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ABSTRACT

This study explored the effects of technical constraints, social isolation, education and income upon participation in formally organized associations by investigating membership, attendance at meetings, and number of leadership positions held in organizations.

One hundred and thirty two male industrial workers were interviewed. All respondents were residents of the city of Windsor, twenty-two years of age or over, and full time employees who had been working for at least one year.

It was hypothesized that: 1) the higher the technical constraints, the lower the membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations; 2) the higher the social isolation on the job, the lower the membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations; 3) social isolation will have a greater effect than will technical constraints; 4) the higher the income and the higher the education, the greater the membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations; 5) education will have a greater effect than either technical constraints or social isolation; 6) income will have a greater effect than either technical constraints or social isolation.

The study found that technical constraints had the greatest effect upon membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations. Education and income, in
that order, also correlated highly with the dependent variables. Social isolation was found to be the poorest predictor of membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between the type of work that an individual does and how he spends his leisure hours. Specifically, the focus of the study was on the effects of social isolation and technical job constraints on participation in organized associations.

For many years, sociologists and social scientists have speculated on and researched factors affecting leisure patterns of individuals. One of the earliest studies on leisure was carried out by Lundberg, Komarovsky, and McInerny in 1923. The study was titled The Amount and Uses of Leisure. It involved an analysis of 2,400 individuals grouped under various occupational headings. In this

---

1It is recognized that there are different definitions of leisure. The interested reader may refer to articles by Donald and Havighurst (1959), Weiss (1964), Giddens (1963), Selman (1965), Bell (1971), and a discussion by Parker (1972), for an understanding of the various definitions of leisure. Leisure, in this paper, is defined as "...time free from obligations either to self or to others - time in which to do as one chooses" (Parker, 1972: 77).

---

2These headings were: labour, white collar, professional and executive, housewives, unemployed, high school students, and college students.
study, the activities engaged in and the amount of time devoted to each activity was reported. It was found that each group examined varied in the amount of time spent on leisure activities. It was also discovered that each group had characteristically different patterns of behaviour. Although the study provided only tentative generalizations about the varying uses of leisure of different groups in the population, it was significant in that it was one of the first major attempts to study the relationship of leisure using sociological variables.

Mirra Komarovsky (1964), in a study titled The Voluntary Association of Urban Dwellers, discovered that: "Economic classes defined in terms of occupation and income differ greatly in extent of participation" in voluntary associations (1964: 689). Five classes were distinguished in the study. They were, from the lowest to the highest, the unskilled, the skilled, white collar, business, and professional. Komarovsky found that only 32 out of 100 unskilled workers belonged to any organization. At the other extreme, the professional men earning over $5,000, 98 per cent stated that they belonged to at least one organization. The data in this study also showed that the classes in between consistently increased in rate of belonging as they went up the economic scale.

Class, Leisure, and Social Participation (Reissman, 1954), was a study based upon a sample of white, male, native-born adults from the city of Evanston, Illinois. It
was an attempt to relate social class to participation in various activities. Class was determined by setting up a measure involving occupation, education, and income. The sample "...was divided into 'higher' and 'lower' class groups at the median of each of the three distributions and then compared, separately for each variable, on a number of items concerned with social participation and leisure activities" (1954: 79). The data indicated that differences in participation and leisure activities existed. Furthermore, this was true regardless of whether occupation, education, or income was used to measure class position. The higher class groups tended to show higher participation levels in most of the activities reported. Reissman's data showed that while the lower class group spent more time listening to the radio and watching television, the higher class people read more books and magazines, attended church more often, belonged to more organizations, attended with greater frequency, and tended more often to hold office in those organizations (1954: 81).

In Social Class Differences in the Uses of Leisure, Clyde White's (1955) thesis was that the use of leisure was a function of class position. White investigated several census tracts in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, using a sampling of families that was representative of income, education, racial composition, occupation, and age. He divided his sample into four classes, the upper-middle, the lower-middle, the upper-lower, and the lower-lower. Nine major categories
of leisure were identified and grouped under the headings of parks and playgrounds, community-chest services, church, museums, libraries, home, ethnic-racial organizations, lecture-study, and commercial amusements. White found that the most frequently used setting for leisure involvement was the home, with commercial amusements a close second. He found that there was much less involvement in community provided facilities such as parks and playgrounds, and community-chest agencies. This study found that the lower social classes generally made greater use of these facilities than the upper classes. White reported similar trends in church activities, museums, and ethnic-racial organizations while for library use "...home activities, and lecture-study courses the trend is reversed and decreases form the upper-middle downward" (1955:200). White carried this analysis further and discovered various patterns of leisure when he examined the age groups six to seventeen and eighteen and over. Although he found the general patterns of the younger groups to be similar for all classes except the lower-middle and lower-lower, White noted that uses of such leisure facilities as radios, phonographs, television, movies and taverns differed markedly in the older group. White believed that as one got older he settled into the ways of the class to which he belonged and chose his leisure activities accordingly. He stated:

It is clear that the tendency to choose leisure activities on the grounds of membership in a particular social class begins in adolescence and becomes more pronounced in maturity ... As
people get older and settle into the ways of
the class to which they belong, they choose
leisure activities which are congenial to their
class. The growing divergence between the uses
of leisure by the middle class and lower classes
is clear. Class differences are reflected by
young people but are not fixed until maturity.
(White, 1955: 204).

A study Urban Structure and Social Participation
(Axelrod, 1956) of 749 individuals found that 63 per cent of
the sample, which was representative of the Detroit area
population, were members of formal groups. The study found
that participation in formal groups varied for different
subgroups of the population. Regarding formal groups the
study discovered that (1) the higher the income, the more
likely it was that the individual was a member, (2) the
higher the education, the more likely it was that the indi-
vidual was a member, (3) the higher the status, as measured
by income, occupation, and education, the more likely it was
that the individual participated in community activities.
Regarding informal activities, Axelrod found that people
with exceptionally high status, high income, or some college
education were more likely to visit friends more often than
relatives. People with low status, low income, or low
education visited relatives more often than friends.

Alfred Clerke's (1956) study, Leisure and
Occupational Prestige, attempted to find out if there was a
systematic relationship between leisure styles and social
status and to determine whether or not the occupational
structure influenced how one spent his leisure time.
Respondents in this study were urban males of different
occupational levels. Using the North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale five different prestige levels were distinguished. Clarke found that significant differences existed between occupational prestige and leisure use. Ken on the highest prestige level were more frequently involved in such activities as attending theaters, concerts, special lectures, visiting museums or art galleries, going to movies, reading for pleasure, studying, or community service work. Those in the lowest prestige level most frequently watched television, went to the zoo, or baseball games, or to drive-in movies, went to a tavern, went fishing, went driving for pleasure, played poker and played with their children. Respondents in the middle occupational prestige level spent most of their leisure hours as spectators (41.3 per cent). Those in the highest and lowest levels reported that only about 25 per cent of their activities were of the spectator type.

Respondents were also asked what they would do if they had an extra free hour or two in the day. Responses are shown in Table I-I. Although differences in leisure behaviour were clearly related to prestige levels, Clarke concluded that new patterns of behaviour seemed to be emerging and called for rigorous research which would take into consideration political affiliations and economic and religious elements.
### TABLE I-I

**USE OF ADDED FREE TIME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Added Free Time</th>
<th>I*</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relax, rest, loaf, sleep</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read, study</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work at job</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work around house</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and children</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch television</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Class I is the highest prestige level; Class V the lowest. (Adapted from Alfred C. Clarke, 1956: 212)

Wendell Bell and Maryanne Force (1956) selected four census tracts in San Francisco for their study on **Neighbourhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations**. The four districts varied in economic level. It was found that the greatest amount of membership in formal associations occurred among people who lived in the high economic status neighbourhood; that the greatest amount of participation also occurred among the persons who lived in the high economic status neighbourhood; and that men in the high status neighbourhood held office more than those in the low status neighbourhood. Since the neighbourhoods were not completely homogeneous, controls for education, occupation, and income were introduced. Bell and Force found that "...the general tendency is for relatively more frequent attenders to have higher education, white collar occupations, and higher income" (1956: 31). Regarding participation, the study showed that men who had been to college and lived in a high status neighbourhood attended more meetings than those
who had been to college but lived in a low status neighbour-
hood. It was also discovered that labourers living in a
high status neighbourhood participated more than those in
low status neighbourhoods. Bell and Force stated:

Within each of the neighbourhoods persons of
higher economic status, as indicated by their
own individual education level, income and
occupation, generally have a greater amount
of associational participation than do
individuals of lower economic status". (1956: 34)

The authors concluded that the neighbourhood made more of a
difference than did economic status:

Age was also considered, and it was found that "in
each of the high economic status neighbourhoods the per cent
of men who are active participants increases with increasing age" (Bell and Force, 1956: 32). In the low economic status
neighbourhood though, the opposite was true; the per cent
who were active participants decreased with increasing age.
The investigators overall conclusion was that the
neighbourhood was important as a pressure agent.

*Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the Central
Life Interests* of Industrial Workers, was a study by
Robert Dubin (1956) which attempted to find out if work was
still a "central life interest". Using a questionnaire, he
studied industrial workers in three urban Midwestern plants
in different communities. He found that 24 per cent of all
workers studied could be labelled job-oriented in their life
interests. Three out of four did not see their job and work
places as central life interests for themselves; they
preferred human associations and areas of behaviour outside
of employment.

Regarding informal group experience Dubin noted:

Only 9 per cent of the industrial workers in the sample prefer the informal group life that is centered on the job. Nine out of ten of those studied clearly indicated that their preferred informal human association and contacts were found in their community, among friends, and the family. (1956: 61)

Dubin also hypothesized that "...a significant proportion of industrial workers will not respond to work as a valued experience..." (1956: 52) and found that:

Only 15 per cent of the workers give job-oriented preferences. The rest - about eleven in thirteen - saw experiences of theirs that were sampled in the study as taking place somewhere away from the workplace. (162)

Dubin concluded that work was no longer a central life interest. The importance of this study lies in that it implied that the lack of interest in work would find compensation in greater interests away from work.

The study Voluntary Association Membership of American Adults by Charles Wright and Herbert Hyman (1958) found that only a minority of Americans belonged to one or more voluntary association. Wright and Hyman's secondary analysis revealed that Protestants were more likely than Catholics to belong to formal associations, but the Jewish respondents were the most likely to belong. Regarding status, their analysis revealed that the higher the status of the respondents the higher the percentage of membership

3The idea of compensation will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.
in formal associations. The study also showed that there were urban-rural differences. They found that "...more of the residents of highly urbanized countries belong to organizations than do persons living in similar types of neighbourhoods but in less urbanized countries" (Light and Hyman, 1959: 322). Their findings suggested that urbanization, not neighbourhood type, was the important factor. They also found that rural farm residence was more closely associated with non-membership than either rural non-farm or urban residence.

In a survey of the life style of American business executives, Executive Leisure, (Heckscher and De Grazia, 1959), the researchers asked respondents how more leisure time would be used. A close examination of the data showed that, depending upon income, different responses were obtained. Executives with an income of over $50,000 were not much interested in improving their homes nor were they interested in improving themselves. Also, those in the upper brackets were not as interested in civic tasks and cultural activities as those earning less than $20,000. In attempting to find out what goals executives consider to be valid end purposes of leisure, Heckscher and De Grazia found that the largest number, (79%) cited self improvement through education and culture. Seventy-two per cent mentioned the use of leisure time "...as a refresher to enable you to do good work...", and leisure as an end in itself came third (67%). Their data indicated that as income rose, the valid end
purpose for use of leisure for self improvement through education and culture decreased, while the use of leisure as an end in itself for the fun it provides increased.

Louis Orzack, in work as a 'Central Life Interest' of Professionals (1959), found that because work was a focal center of self-identification for professionals, it was more likely to be a 'central life interest' for them than it was for industrial workers. In his study, questionnaires containing Dubin's 'central life interest' items were administered to registered (professional) nurses in public and private general hospitals and a state mental hospital in a midwestern city in the United States. Orzack found that four out of five nurses studied responded positively to the questions. Work and the workplace were central life interests for them. Orzack's study concluded that while industrial workers preferred to derive their personal satisfactions outside of work and the workplace, professionals preferred to derive their personal satisfaction from work and the workplace.

