REEVE D. VANNEMAN AND THOMAS F. PETTIGREW

Race and Relative Deprivation in the Urban United States

INTRODUCTION

This study develops out of two separate literatures in social psychology—one concerned with the subjective aspects of social stratification, the other with the correlates of racial attitudes. The first of these areas has a rich history in social science, while the second is of recent vintage. We shall sketch out briefly these two literatures, followed by the presentation of our research findings relevant to both.

Subjective Aspects of Social Stratification

It has long been recognized in sociology and social anthropology as well as in social psychology that the objective features of a society's social stratification system only grossly predict individual attitudes and behaviour. Deviant cases are so numerous that popular names arise to describe them: the Tory worker, the genteel poor, the limousine liberal. Early theorists took up the issue. Cooley discussed 'selective affinity' to groups outside of one's immediate environment; William James argued that our potential 'social self' is developed and strengthened by thoughts of remote groups and individuals who function as normative points of reference (Hyman and Singer, 1968).

But it was not until the 1940s that modern nomenclature and theory was established. Hyman (1942) advanced the term *reference group* to account for his interview and experimental data on how his subjects employed status comparisons in the process of self-appraisal. An individual, he argues, typically 'refers' his behaviour and attitudes to a variety of reference groups to which he may or may not belong. The concept soon found wide favour throughout social psychology, for, as Newcomb points out (1951), it focuses upon the central problem of the discipline: the relationship of the individual to society.

Later writers have contributed a number of clarifying distinctions. Charters and Newcombe (1952) demonstrated that *negative* reference

REEVE D. VANNEMAN is currently completing his Ph.D. degree in Social Psychology at Harvard University; Dr. THOMAS F. PETTIGREW is a Professor of Social Psychology at Harvard University. The authors wish to express their appreciation to their research project colleagues, Robert T. Riley and J. Michael Ross, for their help and suggestions on the work reported here. We also wish to thank the Rockefeller Foundation for their firm support during a difficult period in the United States for social science research on race relations.

groups can be just as influential in reverse as *positive* ones. Merton (1957) noted the operation of reference *individuals* as well as reference *groups*. Most important, Kelley (1952) made the critical distinction between *comparative* and *normative* reference groups.[a] Reference groups can provide standards of comparison for self-evaluation and can also serve as a source for an individual's attitudes, norms, and values. In practice, it is often difficult to untangle these two functions, though our research reported here dwells on the comparative function of class and racial reference groups.

The past twenty years has witnessed widespread use of the reference group concept in research. A few studies have explored the comparative effects of reference groups, ranging from job satisfaction (Patchen, 1961; Form and Geschwender, 1962) and perceptions of class inequalities (Runciman, 1966), to the self-evaluations of the blind (Strauss, 1968) and mental illness among black Americans (Parker and Kleiner, 1966).[b] By far the greatest empirical attention, however, has been paid to normative reference groups. A number of these studies have centred upon changes among college students as a function of their adopting the college as referent; the Bennington College investigation by Newcomb (1943) is an early and famous example of this genre.[c] Other research on the normative function has often employed voting as the dependent variable (Campbell et al, 1954; Campbell et al., 1960; Eulau, 1962; Kaplan, 1968); though Hyman and Singer (1968) report that these normative studies span the globe and focus on everything from student drinking behaviour (Rogers, 1958) to the fantasies of newsmen (Pool and Schulman, 1959).

The direct link of this literature with social stratification theory was forged by Centers (1949) in his classic volume on *The Psychology of Social Classes*. He asked a national probability sample of adult white males in the United States six economic questions 'designed to test conservative–radical orientations'. He also determined his respondents' objective occupational status as well as their subjective status positions; he obtained the latter by asking, 'If you were asked to use one of these four names for your social class, which would you say you belonged in: the middle class, lower class, working class, or upper class?'

The majority of Centers' respondents chose their objective social class; that is, their membership and reference classes were the same. Yet a significant minority of manual workers specified 'the middle class', just as there were white-collar workers who listed themselves among 'the working class'. Not surprisingly, Centers found that the higher the objective social class of the respondent, the more likely he was to be politically conservative. But subjective social class made a discernible difference. Those manual workers who regarded themselves as middle class were on the average somewhat more conservative than other manual workers; and, likewise, those white-collar workers who regarded themselves as working class were on the average considerably less conservative than

[a] Other clarifying theoretical papers include Eisenstadt (1954), Litwak (1960), Merton and Kitt (1950), Sherif (1953), Shibutani (1955), and Turner (1956).

[b] Other examples of investigations of the comparative function of reference groups include the work of Stern and Keller (1953) in France and of Pettigrew (1964, Chap. 8; 1967) on blacks in the United States.

[c] Additional research on college students has been reported by Hartley (1960a; 1960b), Pearlin (1954), and Siegel and Siegel (1957).

other white-collar workers. Eulau (1962) has replicated these results on American national samples in both 1952 and 1956, and Runciman (1966, p. 171) has replicated them with an English national sample. Their findings provide an excellent illustration of the 'cross-pressures' phenomenon where a balance is struck in the conflict between the sociological objective class and the psychological subjective class.

Another finding of Centers' investigation suggests why there is a looseness of fit between objective and subjective class positions. He asked his national sample: 'In deciding whether a person belongs to your class or not, which of these other things do you think is most important to know: Who his family is; how much money he has; what sort of education he has ; or how he believes and feels about certain things?' While only about one-fifth of those respondents who answered at all cited 'family' or 'money' and about one-third cited 'education', more than half emphasized differences in beliefs and feelings. Objective standards were not denied, but more flexible beliefs were stressed. 'If you believe and feel as I do, then we are of the same social grouping' is a contention that, at least in the American context, adds importance to reference group phenomena in social stratification.[d]

The single Centers question on subjective class evokes a *judgement* of one's position, but does not tap *feelings* of true class identification. Consequently, Campbell and his colleagues (1960) began by first asking in a national voting survey: 'There's quite a bit of talk these days about different social classes. Most people say they belong to the middle class or to the working class. Do you ever think of yourself as being in one of these classes?' One-third of their respondents answered 'no' to this query. That this failure to indicate any 'consciousness of class' is not mere evasion is indicated by the sharp political differences by class that emerge between those who identify with their class membership and those who do not. Among the identifiers, for example, respondents who chose the working-class designation voted 14 per cent more Democratic than those who chose the middle-class designation; but this difference shrinks to only 2 per cent among those who did not identify (Campbell et al., 1960, p. 343). Identifiers also evinced greater subjective class differences in party identification and attitudes on economic issues. We shall in this paper provide a replication of this phenomenon using 1968 voting for Governor George Wallace for President of the United States.

Campbell notes that class identifiers are most prevalent among the young and those who were beginning their careers during the Depression of the 1930's and among those who had been raised in and presently lived in large cities. Identifiers and non-identifiers, however, did not significantly differ on sex, education, occupation, ethnicity, or race. Campbell and his University of Michigan associates attached considerable importance to the fact that one-third of the adults of the United States had no apparent 'class consciousness', for these people act as a formidable buffer against the operation of extreme status polarization in American politics.

---

[d] This interpretation of Centers's finding receives important support in the findings on 'belief and value congruence' in racial prejudice reported in Rokeach, Smith, and Evans (1960), Rokeach and Mezei (1966), Stein (1966), Stein, Hardyck, and Smith (1965), and Smith, Williams, and Willis (1967).

This cursory review of reference group studies points to the close interconnection between this concept and a number of other social psychological theories and concepts. Indeed, Pettigrew (1967) has attempted to show that there is a general theory of social evaluation emerging in social psychology under an assortment of related molecular concepts and hypotheses. Thus, the comparative function of reference group analysis can be directly linked with Festinger's (1954) social comparison theory, Lenski's (1954) status inconsistency theory, Thibaut and Kelley's (1959) concept of comparison level, Homans's (1961) concept of distributive justice, Blau's (1964) concept of fair exchange, and Stouffer's concept of relative deprivation (Stouffer et al., 1949). The basic tenet of this more general theory of social evaluation is that human beings learn about themselves by comparing themselves to others. A second tenet is that the process of social evaluation results in positive, neutral, or negative self-ratings which are relative to the standards set by the individuals and groups employed for comparison. These propositions lie at the core of early social psychological thinking, especially in the writings of Cooley (1902) and Mead (1934).

It is Stouffer's famous concept of *relative deprivation* that has proved the most useful in our analyses of American race relations. Both Alexis de Tocqueville and Karl Marx employed the idea in their writings; but it gained wide attention in social science after Stouffer invoked it to account for eleven different and surprising results in his monumental research on *The American Soldier* (Stouffer et al., 1949).

