

1967

Omaha Unemployment Feasibility Study: Final Report

Larry D. Barnett
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Kenneth Root
University of Nebraska at Omaha

George Helling
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cparpubarchives>

 Part of the [Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs Commons](#)

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Barnett, Larry D.; Root, Kenneth; and Helling, George, "Omaha Unemployment Feasibility Study: Final Report" (1967). *Publications Archives, 1963-2000*. 27.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cparpubarchives/27>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for Public Affairs Research at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications Archives, 1963-2000 by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

OMAHA UNEMPLOYMENT FEASIBILITY STUDY:
FINAL REPORT

Prepared by:

Dr. Larry D. Barnett, Project Director
Department of Sociology

Dr. George C. Helling, Chairman
Department of Sociology

Dr. Richard Nicholson
Department of Psychology

Mr. Kenneth A. Root
Department of Sociology

Dr. Russell A. Snyder
Department of Economics

Presented by:

Dr. Elton S. Carter, Dean
Graduate College

June, 1967

(Reprinted July, 1970)

Center for Urban Affairs
University of Nebraska System

The Center for Urban Affairs is pleased to make this material available to you. We would appreciate credit for quotations, paraphrases, or use of any part of this publication.

The research reported here was designed to test the feasibility of a practical approach to the reduction of unemployment, particularly among Negroes.

The need for the particular kind of emphasis used in this approach was recently stated by the director of the U. S. Employment Service in pointing out the need to obtain

. . . more understanding of the things that make the community tick, that keep it from solving its problems, and that lead to the discovery of the real barriers to coordination¹

In the past, there have been two types of research applied to the unemployment problem. The first might be called the "academic" and involves delineating the relationships that exist between a relatively few "causes," on the one hand, and some "effect," on the other. The second type of research might best be labelled the "statistical," for its focus is on ascertaining frequencies and rates. The information provided in such government publications as the Monthly Labor Review and the several "subemployment" surveys in city slums² is of this type to the extent that the information is on the number and percentage of people unemployed, number and percentage of people earning various levels of income, number and percentage of people employed in different occupations,

¹Frank H. Cassell and Charles E. Odell, "Private Sector Involvement in Manpower Development for the Disadvantaged" (mimeographed, 1966), p. 6.

²For example: Sub-Employment in the Slums of Boston; Sub-Employment in the Slums of Cleveland; Sub-Employment in the Slums of Los Angeles; Sub-Employment in the Slums of New Orleans; Sub-Employment in the Slums of New York; Sub-Employment in the Slums of Oakland; Sub-Employment of the Slums of Philadelphia; Sub-Employment in the Slums of St. Louis; Sub-Employment in the Slums of San Francisco; Sub-Employment in the Slums of San Antonio.

etc. The value of this type of research has been demonstrated in documenting the existence of severe unemployment problems in specific sectors of American society.

Review of the literature reveals that the academic type of research suggests a set of factors which appear to be related to the rate of unemployment -- among these are alienation, skills, identity and self-concept, and social organization.¹ Although valuable in delineating specific factors believed to be associated with a given phenomenon, academic research does not explain adequately the interrelationships that exist among those factors.

The war on poverty is being fought with knowledge acquired primarily through academic research. Thus it is no accident, in the words of a consultant to the Office of Economic Opportunity, that "the war on poverty has shown disappointing results in finding jobs for the slum dwellers of our large cities."²

Omaha is not an island in the sea of society. The growing pains experienced from rapid urban expansion and industrialization are not unique to this city alone. What is distinctive, however, is the approach advanced in this report; an approach designed to analyze a host of interrelated factors underlying current unemployment. Effectiveness in solving unemployment problems rests upon research with a systems focus, but little if any research with this focus appears in the pertinent literature of social engineering -- an essentially new field.