Much can be learned about the nature of the relationship between work and leisure by investigating the relative values which people place on these two spheres of life. For example, the study by Dubin which was reported earlier found that 'central life interest' of industrial workers was non job-oriented. Orzack, though, found that the professional nurses which he studied were much more oriented to work as a central life interest. Thus, while
Lubin's study suggested that his respondents compensated off the job, this study by Orzaek suggested that for professionals work had a 'spillover' effect  

Leisure and Life-Style, a study by Havighurst and Feigenbaum (1959) in Kansas City, made use of an interview to study people aged forty to seventy. The sample consisted of both men and women. The investigators found that although community-centered and home-centered life styles and leisure appeared to be equally accessible to both middle-class and working-class people, the latter were rarely community centered. They found that the home-centered style of leisure was strongest in lower-middle and upper-lower class individuals. The study also found that community centered individuals tended not to have young children in the home. Although these researchers found some relationship between life-style and social class position and between life-style and presence of young children in the home, they did not conclude that these were the most important variables affecting leisure activities. Instead, the authors concluded that the way in which people used their leisure was more strongly influenced by personality factors. The personal adjustment of the individuals influenced their life style. The better adjusted people showed a great deal of vitality in the instrumental activities of life while those not so  

A complete discussion of the 'spillover' effect will follow in Chapter II where 'compensation' is also discussed in detail.  

Instrumental activities are activities which serve as a means to an end and not an end in themselves.
well adjusted attempted to get through leisure what they could not get in their other roles. The writers suggested that the low adjusted people used their leisure as a compensation to make up for their deficiencies and to give their life some meaning.

In 1960, Harold Wilensky published an important paper, Work, Careers, and Social Integration, which laid out two possible relationships regarding work and leisure. After reviewing various arguments, Wilensky suggested two possible relationships: the 'compensatory' leisure hypothesis and the 'spillover' leisure hypothesis. These hypotheses will be examined and explained in greater detail in Chapter II. In short, the compensatory leisure hypothesis suggests that people compensate by seeking activities outside of work to fulfill the inadequacies of the work routine while the spillover leisure hypothesis suggests that the nature of one's work will condition the person so that the characteristics of the leisure patterns will resemble those of his work. In his paper Wilensky suggested that the significant variable was the work situation. He stated the general argument thus:

...if we consider people of the same social-economic level, and at the same stage in the life cycle, the variations in behavior among groups differently situated with respect to these work situation variables will be greater than the variations among social-economic strata. (Wilensky, 1960: 553)

In another paper Orderly Careers and Social Participation: The Impact of Work History on Social
Integration in the Middle Mass (Wilensky, 1961a), the work history of 678 white, middle class males in the Detroit Metropolitan Area were studied. Wilensky suggested that:

...where the technical and social organization of work offers much freedom - e.g., discretion in methods, pace or schedule; and opportunity for frequent interaction with fellow-workers who share common interests and values ... then work attachments will be strong, work integrated with the rest of life, and ties to community and society solid. Conversely, if the task offers little workplace freedom (assembly-line workers, dentists, accountants and many engineers) ... then work attachments will be weak, work sharply split from leisure, and ties to community and society uncertain. (522)

The study found that people with orderly work histories generally had stronger attachments to formal associations than those with disorderly work histories; they had more membership and attended more meetings, they averaged more hours in all activities in formal organizations, and they had stronger attachments to the community. Wilensky also predicted that people with orderly work histories would evidence greater vitality in primary relationships than people with disorderly work histories. His prediction was confirmed since it was found that the former had a wider range of primary contacts and had more best friends in clubs and organizations than did the latter. The author concluded that a disorderly work history fostered a retreat from both work and the larger communal life. Wilensky considered education to be important in participation by suggesting that the causal sequence was: education (defined as exposure to the liberal arts) → orderly
career → participation (1961a: 539).

A study by Joel Gerstl in 1961, Leisure Taste and Occupational Milieu, which explored the influence on leisure behaviour of different occupations of approximately the same prestige level, revealed some major differences between the leisure activities of academics, dentists, and admen. Gerstl conducted interviews using both structured and open-ended questions. Seventy-five respondents, all around the age of 40, were involved; twenty-five professors, twenty-five admen, and twenty-five dentists. He found distinct differences in the amount of leisure time each group had - professors generally having the longest work week (56-60 hours), with much of their work being done at home. Advertising men worked an average of 45 hours a week and did some of their work at home, while dentists averaged 40 hours of work a week and rarely did any of it at home. In brief, Gerstl found that, unlike admen and dentists, professors were unable to differentiate between work and leisure; they more often preferred to devote their time to reading and the performing arts (especially music); they avoided television viewing (and, in fact, more than half did not even own a television and were proud of it); and their social life through clubs and organizations were found to be minimal. Since the groups studied were of approximately the same social class, the author concluded that the crucial explanatory factor which allowed, dictated or was conducive to particular patterns of behaviour, was the occupational milieu, and not social class.
This occupational milieu consisted of "...the setting of the work situation, the nature of the work performed, and the norms derived from occupational reference groups" (Gerstl, 1961: 161-162).

Edwin Blakelock's paper, *A Durkheimian Approach to Some Temporal Problems of Leisure* (1961), reviewed the leisure problems of rotating shift workers. According to Blakelock, "the problem was that the individual "...may live in a community where there are many leisure activities available, but these activities may not be available when he has free time" (1961: 9). The author also reported data from a previous study which found that people who worked shifts tended to belong to fewer organizations, go to fewer meetings, and become officers in these organizations less often than people who did not work rotating shifts.

A study by Rolf Keyersohn\(^6\) in 1963, *Changing Work and Leisure Routines*, also suggested that the time that people work affected leisure. In this study of a plant in Southern California the author attempted to find out how willing people were to change their habits. The plant studied had just introduced a new calendar, a three day weekend. When it was introduced, it was announced that this would provide people with the opportunity to go on longer...
trips, and, in the beginning, this was the reason many employees stated that they liked the new schedule. Six months later, one third of those who had previously stated they favoured the new schedule grew to dislike it. The main complaint was that while most people expected to do interesting things on the free Monday, in actual fact they did not. Instead, they complained that there was nothing to do on Monday, that it was a lonely occasion.

In, An Analysis of Selected Variables Affecting Outdoor Recreation Patterns, Douglas Sessons (1963) reported the findings of his analysis of 45 studies. Sessons found that the older one became, the more passive his pursuits and the more limited his activities; the presence of young children in the home tended to restrict travel and make recreation patterns more home centered; the higher the person's income, the more numerous his pursuits; people in the higher occupational prestige levels had more numerous and varied pursuits; urban residents tended to have a higher participation rate in outdoor recreation activities and took more trips than did rural residents. His analysis showed that in investigating leisure patterns there were many factors to consider, and thus far many have been considered.

An article by Pope, Economic Leprivation and Social Participation in A Group of 'Middle Class' Factory Workers (1964), reported the effects of temporary layoffs or unemployment on patterns of social participation. The study was of an auto parts company in Detroit. Work histories of 147
upper blue collar and lower white collar workers were obtained and it was found that the impact of work deprivation was limited. Pope did find, though, that "...cumulative economic deprivation appears to restrict the better educated, higher income, and younger workers from activity in formal voluntary associations – those very workers who might otherwise be among the more active participants" (1964: 297). In this study then, it appeared that age, income, and education were high in importance when it came to participation in formal voluntary associations.

A study by Rolf Neyersohn, *Television and the Pest of Leisure* (1968), reported the findings of a national sample survey carried out by Elmo Roper in 1961. The author found that low income populations had few leisure interests other than watching television. Neyersohn stated that low income populations "...belong to fewer organizations or clubs, they own fewer pieces of leisure equipment, they read fewer newspapers or books, they attend fewer movies..." but they watched more television than those who had more money (1968: 107).

Hagedorn and Labovitz (1968) studied 14 occupations using mail questionnaires to test various theories of participation. Their study, *Participation in Community Associations by Occupation: A Test of Three Theories*, found all three theories supported to some extent. The three theories that they tested were labelled alienation theory, socialization theory, and task generalization theory.
With regard to alienation theory, the authors pointed out that there were two frequently cited conclusions regarding the behavior which could be expected to arise from a condition of alienation. They stated: "One group of scholars ... suggests that the response to alienation is a retreat from the social order, while another group suggests that the response is an active involvement in the social order, generally in extremist groups" (p. 273). Three hypotheses relating to each of the two points of view were formulated and tested.

The three hypotheses relating to retreat were:

Hypothesis 1. The greater the isolation, the less the joining and participation in community associations.
Hypothesis 2. The greater the degree of "formal contacts unimportant", the less the joining and participation in community associations.
Hypothesis 3. The greater the degree of "informal contacts unimportant", the less the joining and participation in community associations.
(From Hagedorn and Labovitz: 1968: 274)

The three hypotheses relating to the compensation mechanism (i.e., involvement), were:

Hypothesis 4. The greater the isolation, the more the joining and participation in community associations.
Hypothesis 5. The greater the degree of "formal contacts unimportant", the more the joining and participation in community associations.
Hypothesis 6. The greater the degree of "informal contacts unimportant", the more the joining and participation in community associations.
(From Hagedorn and Labovitz: 1968: 274)

In general, the authors found support for hypotheses 2, 3, and 4. Hypotheses 1, 5, and 6 were not supported.

The authors then proceeded to formulate a hypothesis relating to socialization theory. This hypothesis was:
Hypothesis 7. The greater the degree of formal education, the more the joining and participation in community associations. (Hagedorn and Labovitz: 1968: 274)

This hypothesis was also supported.

Hagedorn and Labovitz then tested a hypothesis which they formulated on the basis of task generalization theory.

This was:

Hypothesis 8. The greater the degree of leadership, the more the joining and participation in community associations. (1968: 275)

This hypothesis was also supported by the data.

Finally, the authors tested a hypothesis relating to both socialization and task generalization. They suggested that although there was ample reason to treat socialization and task generalization as independently related to participation, a much stronger relationship would be obtained when the two processes worked in combination. It was therefore hypothesized that: "The greater the degree of leadership and education, the more the joining and participation in community associations" (Hagedorn and Labovitz: 1968: 275).

This hypothesis was strongly supported. In summary, the researchers found conflicting support for the two points of view relating to alienation theory. They found support for both socialization and task generalization theory and suggested that education was the best single predictor of the dependent variables. They also found that all three theories were more useful in explaining involvement in associations than in explaining the fact of joining.

A study by William Burch Jr., The Social Circles of
Leisure: Competing Explanations (1969), using a mailed questionnaire to study. Wilderness campers suggested that differences in camping style were due to socialization. The author believed that standard variables used to explain leisure behaviour furnished only a slight explanation. For example, Burch stated: "One gains an income but must learn a life style, and learning requires an organized group concerned with imparting normative standards" (1969: 126).

In his study, Burch first examined a compensatory hypothesis but his data led him to conclude that although some support for this hypothesis was found, other factors related to socialization were more important. The author then examined a spillover hypothesis, which he called the "familiarity Hypothesis", but concluded that although the familiarity and compensatory hypothesis seemed to be logically opposite explanations they tended to converge at the level of group membership. This led him to explore what he called the "personal community hypothesis". This hypothesis suggested that the nature of one's leisure style is shaped by transactions with and socialization by one's workmates, parents, spouse and friends. The study found support for the personal community hypothesis and Burch concluded by stating: "It seems likely that post-industrial man, just like his tribal and peasant counterparts, finds the shape of his free time formed within small circles of workmates, family and friends" (1969: 143). He also suggested further investigation into the effects of socialization on leisure style.
Habel Burdge's study, *Levels of Occupational Prestige and Leisure Activity* (1969), focused on the effects of occupational prestige on structured leisure. His sample consisted of 1635 individuals from Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. All individuals were eighteen years of age or over. The North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale was used to distinguish five prestige levels. The study found that persons in the highest prestige classes participated in a greater variety of leisure activities.

Curtis and Zurcher (1971), studied membership in voluntary associations among low income people. The study, *Voluntary Associations and the Social Integration of the Poor*, found that not all members of our society were likely to join or participate in voluntary associations. They found that lower class integration patterns were largely contained in the local and relatively intimate settings of the family and immediate neighbourhood. In the case of organizations, they were more likely to be affiliated with those that maintained an affective rather than a utilitarian orientation. They found the important background characteristics affecting participation in voluntary associations to be: income, education, occupation, place of residence, race, sex, age, and marital status. The authors also noted that income and education were directly influential in

7Structured leisure was defined as a leisure activity from which the person participating derives status (for participation) from the social structure.
participation in voluntary associations. The study concluded that the more affluent and better educated members of our society were more likely to be members of voluntary associations.

