
	High	Low	
No cleavage	24%	59%	44%
Cleavage	75	41	56
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	17	22	39
$\chi^2 = 4.9$	$p = .05-.02$		

Question: Are there organizations or activities in the Lansing area in which you feel labor should participate but does not?

Similar conclusions can be drawn from Table XXIX which also refutes the hypothesis that representatives in community organizations perceive less cleavage than do

non-representatives. Again there is a slight tendency for community representatives of labor to see cleavage more often than the non-representatives, for the former indicated more often than the latter that labor was not participating in various organizations in which it should.

TABLE XXIX
LABOR-MANAGEMENT CLEAVAGE PERCEIVED BY
LABOR REPRESENTATIVES ACCORDING TO
ORGANIZATIONAL REPRESENTATION

Perception	Representation		Total
	Yes	No	
No cleavage	24%	59%	44%
Cleavage	76	41	56
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	17	22	39
$\chi^2 = 4.9 \quad p = .05-.02$			

Question: Are there organizations or activities in the Lansing area in which you feel labor should participate but does not?

Finally, in Table XXX there is a slight tendency for those in high positions to perceive cleavage more often than those in middle or low positions. This again is contrary to the hypothesis formulated. Those holding high positions were less sure than those in lower positions that management would agree with labor as to the importance of community issues.

TABLE XXX

CLEAVAGE PERCEIVED BETWEEN LABOR AND MANAGEMENT
BY POSITION WITHIN THE UNION

Perception	Position			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
No cleavage	56%	100%	75%	75%
Cleavage	44	-	25	25
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	16	12	8	36
$\chi^2 = 7.00$	$p = .05-.02$			

Question: Would community representatives of management generally agree that these are the most important issues?

These findings with regard to labor as a tangential association exhibit a strain of consistency which was expected to be found, but not in the expected direction. It was assumed that degree of influence within union ranks as measured by such factors as position would be carried over to the respondent's image of the community power structure. It was reasoned that his participation in the community as "spokesman" for labor would result in his having more favorable image of the power structure. Thus labor and management would be viewed more as power equals in the community, and correspondingly, labor would be considered within the power structure rather than without.

However, as has been revealed, it is precisely these groups, which tend to see labor as tangential to the power structure rather than within it. It is quite possible that the reception given these groups in community organizations has resulted in their "realistic," albeit unfavorable, imagery. As new participants in community affairs, they have not been able to identify the interests of labor with those of other community groups, particularly when the other groups hold the balance of power and often times reject such an attempt by labor.

With regard to management domination of the community power structure, two questions elicited responses supporting all but one of the various hypotheses offered. Asked to compare the relative influence of management and labor, the respondents attributed greater power to the former. Similarly, when asked to name a group of community leaders to sponsor a community project, the informants again perceived management superiority judged in terms of the preponderance of management names submitted. With respect to the specific hypotheses, less management power was perceived by organizational representatives and high influentials. In listing community leaders the high position holders included more labor names than did the median and low groups. This also was interpreted as the highs viewing the power structure as less management-dominated compared to those in lower union positions. However, the high position group also listed the

name of Martin Karnas, newspaper publisher, more frequently than did the other two groups. This was interpreted as a view of high management-concentration of power on the part of the highs as compared to the median and low groups, a finding contrary to the original hypothesis.

Table XXXI gives slight support to the hypothesis that organizational representatives of labor see the community power structure as less management dominated than do non-representatives. One-third of the representatives compared labor's power favorably with management, while only one-tenth of the non-representatives did so. Here participation in community organizations has apparently effected a more favorable image of management influence.

TABLE XXXI

POWER ATTRIBUTED TO MANAGEMENT BY LABOR
ACCORDING TO ORGANIZATIONAL
REPRESENTATION

Perception of Power	Representation		Total
	Yes	No	
Greater power of management	67%	90%	81%
Labor equal or more power	33	10	19
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	15	21	36

$$X^2 = 3.2 \quad p = .10-.05$$

Question: How would you compare the relative influence of management and labor in community affairs in Lansing?

Table XXXII gives a different dimension of the respondent's imagery of the community power structure. It was assumed that the name of Martin Karnas would epitomize management-domination in community affairs to those who mentioned him, since he was frequently mentioned in connection with many questions. Certainly, all respondents would agree that Karnas was highly influential in community affairs, whether they placed him on the list of influentials or not. In brief, he was "Mr. Business." It was arbitrarily assumed that those respondents who included his name on the list of community influentials viewed the power structure as concentrated in the hands of a small group, headed by Karnas. Conversely, those who omitted his name saw management power as more diffuse and less effective or pervasive in community activities. Table XXXII offers evidence rejecting the hypothesis that the high group would tend to perceive less management power. The high position group sees concentrated management power, the medium group diffuse management power.