¹A complete enumeration of the factors, and the research that exists on each, is contained in Larry D. Barnett et al., The Omaha Unemployment Study: A Proposal for Further Research (Omaha Nebraska: University of Omaha Urban Studies Center, 1967), pp. 5-25

²Edward Moscovitch, "Finding Jobs for the Poor," The New Republic, November 5, 1966, p. 16.

In this kind of research, the phenomenon under investigation is conceived as a network of interrelated, interdependent elements -- a system of interacting and mutually supporting parts, each one of which contributes to the functioning of the whole at the same time that it is dependent upon its relationships with the other parts in order to continue functioning itself. With the focus being on the interrelationships existing among known factors contributing to unemployment, taken together, these factors can be viewed as constituting a distinct "force field."

As reported here, this approach emphasizes the mapping of various perspectives on a system of forces to determine the similarities and differences among those perspectives held by those responsible for taking the kind of social action which can alleviate the problem. This emphasis is grounded in five premises:

- (1) Unemployment problems cannot be solved without coordinated action among organizations in the community.
- (2) Communication is necessary for the development and maintenance of such coordinated action.
- (3) Successful coordinated action requires consistent perspectives on the problem by the prospective parties to action.
- (4) The inconsistency of perspectives can be reduced through communication.
- (5) The parties to prospective action must possess sufficient motivation to solve the problem if any solution is to be achieved.

In order to maximize the coordination of efforts by responsible leaders representing the various organizations involved in unemployment problems, it is necessary to overcome, displace, or re-direct those

vested interests¹ which tend to inhibit collective social action. Successful social change programs in Omaha have demonstrated repeatedly that organizational representative must re-examine their own interests and intentions in the light of community goals.

The relative lack of information flow between provincially-oriented organizations suggests that the "real barriers to coordination" are the vested interests themselves.

That "what makes a community tick" lay largely in the consistency of perspectives is suggested by a series of experiments conducted in the field of social psychology which indicate that

Each person employs a number of dimensions (factors in perspective) when he considers a particular event. Which dimensions he will employ depends, to some extent, on his membership in various groups. He also assigns the particular event to a position on his dimensions that is, in part, determined by his group membership. . . . When persons A and B consider a particular event there will be overlap in their dimensions. The greater the overlap, the more likely it is that they will communicate. If A uses a dimension that B does not normally employ, B will understand what A is saying to the extent that some of his dimensions correlate with the dimensions used by A. B may also be able to understand A if he is acquainted with B's idiosyncratic dimensions and with the way B places events on these dimensions. Thus, for instance, B may be able to understand what A means by the word "God," though he does not believe in a Supreme Being. To the extent that A and B use the same dimensions and/or assign events to positions on these dimensions in similar ways, they will be successful in their communication and this will increase the interpersonal attraction between them.²

If the "real barriers to making a community tick" are the inconsistency of perspectives which prevent coordination, it is also the case that suitably-designed communication can be effective

¹The term "vested interest" should not be interpreted in an invective sense. Rather, it is used merely to describe a state of affairs resulting from the investment of personal resources, e.g., time, money and effort, into a given agency.

²Harry C. Triandis, "Some Determinants of Interpersonal Communication," Human Relations, 13 (1960), p. 286.

in increasing the similarities and decreasing the differences among the perspectives.¹ It is more likely that suitable communication can be designed when a systematic assessment has located the important interfaces in which inconsistent perspectives exist and has indicated the nature of the inconsistencies,

A remarkable fact about Omaha has been its history of community spirit in solving certain social problems. When a major meat-packing plant transferred its operations elsewhere a few years ago, for instance, a community-wide campaign was inaugurated that was relatively successful in finding and developing jobs for many of those thrown out of work.

But, like most, if not all other cities, Omaha has not yet shown the capability of solving unemployment and contingent problems at will.

In summary, the aim of this approach is to improve the relationship between job market and labor force. The procedure involved is twofold: First, a diagnoses must be made of existing employment conditions; second, drawing upon the past success of related programs, pertinent information must be put to work, in a systems manner, in order to reduce the inconsistencies of perspectives in the system of forces creating the problem.