In *The Long Arm of the Job: A Study of Work and Leisure*, Martin Heissner (1971), analyzed a subsample of 208 industrial workers employed with a large wood-products manufacturing company in a Vancouver Island community of about 20,000 residents. The workers in the study were all male and below the level of foreman. This detailed study (which will be examined in greater detail in a following chapter) was designed to investigate the effects of the structure of the work situation upon leisure patterns of behaviour. Specifically, it was designed to test three hypotheses: the "non-effect hypothesis", which expected that work and leisure were not related but were independent of one another, the "compensatory hypothesis", and the "spillover hypothesis". The study found support for the spillover hypothesis.

A study of selected leisure activities by Carol Kirsh, Brian Dixon and Michael Bond, *A Leisure Study* — Canada 1972, found a wide variation in participation patterns, with the young (particularly the students), the well educated, and the people in the higher socio-economic levels comprising

The selected leisure time activities fell into two groups: (1) cultural and recreational events where attendance at a performance or event such as theatre, opera, musical performances, exhibitions, sports events, visits to museums, art galleries and so on, and (2) non-attendance leisure time activities such as hobbies, watching TV, reading, listening to the radio, and records.
a disproportionately large proportion of most of the participant groups. The study found that participation in leisure time activities was influenced by age, education, and socioeconomic status. Since the study was designed only to find if differences in participation existed, it could not explain why the above variables affected participation.

In 1973 William Form published an article, "The Internal Stratification of the Working Class: System Involvements of Auto Workers in Four Countries," which reported the findings of a research comparing automobile workers of different skill levels for their involvement in the family, work group, union, neighbourhood, community and nation. Four countries (The United States, Italy, Argentina, and India), varying in industrial development were studied. Form believed "...that the spillover hypothesis best describes what happens to skilled workers and the no-relation hypothesis, what happens to the less skilled" (1973: 698). He therefore expected the skilled to be the most involved in both work and non-work social systems. Furthermore, the pattern was expected to be most apparent in the most industrialized countries. The data from his study of skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers supported his basic hypotheses.

Form found that the skilled attended union meetings more often and were more acquainted with the noneconomic activities of the union. He also found that more of the skilled saw their workmates at meetings of the voluntary
organizations (other than union) to which they belonged, and that the skilled were more active in the community than the semi-skilled and unskilled. Everywhere, more of the skilled belonged to organizations than the less skilled. Form found that in no country were age, marital status, and number of children associated with involvement. He did find though, that education influenced two areas in all four countries - the more educated spent more of their time reading and were more interested in the national news than were the less educated. In sum, the study found that skill level and occupation were consistently more related to involvement than any other variable or combination of variables.

A study by Defee, Schultz, and Fasewarx, *Occupational Level and Organizational Membership* (1974), found that occupational level affected membership in formal organizations. Subjects in this study were 3,371 adults, residents of Laramie, Wyoming, a city of twenty-six thousand. The individuals in the study were all members of one or more formal voluntary organization. The study found that the higher an individual's occupation level (classified using the Reiss scale), the more likely he was to belong to a formalized organization in the community.

John Kelly's (1974) thesis was that leisure is learned. Kelly assumed that socialization toward leisure took place in the setting of the family, the school, and in peer groups. In his paper, *Socialization Toward Leisure: A Developmental Approach*, Kelly stated: "Acquiring the
skills, experience, relational norms, equipment, attitudes and frequently the taste required for participation in many kinds of leisure activities is a part of the socialization process" (1974: 192).

Using a one year old telephone directory and a table of random numbers, households in Eugene, Oregon were selected for the study. All adults in the selected household were separately and individually interviewed. Kelly found that:

Leisure activities are evenly distributed between those begun when a child and those begun as an adult. Almost two-thirds of the 744 activities were begun with family associations and about one-third (37 per cent) with peer associations from school, work or community. (1974: 191)

This study found little or no relation between education and occupational level and leisure patterns. Instead, the author concluded that "...the assumption of life-long leisure socialization is supported clearly enough to proceed with research that is developmental in theory and method" (Kelly, 1974: 192).

In an examination of the relationship between work and leisure, a study by Terrence White, The Relative Importance of Education and Income as Predictors in Outdoor Recreation Participation (1975), found that although a person's occupation influenced leisure behavior (in this study, outdoor recreation activities), when multiple regression analyses were computed the most important

9It should be noted that the very poor, the transient, and the unemployed were not studied.
predictors turned out to be education, income, and age. White found that of the three socio-economic variables—education, income, and occupation—education was the most important predictor of participation in the 26 outdoor recreation activities studied. The partial correlation results of the study revealed that while education and income had independent contributions in outdoor recreation activities studied. The partial correlation results of the study revealed that while education and income had independent contributions in outdoor recreation behaviour, occupation did not. White suggested that, in time, the work-leisure hypothesis may not find a great deal of support but may, in fact, be proven spurious. White also suggested that perhaps more detailed assessments of the work milieu (e.g., the study by Neissner, 1971), would provide the best method for measuring the independent variable.

A study by Rollman, Moxley, and Elliott, Family and Community Activities of Rural Nonfarm Families With Children (1975), focused on the effect of various factors upon non-work activities of families with children. It was found that families participating in voluntary organizations were those that had lived in the community for more than one year, had no preschool age children, and were in the upper resource group. The study also found that there was a high frequency of home and family centered activities in families with both a preschool age child and an unemployed mother. Data from this study suggested that individuals in families with
preschool age children tended not to participate much in events outside the home. The presence of preschool age children was found to be more important in restricting participation in events outside the home than was the lack of financial resources.

In the last study to be reported in this chapter, A.W. Bacon, the author, examined the effect of alienating work upon leisure activities. The study, *Leisure and the Alienated Worker: A Critical Reassessment of Three Radical Theories of Work and Leisure* (1975), was of 228 men working in various occupations (skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled, and clerical), and living in a modern prosperous community in England. Three groups were distinguished: the alienated, the unalienated, and the ambivalent group. The author suggested that the alienation thesis of a relationship between work and leisure leads one to predict three different types of expectations. First, those who experienced their work as a calamity and found it meaningless, stripping them of their creative power, would compensate for this degradation by obsessive leisure pursuits and preoccupation with false consumer needs. The second expectation was that people with a lack of interest or motivation, who lacked control or autonomy in their work, would learn to retreat from it. The third expectation was that people doing repetitive, undemanding, and unrewarding jobs would build up frustration within themselves which may then result in aggressive behaviour on the road, against property, and other people.
The first and third expectations would be examples of the "compensatory hypothesis" while the second expectation would be an example of the "spillover Hypothesis". The study found no significant differences in regard to spillover between the two groups. Since he found that alienated workers did not compensate and that alienated work did not have a spillover effect, Bacon concluded that:

...in modern, relatively prosperous sectors of industrial society a sharply segmented relationship occurs between leisure and work...To a considerable extent, the things that people choose to do in their free time are unrelated to the nature of their employment. (1975: 189)

The studies summarized in this chapter represent much of the work done in the area of leisure behaviour. The reader will have noted that factors affecting leisure behaviour have been researched and discussed by social scientists and social philosophers for many years. The reader will also have noted that many variables were considered in attempting to explain various patterns of leisure behaviour. For example, Clarke (1956), and Burdge (1969), suggested that differences in leisure behaviour were due to "prestige level". Komarovsky (1946), Reissman (1956), and White (1955), to name a few, found that social class influenced leisure behaviour of individuals. Havighurst and Feigenbaum (1959), suggested that personality factors such as personal adjustment were important. Bell and Force (1956), found that the type of neighbourhood the individual lived in affected his participation in organizations. Wright and Hyman (1958), concluded that the degree of urbanization, and
not neighbourhood type, was the important explanatory variable. They also found that religion was important. Bollman, Moxley, and Elliott (1975), noted that presence or absence of children affected leisure behaviour. Sessions (1963), showed that the age of the individual and the presence of young children in the home were the important variables. Curtis and Zurcher (1971), White (1975), and various other researchers found that education and/or income were the variables that best explained differences in leisure behaviour. Hagedorn and Labovitz (1968), and Burch (1969), suggested that socialization was the major explanatory variable. Kelly's (1975) study also arrived at the conclusion that socialization was the most important explanatory variable.

Other investigators found that work-related variables had an effect upon what an individual did away from work. For instance, Blakelock (1961), and Keyersohn (1963), found that shift work or the time that an individual had off, affected leisure behaviour. Pope (1964), suggested that temporary layoffs in jobs (and also income and education), affected leisure. Gerstl (1961), Defee, Schultz and Pasewark (1974), and others found that the occupation of the individual was a factor. Form (1973), discovered that skill level was important in explaining different leisure patterns of behaviour. Other investigators such as Dubin (1956), Wilensky (1960), and (1961a), and Heissner (1971), suggested that the type of work performed affected the use of leisure
time. Meanwhile, a study by Bacon (1975) found that no relationship existed between work and leisure.

The literature thus suggests that although a great effort has been made to determine the major factors related to participation in various kinds of leisure activities, it is difficult to arrive at an adequate and definite conclusion. The literature though, does suggest that certain variables are more prominent than others. In the following chapter we will discuss the particular problem to be investigated and build a theoretical perspective from which we will base this study.
CHAPTER II

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the previous chapter we stated that the purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between the type of work that an individual does and how he spends his leisure time. The specific focus of the study was to be on the effects of jobs characterized by technical constraints and social isolation upon participation in formally organized associations.

A review of the studies reported in the preceding chapter shows that many of the studies reported suggested that there was some relationship between work and non-work activities. In many of the studies reported the researchers either investigated or hypothesized a relationship between work and leisure, including participation in organizations\(^\text{10}\). But the studies reported in the previous chapter also showed that many other variables have been correlated with leisure and voluntary participation in formally organized associations.

\(^{10}\)Some of these include Komarovsky (1946), Clarke (1954), Dubin (1956), Crzack (1959), Silenky (1960), and (1961a), Gerstl (1961), Hagedorn and Labovitz (1968), Neissner (1971), Form (1972), White (1975), and Bacon (1975).
associations. It was this that prompted White (1975) to suggest that perhaps the best method of determining the validity of spuriousness of the work-leisure hypothesis would be by undertaking more studies using the methods employed by Heissner (1971). This study employed Heissner's method in an attempt to specifically relate the structure of work with organizational membership, participation, and leadership. Before describing the specifics of this study further we will review some of the more relevant previous research.

Past research regarding an association between work and leisure has suggested three possible relational alternatives. One of these alternatives is explained by the Segmentalists who have suggested that there is no relationship between work and leisure, "...that people's lives are split into different areas of activity and interest, with each social segment lived out more or less independently of the rest" (Parker, 1972: 99). The study by Bacon (1975), which was discussed in the previous chapter, represents an example of this point of view. Holists, on the other hand, purported "...that society is essentially an integrated whole, every part of which affects and is affected to some degree by every other part" (Parker, 1971: 99). In considering work and leisure the holistic perspective explains the two remaining relational alternatives. The first, which Wilensky (1960) labelled the compensatory hypothesis, implies a safety-valve

11This hypothesis states that there is a relationship between work and leisure.
effect. That is, when boredom or monotony of routine builds up, the individual requires a sharply different experience or he will break down psychologically. The individual will therefore spend his leisure time in activities and locales opposite to those of his job. He will seek activities outside of work to fulfill the inadequacies of the work routine. For example, if his routine activity is sedentary, then he will seek vigorous play. Wilensky gave an example of the compensatory leisure hypothesis in this statement:

...The Detroit auto-worker, for eight hours gripped bodily to the main line, doing repetative, low-skilled, machine-paced work which is wholly ungratifying, comes rushing out of the plant gate, helling down the super highway at 80 miles an hour in a second-hand Cadillac Eldorado, stops off for a beer and starts a bar-room brawl, goes home and beats his wife, and in his spare time throws a rock at a negro moving into the neighborhood. In short, his routine of leisure is an explosive compensation for deadening rhythms of factory life. (1950: 544)

The second alternative, the spillover hypothesis, suggests that the characteristics of the leisure patterns that individuals adopt will resemble those of their work. In this case, if the individual's routine activity is sedentary he will seek leisure activities which are somewhat similar, not vigorous play. Wilensky gave this example of the spillover hypothesis:

Another auto-worker goes quietly home, collapses on the couch, eats and drinks alone, belongs to nothing, votes for no one, hangs around the home and the street, watches the 'late-late' show, lets the TV programs shade into one another, too tired to lift himself off the couch for the act of selection, too bored to switch the diels. In short, he develops a spillover leisure routine in which alienation from work becomes alienation from life; the mental stultification produced by
his labour permeates his leisure. (1960: 544)

If the spillover hypothesis proves to be valid, and Neissner's (1971) study suggests that it is, it means that people performing meaningful work tasks will engage in meaningful leisure activities, while people performing nonmeaningful work tasks will engage in nonmeaningful leisure activities.