In this instance, the experiences of the "high" group in community activities have apparently effected a less favorable image of management power. Their greater experience in the power structure enables them to pinpoint the opposition and to hold a conception of greater management power, as the result of seeing it "in action."

TABLE XXXII

POWER ATTRIBUTED TO MANAGEMENT BY LEVEL
OF POSITION WITH THE UNION

Perception of Power	Position			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
Concentrated management power--Martin Karnas group	78%	39%	63%	62%
Diffuse management power--other business spokesmen	22	61	37	38
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	18	13	8	39

$$x^2 = 4.9 \quad p = .10-.15$$

Question: If you were responsible for a major project, which was before the community that required decision by a group of leaders that nearly everyone would accept, which ten would you include on this list?

Table XXXIII offers additional support to the hypothesis that those in high labor positions have a more tolerant view of the community power structure. The "highs" tend to include labor names in the list of community influentials, while the "medium" group tends to omit them. Similarly, in Table XXXIV the high influential labor respondents tend more often to include labor names than do the low influentials.

TABLE XXXIII
POWER ATTRIBUTED TO MANAGEMENT BY LEVEL
OF POSITION WITHIN THE UNION

Perception of Power	Position			Total
	High	Medium	Low	
(Management Power)--No labor name given	17%	69%	37%	39%
(Labor Power)--Labor name given	83	31	63	61
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	18	13	8	39
$\chi^2 = 8.8$ $p = .02-.01$				

Question: If you were responsible for a major project which was before the community that required decision by a group of leaders that nearly everyone would accept, which ten would you include on this list?

TABLE XXXIV
POWER ATTRIBUTED TO MANAGEMENT BY HIGH
AND LOW INFLUENCE GROUPS

Reply	Influence Level		Total
	High	Low	
(Management Power)--No labor name given	18%	55%	39%
(Labor Power)--Labor name given	82	45	61
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%
Number of Cases	17	22	39
$\chi^2 = 5.5$ $p = .02-.01$			

Question: If you were responsible for a major project which was before the community that required decision by a group of leaders nearly everyone would accept, which ten would you include on this list?

Summary

Some remarks are in order concerning the apparent contradictions manifested in the above distributions. With respect to cleavage, the hypotheses are uniformly rejected by the data. However, with respect to power, all are substantiated with the one exception.

There remains the question of why those holding high union positions perceive more cleavage between management and labor, yet view labor's power as relatively higher than do their counterparts. One possible explanation is that their experiences in community activities have been such that they have emphasized management-labor differences, while at the same time reinforcing their image of labor's own power potential. Evidently, labor has not yet successfully penetrated the power structure to the point where the differences between it and other groups are simply those of degree rather than of kind. It is understandable that the divergencies between labor and management would be spotlighted as the former attempts to become a "working member" within the community power structure. These differences would be particularly impressed upon those union leaders representing labor in the power structure.

The fact remains, however, that labor has enjoyed considerable success in at least entering the power structure, if its representation in various community organizations is any criterion by which to judge. Hence, a

feeling of power could develop simply out of this fact. Whether labor's influentials feel that such participation is furthering labor's interests is another matter. As newcomers who have proven labor's power by entering community organizations, the view may be held that labor's goals might best be achieved outside community ranks. This image could obtain even though the influentials express a desire to enter still more community organizations, for this obviously raises labor's prestige in the community and is thus not without benefit.

Lacking the skills of the upper echelon, the lower labor influentials see less cleavage, contrary to the hypothesis originally formulated. In brief, their lack of knowledge, apparently makes them less aware of labor-management differences. However, as was hypothesized, this contributed to their imagery of management-domination in the power structure.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

What Is Labor's Image

The present study has been concerned with labor's image of its place in the community power structure. Since the investigation has concerned itself essentially with attitudes, the following description is limited to what the informants think the community power structure to be and labor's role in it, not what actually prevails. Such a description may provide clues to the actual behavior which labor manifests in its community involvement. A group's actions are in large measure predicated upon the image which it holds of other groups with which it interacts. Thus much "irrational" behavior is rendered more meaningful.