The most famous example involved army advancement. World War II promotions were rapid and widespread in the United States Air Corps, but slow and piecemeal in the Military Police. Conventional wisdom predicts that the Air Corpsmen should have been more satisfied with their chances for promotion, for the 'obvious' reason that they were actually moving ahead faster in their careers. But Stouffer found that the Air Corpsmen were in fact considerably more frustrated over promotions than the Military Police. What is not so obvious is that the fliers' wide-open system of promotions led them to adopt extremely high aspirations. Most of them expected such swift elevation that even the generous promotions of their service left them *relatively* dissatisfied. By contrast, morale was reasonably high among the Military Police, for they did not expect rapid promotions and were relatively content with what few advances they did achieve. Spector (1956) replicated this result in a simulated situation in the laboratory. It is not the absolute level of attainment that made for poor morale so much as relative deprivation—the discrepancy between what one anticipates and what one attains.

In the basic case, relative deprivation or gratification occurs when an individual or class of individuals feels deprived or gratified in comparison to relevant reference individuals and groups. Thus, comparison with a non-deprived referent leads to high expectations that, if unfulfilled, lead in turn to severe feelings of deprivation and unfairness. Simple as this basic structure appears, Davis (1959, 1963) has shown how relative deprivation notions can be formalized into a network of logically consistent propositions concerning phenomena ranging from social distance towards out-groups to group solidarity and differentiation. Not only did Davis make more coherent and consistent the variety of uses of the concept by Stouffer, but he also derived general propositions that are not obvious

from the original statement of relative deprivation. Thus, the Stouffer (1949, pp. 125–6) examples of older and married soldiers—both from social categories with high rates of draft deferment—feeling more deprived than younger and single soldiers turn out to be particular cases of a more general statement: 'If a given social categorization is correlated with objective deprivation, relative deprivation will be more frequent among the deprived in the *more* favoured category ... [and] relative gratification will be more frequent among the nondeprived in the *less* favoured category' (Davis, 1959, pp. 286–7).[e] Davis also derived hypotheses concerning 'in-group consciousness' and 'out-group distance'; in general, his derivations predict that you can increase both characteristics by rewarding subgroups differentially and keeping the reward level in the system intermediate between general deprivation and general gratification.

Blau (1964) and Homans (1961) contributed the further component of *investment* to the formulation. If a reference individual or group is viewed as making a larger investment than you or your group, then proportionately greater rewards to the referent are not likely to be seen as unfair. Perceived injustice occurs when the rewards to the referent are proportionately greater than its investment relative to you or your group.[f]

Patchen (1961) found support for this contention in his study of American oil refinery workers. He asked the workers to name the occupations of others whose earnings differed from their own; and he further asked them how satisfied they were with their earnings compared with those of the others named. His respondents proved far more satisfied, in comparing themselves with others who earn more, when the others compared were professionals than when they were blue-collar workers like themselves. Professionals are perceived to make far larger investments in their jobs than others, especially in terms of education. Consequently, Patchen's findings are consistent with Homans's notion of proportionality between rewards and investments as constituting 'distributive justice'.

Runciman (1966, pp. 33–4) added a further refinement that proves critical in our own research. He distinguishes between *egoistic* and *fraternalistic* deprivation. Egoistic deprivation describes *individual* deprivation sensed through comparisons made between one's self and others within one's own in-group; there is, however, no sense of deprivation concerning the in-group's position in society. By contrast, fraternalistic deprivation describes *group* deprivation sensed through comparisons made between one's in-group and other groups in the society; there is, however, no sense of deprivation concerning one's position within the in-group itself. Runciman found in England and Wales, as had been found in France (Stern and Keller, 1953) and the United States (Form and Geschwender, 1962; Hyman, 1942), that his survey respondents typically restricted their comparisons to friends and relatives within their

[e] This proposition is advanced for individual comparisons made within one's in-group, but it may well be reversed when cross-group comparisons are made. Basically, this difference refers to Runciman's (1966) distinction to be discussed below between egoistic and fraternalistic deprivation. The propositions of Davis (1959, 1963) concerning relative deprivation focus largely upon egoistic deprivation.

[f] Runciman (1966, Chaps. 12 and 13) disagrees with this formulation, and holds that perceived congruence of earnings with need is an even more crucial condition for the existence of 'social justice'.

own social class. Cross-class comparisons were minimal, then, and limited the degree of fraternalistic deprivation. Yet Runciman maintains that it is perceived *group*, not individual, deprivation that is most conducive for the perception of injustice. Our results firmly support this contention, as we shall note following a brief review of the second relevant literature.

Correlates of Racial Attitudes

Research on this topic, most of it conducted during the past decade, has generated a set of surprisingly consistent cross-national findings. At least this consistency in results extends across English-speaking nations. We shall note only the most important of these findings from the United Kingdom and the United States, with some notice paid to the more limited research from the Republics of South Africa and Rhodesia.

Racial attitudes are not, of course, unidimensional; and these various dimensions often possess somewhat different patterns of correlates. Typically, however, these differences are not large.[g] Nor are racial attitudes among the oppressors and the oppressed directly comparable. It is a comment on the racism of both Britain and the United States that the racial attitudes of coloured minorities have been relatively ignored. The first major survey of immigrant attitudes in England did not occur until 1967 (P.E.P., 1967; Daniel, 1968). The recent and otherwise comprehensive report on British race relations, *Colour and Citizenship* (Rose, 1969), omits new survey data on coloured immigrant attitudes altogether. Similarly, the first nationwide probability survey of the racial attitudes of black Americans did not occur until 1963, and that was a commercial effort undertaken for the popular weekly magazine, *Newsweek* (Brink and Harris, 1964). Once race riots broke out in the mid-and late-1960s, however, white America became considerably more interested in black American thinking and a spate of surveys conducted exclusively on blacks was undertaken (Brink and Harris, 1964, 1967; Campbell and Schuman, 1968; Marx, 1967; Meyer, 1968a, 1968b).

We shall confine ourselves, then, to the racial attitudes of the native white English and of white Americans. Two related surveys of racial prejudice in Britain were made in 1966–7 (Rose, 1969, chap. 28). The first study sampled extensively five English boroughs with relatively heavy concentrations of coloured immigrants; the second drew a national sample of 2,250 adults but employed a more limited questionnaire. The initial analyses of these data and the scale of 'prejudice' provided in *Colour and Citizenship* were inadequate.[h] As far as they went, however, these original analyses found racial prejudice nationally to be most intense among the skilled working class, conservatives, authoritarians, the poorly educated, those low in 'socio-political potency' (called 'political efficacy' in the United States), and those with little contact with coloured immigrants. A voluminous American literature over the past generation

[g] Two important dimensions of racial attitudes held by white Americans will be distinguished later in our results: 'contact' and 'competitive' with education a more important predictor of the former.

[h] For criticisms of Chapter 28 in Rose (1969), see: Bagley (1970, appendix), Pettigrew (1971a), and letters by John Rowan, Daniel Lawrence, and Mark Abrams in *New Society* (14 August, 21 August, and 11 September 1969). The inadequate scale of prejudice, which for some reason placed major emphasis on attitudes towards housing discrimination, gave rise to such nonsense in the popular British press as only 10 per cent of the native white population was 'prejudiced'—an arbitrary and far-too-low estimate that was forcefully corrected by Bagley (1970).

has repeatedly found virtually these same relationships for white racial prejudice in the United States (e.g., Adorno et al., 1950; Allport, 1954; Brink and Harris, 1964, 1967; Campbell, 1971; Campbell and Schuman, 1968; Cantril, 1951; Erskine, 1962, 1967, 1967–8, 1968a, 1968b, 1968–9; Fenton, 1960; Hyman and Sheatsley, 1956, 1964; Pettigrew, 1958, 1959, 1971b; Schwartz, 1967; Sheatsley, 1966; Williams, 1964). Still further evidence for these trends in the United States is provided by the data we are about to present.

Moreover, available data over the years suggest extremely similar correlates of racial prejudice among white South Africans and Rhodesians. From McCrone's (1937, 1949, 1953) classic initial work and that of Malherbe (1946) to later investigations of limited samples (Pettigrew, 1958, 1960; van den Berghe, 1962), the importance of occupation, education, and conservative political orientation in white racial attitudes has been repeatedly noted. And these relationships seem to hold for both English- and Afrikaans-speakers.

In a 1959 national sample of whites in (then) Southern Rhodesia, Rogers and Frantz (1962) found the greatest support for blatant racial discrimination resided among the skilled working class, political conservatives, and the poorly educated—as in Great Britain and the United States. These investigators were unable to test the remaining relationships reported in *Colour and Citizenship*, though they did not find significant relationships with sex, age, urban–rural residence, and income.[i]

In the five-borough English sample, the three most persistent racial concerns again recall American findings for urban whites: the presence of coloured people is bad for the neighbourhood, their presence leads to inter-marriage, and they will become a local majority.[j] And the conclusion that there is 'a guarded willingness to allow coloured entry into the fortress of working-class privilege' (Rose, 1969, p. 580) also appears to hold with equal force on both sides of the Atlantic—a point that will be demonstrated for American workers in the following section.