¹S. I. Hayakawa, Language in Thought and Action (2nd ed.; New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1964), esp. ch. 1.

One crucial condition for communication to be effective in obtaining a convergence of perspectives is the existence of trust between the communicating parties. See Glen D. Mellinger, "Interpersonal Trust as a Factor in Communication," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52 (May 1956), pp. 304-309.

In turn, trust will be generated to the extent that each party is cognizant that every other party realizes success in task performance is contingent upon cooperation between the parties. See James L. Loomis, "Communication, the Development of Trust, and Cooperative Behavior," Human Relations, 12 (1959), pp. 305-315.

II

In June 1966, a contract was signed by the Nebraska Employment Service and the Municipal University of Omaha providing \$50,000 for the latter to conduct a study of unemployment in low-income, especially Negro areas of Omaha. From the experience acquired from an initial survey in August, it became evident to the project staff that the traditional academic and statistical forms of research would be relatively fruitless because they are not oriented directly toward action to reduce unemployment; but it appeared that a social engineering approach could be successfully instituted by conceptualizing the interacting forces as a system. Therefore, in October 1966, the decision was made to proceed with a systems type of research, with a focus upon social action to alleviate the problem.

On the basis of prior academic research, a delineation of the system of forces that appeared to be crucial in creating relatively high levels of unemployment resulted in the formulation of a basic interview schedule. This schedule was designed to map the various perspectives on the system of forces causing the problem, and to supply data in a form suitable for assessing the divergences in perspectives among parties responsible for alleviating the problem.

Because of limited resources, the interview schedule was restricted to testing the feasibility of the approach. Thus the number of different types of parties to be interviewed was limited to three -- employers, employment agents,¹ and Omaha residents -- with the last group divided into four subsets: Negro middle-income residents, white middle-income residents, Negro low-income residents, and white

¹Employment agents are organizations such as labor unions and employment services whose aim is to bring together employers and workers.

low-income residents. On the basis of the subsets of persons that were to be interviewed, four versions of the basic interview schedule were developed, one for each of the above subsets. The four interview schedules differed principally in terms of the point of view which the respondent was asked to take, in addition to his own, in answering the items; for instance, low-income residents were asked to respond to a series of items both from their own point of view and from the point of view they felt the typical employer would take.

In order to obtain an adequate sample of residents, two pairs of census tracts were selected on the basis of 1960 census data. In each pair, one census tract was predominantly Negro and one predominantly white. One pair, however, had a median income in 1959 within several hundred dollars of the median income that was less than half the median income for the city of Omaha.¹ The first pair provided mostly Negro and white middle-income residents, and the second pair provided principally Negro and white low-income residents.²

Residents were sampled by assigning a unique number to every address listed in the City Directory. Fifty residential addresses were

¹In each pair, the median incomes were within four dollars of each other. The middle-income tracts had median incomes of \$5018 and \$5022 while the low-income tracts had median incomes of \$2577 and \$2580. For Omaha as a whole, the median income in 1959 was \$5310.

²The dividing line for differentiating middle-income and low-income was a household income of \$4000 in 1966.

then selected from each tract through the use of a table of random numbers. Thus the selection procedure was simple random sampling.

Employers, too, were selected by random sampling. A list of all businesses in Omaha was available in the Urban Studies Center of the University of Omaha, and each business was assigned a different number. Using a table of random numbers, 125 were selected. These were approached by an interviewer and, if the business was determined to be an employer, the person in charge of hiring was interviewed.

With regard to employment agents, there were less than a dozen and a half in the city. Therefore, an attempt was made to interview an appropriate official of each such organization.

In interviewing at households, the respondent was the head of the household.¹ Explicit directions were given to the interviewers in training sessions on how to determine which person was the head of the household.