This is not to say that no factual information was obtained, for the preceding chapters contain most objective data on the behavior of the informants. Important community problems were noted, and to some extent the machinery by which they were resolved was indicated. Thus not only the structural aspects, but the functional concerns of community power were considered; i.e. organizations and individuals concerned with community power were cited as well as their interrelationships.

A number of attitudes may be said to comprise labor's perception of its role in the community. First of all, labor admits it needs the cooperation of management in resolving community issues. At present community decisions are perceived as being made primarily by a small group from management. Correspondingly, labor feels excluded from many community organizations which it perceives as being management-dominated. Nevertheless, labor does credit itself with some influence on the outcome of community issues and sees itself as one of the influential organizations in the city. Similarly, a few labor representatives are considered to be community influentials.

Although minimizing its influence in the community, labor did not clearly view itself as being an "outside" group. Its perception of community issues was thought to coincide with that of management. Differences between management and labor regarding community issues were seen as revolving around methods of solution rather than ultimate objectives. Both groups were perceived as having important economic stakes in their community participation. Labor expressed an eagerness to increase its community involvement, and saw its participation in community affairs as being less motivated by narrow economic interests, compared to management.

Significantly, labor viewed Lansing as a "good" union town, although they had a less favorable image of the community power structure. Lansing was considered a "good"

town because in the area of collective bargaining, it was felt that the union was dealing with management on an equal footing. This position of strength did not carry over into the community power structure, however.

The imbalance perceived by labor has seemingly engendered a striving to correct what it considers to be an inequitable situation. It wants to increase both its community involvement and community power. The perception of its subordinate position vis-a-vis management in community activities has not resulted in attitudes of futility. Nor has labor developed a militant attitude although this could easily be interpreted from its present philosophy of community participation.

The fact that labor wants to be included on various community endeavors is better explained by its long history of non-involvement rather than by any desire to dominate the community. Labor's historic desire for status continues. It has long had some economic power, but this was not enough to give it social recognition. With legal recognition of its collective bargaining rights, the next step was to obtain respectability in the eyes of the community, to show that it had earned its place so to speak. Hence, the union turned to community activities. The aura of disrepute surrounding its bargaining function made the union's entrance into the community arena especially difficult. Their motives are still highly suspect. For its part, labor is

also highly suspicious of others whom they feel are purposely preventing them from participating in community affairs.

One might describe labor's present attitude as somewhat opportunistic. Feeling somewhat devoid of community influence, labor tries to "get what it can." What influence it does have seems to be perceived as largely negative in character, i.e. labor can protest or invalidate decisions, but cannot make them. As a result it will continue in this role until such time that its penetration in community organizations is sufficient to enable it to have an equal voice in making decisions. This "wait and see" attitude is somewhat tempered with caution, for the drive for status could hardly afford to appear as an intemperate, militant posture.

As an "underdog" in local structures it is noteworthy that labor has not professed a desire to align itself with other community groups. Community power was perceived as a bi-polar relation of labor versus management. Various "non-partisan" organizations were perceived to be dominated largely by management representatives and, as such, were not considered allies of labor.

Further Topics for Investigation

The limitations inherent in the present research preclude discussion of the labor image. Both size and composition of the sample do not allow room for widespread

generalizations regarding how sub-groups perceive the place of labor in the community. All subsequent findings are subject to rather severe qualifications. Neither labor nor management can be considered "typical," if one demands precise usage of the term. The present sample contained a majority of industrial union representatives. Furthermore, the respondents represented, for the most part, a non-mobile work force within the community. One of the most important features of the sample was that it consisted of labor influentials rather than the "average" rank-and-file members. The effect of these factors must be determined before one can speak of the labor image. Subsequent research can thus yield many bases of comparison with the current study. How does the average union member perceive the union's role in the community? How does the imagery of migratory workers compare with that of stable workers? How would craft union representatives differ from industrial union leaders?

Still other questions would arise if one considered a management group different from the one perceived in the present study. It is not likely that a bi-polar perception of the community power would obtain in a larger city such as Detroit or Seattle. Power was much more localized in the eyes of the Lansing informants than it might be in a study in a larger city where the question "Who has the power?" is less easily answered. Also, in the current investigation, labor-management relations in collective

bargaining were viewed as quite satisfactory, a fact which partially carried over into the imagery of the community power structure. This raises the rather obvious question regarding the image held if the reverse situation prevailed, i.e. if there were labor-management strife in collective bargaining.