To date, much of the research relevant to the evaluation of the hypotheses on the work-leisure relationship has been conducted by equating the nature of the work with broad occupational prestige categories. Other researchers examined the hypotheses by focusing on the more specific structure of work, such as autonomy on the job, technology employed, etc. The following brief summaries, for example, represent a sampling of the range of studies whose findings are relevant here.12

An early study by Komarovsky (1946), found that while only thirty-two out of one hundred unskilled workers belonged to any organization, over ninety-eight per cent of professional men stated that they belonged to at least one voluntary organization. Komarovsky also found that the classes in between consistently increased in rate of belonging as they went up the economic scale. Alfred Clarke (1956), found that men in the higher occupational prestige levels were more frequently involved in activities such as attending

12 The reader will note that the studies reported here were discussed in greater detail in the previous chapter.
theaters, concerts, special lectures, visiting museums or art galleries, going to the movies, reading for pleasure, studying, or community service work, while those in the lowest occupational prestige level most frequently watched television, went to a tavern, went fishing, went driving for pleasure, played poker, and played with their children. The study by Gerstl suggested that the occupational milieu consisting of "...the setting of the work situation, the nature of the work performed, and the norms derived from occupational reference groups..." are the crucial explanatory factors which allow, dictate, or are conducive to particular patterns of behaviour (1961: 161-162). Burdige (1969), using a large sample of 1,635 individuals and the North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale to distinguish five prestige levels, found that the most active in outdoor recreation activities were those in the highest prestige levels. Defee, Schultz, and Pasewark (1974), using the Reiss scale to classify occupations, found that the higher an individual's occupation level, the more likely he was to belong to a formalized organization in the community. These studies, and a study by Neissner to be summarized below, tend to support the spillover leisure hypothesis since, as Parker summarized after assessing similar patterns: "The present evidence is that those who find work more demanding of their abilities are more likely to be socially or intellectually active in their leisure than are those who find work less demanding" (1972: 24).
In a more detailed study of the work-leisure hypothesis, Keissner (1971) related the work structure, specifically technological constraints and social interaction patterns on the job, to leisure behaviour. He found that individuals who had little opportunity to exercise discretion on the job seldom engaged in activities off the job which required discretion. He also found that individuals who were more socially isolated on the job spent less time in organized and purpose-directed activities. In analyzing leadership Keissner found that workers who were more socially isolated and whose jobs were technically constraining held less leadership positions in voluntary associations. His data indicated that both variables had an independent effect but social isolation made more of a difference than did technical job constraints. The study suggested that people chose leisure activities whose characteristics were similar to those of their job. Keissner stated:

When choice of action is suppressed by the spatial, temporal, and functional constraints of the work process, worker capacity for meeting the demands of spare time activities which require discretion is reduced. They engage less in those activities which necessitate planning, coordination, and purposeful action...

When work is socially isolating, workers reduce their exposure to situations in which they have to talk, and also spend less time in organized and purpose-directed activities... Lack of opportunity to talk on the job is associated with dramatically reduced rates of participation in associations, that is, in activity commonly believed to help integrate individuals into the community. (1971: 260)

The study by Keissner also quoted other studies which suggested a relationship between work and leisure.
but as Meissner pointed out, while these studies only alluded to a relationship his study provided support by including data to verify the hypothesized relationship (1971: 232-241). Thus, although Bacon's (1975) study found no relationship between work and leisure, other researchers have hypothesized or shown that life at work does affect life outside the workplace. Furthermore, more of the studies on the work-leisure relationship suggested that work had a spillover effect.

The specific concern of this study was to test the validity of Meissner's (1971) findings regarding participation in organizations and his conclusion that work had a spillover effect. In doing so we carried this study one step further than Meissner by also considering the variables income and education. A review of the studies reported in chapter I showed that social scientists have considered many variables in their studies of factors affecting leisure patterns of individuals. The reader will have noted that in investigations of a work-leisure relationship various authors suggested that factors such as education and income were important. White (1975), for example, found that although a person's occupation influenced leisure behavior, further analysis showed that two of the most important predictors of participation in various outdoor recreation activities were education and income. Furthermore, partial correlation results revealed that while education and income had independent effects, occupation did not.

A review of the literature reported in the previous
chapter also showed that education and income were considered to be important predictors of organizational affiliations. For example, the study by Curtis and Zurcher (1971), found that income and education directly influenced membership in voluntary associations. In short, other studies reported in the previous chapter have either suggested or shown that education and income were variables to be considered. These studies prompted this researcher to suggest that education and income may perhaps be more important in determining membership, active participation, and leadership in formally organized associations than either technical job constraints or social isolation on the job. This researcher's view regarding the importance of education and income is discussed below.

**Education:** Education is an important variable in that it tends to broaden one's perspective. A broader knowledge may give rise to a greater or better self-concept, which may, in turn, encourage participation. A higher education is also responsible for the acquisition of speaking skills. A person having these skills will likely participate more in organizations and run for office more than someone who does not possess these skills. Formal education, therefore imparts skills which encourage social participation. Furthermore, education makes one more aware, through both formal and informal channels of communication, of various organizations and more cognizant of community resources for leisure time activities. It has also been suggested that
one of the values that formal education instills in individuals is that community participation is socially desirable (Hagedorn and Labovitz, 1968). Thus, a higher education would also make one more aware of social pressures for participation.

**Income:** Income is an important variable in that an individual with an adequate income can afford to spend more time in various activities. It is important to have financial ability in order to participate in organized activities. A moderate level of income permits the acquisition of necessary equipment and allows the costs of sometimes necessary travel to be borne. Lacking adequate financial resources, the lower income individual may not have sufficient time or ability to free himself from economic and financial responsibilities, thus affecting participation in organized associations.

In reaching his conclusions Heissner (1971), did not investigate the effects of education and income. This study did. The framework of the study can be organized in the following manner:

**Independent Variables**
- Technical Constraints
- Social Isolation
- Education
- Income

**Dependent Variables**
- Membership in Organizations
- Attendance at Meetings
- Leadership Position in Organizations
CHAPTER III
METODOLOGY

SAMPLE

Data for this study was obtained using an interview schedule. Respondents were interviewed during a three month period between December 1975 and March 1976. All the interviews were conducted by the researcher thus lessening the effects of interviewer bias.

Prior to actual interviews of the final sample, a pretest was carried out by the researcher. The purpose of this pretest was first to determine the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the questions to be included in the schedule and second to make certain that the questions flowed or followed one another without causing the respondent to terminate the interview at some point prior to its completion.

The sample for this study was a stratified random sample. All the respondents were male industrial workers below the level of foreman, twenty-two years of age or over, and residents of the city of Windsor, Ontario, Canada. It was decided that workers under the age of twenty-two not be included in the sample because the
organization from which the sample was drawn employed many students on a part-time basis. Information regarding the status of the worker (i.e., part-time or full-time) was not available to the researcher. It was therefore felt that by restricting the sample to those workers who were twenty-two years of age or older the chances of selecting someone who was a student, and thus not eligible for the study, would be greatly reduced.

Another reason for restricting the sample to individuals who were twenty-two years of age or over was that it would reduce the chances of choosing someone who had just recently been a student and was only a recent addition to the work force. The researcher felt that individuals new in the work force had perhaps not yet had a chance to settle into their new role. Their patterns outside of work may thus differ from those who had been working for at least a year or longer.

A union pay list for the 39th week of 1975 was used to pick the sample for the study. The list included the names, addresses, and age of all the Canadian hourly rated workers employed by the particular organization studied. The sample chosen included only those workers employed in what will be called Plant X and located in the city of Windsor. Plant X was chosen for this study because it was known that some employees in this plant worked in jobs in which the speed or pace of the work was determined not by the individual but controlled by a machine. Others worked
in jobs where social interaction with other employees was restricted. Still others worked at jobs which limited the individual's social interaction with other employees and pace of work was controlled by a machine on production line. Some of the workers in Plant X had none of these constraints, that is, they worked at their own speed (i.e., they were not controlled by a machine or a production line), and their social interaction on the job was not limited to a few contacts.

Using the previously mentioned union pay sheet in which the names of all employees were listed in alphabetical order, the researcher chose from it all those workers in Plant X who lived in the city of Windsor, and were twenty-two years of age or older\(^{13}\). This resulted in a total population of one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four individuals. The names of these individuals were listed in alphabetical order and numbered from one to 1854. Using a table of random numbers, a sample of one hundred and sixty workers was selected.

When this researcher was ready to begin interviewing in December 1975, a national mail strike was in effect in Canada. Because of the mail strike letters of introduction could not be mailed to the individuals in the sample. Telephoning each person before the interview was ruled out since it was felt that people would be more inclined to refuse over the phone than if approached in person by the

\(^{13}\) All workers in the plant were male.
interviewer. Thus it was decided that the interviewer would simply go to the homes of all the individuals in the sample without giving prior notification. The researcher thus went to the homes of the individuals in the sample, introduced himself, and informed the individual that he was conducting a research project in the city of Windsor and that the respondent was one of the people on his interview list. The researcher also stated that the interview would only take up a few minutes of his time. To assure him that he was not a salesman and that this was a legitimate interview, the researcher showed the individual a brief letter.  

INTERVIEW RESULTS

A total of one hundred and thirty-two interviews were obtained. Table III - 1 gives a breakdown of the results of the interviews and attempted interviews of the sample in this study.

Every possible effort was made to at least speak with each individual in the sample. Two of the four individuals reported in Table III - 1 as no longer employed with the organization studied could not actually be located. It was assumed that they were no longer employed with the organization when a more recent union payroll sheet was obtained.

---

14 See APPENDIX A.

15 These people were no longer living at the address on the union list. They could not be located by telephone since the telephone number that the researcher had for these individuals was no longer in operation. Furthermore, telephone information service had no new number for these individuals.
was referred to and it was noted that their names were no longer on that list. The two individuals reported under 'Could not locate' were still on the payroll but they had changed address and had not reported the change. They could not be reached by telephone since no number was listed in their name.

**TABLE III - 1**

| INTERVIEW BREAKDOWN OF THE SELECTED SAMPLE |
| Completed Interviews | 132 |
| Refusals              | 11  |
| Part-time employees (or students) | 5   |
| Retired               | 4   |
| Foremen               | 2   |
| Could not locate      | 1   |
| No longer employed with the organization studied | 4 |
| **TOTAL**             | **160** |

Two foremen were chosen in the sample but were not interviewed because only industrial workers below the level of foremen were to be included in the study. Four individuals picked were retired and therefore not interviewed and five others were students and employed with the organization on a part-time basis only. Students were not interviewed since only full time company employees were to be included in the study.

Finally, eleven individuals refused to participate in the interview. The researcher noted that these individuals
did not represent one particular age level but included both young and older workers. He also noted that about one half of those that refused spoke English with a foreign accent; some appeared to be suspicious of the interview. It should be noted though, that the refusal rate was comparatively low. The researcher attributes this low refusal rate partly to the dress style and approach manner but mostly to the surprise of the approach. Not having had prior warning, the individual to be interviewed was taken by surprise at his home. The researcher feels that this did not give the individual much opportunity to make up an excuse to refuse the interview.

CODING THE DATA

When the interviews were completed this researcher coded the data. Most of the questions in the interview schedule were precoded (particularly those used directly in this study), but questions which were not, or required coding changes, were first coded by the researcher then checked by another experienced researcher for accuracy and reliability. The data, which was now transferred on Fortran Coding Form sheets, was checked again then keypunched on computer cards by the researcher. When keypunching was completed the 132 card deck was put into the verifier in

16 The interviewer was dressed neatly but did not wear a tie. Clothes worn were somewhat casual since he wanted to appear like a student and not a salesman.

17 According to the person checking this researcher, coding reliability was accurate to within 4.8 per cent.
order to obtain a readout for the purpose of checking the keypunching. The researcher then checked for keypunching errors and then had the information re-checked by another person. Two keypunching errors were found and the two cards were re-punched correctly, checked over for accuracy, and then placed back in the card deck. The data was then ready for analysis.

VARIABLES AND THEIR MEASURES

The Independent Variables in this study were: (1) Technical Constraints and, (2) Social Isolation.

Technical Constraints

Presence or absence of technical constraints on the job was determined by the answer to two questions. (i) "In your job, do you decide on your own work speed or is the speed controlled by a machine or production line?"

High Constraints: paced by machine or production line.