Interviewing had to be restricted to a three-week period (March 20th through April 6th). This was preceded by three weeks in which interviewers were trained and gained experience by conducting interviews with persons not in the final sample.² The necessity of restricting the interviewing in the final sample to three weeks was perhaps the single most important factor in reducing the completion rate, although the training and experience acquired by the interviewers prior to the "real run" was of

¹If an apartment house was selected, the head of the household in each dwelling unit in the building was interviewed.

²On the basis of these interviews, the interview schedules were revised to make them more precise and concise.

considerable help in partially offsetting this handicap.¹

Among residents, the completion rate was 55 percent; outright refusals to be interviewed accounted for an additional 14 percent. There was no significant difference in the refusal rate between lower- and middle-income residents; however, a significant difference in the refusal rate of white and Negro residents occurred, with white residents refusing about three times as frequently as Negroes.

Among employers, 38 percent of the attempted interviews were successfully completed; this was the lowest completion rate. However, while 26 percent refused to be interviewed, another 26 percent were never contacted because the three-week interviewing period had elapsed, and an additional 13 percent indicated that they were too busy to undertake the interview. Thus, of the three types of respondents, the time limit on interviewing appears to have been most detrimental to the completion of interviews with employers.

Among employment agents, the completion rate was 53 percent. An additional 35 percent indicated that they could not give up time for an interview.

In no case, then, did the completion rate exceed 60 percent! Therefore, generalizations should be interpreted accordingly.

¹Another helpful factor was the use of Negro interviewers for the Negro residents. The seeming hostility of much of the Negro community toward whites may have been circumvented in large measure by this technique.

III

Not all of the possible frequency distributions and cross-classifications were developed from the data inherent in the responses to the interview schedule. Instead, those aspects which seemed to offer the greatest promise in testing the feasibility of the approach were analyzed.

Although definite and important differences in perspectives were found between all respondent categories, the most outstanding conclusion is the divergence between employers and low-income workers. Not only do employers and low-income workers appear to live in different worlds, but there seems to be a marked tendency for each to be unable to project an accurate picture of the world of the other.

The specific findings from which this conclusion and others may be drawn are classified, for the sake of simplicity, into two general categories: data with an economic emphasis, and data with a social-psychological emphasis. Each will be examined in turn.

The economic focus of the interview schedule was in terms of the job market and the efficiency with which it functions. From the data analyzed, the following generalizations with an economic emphasis seemed to emerge:

- (1) Employers were significantly more likely than low-income household heads to believe that adequate job information is available to low-income workers in Omaha.
- (2) There were no significant differences between the respondent categories in terms of opinion regarding whether or not there was a shortage of jobs for low-income workers. (About two-thirds of the respondents in each group thought that there was not a job shortage.)

- (3) Employers were significantly less likely than employment agents to believe that the skill level of low-income workers is adequate for present and future job possibilities.
- (4) Low-income household heads were significantly more likely than employers and employment agents to believe that the prospects are good for low-income Negroes to move to better jobs.
- (5) There were no significant differences between the respondent categories in terms of opinion regarding whether Negroes have a fair chance to get and keep better jobs. (About half of the respondents in each category believed Negroes to have a fair chance.)
- (6) There were no significant differences between respondent categories in terms of opinion regarding whether there are sufficient openings in job training programs. (About 7 out of 10 respondents in each category believed that there are enough openings.)
- (7) Low-income household heads were significantly less likely than middle-income household heads, employers, and employment agents to believe that persons receive enough income from training allowances to get by while undergoing job (re)training.
- (8) There was substantial uniformity between the respondent categories in their views of present and future job opportunities in the various industries.

Data with a social-psychological emphasis may be best described as concerned with the individual's outlook with regard to his relationships with other individuals and groups in his environment. This category of data consisted of three standardized tests.

The first test is the Social Reaction Inventory, which measures the degree to which individuals feel that they themselves can control the reinforcements (rewards and punishments) they receive. Persons who score low on the test are considered to be "internally oriented," i.e., they believe that accrued reinforcements are a function of their own actions. On the other hand, those achieving high scores are "externally oriented" in that they feel they are not masters of their own fate. Prior research indicates that internally-oriented individuals are more likely to prefer tasks requiring skill, whereas externally-oriented individuals tend to prefer "chance" or gambling tasks.