The community power structure has only been considered from the viewpoint of one of its participants. To broaden understanding the image of management must also be considered, for its actions are also conditioned by how it views labor. The present study has provided only a few clues as to how management considers the role of labor in community activities. Labor's entering wedge into the community arena could engender a number of images, which can be determined in future research.

Contributions to Theory

The basic dichotomy between economic and social power made at the beginning of this study appears to have been substantiated. "Power," broadly conceived, has various determinants and can be divided accordingly. Community power is not necessarily determined by "wealth," for the ability to influence community decisions on the part of labor was severely curtailed, and no one would deny that labor has resources sufficient to give it power in an economic sense. Economic power alone, however, was not enough to make labor influential in community affairs. This is

not to say that the major influential groups in Lansing did not also possess economic power, but in addition they also enjoyed a high degree of status, an element which labor lacked.

The low prestige of labor presents a somewhat paradoxical situation. Prestige accrues to a group by virtue of its position in a stratification system. It is the basis of what has been called social power. The problem for labor has been to increase its power and influence by raising its prestige in the wider community. Only in this way could it successfully compete with management in the community power structure. However, labor's relative lack of prestige to begin with, has prevented it from exercising decisive influence in the community. A certain degree of prestige is needed before a group can wield legitimate power in the community. The question becomes, "How labor can prove its 'right' to wield social power in the community?" Indeed, how does any group become influential in the community?

To say that position determines status does not answer the question, but gives rise to the complex problem of how the position was originally assigned. If labor is to improve its position in the stratification hierarchy, it must know on what basis such a position is assigned. Historical precedence has assigned labor a low position because of the negative overtones surrounding its bargaining

tactics. In this sense, one could say that labor's status has been determined by its achievements in the economic sphere. To the detriment of labor these "achievements" have been negatively appraised by other groups, as having gained power through coercion rather than through "honorable" means.

Contrariwise, management's achievements have been evaluated "positively" in the sense that management has been viewed by itself and others as contributing to the economic well-being of the community. Management, like other segments of the community has been defined as the "victim" of strikes. Thus the carry-over from collective bargaining has enabled management to ally its interests with those of "the community," while labor could not easily do so. The latter's interests were often seen as conflicting with those of "the community."

Finally, this raises the problem as to what groups make up the community for whose recognition labor is striving. It would appear that such groups must necessarily be higher in prestige than labor, for labor is trying to emulate the behavior of groups whose evaluation are important for bestowing prestige. Prestige can come to labor only through the deference accorded it by groups which themselves are higher in prestige. Accordingly, labor must look to the middle and upper status groups, both of which are identified with management. Consequently, labor would model its community participation after these groups.

However, the determinants of social power while often described in such terms as status, prestige, or wealth are not readily discernible. Status is seen as being related to the evaluation of a group's behavior which, in the case of labor, means a low status level. When labor deals with non-economic concerns, its actions are usually not judged in their own right but rather through the reputation gained from the economic sphere. Because of this, labor's attempt to move up the stratification hierarchy, and into the community power structure has proved especially difficult. The Lansing case has amply illustrated labor's attempt to erase the stigma attributed to its economic function by becoming active in community affairs. However, activity and influence in community affairs are two different things, and labor has not attained the latter precisely because of the stigma which has been attached to it.

Social power cannot be usurped by a group as is the case with economic power. In essence, it is bestowed upon a group, whereas economic power is exerted with material and organizational resources.¹ Management has been successful in defining itself as creating wealth, while defining labor as "taking" it. As a result social power has occurred to the former but not the latter. Consequently

¹Hans Speier, "Honor and the Social Structure," Social Research, 2 (February, 1953), 74-97.

the contributions which labor can make to general community welfare have not been appreciated or accepted. This dilemma has engendered feelings of ambivalence and futility and lack of direction on the road to community influence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakke, E. Wight. "Why Workers Join Unions," Personnel, 22 (July, 1945), 37-46.
- Beck, Duane. An Historical Study of Organized Labor's Participation in Community Chest and Council Activities in Lansing, Michigan. Unpublished Project Report, Department of Social Work, Michigan State University, 1955.
- Bell, Daniel. "Labor's New Man of Power," Fortune, June, 1953, pp. 148-62.
- Chalmers, W. E., M. K. Chandler, L. L. McQuitty, R. Stagner, D. E. Wray, and D. M. Derber. Labor-Management Relations in Illini City. Champaign, Illinois: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, 1954.
- Chamberlain, N. W. Collective Bargaining. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951.
- Commons, John R. and Associates. History of Labor in the United States, Vols. I and II. New York: Macmillan Company, 1926.
- Cook, Alice. "Labor's Search for its Place in the Community: The Role of a Professional Community Consultant," The Journal of Educational Sociology, 29 (December, 1955) [Reprint], 173-183.
- Dulles, Foster Rhea. Labor in America: A History. Revised edition. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1955.
- Durkheim, Emile. The Division of Labor in Society. Trans. by G. Simpson. Glenco: The Free Press, 1949.
- Faulkner, Harold U. and Mark Starr. Labor in America. Revised edition. New York: Harper and Bros., 1955.
- Form, William H. and Harry K. Dansereau. "Union Member Orientations and Patterns of Social Integration," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 11 (October, 1957), 3-12.