Low Constraints: decides own work speed.

(ii) "Are you confined to a fixed work place or small area or can you move around in a larger area (shop, yard, plant or beyond)?"

High Constraints: confined to a single position or small place.

Low Constraints: can move in a larger area.

These two questions were then correlated to determine whether or not they could be combined to form an index of technical constraints. Table III - 2 shows the results obtained suggested that it was permissible to do so.
TABLE III - 2

MATRIX OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF ITEMS COMPRISING INDEX OF TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS IN GAMMAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work speed decided by</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.95748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Confined or can move.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An index of technical constraints was then constructed in the following manner:

High Technical Constraints: those respondents who gave a high constraint response to both questions.

Medium Technical Constraints: those respondents who gave a high constraint response to only one of the two questions.

Low Technical Constraints: those respondents who gave a low constraint response to both questions.

Table III - 3 shows the sample distribution which was obtained using the criteria outlined above.

TABLE III - 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRIBUTION OF TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Isolation

To determine whether or not an individual was socially...
isolated on the job, three questions were asked. (1) "Do you usually work by yourself, or do you usually work together with other people in a workgroup -- in a team, a crew, or something like that?"

High Isolation: works alone.
Low Isolation: works with others.

(ii) "While you are actually doing your work, can you talk to other people, besides the ones you work with?"

High Isolation: no, cannot talk to other people.
Low Isolation: yes, can talk to other people.

(iii) "How many people can you talk to while you are working at your job?"

High Isolation: cannot talk to anyone.
Low Isolation: can talk to one or more.

The results obtained when the three questions above were correlated suggested that they could be combined to form an index of social isolation. These results are shown in Table III - 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE III - 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATRIX OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF ITEMS COMPRISING INDEX OF SOCIAL ISOLATION IN GANNAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Works alone or with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can talk with non-workmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total can talk with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An index of social isolation was therefore constructed in the following manner.

High Social Isolation: those respondents who gave a high isolation response to two or all three questions.

Medium Social Isolation: those respondents who gave a high isolation response to one of the three questions.

Low Social Isolation: those respondents who gave a low isolation response to all three questions.

Table III - 5 shows the resultant sample distribution of social isolation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Isolation</th>
<th>Medium Isolation</th>
<th>Low Isolation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other independent variables in this study were
(1) Years of Formal Education and, (2) Total Family Income.

Years of Formal Education
The variable was measured by asking the respondents this question: "What was the highest grade of school you completed?"

Total Family Income
This variable was measured by asking the respondents:
"Now, would you look at this card and tell me what your
total family income was (approximately) before taxes in 1974 -- consider all sources such as wife's income, rents, profits, wages, interests and so on."18.

The dependent variables in this study were:

(1) Membership in Organizations, (2) Active Participation in Organizations, and (3) Leadership in Organizations.

Membership in Organizations

Membership was determined by asking the respondents:

"Here is a list of clubs and organizations that some people belong to. Would you look at this list (show Card 1) and tell me if you belong to any of these kinds of organizations and could you name the organization?"19

Active Participation in Organizations

Participation was determined by asking: "How often do you attend meetings?" While asking this question Card 3 was handed to the respondent20.

Leadership in Organizations

This was determined by asking the respondents two questions. The questions were:

(1) "Do you have a leadership position in the organization?"

18 The respondents were shown a card with various categories of income on it (see APPENDIX B). They were also told not to give the respondent the actual income but to simply give him the corresponding number (e.g., 1. under $1,000; 2. $1,000 - $9,999 etc.). Only a few respondents were somewhat hesitant to answer this question. The interviewer was able to get an answer here by simply asking them to give an approximate total stressing "approximate". It was felt that people would generally be honest or at least would not be very far off the total income.

19 See APPENDIX C.
20 See APPENDIX C.
(2) "Have you had a leadership position in the organization during the past three years?"  

HYPOTHESES

It was pointed out in Chapter II that the specific concern of this study was to test the validity of Meissner's (1971) findings regarding participation in organizations and his conclusion that work had a spillover effect. His study found that technical constraints and social isolation on the job had a negative effect upon (1) membership in organized voluntary associations, and (2) active participation in these organizations. Specifically, his study found that people working in jobs characterized by technical constraints and/or social isolation belonged to fewer, attended fewer meetings, and held fewer leadership positions in organizations. He investigated technical constraints and social isolation independently and discovered that they had an independent effect but that social isolation was more important than technical constraints. That is, people who experienced social isolation on the job belonged to fewer, attended fewer meetings, and had fewer leadership positions in organizations than did people working in jobs characterized by technical constraints. Since this study was designed to test these findings, hypotheses I, II, and III were proposed.

21 See APPENDIX C.
Although Meissner (1971) did not study the effects of education and income, Chapters I and II suggested that these variables were important in predicting organizational activity. Because this researcher felt that education and income were in fact the most important predictors of membership, participation, and leadership in organizations hypotheses A I, A II, and A III were proposed and tested. The hypotheses of this study therefore were:

**Hypothesis I:** People whose job is characterized by technical constraints will belong to fewer, attend fewer meetings, and hold fewer leadership positions in organizations than people whose job involves less technical constraints.

**Hypothesis II:** People who experience more social isolation on the job will belong to fewer, attend fewer meetings, and hold fewer leadership positions in organizations than people who experience less social isolation on the job.

**Hypothesis III:** Social isolation will have a more negative effect upon membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations than will technical constraints.

**Hypothesis A I:** People who have a high income and people who have a high education will belong to more, attend more meetings, and have more leadership positions in organizations than people who have a low income and people who have a low education.
Hypothesis A II: Education will have a greater effect upon membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations than either technical constraints or social isolation.

Hypothesis A III: Income will have a greater effect upon membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations than either technical constraints or social isolation.

In the following chapters we will test the hypotheses outlined in this chapter.
CHAPTER IV

TESTING THE HYPOTHESES: TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS

In this chapter the hypothesis relating to technical constraints which was developed in Chapter III will be tested. Specifically, the hypothesis to be tested here is Hypothesis I which was:

Hypothesis I: People whose job is characterized by technical constraints will belong to fewer, attend fewer meetings, and hold fewer leadership positions in organizations than people whose job involves fewer technical constraints.

Table IV - I shows the results of correlating technical constraints with the number of organizations to which the individuals belong. The table shows a positive relationship between the variables with a Gamma of 0.35747 and a Kendall's Tau $\hat{b}$ of 0.22092. In general, the data suggests that individuals working in jobs characterized by low technical constraints belong to more organizations than those experiencing high technical constraints.

**Note:** It should be noted that along with Gamma, Kendall's Tau B will be reported whenever we have a square table and Kendall's Tau C will be reported whenever we have a rectangular table. While Gamma measures the relationship between the variables Kendall's Tau shows the significance level of the relationship.
### Table IV - 1

**Technical Constraints by Number of Organizational Membership (in percentages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Org. Membership</th>
<th>Technical Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>$64.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>$37.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td>$2.0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.35747
Kendall's Tau B = 0.22092 (sig. .002)

Table IV - 2 shows the results of correlating technical constraints with attendance at meetings. The table shows a positive relationship between the two variables with a Gamma of 0.36269 and a Kendall's Tau B of 0.21962. This data suggests that proportionally more individuals who have low technical constraints attend organization meetings more often than do individuals who have high technical constraints on the job.

We next wanted to see if technical constraints on the job would affect whether or not our respondents took leadership roles in organizations. In order to determine this, we asked the respondents two questions. In the first, each individual was asked to state if he presently held a leadership position in the organization to which he belonged.
TABLE IV - 2

TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS BY ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS
(in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance At Meetings</th>
<th>Technical Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never or Hardly Ever</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{Gamma} = 0.36269
\]

\[
\text{Kendall's Tau B} = 0.21962 \text{ (sig. .003)}
\]

\[
N = 132
\]

* Never or Hardly Ever = 0 to 3 times a year
  Sometimes = At least 4 times a year but not more than once a month
  Frequently = more than once a month

Table IV - 2 shows the results of correlating technical constraints with present leadership position in an organization. The table shows a very strong positive relationship between these variables with a Gamma of 0.75574. Although we had only thirteen cases, this data indicates that proportionally more people with low technical constraints on the job had a leadership position in an organization than respondents working under medium and high technical constraints.\(^\text{23}\)

\[^{23}\text{This is discussed later on in the chapter.}\]
### TABLE IV - 3

**Technical Constraints by Presently Has A Leadership Position in an Organization** (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Technical Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total         | 100.0 | 100.0   | 100.0|
Number        | 50    | 24      | 58   |

\[ \text{Gamma} = 0.75574 \]
\[ \text{Kendall's} \tau_u \text{ C} = 0.16621 \text{ (sig. .001)} \]
\[ N = 132 \]

The second question was concerned with whether or not the respondent had a leadership position in an organization at the time of the interview or had held a leadership position in an organization within the past three years. Table IV - 4 shows the results of correlating technical constraints with presently has or had, in the past three years, a leadership position in an organization. This table also shows a very strong relationship between the variables with Gamma being 0.60825. Our data thus showed that proportionally more respondents who worked in jobs characterized by low technical constraints hold or have held a leadership position in an organization than respondents working in jobs characterized by high technical constraints.
## Table IV - 4

**Technical Constraints by Has Now or Previously Had a Leadership Position in an Organization**  
(in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has or Had Leadership</th>
<th>Technical Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.60925  
Kendall's Tau C = 0.16253 (sig. 0.004)  
N = 132

### Discussion

Kleinseder (1972) found that technical constraints on the job had a negative effect upon participation in voluntary associations. As he pointed out in "The Long Arm of The Job: A Study of Work and Leisure", available writings suggested that workplaces varied in the constraints which factory technology imposed upon workers' actions. This condition was considered to have a profound influence on the workers' lives away from work. Until his study, available data only described the workers' attitudes and evaluations without demonstrating the expected effect on activities away from work. With the possible exception of a study by Hagedorn and Labovitz (1962), no research had identified dimensions of constraint and discretion in
industrial work and dealt with their effects on social participation.

The study by Neissner was designed to provide data on the employee's conditions of work and relate this to how he spent his leisure time. Most of his relationships suggested that employees chose leisure activities similar to those of their job. Thus, speaking in terms of "spillover" or "carryover" effect versus the "compensatory" effect, Neissner's study found support for the "carryover".

The results that have just been reported in this chapter provided further support to Neissner's findings. Lack of technical constraints on the job implies that the worker had a certain amount of discretion in his work. Conversely, active participation in organizations implies discretionary activity. Therefore, if work had a compensatory effect one would have expected that workers in jobs characterized by high technical constraints would, in their free time, involve themselves in organizations more than workers in jobs having less technical constraints. With regard to our variables of membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations, we would have expected that the more the constraints the more the workers involvement. If work had a carryover effect we would have expected that people working under more pronounced technical constraints would have belonged to fewer organizations and participated less than workers not so constrained.

In general, the data from our study suggested that
people working in jobs characterized by low technical constraints belonged to more organizations than those who experienced high technical constraints. Everyone in the sample belonged to at least one organization, a union. But Table IV - 1 shows that the constrained workers generally belonged to fewer organizations. For example, of those workers who belonged to only one organization 64 per cent were in the high constraint group, 58.3 per cent were in the medium constraint group, and 43.1 per cent were in the low constraint group. At the other extreme we found that only 4 per cent of the high constraint group belonged to three or more organizations while 12.5 per cent of the medium constraint group and 25.9 of the low constraint group were in this category.

Similar findings were observed when the variable technical constraints was correlated with attendance at meetings. That is, our data suggested that proportionally more individuals who were low in technical constraints attended organization meetings more often than did individuals who had jobs which were characterized by high technical constraints. For example, Table IV - 2 shows that while 70.0 per cent of the high technical constraint group never or hardly ever attended meetings of the organizations to which they belonged, 66.6 per cent of the medium constraint group and 44.8 per cent of the low constraint group gave a similar response. Meanwhile, of those who responded that they attended meetings frequently, 8.0
per cent were in the high constraint category, 16.7 per cent were in the medium constraint category, and 22.4 per cent were in the low constraint category. These findings are consistent with the carryover (or spillover) hypothesis and with Martin Neissner's (1971) study. Thus, our study suggested that people do not compensate off the job. If they did, theory suggests that we would have found that the greater the constraints the greater the workers involvement. That is, the greater the constraints, the greater the belonging and the greater the attendance at organization meetings.