The results of the analysis of scores on the Social Reaction Inventory suggest the following generalizations:¹

- (1) Low-income household heads were relatively high in external orientation towards reinforcement significantly more often than employment agents, employers, and middle-income household heads. Between the latter three respondent categories, there were no significant differences in orientation towards reinforcement.
- (2) The actual level of external orientation among low-income household heads was significantly lower (i.e., the actual level of internal orientation was significantly higher) than that thought by middle-income household heads to characterize low-income workers.

¹The data from which these generalizations were developed appear in Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 in the Appendix.

- (3) The actual level of external orientation among low-income Negro household heads was significantly lower than that thought by employers to characterize low-income workers.
- (4) There was no significant difference between the level of external orientation actually characterizing low-income Negro household heads and the level thought by employment agents to prevail among low-income Negro workers.

The second instrument employed was the test of alienation developed by the sociologist, Leo Srole. A high score on this test has been found to indicate

feelings of uncertainty and pessimism, distrust bordering on suspicion, extreme pessimism about the future, cynicism about the motives of others, and a general perception of society as rapidly changing, with most people lonely, distrustful and unrelated to each other.¹

This instrument produced results which suggest the following generalizations:²

- (1) Low-income heads of households were significantly more likely to score high in alienation than middle-income household heads, employment agents, and employers.
- (2) Middle-income heads of households possessed a conception of the alienation level of low-income workers which did not differ significantly from the alienation level actually characterizing low-income household heads.
- (3) Employers and employment agents possessed a conception of the alienation level of low-income Negro workers that did not differ significantly from the alienation level actually characterizing low-income Negro household heads.
- (4) Low-income household heads believed that employers would score high in alienation significantly more often than employers actually achieved.

The third instrument employed, developed by sociologist Bernard Rosen, measured the degree to which the respondent accepted those forms of behavior which appear to facilitate achievement in our society: planning, geographical migration, and the belief that one can control his own destiny.

¹Elmer L. Struening and Arthur H. Richardson, "A Factor Analytic Exploration of the Alienation, Anomia, and Authoritarianism Domain," American Sociological Review, 30 (October 1965), p. 770.

²The data from which these four generalizations were developed are presented in tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 in the Appendix.

Using the Rosen Test of Achievement Norms, the following generalizations appeared:¹

- (1) Low-income household heads scored high in achievement norms significantly more frequently than middle-income household heads and employers.
- (2) Middle-income household heads were significantly more likely to score low in achievement norms than low-income household heads, employers, and employment agents.
- (3) Employment agents were as likely to score high (or low) in achievement norms as were low-income household heads and employers.
- (4) Middle-income household heads believed that low-income workers would score low in achievement norms significantly more often than low-income household heads actually scored.
- (5) Employers and employment agents did not differ significantly in their conception of the level of achievement norms of low-income Negro workers, but their conceptions consisted of low scores significantly more often than low-income Negro household heads actually scored.
- (6) Employers were characterized by high achievement norms significantly more often than low-income household heads believed they would.

¹The data from which these generalizations were discerned appear in tables 9, 10, 11, and 12 in the Appendix.

A "high" achievement norms score means adherence to those forms of behavior that seem to facilitate achievement, while a "low" score means nonadherence.

The preceding findings indicate substantial differences in the perspectives of the parties whose coordinated action is necessary if the unemployment problem is to be solved. Since a consistent set of perspectives is assumed to be a prerequisite for coordinated social action, the study suggests the need for the design of communication which will reduce the inconsistencies in perspectives between the concerned parties, particularly employers and low-income workers.

However, before such communication can be designed with the greatest possible degree of effectiveness, there must be (1) an assessment of the nature of the differences in perspectives that is more systematic and thorough than that conducted for this feasibility study, and (2) a determination of the conditions under which the existence of an accurate picture of the perspective of another is accompanied by an effective understanding, and action, leading to a solution of his problem.