Ginzberg, Eli. The Labor Leader: An Exploratory Study. New York: MacMillan Company, 1948.

Gouldner, Alvin W. Studies in Leadership. New York: Harper and Bros., 1950.

Gulick, Charles A. and Melvin K. Bers. "Insight and Illusion in Perlman's Theory of the Labor Movement," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 6 (July, 1953), 510-531.

Hart, C. W. M. "Industrial Relations Research and Social Theory," The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 15 (February, 1949), 53-73.

Henry, David. "One Hundred Years of Labor in Politics," in The House of Labor: Internal Operations of American Unions. Edited by J. B. S. Hardman and Maurice Neufeld. New York: Prentice-Hall Company, 1951. Pp. 90-112.

Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1952.

Imberman, A. A. "Labor Leaders and Society," Harvard Business Review, 28 (January, 1950), 52-60.

Lansing State Journal, November 5, 1957.

Lester, Richard A. Labor and Industrial Relations: A General Analysis. New York: MacMillan Co., 1951.

McCormick, Thomas C. Elementary Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1941.

McKee, James. "Status and Power in the Industrial Community," American Journal of Sociology, 58 (January, 1953), 364-370.

_____. "Organized Labor and Community Decision-Making: A Study in the Sociology of Power." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, 1953.

Mills, C. Wright. The New Men of Power: America's Labor Leaders. New York: Harcourt, Brace Co., 1948.

Perlis, Leo. "Unions and Community Services, the CIO Community Services Program," in The House of Labor: Internal Operations of American Unions. Edited by J. B. S. Hardman and Maurice Neufeld. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951. Pp. 333-340.

Perlman, Selig. A Theory of the Labor Movement. New York: MacMillan Company, 1928.

Perlman, Selig and Philip Taft. Labor Movements, Vol. IV, 1896-1932. New York: MacMillan Company, 1935.

Peterson, Florence. American Labor Unions: What They Are and How They Work. New York: Harper and Bros., 1945.

Phelps, Orme W. "Community Recognition of Union Leaders," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 7 (April, 1954), 419-433.

Sayles, Leonard R. and George Strauss. The Local Union: Its Place in the Industrial Plant. New York: Harper and Bros., 1955.

Selekman, Benjamin. Labor Relations and Human Relations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1947.

Speier, Hans. "Honor and the Social Structure," Social Research, 2 (February, 1953), 74-97.

Stagner, Ross. The Psychology of Industrial Conflict. New York: Wiley and Sons, Co., 1956.

Starr, Mark. "Role of Union Organization," in Industry and Society. Edited by William F. Whyte. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1946. Pp. 148-167.

Sturmthal, Adolf. "Comments on Selig Perlman's 'A Theory of the Labor Movement'," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 4 (July, 1951), 483-496.

Taft, Philip. "Theories of the Labor Movement," in Industrial Relations Research Association, Interpreting the Labor Movement (1952), pp.1-38.

Tagliacozzo, Daisy. "Trade Union Government, Its Nature and Its Problems: A Bibliographical Review, 1944-1945," American Journal of Sociology, 61 (May, 1956), 554-581.

Tannenbaum, Frank. A Philosophy of Labor. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951.

Weber, Max. "Class, Status, and Power," From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Trans. and Eds. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford Press, 1946. Pp. 180-195.

Whitehead, Thomas. Leadership in a Free Society.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Yule, G. Udney and M. G. Kendall. An Introduction to the
Theory of Statistics. Thirteenth edition, revised.
London: Charles Griffin, 1948.

ROOM USE ONLY

14 Jun 59

~~JUN 10 1960~~

~~JUN 10 1960~~

~~AUG 25 1960~~

~~AUG 5 1961~~