Additional support for Neissner's contention that work had a carryover effect was found when we analyzed the results of correlating technical constraints with leadership in organizations. Leadership is perhaps the most demanding indicator of participation and our study found that the effects tended to be strongest when leadership was related with the independent variable. That is, our study found that proportionally more people working in jobs characterized by low technical constraints had a leadership position in an organization than did those with high technical constraints. For example, Table IV - 3 shows that while only 2.0 per cent of the high constraint group, and 4.2 per cent of the medium constraint group had a leadership position in an organization at the time of the interview, 19.0 per cent of the low constraint group responded that they had a leadership position. As a total, only thirteen of the
individuals interviewed responded that they had a leadership position in an organization. Thus, while at first glance the difference between 2.0 per cent and 19.0 per cent may not seem great, when translated into numbers (i.e.; High = 1, Medium = 1, Low = 11) we can indeed see why Gamma = 0.7557 and the significance of the relationship was .001.

Similarly, a high relationship was also found when technical constraints was correlated with the variable which asked respondents if they presently had a leadership position in an organization or had had one during the past three years (Table IV – 4). Going back three years increased the total who had a leadership position from 13 to 16 respondents. In this case two people from the high constraint group, and twelve from the low constraint group responded that they had now or had held a leadership position in an organization during the past three years.

The study thus found that more people working in jobs characterized by low technical constraints had a leadership position in an organization than did people with high constraint jobs. Our findings clearly favour a carry-over or, to put it in Wilensky's terms, a spillover effect, since a compensatory effect would have predicted that high constraint workers would be more involved than low constraint workers. These findings are also consistent with Neisser's (1971) findings that technical constraints on the job have a negative effect upon an individuals participation in activities off the job.
In the following chapter we will report on the results of correlating social isolation with membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations. We will also report on the relative importance of technical constraints and social isolation.
CHAPTER V

TESTING THE HYPOTHESES: SOCIAL ISOLATION AND THE
RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS
AND SOCIAL ISOLATION

In the previous chapter the hypothesis relating technical constraints to organization membership, participation, and leadership was tested. In this chapter the hypothesis relating social isolation to organizational membership, participation, and leadership and the hypothesis regarding the relative importance of technical constraints and social isolation will be tested. First, though, we will test Hypothesis II which was outlined in Chapter III.

Hypothesis II: People who experience more social isolation on the job will belong to fewer, attend fewer meetings, and hold fewer leadership positions in organizations than people who experience less social isolation on the job.

Table V - I shows the results of correlating social isolation with the number of organizations to which the respondents belong. The table shows a positive relationship between the variables with a Gamma of 0.15865 and a Kendall's Tau B of 0.09814.
### Table V - I

Social Isolation by Number of Organizational Membership (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Org. Membership</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                | 100.0 | 100.0  | 100.0 |
| Number               | 32    | 41     | 59    |

\[ \text{Gamma} = 0.1565 \]

Kendall's Tau B = 0.09214 (N.S.)  
\[ N = 132 \]

When social isolation was correlated with attendance at meetings we again found a positive relationship. In this case Gamma was 0.10986 and Kendall's Tau B was 0.06637.

Table V - 2 shows the results obtained when social isolation was correlated with the frequency with which the respondents attended meetings in organizations to which they belonged.

Social isolation was next correlated with two questions concerned with whether or not the respondent had a leadership position in an organization. Table V - 3 shows the results of correlating social isolation with presently has a leadership position in an organization. The table shows a positive relationship between the variables with a Gamma of 0.20821 and a Kendall's Tau C of 0.04660.
### TABLE V - 2

**SOCIAL ISOLATION BY ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS** *(in percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance At Meetings</th>
<th>Social Isolation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never or Hardly Ever *</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.10986
Kendall's Tau B = 0.06637 *(N.S.)*
N = 132

* Never or Hardly Ever = 0 to 3 times a year
  Sometimes = At least 4 times a year but not more than once a month
  Frequently = more than once a month

### TABLE V - 3

**SOCIAL ISOLATION BY PRESENCE IN A LEADERSHIP POSITION IN AN ORGANIZATION** *(in percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has Leadership</th>
<th>Social Isolation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.20621
Kendall's Tau C = 0.04660 *(N.S.)*
N = 132
Table V - 4 shows the results obtained regarding the second question on leadership. This question asked the respondent if he had at the present time or had, at any time during the past three years, a leadership position in an organization. The table shows that when social isolation was correlated with presently has or had a leadership position in an organization a positive relationship was again obtained. In this case Gamma was 0.13845 and Kendall's Tau C was 0.05096.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has or Had Leadership</th>
<th>Social Isolation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mid.</th>
<th>Low.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.13845  
Kendall's Tau C = 0.05096 (n.s.)  
\[ n = 132 \]

Before proceeding with a discussion of the findings regarding Hypothesis II, the third hypothesis of this study will be investigated. This hypothesis was concerned with the relative importance of technical constraints and social isolation upon organizational membership, participation,
and leadership. First discussed in Chapter III, this hypothesis was:

**Hypothesis III**: Social isolation will have a more generative effect upon membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations than will technical constraints.

Specifically, we had expected that people who experienced social isolation on the job would belong to fewer, actively participate less, and hold less leadership positions in organizations than people whose jobs were characterized by technical constraints. A comparison of tables one to four in Chapter IV with the appropriate tables one to four in this chapter clearly shows that this study found the opposite to be true. That is, technical constraints generally had a greater effect upon membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations than did social isolation. For example, Table IV - I shows that when technical constraints was correlated with organizational membership a Gamma of 0.35747 and a Kendall's Tau B of 0.22092 was obtained. In Table V - I the results of correlating social isolation with organizational membership are shown. The table shows that in this case Gamma was 0.15865 and Kendall's Tau B was 0.09814. The relationship between social isolation and organizational membership was therefore much lower than the relationship between technical constraints and organizational membership.

Tables IV - 2 and V - 2 show the results obtained
When technical constraints and social isolation were related to participation in organizations. The reader will note that when technical constraints was correlated with attendance at meetings the Gamma obtained was 0.36269 and Kendall's Tau $\beta$ was 0.21962 while when social isolation was correlated with the same variable the Gamma was 0.10966 and Kendall's Tau $\beta$ was 0.06637.

With regard to leadership, Table IV - 3 shows that when technical constraints was correlated with presently has a leadership position in an organization we obtained a Gamma of 0.75574 and a Kendall's Tau C of 0.16621. Table IV - 4 shows the relationship obtained when technical constraints was correlated with presently has or had a leadership position in an organization during the past three years. In this case the Gamma was 0.60825 and Kendall's Tau C was 0.16253.

The data in Table V - 3 shows that when social isolation was correlated with presently has a leadership position in an organization Gamma was 0.20821 and Kendall's Tau C was 0.04660. When correlating social isolation with presently has or had a leadership position in an organization during the past three years the results, which can be observed in Table V - 4, show that the Gamma in this case was 0.18845 and Kendall’s Tau C was 0.05096.

Discussion

In "The Long Arm of the Job: A Study of Work and Leisure", Martin Niessner (1971), found that social isolation
had a negative effect upon participation in voluntary associations. Like technical constraints, social isolation on the job was considered to have a profound influence on workers lives away from work. Neissner's theory suggested that lack of social isolation on the job implied that the worker had some discretion in his work. Since active participation in organizations implies discretionary activity, if work had a compensatory effect one would expect that workers in jobs characterized by high social isolation would be more involved in their leisure time than workers in jobs characterized by little social isolation. Thus, one would expect that the more the isolation, the more the workers involvement in organizations. Conversely, if work had a carryover effect one would expect that people having high social isolation on the job would participate less than people having low social isolation on the job. The high isolation workers would thus belong to fewer, attend fewer meetings, and hold fewer leadership positions in organizations than the low social isolation workers.

Our findings on the effects of social isolation upon participation were not as clear cut as were the findings on the effects of technical constraints. When social isolation was correlated with membership in organizations we found a low positive relationship. Low positive relationships were also obtained when social isolation was correlated with both attendance at meetings and leadership in organizations. Although they were in the right
direction, indications that social isolation did correlate with our dependent variables were low and, unlike the case of technical constraints, none of these relationships were statistically significant.

Because the results of correlating social isolation with the dependent variables did not yield statistically significant relationships, social isolation was recoded so as to conform more closely to Meissner's coding\(^ {24}\). The recoded variable was then correlated with each of the dependent variables. The results of these correlations were virtually no different than the results obtained using our coding\(^ {25}\).

Our findings regarding the importance of social isolation were surprising indeed. Following Meissner's theory, one would assume that if work had a carryover effect, as he found in his study, social isolation on the

---

\(^ {24}\) In Meissner's (1971) study there was no medium isolation category. Meissner used only two categories; high isolation and low isolation. In his study, a high isolation response was coded if an individual answered negatively to one or more of the questions. In our study, one negative response was coded as medium constraints, not high constraints. Our high constraint category consisted of individuals giving a negative response to two or all three questions (see Chapter III for complete information regarding construction of our measures).

\(^ {25}\) In fact, most of the relationships using Meissner's coding were even lower than the relationships obtained using our coding. For the purpose of analysis though, the differences were so small that they are hardly worth commenting on. For example, the largest difference was observed in the case of correlating social isolation with presently has or had within the past three years, a leadership position in an organization. In this case our coding produced a Gamma which was greater by 0.06776.
job would certainly be an important predictor of participation. The variable should in fact be a more important predictor of participation than should technical constraints\(^\text{26}\). This is because technical constraints, by definition, does not imply lack of social contact with other workers. Meanwhile, social isolation relates specifically to lack of social contacts on the job. If work has a carryover effect it appears logical to expect social isolation to be the major predictor variable regarding membership, attendance at meetings and, in particular, leadership in organizations.

Outside the realm of work, participation in organizations is a more formal and thus more demanding measure of social interaction. Participation in organizations could be considered a more 'purpose-directed activity' than other involvements\(^\text{27}\). Since technical constraints does not imply lack of social interaction while social isolation does, and since participation in organizations also implies social interaction, social isolation on the job should be more closely related to participation in organizations than should technical constraints.

\(^{26}\)This finding would then be consistent with Keissner's findings in 'The long arm of the job', (1971).

\(^{27}\)The relevance of these statements is perhaps best described and related to our discussion by re-quotting part of a previously quoted statement..."When work is socially isolating, workers reduce their exposure to situations in which they have to talk, and also spend less time in organized and purpose-directed activities...Lack of opportunity to talk on the job is associated with dramatically reduced rates of participation in association, that is, in activity commonly believed to help integrate individuals into the community." (Keissner; 1971 : 260)
Since our findings were not consistent with Neissner's (1971) study and with our theory, social isolation was correlated with technical constraints. Unlike Neissner's study which found that technical constraints and social isolation had independent effects, our data showed a high correlation between the variables.\footnote{This data is shown in Appendix 2.} Generally, we found that the higher the constraints, the higher the social isolation. Thus, in our study, social isolation was not an independent variable but was in fact related to technical constraints.

We can perhaps explain our findings regarding social isolation in two ways. First, it may be that in our study the findings were opposite to Neissner's because of the phrasing of one of the questions used to construct the variable, social isolation. In our study, one of the questions used was: "While you are actually doing your work, can you talk to other people, besides the ones you work with?" In Neissner's study, the question was: "While you are actually doing your work, do you get to talk to other people, besides the ones you work with?" (1971: 247). While reading Neissner's article, it occurred to us that do you get to talk to other people may not elicit a clear cut answer since it may be interpreted to mean 'do you talk to other people'. Furthermore, workers may not 'get to talk to other people' simply because they do not care to do so.
For this reason, we asked "can you talk to other people". It was felt that asking the question using can would elicit a more clear cut yes or no answer. If the question was misinterpreted by some of Meissner's respondents, the fact that he placed those giving one negative response in the high isolation category may have made his categorization invalid. That Meissner's question could have been misinterpreted and even coded incorrectly seems possible since, in his interviews, this researcher found that when asked if they could talk to other people, some respondents simply gave answers such as "I don't talk with other people". In cases such as this they were asked to simply state if they could, not if they did or did not. Our interest was not in determining whether or not an individual talked to other people for psychological or personal reasons. Our interest was in finding out if the reason our respondents talked to others on the job was related to a particular job characteristic, social isolation.

Another likely explanation for the different results could be that while Meissner studied a subsample of a large wood-products manufacturing company, our study involved a sample of automobile workers. While social isolation in an automobile plant may be a product of technical constraints, this may not be true in the case of a lumber camp. Thus, the nature of the industries involved may have produced the dissimilar results. In any case, our data clearly indicated that social isolation was not nearly as important in
predicting membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations as was technical constraints. This finding suggests that conclusions which state that work has a spillover effect may be premature.