To accomplish these goals, the following are advanced as possibilities for incorporation in a further study:¹

First, there should be a larger number of respondents in the sample in order to allow for a more refined analysis of the data gathered. Among other things, this will require a longer period of time for interviewing.

Second, the population from which the sample is drawn should be the entire Omaha-Council Bluffs metropolitan area. State and county

¹ See also Larry D. Barnett et al., The Omaha Unemployment Study: A Proposal for Further Research (Omaha, Nebraska: University of Omaha Urban Studies Center, 1967).

boundaries should be disregarded in order to include in the study the whole of the urban area which is involved in this problem.

Third, to gather the data necessary to achieve the goals indicated and yet not have to ask respondents to undertake an unfairly long interview, it is suggested that the sample be divided randomly into two or more segments, with each segment assigned a different portion of the interview schedule. Some token payment should be made to respondents, when residents, and respondent-selected charity for employers and employment agents.

Finally, there should be careful study of different forms of employment and employment seeking behavior (e.g., the different occupations, part-time versus full-time work, the different sources through which jobs are obtained) among different types of persons (e.g., household members as well as household heads, female as well as male household heads, older versus younger workers) in order to determine which of the three standardized tests most efficiently and accurately predict job seeking and performance among the many types of individuals in the Omaha area. This will allow for the selection of those low-income unemployed who offer the greatest promise for achieving that stability of employment which will pull them and their families out of poverty. The first stages of social action (including the above-mentioned communication) will probably be most profitable if it deals with the more-promising low-income unemployed. The experience gained from the more-promising will contribute to the effectiveness of the social action that will later deal with the less-promising or "hardcore unemployed."

Moreover, it is recommended that different scoring procedures be employed for the Srole Test of Alienation, and perhaps for the others, in order to determine the optimum weighting that should be given to each test item in order to achieve the greatest accuracy in prediction.

Although the finding that middle-income household heads were lowest in achievement norms needs to be explained in view of its inconsistency with prior research and existing theory, the Rosen Test of Achievement Norms appears to be potentially very fruitful for obtaining the kind of predictability desired.¹ The same is true for the Social Reaction Inventory. This potential promise appears to arise because the tests measure what the consequences of the interrelationships are among the factors outlined as responsible for the unemployment problem, whereas the Srole Test measures only one of the factors per se (namely, alienation). Thus, the Rosen Test and the Social Reaction Inventory are more consistent with a systems approach than is the Srole Test.

¹Harold L. Sheppard, "Worker Attitudes in Job Seeking," Employment Service Review (September 1966), pp. 51-52, 67.

APPENDIX

Table 1

Social Reaction Inventory: Mean Self Scores

Low-income household heads	Middle-income household heads	Employment agents	Employers
8.63	6.35	7.22	4.44

Table 2

Statistical Comparisons of Mean self Scores on Social Reaction Inventory

Comparisons	Differences	t	P
Employer -- low-income	-4.19	-5.12	≤.01
Agents -- low-income	-1.41	-3.85	≤.01
Middle-income -- low-income	-2.28	-3.16	≤.01
Agents -- employers	2.78	2.16	N.S.
Agents -- middle-income	.87	2.45	N.S.
Employer -- middle-income	-1.91	-2.39	N.S.

Table 3

Social Reaction Inventory

Type of Respondent and Perspective	Mean Score	Differ- ence	t	P
Low-income household head self-score (own perspective)	8.63			
Middle-income household heads conception of the typical low-income worker's perspective	12.39			
		3.76	3.98	$\leq .002$

Table 4

Social Reaction Inventory: Accuracy of Perception of Low-Income
Negro's Score

Type of Respondent and Perspective	Mean Score	Difference with low- income Negro's mean score	t	P
Low-income Negro household head own perspective	8.14			
Employers conception of the typical low- income Negro worker's Perspective	13.14	4.73	3.58	<.002
Employment agents conception of the typical low-income Negro worker's perspective	9.89	1.48	1.08	N.S.