Bagley (1970) re-analysed the five-borough English data, and employed a more adequate six-item scale of prejudice. He found age, education, and occupation, in that order, to be the strongest correlates of his prejudice measure.[k] And each of these demographic factors remained significantly associated with prejudice even after the other two were dichotomously controlled. Younger, well-educated, and white-collar respondents

---

[i] The one possible exception involves the role of contact. As Allport (1954) argued and later research supports (Pettigrew, 1971b), interracial contact can lead to either increased tolerance or intolerance depending on the particular conditions under which it takes place.

[j] A salient stereotype of coloured people that emerges in the five-borough data involves an alleged lack of cleanliness and hygiene. This was the reason most often cited for considering coloured people to be inferior (Bagley, 1970, p. 23); and 'be cleaner' was the chief method mentioned by the white respondents as to how the coloureds could 'improve their position' (Bagley, 1970, p. 25). This, too, is similar to American results. Thus, 60 per cent in 1963 and 52 per cent in 1966 of national samples of white Americans believed black Americans 'smell different'—the second most pervasive stereotype tapped in these surveys (Brink and Harris, 1964, 1967).

[k] As in Rhodesia and as is typical of American studies, sex did not prove to be a significant correlate (Bagley, 1970, p. 38). However, Bagley (1970, pp. 63–7) found that deprivation in housing relative to that occupied by members of the same social class to be positively related to extreme prejudice. But unlike the relative fraternalistic deprivation in income results for white urban Americans provided in the next section, this result involves only egoistic deprivation.

tended to be the most accepting of coloured peoples, though the effects were neither completely additive nor were they linear.[1] Most interesting of all was the curvilinear association of occupation with prejudice. While blue-collar workers in general in the five boroughs were more intolerant of coloured minorities than white-collar workers, the *skilled* manual group exhibited appreciably more animosity than the *unskilled* manual group. Thus, skilled manuals comprised only 31 per cent of the total sample but 40 per cent of the most prejudiced group that answered negatively all six of the scale's questions (Bagley, 1970, p. 39). By contrast, unskilled manual respondents, as well as white-collar respondents, were *under*-represented among the most prejudiced. And it is precisely the skilled manual workers who constituted the core of support for George Wallace for President in 1968 in the northern United States (Pettigrew, 1971b; Lipset and Raab, 1970).

South Africa once again appears to replicate this trend. Ethnic membership, or course, is the dominant determinate of party voting among white South Africans. And though survey data are not available, aggregate analyses of the votes for the anti-African, Afrikaner-dominated Nationalist Party, point to the lower middle-class areas as particular centres of electoral strength. Tingsten (1955, p. 23) summarizes the trend:

> . . . industrialization and commercialization . . . [have] formed that social class now constituting the stronghold of Boer nationalism: workers, shop assistants, clerks, lower grades of civil servants. Here, as in the United States, these 'poor whites'—more correctly, whites threatened with poverty—are the leading guardians of prejudice and white supremacy. The Voortrekker with his vast landed property has been transformed into a salaried worker with a three-roomed house . . . . He and people like him poll the votes which support Malan as his predecessors in the American South have been supported for a century.

A similar phenomenon appears to operate in Rhodesia as well. Rogers and Frantz (1962, pp. 124–5) found craftsmen to be by far the most willing of all occupational groups to restrict African freedoms. They write:

> At the conservative end of the dimension, we find the craftsmen—the fitters, motor mechanics, menial workers, plumbers, welders, and so on—who are beginning to experience the impact of African competition. In the interviews, the craftsmen continually expressed concern for the future, as did the transport, mine, service, and sales workers. Hence, it is not difficult to forecast that, in such occupational groupings, we will find the most conservative attitudes about the problems posed by African advancement.

Helpful as these survey data are in isolating and establishing the fact, they do not shed light directly upon the *process* by which the skilled worker becomes so particularly resistant to racial change. Obviously, these individuals are reflecting in Parsonian terms special strains; but just what these strains are is by no means clear. The most immediate possibilities do not afford sufficient explanations. For example, 'working class authoritarianism', the social psychological theory persuasively advanced by Lipset (1960, chap. 4), operates in the reverse direction. That

[1] Bagley (1970, pp. 47–52) found some evidence that status discrepancy was related positively to prejudice, a result reminiscent of Rush's (1967) results in the United States on right-wing extremism.

is, the unskilled and the semi-skilled tend to be considerably more authoritarian than the more racist skilled workers (Lipset, 1960, pp. 93, 95, 101–2).[m] Nor is *absolute* occupational deprivation apparently an adequate explanation. Inkeles (1960, p. 6) has shown that job satisfaction among skilled workers and artisans is without exception considerably greater than among the semi-skilled, the unskilled, and farm labourers in survey samples of Soviet refugees, West Germans, Italians, and Americans. Further, he showed that artisans are less dissatisfied, or at least no more dissatisfied, with how they were 'getting on' than workers and farm labourers in seven out of nine national samples.[n]

Rogers and Franz (1962) provided a lead from Rhodesia in the quote above, as did Abrams in his British reference to 'a guarded willingness to allow coloured entry into the fortress of working-class privilege' (Rose, 1969, p. 580). Status and economic threat seems to be involved for these skilled workers who benefit most from positions closed to competition by union and colour barriers. And Runciman's (1966) formulation of *fraternalistic* deprivation offers a way to conceptualize this possibility and link it with the developing social psychological theory of social evaluation (Pettigrew, 1967). We now turn to our empirical efforts over the past three years to follow up these leads.

FRATERNAL DEPRIVATION AND THE RACIAL ATTITUDES OF WHITES IN URBAN AMERICA

Outline of the Research

We have conducted twelve separate surveys of blacks and whites in four American cities where competent black candidates have run for mayor: Gary, Indiana; Cleveland, Ohio; Los Angeles, California; and Newark, New Jersey. We studied Gary in October 1968, just before the Presidential elections, and again in December 1970. In the first of these studies, we drew a sample of 257 white male registered voters and concentrated on both Governor George Wallace's bid as a third-party candidate for the Presidency and Mayor Richard Hatcher's successful bid in 1967 to become Gary's first black Mayor. In the second study, we drew probability samples of 192 black and 291 white registered voters and utilized appropriately different interview schedules for each. This time we focused on Mayor Hatcher's forthcoming race for re-election in 1971, a race that he later won handsomely.

In the late spring of 1969, we began our research in Cleveland, where Mayor Carl Stokes was beginning his successful efforts to gain re-election. His initial victory in 1967 received considerable world publicity, as he also was his city's first black head. We interviewed probability samples

---

[m] However, Lipset (1960, Chap. 4) did propose an interesting political proposition concerning the upper and lower rungs of blue-collar workers. With data from a wide variety of countries, he attempted to demonstrate that communist parties most effectively appeal to the unskilled and the semi-skilled when they are large and offer simple programmes; but they lose this following to large socialist parties and win their most favour among the affluent workers when they are small and offer somewhat more complex programmes.

[n] The glaring exceptions are in the British and Australian samples, in which artisans express greater dissatisfaction than lower-ranked blue-collar respondents. The Italian and Norwegian samples revealed the greatest dissatisfaction among farm labourers with virtually identical levels among the artisans and general workers (Inkeles, 1960, p. 17).

of 400 black and 488 white registered voters. After Stokes's triumph in early November of 1969, we returned and reinterviewed the white sample. The retrieval rate was over 80 per cent—a fine result in mobile America that attests to the diligence and expertise of the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center to whom we subcontracted interviewing in all four cities. Also in the spring of 1969, we interviewed 300 white registered voters who together comprised probability samples of two contrasting areas of sprawling Los Angeles. Our study began after Thomas Bradley, a black city council member, had surprised observers by coming in first of a large field in the initial mayoralty election. He later lost to incumbent Mayor Samuel Yorty in a run-off election after a bitter campaign. We reinterviewed our respondents immediately following Bradley's run-off defeat. Again our retrieval rate was approximately 80 per cent.°

Finally, our research took us to Newark in the spring of 1970 where Kenneth Gibson won easily over the entrenched incumbent to become the city's first black mayor. We interviewed probability samples of 200 black and 300 white registered voters before the first election in April of 1970. Then we interviewed a fresh sample of 200 black registered voters, and reinterviewed 80 per cent of the original white sample following the first election but prior to the final run-off election.

Details of these interesting and history-making elections together with our general survey results are available elsewhere (Pettigrew, 1972). For present purposes, we wish to focus upon the data from these surveys relevant to the relationship between relative deprivation and the racial attitudes and behaviour of whites in these four major American cities.

The Results

We have developed over the course of our twelve surveys an elaborate battery of measures of relative deprivation, the fullest we believe yet attempted in survey research. Eight basic questions are asked requiring forty-nine different responses; and though this sounds complex, even poorly educated respondents have typically had no trouble supplying meaningful data. In addition to the standard Cantril self-anchoring ladder items (Cantril, 1965; Cantril and Roll, 1961), we asked about the respondent's economic gains over the past five years and his satisfaction with them. More important, we obtained comparative ratings of his economic gains relative to eight critical groups: white-collar workers, blue-collar workers, Negroes, professionals, whites, unskilled labourers, people in the neighbourhood, and people in the suburbs.