In the following chapter we will examine the importance of education and income in predicting membership, attendance at meetings and leadership in organizations. We will also discuss the relative importance of education, income, technical constraints and social isolation as predictors of participation in organizations.
CHAPTER VI

TESTING THE HYPOTHESES: EDUCATION AND INCOME

In the two preceding chapters the hypotheses relating technical constraints and social isolation with number of organizational membership, active participation in organizations (i.e., attendance at meetings), and leadership in organizations were tested. Also tested was the hypothesis concerning the relative importance of technical constraints and social isolation. In this chapter we will focus on the role of education and income in predicting membership, attendance at meetings and leadership in organizations. We will now test hypothesis AI which was first stated in Chapter III.

Hypothesis AI: People who have a high income and people who have a high education will belong to more, attend more meetings, and have more leadership positions in organizations than people who have a low income and people who have a low education.

Income

Table VI - I shows the results of correlating total family income with the number of organizations to which the respondents belonged. The table shows a positive
correlation with a Gamma of 0.31207 and a Kendall's Tau C of 0.19370. The data indicates that proportionally more respondents who have a high total family income belong to more organizations than do respondents who have a low family income.

### TABLE VI - 1

**TOTAL FAMILY INCOME BY NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP (in percentages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of org. membership</th>
<th>6,000</th>
<th>12,000</th>
<th>16,000</th>
<th>20,000 or over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.31207  
Kendall's Tau C = 0.19370 (sig. .005)  
N = 132

When total family income was correlated with attendance at meetings we again found a positive relationship. Our Gamma here was 0.29358 and Kendall's Tau C was 0.16912. Table VI - 2 shows the results of correlating the two variables. This data suggested that proportionally more individuals who have a high total family income attend organization meetings more often than do respondents who have a low family income.
TABLE VI - 2
TOTAL FAMILY INCOME BY ATTENDANCE
AT MEETINGS (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Attendance</th>
<th>8,000</th>
<th>12,000</th>
<th>16,000</th>
<th>19,999</th>
<th>20,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never or Hardly Ever</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.29858
Kendall's Tau C = 0.15912 (sig. .007)
N = 132

* Never or Hardly Ever = 0 to 3 times a year
* Sometimes = At least 4 times a year but not more than once a month
* Frequently = more than once a month

When leadership in organizations was investigated, the study found a positive relationship between total family income and presently has a leadership position in an organization. Table VI - 3 below shows that Gamma was equal to 0.54454 and Kendall's Tau C was 0.13613.

The second question was concerned with whether or not the respondent had a leadership position in an organization at the time of the interview or had held a leadership position in an organization within the past three years. Table VI - 4 shows the results of correlating total family
income with presently has or had, in the past three years, a leadership position in an organization. This table also shows a positive relationship with Gamma equal to 0.43036 and Kendall's Tau C equal to 0.12626. Our data thus showed that proportionally more respondents with a high total family income hold or have held a leadership position in an organization than respondents with a low total family income.

**TABLE VI - 3**

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME BY HAS A LEADERSHIP POSITION
(in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has Leadership</th>
<th>5,000</th>
<th>15,000</th>
<th>16,000</th>
<th>20,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total          | 100.0 | 100.0  | 100.0  | 100.0          |
| Number         | 16    | 53     | 45     | 18             |

Gamma = 0.54454

Kendall's Tau C = 0.13613 (sig. 0.008)

N = 132
TABLE VI - 4
TOTAL FAMILY INCOME BY PRESENTLY HAS OR PREVIOUSLY HAD A LEADERSHIP POSITION (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has or Had Leadership</th>
<th>Total Income $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number

| Gamma = 0.43036       |
| Kendall's Tau C = 0.12675 (sig. .021) |
| N = 132               |

Education

Turning to education as a predictor variable, tables five to eight show the results of correlating the variable with membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations. Table VI - 5 shows the results of correlating education with number of organizational membership. The table shows a positive correlation with a Gamma of 0.34491 and a Kendall's Tau $b$ equal to 0.18777. In general, the data suggested that proportionally more individuals who had more years of formal education belonged to a greater number of organizations than those who had fewer years of formal education.

When correlating education with attendance at meetings a positive relationship was found. Table VI - 6 shows that
here we obtained a Gamma equal to 0.31822 and a Kendall's Tau B of 0.17442. This data suggested that proportionally more individuals who had more formal education attend organizational meetings more often than those who had less formal education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Org. Membership</th>
<th>3-8 years</th>
<th>9-12 years</th>
<th>13 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.34481  
Kendall's Tau B = 0.18777 (sig. .010)  
N = 132
### TABLE VI - 6

**NUMBER OF YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION**

**by Attendance at Meetings**

(in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Attendance</th>
<th>3-8 years</th>
<th>9-12 years</th>
<th>13 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never or Hardly Ever</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100.0 100.0 100.0

Number 27 87 18

\[ \text{Gamma} = 0.31922 \]

\[ \text{Kendall's Tau B} = 0.17442 \text{ (sic .015)} \]

\[ \gamma = 132 \]

* Coding is the same as Table VI - 2

Turning to leadership, Table VI - 7 shows the results obtained when education was correlated with whether or not the respondent held a leadership position in an organization at the time of the interview. The table shows a positive relationship with Gamma equal to 0.58929 and Kendall's Tau C equal to 0.12121.

The second question on leadership asked the respondents if they held a leadership position in an organization at the time of the interview or if they had held a leadership position in an organization during the past three years. Table VI - 8 shows the results of
correlating education with presently has or previously had a leadership position in an organization. Here again we see a positive correlation with Gamma equal to 0.49546 and Kendall's Tau C equal to 0.12534. This data indicated that there were proportionally more respondents with a high level of formal education that had now or had held at some time during the past three years, a leadership position in an organization than respondents with less years of formal education.

**TABLE VI - 7**

**EDUCATION BY HAS A LEADERSHIP POSITION**

(in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has Leadership</th>
<th>3-8 years</th>
<th>9-12 years</th>
<th>13 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.58929  
Kendall's Tau C = 0.12121 (sig. .008)  
N = 132
TABLE VI - 8
EDUCATION BY PRESENTLY HAS OR PREVIOUSLY
HAD A LEADERSHIP POSITION
(in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has or Had Leadership</th>
<th>3-8 years</th>
<th>9-12 years</th>
<th>13 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.49546
Kendall's Tau C = 0.12534 (sig. 012)
N = 132

Discussion: Hypothesis A1

The studies reported in Chapter I have suggested that social participation is affected by many variables. In this research we have suggested that two of the most important variables affecting participation would be education and income. This suggestion emanated from the findings of studies reported in the review of the literature. For example, Reissman (1954), found that social class differences in participation and leisure activities existed. His data showed that higher class people belonged to more organizations, attended more meetings, and tended to hold

29Social Class was measured by occupation, education, and income.
office in those organizations more often than did lower class people. In relation to our expectations, the interesting finding here was that this was true regardless of whether occupation, education, or income was used to measure class position.

The suggestion that education and income were important predictors of participation got further support from many other studies reported in the review of the literature. Here, we are specifically referring to those which used social class or prestige level to show differences in participation. Furthermore, studies dealing specifically with education and/or income, and not such broad measures as prestige level or social class, found these variables to be important predictors of participation.

Our study also suggested that both education and income were good predictors of participation. When income was correlated with the dependent variables, our data showed that proportionally more respondents who had a high total family income belonged to more, attended more meetings, and held more leadership positions in organizations than did respondents who had a low family income. When education was correlated with the dependent variables the data suggested that, in general, the higher the education, the more membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership

30The obvious reason for this being that education and income were used to measure prestige level and high or low social class.
in organizations. Thus, our findings were consistent with Hypothesis A1 and with the many studies which showed that education and income were good predictors of participation in organizations.

In Chapter II we outlined some possible explanations for the importance of education and income in predicting active participation in organizations. It was suggested that education tends to broaden one's perspective and a broader knowledge may give rise to a better self-concept which may, in turn, encourage participation. Education is also responsible for the acquisition of speaking skills. A person having these skills may participate more in organizations and run for office more than someone who does not possess these skills. It has also been suggested that one of the values that formal education instills in individuals is that community participation is socially desirable (Kepedjian and Labovitz, 1968). Thus, a higher education would also make one more aware of social pressures for participation. Furthermore, education makes one more aware, through both formal and informal channels of communication, of various organizations and more cognizant of community resources for leisure time activities.

Income was considered important in that an individual with an adequate income could afford to spend more time in various activities. A certain level of income may permit the acquisition of necessary equipment and also allow the costs of sometimes necessary travel to be borne. Lackin
adequate financial resources, the lower income individual may not have sufficient time or ability to free himself from economic and financial responsibilities. He may thus be left with little time to devote to participation in organized associations. Unfortunately, the focus of this study was not to be upon specifically determining why education and income were important. Instead, the study was designed to test the validity of Heissner's (1971) findings that technical constraints and social isolation would have a negative effect upon participation in organizations and, consequently, his conclusion that work had a spillover effect. It was also expected that this study would provide data which would allow us to arrive at a conclusion with regard to which variables (i.e., technical constraints, social isolation - education, income) were the best predictors of participation in organizations. We will now turn to an examination and discussion of the relative importance of our independent variables in predicting participation in organizations.

Discussion: Hypothesis AII and Hypothesis AIII

In Chapter III we proposed Hypothesis AII and Hypothesis AIII, which were:

**Hypothesis AII:**

Education will have a greater effect upon membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations than either technical constraints or social isolation.
Hypothesis III:
Income will have a greater effect upon membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations than either technical constraints or social isolation.

In Appendix E we see, in summary, the results obtained when our independent variables were correlated with the dependent variables. In general, our data suggested that technical constraints was the best predictor of membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations. Our summary shows that the relationships were greater when technical constraints was correlated with each of the dependent variables than when social isolation, education, or total family income was correlated with these variables. The summary table also shows that while technical constraints gave us the highest correlations, education, the next highest, and income, also gave high correlations. The lowest correlations were obtained when social isolation was correlated with each of the dependent variables. Furthermore, while we generally found the correlations between technical constraints, education, and income and the dependent variables to be statistically significant\footnote{We only found that we did not obtain a significant relationship (i.e., $< 0.01$), when income was correlated with presently has or previously had a leadership position in an organization. In this case the significance obtained was $0.01$.}, none of the relationships between social isolation and the dependent
variables were significant\(^3\). Hypotheses AII and AIII were not supported, at least as we stated them by our data. That is, while we found that both income and education were better predictors of participation in organizations than was social isolation, we also found that technical constraints was a somewhat better predictor than either income or education\(^3\).

Considering the size of our sample and the relationships obtained we must conclude that education and income are indeed important variables to consider when attempting to predict participation in organizations. Although technical constraints appeared to be important, our study found that social isolation did not have the effect reported by Meissner (1971). In our study social isolation was highly related to technical constraints and did not have an independent effect and both education and income were found to be good predictors of participation. Hypotheses AII and AIII were therefore partially supported.

---

\(^3\)These relationships are also shown and discussed in Chapter V.

\(^3\)We should also state here that we initially intended to correlate technical constraints and social isolation with the dependent variables and control for education and income and discuss these findings. This would have allowed for a better interpretation of the relative importance of the variables. Unfortunately, when we did this our cells were too small to warrant a discussion.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will be presented in four sections. In the first three sections a review and discussion of the findings on technical constraints, social isolation, and education and income will be presented. The final section will focus on the conclusions of the study.

PART I - TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS

In Chapter IV we reported the findings on technical constraints. Following Neissner's theory (1971), it was suggested that people working in jobs characterized by high technical constraints would belong to fewer, attend fewer meetings, and have fewer leadership positions in organizations than people whose job was less constraining. Data from this study suggests that this was in fact the case. First, the study found that people whose job was more constraining generally belonged to fewer organizations than people whose job was less constraining.

Secondly, we found that people whose job was more constraining generally attended fewer meetings in organizations than people whose job was less constraining.

Finally, we found that people whose job was more
constraining tended to have fewer leadership positions in organizations than people whose job was less constraining. Two questions were used to determine leadership. The first referred to whether the respondent presently had a leadership position in an organization and the second to whether the respondent presently has or had a leadership position in an organization during the past three years. The relationship obtained when correlating technical constraints with both these variables were much higher than those obtained when technical constraints was correlated with membership in organizations and attendance at meetings. Since leadership is the most demanding indicator of participation, this finding was expected. In general, data from this study suggested that the higher the constraints on the job the lower the membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in formally organized associations.