Table 3

Srole Test of Alienation

Type of Respondent and Perspective	Score		
	High	Low	Total
I. Low-income residents own perspective	69% (N=22)	31% (N=10)	100% (N=32)
II. Middle-income residents own perspective	32% (N=8)	68% (N=17)	100% (N=25)
III. Employers own perspective	0% (N=0)	100% (N=29)	100% (N=29)
IV. Employment agents own perspective	11% (N=1)	89% (N=8)	100% (N=9)

Table as a whole: $p < .001$ Row-by-row Comparisons: I, II: $p = .005$ I, III: $p = .000$ I, IV: $p = .003$ II, III: $p = .001$ II, IV: $p = .186$ III, IV: $p = .24$

Table 6

Srole Test of Alienation

Type of Respondent and Perspective	Score		Total
	High	Low	
Low-income residents own perspective	69% (N=22)	31% (N=10)	100% (N=32)
Middle-income residents conception of the typical low-income worker's perspective	82% (N=28)	18% (N=6)	100% (N=34)

p = not significant

Table 7
Srole Test of Alienation

Type of Resident and Perspective	Score		Total
	High	Low	
Negro low-income residents own perspective	64% (N=14)	36% (N=8)	100% (N=22)
Employers conception of the typical low- income Negro worker's perspective	70% (N=19)	30% (N=8)	100% (N=27)
Employment agents conception of the typical low-income Negro worker's perspective	85% (N=6)	15% (N=1)	100% (N=7)

p = not significant

Table 8

Srole Test of Alienation

Type of Respondent and Perspective	Score		Total
	High	Low	
Low-income residents conception of the typical employer's perspective	52% (N=17)	48% (N=16)	100% (N=33)
Employers own perspective	0% (N=0)	100% (N=29)	100% (N=29)

$p < .001$

Table 9

Rosen Test of Achievement Norms

Type of Respondent and Perspective	Score		Total
	High	Low	
I. Low-income residents own perspective	78% (N=31)	22% (N=9)	100% (N=40)
II. Middle-income residents own perspective	58% (N=22)	42% (N=16)	100% (N=38)
III. Employers own perspective	97% (N=28)	3% (N=1)	100% (N=29)
IV. Employment agents own perspective	100% (N=9)	0% (N=0)	100% (N=9)

Table as a whole: $p < .001$ Row-by-row comparisons: I, III: $p = .023$ I, II: $p = .036$
 I, IV: $p = .1331$ II, III: $p = .0002$ II, IV: $p = .015$ III, IV: $p = .763$

Table 10

Rosen Test of Achievement Norms

Type of Respondent and Perspective	Score		Total
	High	Low	
Low-income residents own perspective	78% (N=31)	22% (N=9)	100% (N=40)
Middle-income residents conception of the typical low-income worker's perspective	13% (N=5)	87% (N=33)	100% (N=38)

$p < .001$

Table 11

Rosen Test of Achievement Norms

Type of Respondent and Perspective	Score		
	High	Low	Total
I. Negro low-income residents own perspective	72% (N=21)	28% (N=8)	100% (N=29)
II. Employers conception of the typical low-income Negro worker's perspective	41% (N=12)	59% (N=17)	100% (N=29)
III. Employment agents conception of the typical low-income Negro worker's perspective	44% (N=4)	56% (N=5)	100% (N=9)

Table as a whole:

 $p < .05$

Row-by-row comparisons:

I, II: $p = .013$ I, III: $p = .0999$ II, III: $p = .294$

Table 12

Rosen Test of Achievement Norms

Type of Respondent and Perspective	Score		Total
	High	Low	
Low-income residents conception of the typical employer's perspective	60% (N=24)	40% (N=16)	100% (N=40)
Employers own perspective	97% (N=28)	3% (N=1)	100% (N=29)

$p < .001$