Two general trends across the two races and all four cities are of interest. First, the *average* ratings assigning the economic gains of the eight groups by our respondents are quite accurate. This suggests that the social science dogma that Americans are relatively unaware of their social class structure deserves serious questioning. Second, there exists a broad resentment in these cities of the economic gains of white-collar workers in general and professionals in particular. Large numbers of the respondents of varying background from Newark to Los Angeles believed, for

° We also interviewed a small fresh sample in this second wave in order to have a control for the effects of the initial interviewing.

instance, that 'professionals in America today have gained more economically in the past five years than they are entitled to'. And this resentment of the gains of professionals was consistently greater than resentment over the gains of black Americans.

Table 1

Relative Deprivation and Wallace Support, Gary, 1968

	Wallace Supporters	*Nixon Supporters*	*Humphrey Supporters*	*Total*
Total Sample (245)	29·8%	42·0%	28·2%	100%
'In spite of what some people say the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.'*				
Agree (118)	41·5	33·1	25·4	100%
Disagree (122)	18·9	49·2	32·0	100%
Union Members				
Agree (76)	47·3	30·2	22·5	100%
Disagree (63)	27·0	33·3	39·7	100%
Non-Members				
Agree (40)	27·5	40·0	32·5	100%
Disagree (59)	10·2	66·1	23·7	100%
Religion				
Protestants				
Agree (53)	50·9	34·0	15·1	100%
Disagree (45)	22·2	53·7	24·1	100%
Roman Catholics				
Agree (53)	34·0	34·0	32·1	100%
Disagree (51)	17·6	43·1	39·2	100%
Social-class Identification				
Close to the working class				
Agree (49)	57·1	18·4	24·5	100%
Disagree (36)	25·0	47·2	27·8	100%
Not close to the working class				
Agree (25)	36·0	36·0	28·0	100%
Disagree (20)	30·0	20·0	50·0	100%
Close to the middle class				
Agree (27)	25·9	44·4	29·6	100%
Disagree (40)	7·5	60·0	32·5	100%
Not close to the middle class				
Agree (15)	26·7	60·0	13·3	100%
Disagree (23)	21·7	56·5	21·7	100%

* This item was originally introduced in: Leo Srole, 'Social Interaction and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study,' *American Sociological Review*, (Vol. 21, 1956), pp. 709–16.

Our interest in the role of relative deprivation in racial voting was initiated by an array of consistent relationships noted between a single relative deprivation item and support for Governor George Wallace in Gary in 1968. As previously reported (Pettigrew, 1971b, Chap. 10), Table 1 shows how agreement with the straightforward statement—'In spite of what some say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better'—predicted Wallace voting intentions within a number of relevant social controls.[p] Moreover, as Table 2 indicates, the item's predictive value is independent of anti-Negro prejudice despite their positive relationship.

[p] Relevant to the earlier discussion, note how the cell sizes in Table 1 reveal Wallace's special strength among union members and those highly identified with the working class.

Table 2

Anti-Negro Prejudice, Relative Deprivation, and Wallace Support, Gary, 1968

	Wallace Supporters	*Nixon Supporters*	*Humphrey Supporters*	*Total*
Total Sample (245)	29·8%	42·0%	28·2%	100%
High anti-Negro prejudice:				
Agree that 'the lot of the average man is getting worse' (59)	52·5	20·3	27·1	100%
Disagree (34)	23·0	42·3	34·7	100%
Moderate anti-Negro Prejudice:				
Agree that 'the lot of the average man is getting worse' (38)	36·8	44·7	18·5	100%
Disagree (38)	26·3	44·7	28·9	100%
Low anti-Negro prejudice:				
Agree that 'the lot of the average man is getting worse' (18)	27·7	44·6	27·7	100%
Disagree (58)	12·1	55·2	32·8	100%

Once we measured relative deprivation with a battery of items beginning with the Cleveland surveys, we soon learned that the most effective approach was through use of the scheme shown in Table 3. This scheme builds on Runciman's (1966) theoretical analysis of relative deprivation discussed earlier. Table 3 is formed with two pieces of information: how each respondent views his own economic gains over the past five years in relation (1) to his ingroup (his class or racial category) and (2) to the relevant outgroup (e.g., white-collar workers for the blue-collar respondent, or blacks for the white respondent). Type A respondents are *doubly gratified*, for they feel they have been doing as well or better than both

Table 3

Four Types of Relative Deprivation and Gratification

		Personal Economic Gains Compared to Outgroup ('White-Collar Workers' or 'Negroes')	
		Equal or Greater than	*Less than*
Personal economic gains compared to ingroup ('blue-collar workers' or 'whites')	Equal or Greater than	A. Doubly gratified	B. Fraternally deprived
	Less than	C. Egoistically deprived	D. Doubly deprived

their ingroup and outgroup. Type B are the critical respondents, for they feel *fraternally deprived* in Runciman's sense. They feel they have kept up with or even surpassed the gains of their own group but that they have slipped behind those of their outgroup. Consequently, their deprivation is fraternal in that it is their group as a whole which is seen as losing ground in comparison with the outgroup.

By contrast, Type C consists of individuals who sense their gains to have been less than those of their ingroup but at least equal to those of their outgroup; they are therefore termed, following Runciman, as the *egoistically deprived.* Finally, and least interesting, are the *doubly deprived* respondents of Type D who feel they have lost ground to both their ingroup and outgroup. These individuals are typically older and often retired; their fixed incomes probably have in fact been surpassed by younger groups generally.

Table 4

Class Deprivation and 1968: Wallace Vote Percentages in Cleveland

	Class Deprivation Type			
	A. Doubly Gratified	*B. Fraternally Deprived*	*C. Egoistically Deprived*	*D. Doubly Deprived*
	%	%	%	%
Entire Cleveland Sample* (N = 301)	16	*31*	15	13
Just those who identify themselves with working class (N = 154)	11	*41*	23	15
Just those who identify themselves with middle class (N = 156)	21	**17**	12	12

* Those who did not vote in the 1968 presidential election are omitted.

Table 5

Class Deprivation and 1972: Wallace Preference Percentages in Gary, 1970

	Class Deprivation Type			
	A. Doubly Gratified	*B. Fraternally Deprived*	*C. Egoistically Deprived*	*D. Doubly Deprived*
	%	%	%	%
Entire Gary sample (N = 288)	12	*24*	15	17
High (6–8) blue-collar identifiers (N = 132)	15	*30*	15	13
Low (1–5) blue-collar identifiers (N = 150)	9	19	15	18

Both social class and racial comparisons, using the scheme of Table 3, have been found to be important. The class comparisons contrast blue-collar versus white-collar workers; the racial comparisons, of course, contrast whites versus blacks in economic gains. Tables 4 and 5 demonstrate that the Wallace vote came disproportionately from respondents who felt that white-collar, but not blue-collar, workers were making greater economic gains than they. Since our respondents were largely blue-collar workers themselves, the results support the importance of fraternal deprivation. Nevertheless the perception that white-collar gains are greater than blue-collar gains should be interpreted as fraternal deprivation only for those respondents who subjectively identify with other blue-collar workers. In Cleveland we were able to divide the sample into working- and middle-class identifiers. As we would predict, the effect of the class comparisons is limited to working-class identifiers. In Gary we were able to measure identification with other blue-collar workers even more directly, employing a scale from 1 ('little in common with, not close at all') to 8 ('great deal in common with, very close'). Again, the class comparisons had a larger effect among those who identified more closely with blue-collar workers.

Some, but not all, of these differences, however, are traceable to background differences of the four class deprivation types. Whites who feel fraternally deprived in class terms are disproportionately concentrated

among those of medium income and education who are younger, full-time, working-class members of labour unions. These respondents are precisely the ones we have isolated in other analyses as especially prone to being pro-Wallace and against black candidates. Yet controls for these factors, as in the earlier Gary analysis of Table 1, reduce but do not remove the predictive value of the relative class deprivation measures. This fact strongly implies that *fraternal class deprivation acts as a mediator of some, though not all, of the special skilled worker component of the Wallace phenomenon in the North.* In sharp contrast, fraternal *race* deprivations do not effectively predict Wallace leanings in either city. This suggests, together with other evidence (Pettigrew, 1971b, Chap. 10), that *the Wallace appeal had a strong economic as well as racist flavour.*

Table 6

Racial Deprivation and the Reactions of Whites to Black Mayoralty Candidates

Reactions to Black Candidates	*Racial Deprivation Type*			
	A. Doubly Gratified %	*B. Fraternally Deprived* %	*C. Egoistically Deprived* %	*D. Doubly Deprived* %
Mayoralty voting				
For *Stokes* v. Perk, Cleveland 1969*	**31**	***12***	**49**	**29**
For *Bradley* v. Yorty,				
L.A. primary vote, 1969	26	***17***	34	30
Run-off preference, 1969	51	***30***	46	46
Run-off vote, 1969	35	***21***	52	42
For *Gibson* v. Addonizio, Newark, 1970	19	***14***	**29**	**20**
For *Hatcher* v. Williams, etc., Gary primary, 1971	17	***7***	**30**	**15**
Candidate image (% favourable)‡				
Stokes, 1969	**57**	***33***	64	50
Bradley, 1969	**65**	***44***	71	49
Gibson, 1970	**25**	***18***	27	36
Hatcher, 1970	35	*17*	36	29

* For Democrats only, since this was a partisan final election.