Our findings regarding technical constraints on the job thus provide additional support to Heissner's thesis. Besides finding the relationships between technical constraints and the dependent variables to be all in the predicted direction, we also found that they were statistically significant. Furthermore, we found that the effects of technical constraints were more apparent in the case of leadership in organizations. This finding was also consistent with Heissner's (1971) thesis.
PART II - SOCIAL ISOLATION

The study by Martin Heissner (1971) also found that people working in jobs that limited interaction with others would participate less in voluntary organizations than people working in jobs which did not limit interaction with other people in the workplace. This characteristic was referred to as social isolation on the job. Again, following Heissner (1971), we hypothesized that people who experienced more social isolation on the job would belong to fewer, attend fewer meetings, and have fewer leadership positions in organizations than people who experienced less social isolation on the job. Although the relationships were in the hypothesized direction, in this case our findings were not as clear as they were in the case of technical constraints. When social isolation was correlated with the number of organizational membership the data suggested that the more isolated individuals generally belonged to fewer organizations than the less isolated individuals. But the relationship obtained here was much smaller than the relationship obtained when technical constraints was correlated with the dependent variable.

When social isolation was correlated with attendance at meetings we found that although the relationship was in the predicted direction, the relationship was, again, much smaller than when technical constraints was correlated with the variable. Since this finding did not support Heissner, we re-coded social isolation so that it would be more
consistent with his categories. This change resulted in an even lower relationship between social isolation and attendance at meetings. In this case, then, we obtained results which were contrary to our expectations and to Keissner's (1971) findings.

When we correlated social isolation with the questions on leadership, we found the relationships to be in the predicted direction. This data also suggested that the more isolated respondents had fewer leadership positions in organizations than respondents who were less isolated. Again, though, as was the case for membership in organizations, the relationships obtained when correlating social isolation with the two questions on leadership were much smaller than the relationships obtained when technical constraints were correlated with the same questions.

Keissner (1971) found that social isolation on the job had a greater effect upon participation in organizations than did technical constraints. He found that people who worked in jobs characterized by social isolation participated less than people who worked in jobs characterized by technical constraints. We therefore also hypothesized this relationship. We expected that social isolation would have a greater (more negative) effect upon membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations than would technical constraints. Contrary to these expectations and contrary to Keissner's (1971) findings, our data clearly showed that technical constraints was much more important than
was social isolation. When the dependent variables were correlated with technical constraints the relationships obtained were much higher than when they were correlated with social isolation. Furthermore, while the relationships between technical constraints and the dependent variables of this study were all statistically significant, none of the relationships between social isolation and the dependent variables were found to be significant.

PART III - EDUCATION AND INCOME

In Chapter I we noted that previous studies also found that, for various reasons, education and income influenced leisure response patterns. Some of these studies showed that these variables were good predictors of participation in voluntary associations. In Chapter II, the researcher gave a summary outline of the importance of education and income. Because the researcher felt that these variables were perhaps better predictors of participation in organizations, other hypotheses were purported and investigated. One specified that education would have a greater effect upon membership, participation, and leadership in organizations than either technical constraints or social isolation. This hypothesis was partially supported by the data from this study.

The researcher expected that a lower number of years of formal education would have a negative effect on participation in organizations. It was therefore expected that a lower education would be a better predictor of
membership, participation, and leadership in organizations than would either technical constraints or social isolation. In this regard, our data was consistent throughout for each of the dependent variables. The study found, as expected, that education was much more important in predicting number of organizational membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations than was social isolation. But contrary to expectations, the study found that technical constraints was a better predictor of each of the dependent variables than was total number of years of formal education. Although this finding was contrary to our expectations, the difference in the strength of the relationships was very small.

Another hypothesis predicted that income would have a greater effect upon membership, participation, and leadership in organizations than either technical constraints or social isolation. The researcher expected that a lower total family income would have a negative effect on participation in organizations. It was therefore predicted that a lower income would be a better predictor of membership, participation, and leadership in organizations than would either technical constraints or social isolation. This hypothesis was also partially supported by the data from this study. Again the data was consistent throughout for each of the dependent variables. For example, as was expected, the study found that total family income was much more important in predicting number of organizational
membership, attendance at meetings, and leadership in organizations than was social isolation. But contrary to expectations, the study found that technical constraints were somewhat better in predicting the dependent variables than was total family income. Again, though, the difference in the strength of the relationships was very small.

In sum, our data suggested that both education and income were good predictors of membership, attendance at meetings and leadership in organizations but the best predictor was technical constraints. Contrary to Reissner's (1971) study, our study found that social isolation was not a good predictor of the dependent variables.

PART IV - CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter II we noted that in The Long Arm of the Job: A Study of Work and Leisure, Martin Reissner suggested that: "When choice of action is suppressed by the spatial, temporal, and functional constraints of the work process worker capacity for meeting the demands of spare-time activities which require discretion is reduced." As a consequence, these people engage less in activities which necessitate planning, coordination, and purposeful action such as active participation in voluntary organizations. His study found that technical constraints had a negative effect upon participation in organizations. He found that people working under more pronounced technical constraints participated less in voluntary organizations. He also found that these people held fewer leadership positions.
people having lesser technical constraints. In fact, the effects of technical constraints tended to be strongest for leadership in organizations. He felt that this finding was particularly important because Neisser considered leadership to be the most demanding indicator of participation. According to Neisser, these findings tended to support the 'spillover' leisure hypothesis which suggests that work and leisure are related in that the leisure patterns people adopt are similar to their work. In other words, people who perform meaningful work tasks will engage in meaningful leisure activities while people who perform nonmeaningful work tasks will engage in nonmeaningful leisure activities.

In the same study quoted above, Neisser also suggested that: "When work is socially isolating, workers reduce their exposure to situations in which they have to talk...lack of opportunity to talk on the job is associated with dramatically reduced rates of participation in associations, that is, in activity commonly believed to help integrate individuals into the community." (1971: 260). His study found that social isolation on the job had a negative effect upon participation in organizations. An analysis of his data showed that people who were more socially isolated in their job participated less in voluntary organizations. He concluded that this finding also supported the 'spillover' hypothesis of work and leisure. Neisser also found that, while both technical constraints and social isolation had independent effects, social
isolation was more important than technical constraints.

Meissner’s study did not take into consideration variables such as education and income. Many leisure studies reported in Chapter I have either suggested or implied that education and income affected an individual’s leisure patterns, including participation in organizations. Bell and Force (1956), for example, found that people who belonged to more formal associations and participated more, tended to have a higher education and a higher income. Wilensky (1961a), suggested that education led to an orderly work history, which in turn led to more membership and attendance at meetings in formal organizations. Pope (1964), also found that education and income were important when considering participation in formal voluntary associations. Numerous other studies have also suggested that education and income were important predictors of participation in organizations. This study, therefore, was a test of Meissner’s (1971) thesis but also looked at the importance of education and income. The researcher also suggested that the most important predictors of participation were education and income.

The question that arises here then is: What can be concluded from the findings of this study? Perhaps the most obvious and simplest answer to the question would be that technical constraints, education, and income were the

These authors, though, concluded that it was the neighbourhood that made the major difference.
most important predictors of the independent variables.
Such an answer, though, does not explain the contradictory
findings.

The most contradictory findings of this study appear
to be those regarding the effects of technical constraints
and social isolation. Technical constraints were found to
have a negative effect upon the dependent variables but
social isolation apparently had little effect. This is
indeed an interesting finding since one would probably
expect that if Keissner (1971) is correct and work has a
'spillover' effect the opposite would be true. One would
think that social isolation would be more closely related
to involvement in organization than would technical
constraints simply because both social isolation on the job
and involvement in organizations deal with social contact.
While technical constraints do not necessarily imply lack
of social contact with others on the job, social isolation,
by definition, does. Keissner's (1971) finding that social
isolation makes more of a difference than technical con-
straints is therefore consistent with the 'spillover'
effect. Our study then, seems to indicate that there was no
spillover effect. But this is not necessarily the case.
The reason for this is that while Keissner found that both
social isolation and technical constraints had independent
effects, this study found that only technical constraints
had independent effects. When we correlated social isola-
tion with technical constraints we found a high correlation
between the variables. We found that the higher the constraints the higher the isolation.

Our data on the effects of education and income shows that both were good predictors of the dependent variables. Technical constraints though, was a somewhat better predictor. This was particularly true in the case of number of meetings attended. The fact that, as predicted, both education and income were found to be so important suggests that they may still be the most important predictors of participation in organizations. It should be remembered that there were only 132 respondents in this study. Therefore, a study similar to ours but using a much larger sample which would include more people in each category would obviously allow us to arrive at more definite conclusions. Studies along this line should also include questions which would allow the investigator to study specific reasons for the importance of education and income, assuming they are again found to be important. This type of a study appears to be the only type that would allow more definite conclusions regarding the relative importance of the work structure related variables and variables such as education and income.
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### APPENDIX B

**CAPD SHOWING TOTAL FAMILY INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Income</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. under $8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $8,000 - $9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $10,000 - $11,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $12,000 - $13,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $14,000 - $15,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. $16,000 - $17,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. $18,000 - $19,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. $20,000 - $24,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. $25,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Card 1 and 3 are shown below. Exhibit 1 shows Card 1 which was given to the respondent when he was asked, "Here is a list of clubs and organizations that some people belong to. Would you look at this list and tell me if you belong to any of these kinds of organizations and could you name the organization?" Exhibit 2 shows Card 3 which was presented to the respondent when he was asked: "How often do you attend meetings?"

When the respondent answered these questions the information was coded in the information sheet which is shown as Exhibit 3. On this sheet, the interviewer coded the actual name of the organization and all other information in the appropriate spot. The numbers 22 to 26 in Exhibit 3 indicate that this was question 22, 23, and so on. The information was coded below. For example, suppose the respondent belonged to three organizations. The name of each organization (and other information about its activities), was recorded on the sheet. For each organization, the respondent was then asked: "How often do you attend meetings?", and shown Card 3 (see Exhibit 2). If the respondent attended about once a year in each organization, number 5 was marked in the appropriate spot on Exhibit 3.

When all the interviews were completed the researcher coded the number of organizations to which the respondents
belonged. All belonged to at least one, their union. The researcher then had to code the next variable, active participation, meaning the number of meetings that the respondent attended in these organizations. Some people belonged to more than one organization. Furthermore, each organization had various amounts of meetings per year and people also attended more meetings in some organizations and less in others. A coding system to consider how often an individual attended meetings was then devised. Take, for example, the individual above who belonged to three organizations and attended meetings about once a year in each. Thus, the researcher considered that this individual attended organization meetings about three times. The final coding scheme for the purpose of analyzing the question regarding attendance at meetings is shown below and marked Exhibit 4.
Labour Unions
Church-Connected Groups
Fraternal Organizations or Louges
Veteran's Organizations
Business or Civic Groups, Service Clubs
Parent-Teachers Associations
Youth Groups (Scout Leaders, etc.)
Neighbourhood Clubs or Community Centers
Organizations of People of the Same Nationality
Sports Team, Country Clubs
Professional Groups
Political Clubs or Organizations
Neighbourhood Improvement Associations
Card Clubs, Men's Social Clubs
Charitable and Welfare Organizations
Other (specify)
**EXHIBIT 2**

**Card 3**

1) About once a week
2) About once a month
3) About every three months
4) About twice a year
5) About once a year
6) Never
7) Other (specify) __________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization (What kind of things do you do at the meetings?)</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL
EXHIBIT 4

ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS

0. Never
1. One to three times a year
2. More than three times a year but less than once a month
3. About once a month
4. More than once a month but less than once a week
5. About once a week (or more)
APPENDIX D

TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS BY SOCIAL ISOLATION
(in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Isolation</th>
<th>Technical Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{Gamma} = 0.33932$

Kendall's Tau $\hat{b} = 0.32-30$ (Sig. .002)

$\hat{b} = 132$
**APPENDIX F**

**SUMMARY RESULTS OF COMPARING THE RELATIVE EFFECTS OF TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS, SOCIAL ISOLATION, EDUCATION AND INCOME WITH THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Constraints</th>
<th>Social Isolation</th>
<th>Total Family Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>.35747</td>
<td>.15865</td>
<td>.31207</td>
<td>.34491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>.36269</td>
<td>.10986</td>
<td>.29358</td>
<td>.31822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>.75574</td>
<td>.20821</td>
<td>.54494</td>
<td>.58929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>.60525</td>
<td>.18845</td>
<td>.43036</td>
<td>.49546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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