‡ The respondents were each presented a printed card with twelve adjectives from which three were chosen as the most descriptive of the black candidate. Half of the adjectives were favourable in tone (e.g., intelligent, honest) and half were unfavourable (e.g., out-for-himself, prejudiced). The favourable percentages provided here represent those whites who chose three favourable adjectives in the cases of Stokes and Gibson, and two or three favourable adjectives in the cases of Bradley and Hatcher.

Perceived racial deprivations become important, however, for predicting white support of black mayoralty candidates. Table 6 provides these consistent and dramatic results across the four cities. Note that *the fraternally deprived on race report less willingness to vote for, and a more negative image of, the black candidate in every instance.* The background differences between the four racial deprivation types are similar to those between the four class deprivation types noted above, though they are less extensive. Controls for these background variables do not substantially affect the relationships shown in Table 6.

Table 7

Racial Deprivation and White Attitudes Towards Blacks

Attitudes toward Blacks (*% Agreement*)	*Racial Deprivation Type* A. *Doubly Gratified* %	B. *Fraternally Deprived* %	C. *Egoistically Deprived* %	D. *Doubly Deprived* %
a. Negroes have gained more than they are entitled to.				
Cleveland 1969	15	*37*	10	19
Los Angeles 1969	6	13	2	*23*
Newark 1970	23	*57*	15	21
Gary 1970	17	*46*	24	32
b. Single most important cause of riots is . . . [looters/agitators / militants / communist influence/violent instincts of Negroes].				
Cleveland 1969	66	*79*	63	68
Los Angeles 1969	54	73	44	*79*
Newark 1970	67	*84*	45	65
Gary 1970	76	80	55	*84*
c. Nowadays most politicians care too much about the disadvantaged and not enough about the average man.				
Cleveland 1969	71	*87*	62	77
Los Angeles 1969	53	*68*	65	64
Newark 1970	74	*89*	73	69
Gary 1970	66	*80*	67	*80*
d. . . . most Negroes who receive money from welfare . . . could get along without it if they tried. . . .				
Cleveland 1969	70	*84*	61	72
Los Angeles 1969	43	*64*	42	59
Newark 1970	58	*71*	48	62
Gary 1970	65	75	*76*	72
e. Negroes and whites can never be really comfortable with each other, even if they are close friends.				
Cleveland 1969	44	54	45	*61*
Los Angeles 1969	20	27	22	*34*
Newark 1970	49	64	*69*	66
Gary 1970	42	53	49	*66*
f. . . . white students and black students should to to . . . *separate* schools.				
Cleveland 1969	22	*37*	22	32
Los Angeles 1969	5	5	4	*9*
Newark 1970	12	8	13	*22*
Gary 1970	15	21	21	*34*
g. . . . would object if a member of . . . family wanted to bring a Negro home to dinner.				
Cleveland 1969	47	*59*	47	58
Los Angeles 1969	21	23	27	*31*
Newark 1970	44	56	55	*66*
Gary 1970	43	41	38	*54*
h. . . . would mind if a Negro family with about the same income and education . . . moved next door.				
Cleveland 1969	52	*66*	65	63
Los Angeles 1969	31	38	33	*46*
Newark 1970	46	36	39	*49*
Gary 1970	39	50	28	*56*

Table 7 presents additional data that thicken the plot further. Observe that there is a tendency across cities for the fraternally deprived to not only believe that blacks have economically received more than they are entitled to (item a), but to more readily subscribe to a number of other conspiratorial and competitive statements.[q] Hence, the fraternally deprived are more likely to believe that race riots are caused by subversive elements rather than discrimination (item b), that politicians care too much about the disadvantaged (item c), and that Negroes could get along without welfare aid (item d). However, items which directly concern interracial interaction (items e, f, g, and h) do not elicit such a special reaction from the fraternally deprived.

These results suggest that we are dealing here with more than a single dimension of 'prejudice'. In order to understand fully the operation of relative deprivation and the racial attitudes and voting of our respondents, then, we must factor analyse our various attitude items. The results of this operation are provided in Table 8.

Table 8

*Rotated Factor Loadings of Eighteen Racial Items**

Racial Item	*Factor I 'Contact Racism'*	*Factor II 'Competitive Racism'*	*Communality*
Major contact racism items			
a. Would object if family member wanted to bring a Negro friend home to dinner.	+ *·754*	+ ·081	0·575
b. Would mind if Negro family with about the same income and education moved next door.	+ *·718*	+ ·013	0·516
c. Agrees that Negroes and whites can never be comfortable with each other, even if close friends.	+ *·615*	+ ·276	0·454
d. Thinks white and black students should go to separate schools.	+ *·599*	− ·012	0·359
e. Would not vote for a Negro for President even if nominated by own party.	+ *·521*	+ ·172	0·301
f. Has not visited socially with Negroes in home during last month.	+ *·401*	− ·030	0·162
Items loaded on both factors			
g. Believes Negroes over the past few years have got more than they deserve.	+ *·516*	+ *·462*	0·480
h. Agrees that Negroes should not push themselves where they are not wanted.	+ *·460*	+ *·516*	0·478
i. Agrees that 'hardworking people like me have not done as well as Negroes over the past few years'.	+ *·484*	+ *·309*	0·329
Major competitive racism items			
j. Believes race riots caused by looters, agitators, militants, violent instincts, communist influence rather than bad conditions and racial discrimination.	+ ·123	+ *·531*	0·298
l. Thinks most Negroes who receive welfare aid could get along without it if they tried.	+ *·306*	+ *·514*	0·358
m. Believes poverty programmes promote laziness and not hard work.	+ ·187	+ *·495*	0·280

[q] It is noteworthy that the exceptions to this trend involve Type D, the doubly deprived, who reflect as previously noted an older, more traditional sub-sample.

Table 8—continued

Racial Item	*Factor I 'Contact Racism'*	*Factor II 'Competitive Racism'*	*Communality*
n. Agrees that 'most politicians care too much about the disadvantaged and not enough about the average man'.	+ ·280	+ *·475*	0·305
o. Denies that Negroes miss out on jobs or promotions in his city because of racial discrimination.	+ ·260	+ *·432*	0·254
p. Believes busing elementary school children harms their education.	− ·038	+ *·539*	0·292
q. Disagrees that it is best for children to attend elementary school outside their neighbourhood.	+ ·090	+ *·415*	0·181
r. Thinks race riots hurt Negro cause.	+ ·005	+ *·428*	0·184
Miscellaneous additional item			
s. Believes Negroes with same education and income are 'better off' than himself.	+ ·029	·247	0·062
Sum of Squares	3·266	2·602	5·868

* Based on the probability samples of 1,539 white registered voters in the 1969–70 studies of Gary, Cleveland, Los Angeles, and Newark. Varimax rotations were made of the original principal components solution.

Two reasonably clear factors emerge. Factor I weights are heaviest on items involving interracial contact, so it seems appropriate to label it *contact racism*. The one exception is item e, concerning voting for a Negro for President. What this non-contact item appears to have in common with the contact items is a certain hypothetical quality. Just as it is highly unlikely for most of our respondents that a 'family member wanted to bring a Negro friend home to dinner' (item a), it is equally unlikely that the United States will soon witness a major black candidate for President. Consistent with this interpretation of a certain hypothetical quality in Factor I is the fact that it is heavily related to education (Table 9). If we are right, item e's weights on Factor I should decrease and on Factor II increase over time as the probability of a Negro President increases.

Factor II is labelled *competitive racism* for its heavily weighted items include opposition to government programmes to help blacks and beliefs that racial discrimination is not an important problem.[r] Thus, 'politicians care too much about the disadvantaged' (item n), Negroes do not need welfare aid (item l), and 'poverty programmes promote laziness' (item m). Items s, p, and q refer to the current euphemisms in America for opposing the racial desegregation of schools through objecting to court-ordered 'busing' away from segregated 'neighbourhood schools'.[s] Moreover, Factor II includes denial of the role of racial discrimination (items j and o) and of the liberal interpretation of race riots (items j and r).

[r] This factor seems to tap the type of 'competitive prejudice' that van den Berghe (1958) has maintained in an ideal-type analysis to be critical and characteristic of modern industrial societies.

[s] No less a figure than President Nixon has blatantly legitimated this thinly disguised opposition to racial change as a cynical component of his 'southern political strategy'.

Three additional items (g, h, i) in our battery of eighteen contain elements of each of these factors and achieve sizeable weights on both. Another (item s) is relatively unrelated to either factor. Note also that most of the Factor II items contain modest weights on Factor I. This indicates that there would be a small but definite positive correlation between our two racism factors if oblique rotation were utilized.

Table 9
*Types of Racism and Deprivation by City**

Type of Deprivation	L.A. Sample	Cleveland Sample	Newark Sample	Gary Sample	Total Unweighted Means
	Contact Racism Factor Scores				
A. Doubly gratified	− 61·4	+ 6·1	− 14·0	− 14·4	− 20·9
B. Fraternally deprived	− 40·8	+ 58·1	+ 16·4	+ 23·5	+ 14·3
C. Egoistically deprived	− 48·9	+ 18·8	− 11·9	− 13·4	− 13·9
D. Doubly deprived	*− 25·0*	*+ 62·7*	*+ 24·3*	*+ 54·5*	*+ 29·1*
Total unweighted means	− 44·0	+ 36·4	+ 3·7	+ 12·6	+ 2·2
	Deprivation type F = 10·1, p < ·001				
	City F = 20·7, p < ·001				
	Deprivation × city F = 0·4, not significant				
	Competitive Racism Factor Scores				
	L.A. Sample	*Cleveland Sample*	*Newark Sample*	*Gary Sample*	*Total Unweighted Means*
A. Doubly gratified	− 52·0	− 17·6	+ 27·1	+ 19·6	− 5·7
B. Fraternally deprived	*− 1·4*	*+ 4·7*	*+ 89·3*	*+ 73·7*	*+ 41·6*
C. Egoistically deprived	− 58·4	− 34·2	+ 2·0	+ 34·3	− 14·1
D. Doubly deprived	− 32·3	− 27·7	− 8·3	+ 32·3	− 9·0
Total unweighted means	− 36·0	− 18·7	+ 27·5	+ 40·0	+ 3·2
	Deprivation type F = 12·5, p < ·001				
	City F = 24·7, p < ·001				
	Deprivation × city F = 1·2, not significant				

* The total sample of respondents for these unweighted means analyses of variance was 1,176. In order to have the Type D, the doubly deprived, more nearly approach the background characteristics of the other three types, all respondents over 65 years of age were removed from the total sample.

Table 9 employs the factor scores for each of these two factors and relates them to the four types of deprivation in each of our urban samples. Contact racism is consistently related to the doubly deprived; and competitive racism is consistently related to fraternal deprivation. Observe that deprivation type is significantly related to both types of racism as is the city variable,[t] but there is no significant interaction between deprivation type and city. In other words, while the cities vary considerably in measured racism, the deprivation effects are essentially the same across cities.

Note, too, that the fraternally deprived are the second highest group in contact racism in three of the four cities and for the total sample. Thus, both of the groups high in contact racism—the doubly deprived and the fraternally deprived—share an *individual* sense of not having done as well economically as black Americans. By contrast, the doubly deprived do not typically exhibit competitive racism; in Newark they are the lowest group, and for the total sample they are not significantly different from

[t] It is of interest to note that competitive racism is without exception inversely related to city size, with Los Angeles and Gary at the extremes. The same would be true for contact racism were it not for the sharp degree of contact racism in Cleveland.

either the doubly gratified or the egoistically deprived. Competitive racism, then, is strongly associated with just the *group* sense of deprivation represented by fraternals alone.

Table 10

*Contact Racism Factor Scores and Types of Deprivation by Age and Education**

Type of Deprivation	Younger Respondents (21–40) Education		
	11 Yrs. or Less	*High School Graduate (12)*	*College (13+)*
A. Doubly gratified	+ 16·3	− 7·2	− 78·4
B. Fraternally deprived	+ 51·7	+ *31·2*	− 36·5
C. Egoistically deprived	+ 13·0	− 16·5	− 61·8
D. Doubly deprived	+ *69·3*	+ 20·8	− *22·7*
	Older Respondents (41–65) Education		
	11 Yrs. or less	*High School Graduate (12)*	*College (13 +)*
A. Doubly gratified	+ 2·2	− 22·3	− 71·4
B. Fraternally deprived	+ 32·6	+ 8·2	− 18·5
C. Egoistically deprived	+ 28·0	+ *15·1*	− 84·9
D. Doubly deprived	+ *93·1*	− 24·2	− *9·7*
Deprivation type		$F = 9{\cdot}9$, $p < {\cdot}001$	
Age		$F = 0{\cdot}1$, not significant	
Education		$F = 46{\cdot}9$, $p < {\cdot}001$	
Deprivation × age		$F = 0{\cdot}3$, not significant	
Deprivation × ed.		$F = 1{\cdot}8$, $p. < {\cdot}11$	
Age × education		$F = 0{\cdot}5$, not significant	
Deprivation × age × ed.		$F = 1{\cdot}3$, not significant	

* As in Table 9, all respondents over 65 years of age were removed from this total sample, leaving a total of 1,176 for the unweighted means analysis of variance.

Tables 10 and 11 explore these results further by controlling for both education and age—the two key background correlates in our data just as in Bagley's (1970) five-borough English data. Contact racism, shown in Table 10, is highly related to education but not to age. Indeed, fifteen out of the sixteen educational comparisons within the age and deprivational type controls show reduced contact racism with each increase in educational level. And while there is no education and age interaction, the jump from high school graduate to college reflects a considerably larger reduction in contact racism among the younger respondents, and from grade school to high school graduate among the older respondents. In four of the six comparisons, the doubly deprived have higher scores. Interestingly, both exceptions occur for high school graduates—the modal educational category of the affluent worker; and this fact is reflected in the weakly significant interaction term between type of deprivation and education. Notice also that the fraternally deprived had the second highest scores in five instances and the highest in the sixth.

A contrasting pattern appears for competitive racism in Table 11. Education and age are both significantly related; yet the fraternally deprived achieve the highest average factor scores in all six comparisons. Unlike with contact racism, the effects of education are not consistent. While the major effect is found between the high school graduate and college groups for both age groups, the key cluster of young high school graduates tend to possess slightly *higher* scores than the 11 years-or-less group. This trend is not true for the older respondents. Age, which did not relate to contact racism, provides an interesting pattern. In ten out of twelve

Table 11

*Competitive Racism Factor Scores and Types of Deprivation by Age and Education**

Type of Deprivation	Younger Respondents (21–40) Education 11 Yrs. or less	High School Graduate (12)	College (13+)
A. Doubly gratified	− 5·8	+ 3·3	− 91·4
B. Fraternally deprived	+ *35·7*	+ *39·1*	− *8·0*
C. Egoistically deprived	− 38·6	− 27·4	− 65·3
D. Doubly deprived	+ 24·6	+ 19·4	− 92·8
	Older Respondents (41–65) Education		
	11 Yrs. or Less	*High School Graduate (12)*	*College (13 +)*
A. Doubly gratified	+ 32·2	+ 25·2	− 38·8
B. Fraternally deprived	+ *58·1*	+ *41·6*	+ *17·4*
C. Egoistically deprived	+ 5·0	+ 38·6	− 27·2
D. Doubly deprived	0·0	− 22·8	− 8·2
	Deprivation Type	F = 8·9, p. < ·001	
	Age	F = 12·7, p. < ·001	
	Education	F = 21·6, p. < ·001	
	Deprivation × age	F = 1·6, not significant	
	Deprivation × ed.	F = 1·0, not significant	
	Age × education	F = 2·3, p. < ·11	
	Deprivation × age × ed.	F = 1·7, p. < ·11	

* As in Tables 9 and 10, all respondents over 65 years of age were removed from the total sample leaving a total of 1,176 for the unweighted means analysis of variance.

comparisons, the young reveal that they are less threatened by blacks; but the two exceptions are suggestive, since they consist of the doubly deprived young who did not obtain college training. These trends lie behind the two interaction terms which approach significance.

We can summarize the results of Tables 9, 10, and 11, then, by stating that: *across city, educational, and age samples, contact racism is strongest among those who individually regard their economic gains as inferior to the gains of blacks; while competitive racism is strongest among those who collectively regard white economic gains as inferior to the gains of blacks.*

It remains, however, to test the links between these relative deprivation findings and the 'affluent worker phenomenon' discussed earlier. If our reasoning is correct then at least part of the greater prejudice of the affluent workers may be attributed to their greater sense of fraternal deprivation. Unlike the poorer workers below them, they have both the fraternal solidarity of doing as well as most white workers and the increased aspirations resulting from past successes. And unlike the truly affluent above them they are not doing so well as to be free from any threat of deprivation. This should reflect itself in a curvilinear relationship of our fraternal deprivation measures with socio-economic status. Table 12 reports the incidence of fraternal deprivation according to income and education. In general, the results confirm our expectations although some of the relationships are not strong. For racial deprivation, only 12 per cent of the low-education low-income group feels fraternally deprived. This increases to 26 per cent among high school graduates making $7,500 to $10,000 a year and then decreases again to 16 per cent of the college graduates making over $15,000. For class deprivation the analogous percentages are 6 per cent, 29 per cent and 11 per cent, again showing a curvilinear trend.

Table 12

Fraternal Deprivation by Income and Education

Education	*Fraternal Racial Deprivation* Income				
	$5,000 or Less	*$5,000–$7,500*	*$7,500–$10,000*	*$10,000–$15,000*	*$15,000 or More*
11 years or less	*12%**	22%	24%	21%	20%
High school graduate	19%	24%	*26%*	19%	24%
College	10%	18%	19%	16%	*16%*
	Fraternal Class Deprivation‡ Income				
Education	*$5,000 or Less*	*$5,000–$7,500*	*$7,500–$10,000*	*$10,000–$15,000*	*$15,000 or More*
11 years or less	*6%*	13%	17%	13%	(7%)
High school graduate	(21%)	9%	*29%*	14%	14%
College	(8%)	(25%)	22%	32%	*11%*

* Percentages are the percentages of the total respondents in each cell who were classified as fraternally deprived.

‡ As in Tables 4 and 5 results are from Gary and Cleveland only. Parentheses indicate percentages are based on small cell sizes (N < 20).

DISCUSSION

Merton and Kitt (1950), in reviewing the Air Corps and Military Police example of relative deprivation cited earlier, raise an issue that becomes critical in our own analysis.

> We note that [the dependent variable] consists in soldiers' evaluations of the institutional system of promotion in the Army, and not to self evaluations of personal achievement within that system. . . . This introduces a problem, deserving attention which it has not yet received: *do the two types of evaluations, self-appraisals and appraisals of institutional arrangements, involve similar mechanisms of reference group behaviour?* [italics added].

This question finally began receiving conceptual attention years later from Runciman (1966), as we have noted, in his distinction between egoistic and fraternalistic deprivation. His answer to the query posed by Merton and Kitt was basically, *no*, in that two mechanisms of reference behaviour appear to be involved. Runciman insisted that it is only fraternal, and not egoistic, deprivation that results in movements for and against fundamental structural change in society.

This point seems almost obvious on closer analysis. Structural change involves by definition changes in the position of groups within society and not the movements of particular individuals within that structure. It seems obvious, then, that attitudes about structural change would involve group-to-group comparisons (fraternalist) and not individual-to-group comparisons (egoistic). And yet this point has been largely ignored or obscured by most of the researchers who have sought to link relative deprivation to movements for and against social change. There has been, in short, a consistent and erroneous individualistic bias throughout this literature.

Perhaps the most frequent definition of relative deprivation in these studies refers to the gap between individual aspirations and satisfactions. Davies (1962), Feierabend and Feierabend (1966), and Gurr (1970), for

example, all make use of such an individually focused definition.[u] And recent research based on the Cantril Self-Anchoring Scale has provided an empirical method for measuring the gap between aspirations and satisfactions (e.g., Crawford and Naditch, 1970). Defined in this way, relative deprivation is virtually divorced from its original reference group links. The hypothesized comparison is entirely within the individual, between his present or expected satisfactions and his past aspirations. Some of these investigators, for example, Gurr (1970), admit that reference groups do influence the nature of an individual's aspirations, but the *anchor* to the comparison process is still assumed to be the individual himself. 'How are the blacks doing relative to *me*?'

The point is not that such individualistic comparisons are never made or are never relevant to social action. Rather the problem with this past research is that it fails to distinguish between self-evaluations and structural evaluations and, thus, between the different comparisons which underlie these evaluations. The frustrated aspirations of whites, or their failure to keep up with the perceived gains of black Americans, has important consequences for one's self and perhaps for how one interacts with blacks. But not until this deprivation is generalized to one's entire membership group are there implications for desired institutional changes in the fundamental structure of society. Our own research demonstrates that evaluations of *structural* changes in race relations are related to fraternal comparisons, while attitudes towards *individual* intergroup behaviour (contact with blacks) is more closely associated with individualistic cross-group comparisons.

Two important differences between individual and group comparisons that relate to reference group ideas require emphasis. First, as Hyman and Singer (1968), Pettigrew (1967), and others have emphasized, the weakest link in reference group theory is the failure to explain adequately how reference groups are selected in the first place. This weakness exists especially for egoistic deprivation; but it holds with less force for fraternal deprivation, because of the tendency for reference groups to be reciprocally paired much in the manner of social roles: white–black, native–immigrant, blue collar–white collar. Thus, once an individual has identified with his in-group, the relevant group referent with which to compare the status of the in-group is largely determined.

For fraternal deprivation the nature of the question is therefore quite different. We know what the appropriate comparison group is, but what determines how the individual makes that comparison? Our data indicate that there is a curvilinear relationship between the individual's objective position and his perception of fraternal deprivation. The poor tend to feel deprived relative to their in-group as well as to the comparative referent, while the wealthy can avoid any feeling of deprivation. Those in the middle, however, can maintain fraternal solidarity with their own in-group while resenting or envying gains made by external referents.

Secondly, fraternal deprivation presents a unique solution for the tension created between mobility aspirations and the *Gemeinschaft* bonds of the in-group. As one rises in the social structure, there necessarily are

---

[u] Other writers have confused the two orientations, among them one of the present authors (Pettigrew, 1964). For collections of the relevant studies in this literature, see Masotti and Bowen (1968) and Davies (1971).

created pressures for breaking old in-group ties. In essence, this tension is implicit in Durkheim's distinction between organic and mechanical solidarity; and it marks the limits, as Davis (1966) has noted, to the operation of balance theory—the currently popular social psychological version of mechanical solidarity. But fraternal aspirations skirt the problem by opting for, in essence, group mobility. If structural change succeeds in raising the status of one's group, then one achieves a type of personal mobility while maintaining—indeed strengthening—in-group bonds. This phenomenon is in marked contrast to egoistic aspirations; and it suggests that fraternal aspirations and deprivation will be most prevalent in societies where rapid mobility is perceived and cohesive subgroups exist. Put differently, fraternal deprivation is created when perceptions of rapid mobility raise aspirations while in-group solidarity channels the aspirations into group terms.

Finally, the findings presented here distinguish between two, only slightly related, dimensions of anti-black prejudice—*contact racism* and *competitive racism*. We strongly suspect that many omnibus measures of prejudice employed in previous research have confounded these and other dimensions of prejudice. This confounding in turn introduces unnecessary error and retards the progress of the field by rendering more difficult comparisons across diverse investigations.

Consequently, we believe our results point to five conclusions:

1. Runciman's (1966) distinction between egoistic and fraternalistic deprivation is vital to any use of reference group theory and the relative deprivation hypothesis for the study of social movements for or against major structural change in society. The key form of relative deprivation for producing social unrest is group-to-group, fraternalistic comparisons, even though other forms of individual comparisons are critical for self-evaluations.
2. Special resistance to racial change in urban America today is centred among the affluent workers and the fraternally deprived. Wallace support is particularly found among younger affluent workers who feel their class is relatively deprived in reference to white-collar job holders. Indeed, it appears as if fraternal *class* deprivation acts as a mediator for the affluent worker component of the 'Wallace phenomenon'. Resistance to black mayoralty candidates is particularly found among those who feel their *racial* group (whites) is deprived relative to blacks.
3. Negative individual evaluations in comparison with black Americans, as exemplified by both the doubly and the fraternally deprived, tend towards *contact racism* involving an expressed aversion to reasonably intimate interracial contact. By contrast, negative group-to-group evaluations in comparison with black Americans, as exemplified by the fraternally deprived alone, tend strongly towards *competitive racism* involving resentment of government programmes designed to help blacks and a denial of the existence of racial discrimination. These suggestive results hold up even after crude controls for city sample, education, and age are applied.
4. The incidence of fraternal deprivation is greatest at intermediate economic levels. This curvilinear relationship suggests that fraternal deprivation acts as a mediating link in the relationship between racial prejudice and working-class affluence.
5. Finally, future research in this realm would be well advised to: (a) measure perceived deprivation in a wide variety of ways;

(b) draw sharp distinctions between various types of deprivation, especially fraternal and egoistic, relative to a large array of potential comparison groups; and (c) divide the dependent variable of prejudice into its several components.

References

T. W. Adorno, E, Frenkel-Brunswik, D. F. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York, Harper-Row, 1950).

G. W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge, Mass., Addison-Wesley, 1954).

C. Bagley, *Social Structure and Prejudice in Five English Boroughs* (London, Institute of Race Relations, 1970).

P. M. Blau, *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (New York, Wiley, 1964).

W. Brink and L. Harris, *The Negro Revolution in America* (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1964).

W. Brink and L. Harris, *Black and White* (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1967).

A. Campbell, *White Attitudes Toward Black People* (Ann Arbor, Mich., Institute for Social Research, 1971).

A. Campbell, P. E. Converse, W. E. Miller, and D. E. Stokes, *The American Voter* (New York, Wiley, 1960).

A. Campbell, G. Gurin, and W. E. Miller, *The Voter Decides* (Evanston, Ill., Row, Peterson, 1954).

A. Campbell and H. Schuman, 'Racial Attitudes in Fifteen American Cities', in the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, *Supplemental Studies* (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968).

A. H. Cantril and C. W. Roll, Jr., *Hopes and Fears of the American People* (New York, Universe Books, 1971).

H. Cantril, *Public Opinion, 1935–1946* (Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1951).

H. Cantril, *The Pattern of Human Concerns* (New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers University Press, 1965).

R. Centers, *The Psychology of Social Classes* (Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1949).

W. W. Charters, Jr., and T. M. Newcomb, 'Some Attitudinal Effects of Experimentally Increased Salience of a Membership Group', in G. E. Swanson, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology* (2nd edition, New York, Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1952).

C. H. Cooley, *Human Nature and the Social Order* (New York, Scribner's, 1902).

T. J. Crawford and M. Naditch, 'Relative Deprivation, Powerlessness, and Militancy: The Psychology of Social Protest', *Psychiatry* (**33**, 1970).

W. W. Daniel, *Racial Discrimination in England* (Harmondsworth, Penquin, 1968).

J. C. Davies, 'Toward a Theory of Revolution', *American Sociological Review* (**27**, 1962).

J. C. Davies (ed.), *When Men Revolt and Why: A Reader in Political Violence and Participation* (New York, Free Press, 1971).

J. A. Davis, 'A Formal Interpretation of the Theory of Relative Deprivation', *Sociometry* (**22**, 1959).

J. A. Davis, 'Structural Balance, Mechanical Solidarity, and Interpersonal Relations', *American Journal of Sociology* (**72**, 1966).

S. N. Eisenstadt, 'Studies in Reference Group Behaviour', *Human Relations* (**7**, 1954).

H. G. Erskine, 'The Polls: Race Relations', *Public Opinion Quarterly* (**26**, 1962).

H. G. Erskine, 'The Polls: Negro Housing', *Public Opinion Quarterly* (**31**, 1967).

H. G. Erskine, 'The Polls: Demonstrations and Race Riots', *Public Opinion Quarterly* (**31**, 1967–8).

H. G. Erskine, 'The Polls: Negro Employment', *Public Opinion Quarterly* (**32**, 1968a).

H. G. Erskine, 'The Polls: Speed of Racial Integration', *Public Opinion Quarterly* (**32**, 1968b).

H. G. Erskine, 'The Polls: Recent Opinion on Racial Problems', *Public Opinion Quarterly* (**32**, 1968–9).

H. Eulau, *Class and Party in the Eisenhower Years* (New York, Free Press, 1962).

L. Festinger, 'A Theory of Social Comparisons', *Human Relations* (**7**, 1954).

J. M. Fenton, *In Your Opinion* (Boston, Little-Brown, 1960).

I. K. Feierabend and R. L. Feierabend, 'Aggressive Behaviors within Polities, 1948–1962: A Cross-National Study', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (**10**, 1966).

W. H. Form and J. A. Geschwender, 'Social Reference Basis of Job Satisfaction: The Case of Manual Workers', *American Sociological Review* (**27**, 1962).

T. R. Gurr, *Why Men Rebel* (Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1970).

R. E. Hartley, 'Relationships Between Perceived Values and Acceptance of a New Reference Group', *Journal of Social Psychology* (**51**, 1960a).

R. E. Hartley, 'Personal Needs and the Acceptance of a New Group as a Reference Group', *Journal of Social Psychology* (**51**, 1960b).

G. C. Homans, *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms* (New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961).

H. H. Hyman, 'The Psychology of Status', *Archives of Psychology* (**269,** 1942).

H. H. Hyman and P. B. Sheatsley, 'Attitudes Toward Desegregation', *Scientific American* (**195,** 1956).

H. H. Hyman and P. B. Sheatsley, 'Attitudes Toward Desegregation', *Scientific American* (**211,** 1964).

H. H. Hyman and E. Singer (eds.), *Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research* (New York, Free Press, 1968).

A. Inkeles, 'Industrial Man: The Relation of Status to Experience, Perception, and Value', *American Journal of Sociology* (**66,** 1960).

N. Kaplan, 'Reference Groups and Interest Group Theories of Voting', in H. H. Hyman and E. Singer (eds.), *Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research* (New York, Free Press, 1968).

H. H. Kelley, 'Two Functions of Reference Groups', in G. E. Swanson, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology* (2nd edition, New York, Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1952).

G. E. Lenski, 'Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status', *American Sociological Review* (**19,** 1954).

S. M. Lipset, *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics* (New York, Doubleday, 1960).

S. M. Lipset and E. Raab, *The Politics of Unreason: Right-Wing Extremism in America, 1790–1970* (New York, Harper and Row, 1970).

E. Litwak, 'Reference Group Theory, Bureaucratic Career, and Neighborhood Primary Group Cohesion', *Sociometry* (**23,** 1960).

I. D. MacCrone, *Race Attitudes in South Africa* (London, Oxford University Press, 1937).

I. D. MacCrone, 'Race Attitudes', in E. Hellmann (ed.), *Handbook of South African Race Relations* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1949).

I. D. MacCrone, 'Ethnocentric Ideology and Ethnocentrism', *Proceedings of the South African Psychological Association* (**4,** 1953).

E. G. Malherbe, *Race Attitudes and Education* (Johannesburg, S. A., Institute of Race Relations, 1946).

G. T. Marx, *Protest and Prejudice: A Study of Belief in the Black Community* (New York, Harper and Row, 1967).

L. H. Masotti and D. R. Bowen (eds.), *Riots and Rebellion: Civil Violence in the Urban Community* (Beverly Hills, Cal., Sage, 1968).

G. H. Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1934).

R. K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Rev. edition, Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1957).

R. K. Merton and A. S. Kitt (Rossi), 'Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior', in R. K. Merton and P. F. Lazarsfeld (eds.), *Continuities in Social Research: Studies in the Scope and Method of 'The American Soldier'* (Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1950).

P. Meyer, *A Survey of Attitudes of Detroit Negroes after the Riot of 1967* (Detroit, Mich., Detroit Urban League, 1968a).

P. Meyer, *Miami Negroes: A Study in Depth* (Miami, Fla., The Miami Herald, 1968).

T. M. Newcomb, *Personality and Social Change* (New York, Holt, Reinhart, and Winston, 1943).

T. M. Newcomb, 'Review of Continuities in Social Research', *American Journal of Sociology* (**57,** 1951).

S. Parker and R. J. Kleiner, *Mental Illness in the Urban Negro Community* (New York, Free Press, 1966).

M. A. Patchen, 'A Conceptual Framework and Some Empirical Data Regarding Comparisons of Social Rewards', *Sociometry* (**24,** 1961).

L. I. Pearlin, 'Shifting Group Attachments and Attitudes Toward Negroes', *Social Forces* (**33,** 1954).

T. F. Pettigrew, 'Personality and Socio-Cultural Factors in Intergroup Attitudes: A Cross-National Comparison', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (**2,** 1958).

T. F. Pettigrew, 'Regional Differences in Anti-Negro Prejudice', *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* (**59,** 1959).

T. F. Pettigrew, 'Social Distance Attitudes of South African Students', *Social Forces* (**38,** 1960).

T. F. Pettigrew, *A Profile of the Negro American* (Princeton, N.J., Van Nostrand–Reinhold, 1964).

T. F. Pettigrew, 'Social Evaluation Theory: Convergences and Applications', in D. Levine (ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1967* (Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1967).

T. F. Pettigrew, Review of Rose's Colour and Citizenship, *Race* (**12,** 1971a).

T. F. Pettigrew, *Racially Separate or Together?* (New York, McGraw–Hill, 1971b).

T. F. Pettigrew, 'When a Black Candidate Runs for Mayor: Race and Voting Behavior', in H. Hahn (eds.), *Urban Affairs Annual Review* (Beverly Hills, Cal., Sage, 1972).

Political and Economic Planning and Research Services Ltd., *Racial Discrimination* (London, P. E. P., 1967).

I. de Sola Pool and I. Shulman, 'Newsmen's Fantasies, Audiences, and Newswritings', *Public Opinion Quarterly* (**23,** 1959).

C. A. Rogers and C. Frantz, *Racial Themes in Southern Rhodesia* (New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press, 1962).

E. M. Rogers, 'Reference Group Influences on Student Drinking Behaviour', *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol* (**19,** 1958).

M. Rokeach and L. Mezei, 'Race and Shared Belief as Factors in Social Choice', *Science* (**151,** 1966).

M. Rokeach, P. W. Smith, and R. I. Evans, 'Two Kinds of Prejudice or One?', in M. Rokeach (ed.), *The Open and Closed Mind* (New York, Basic Books, 1960).

E. J. B. Rose and Associates, *Colour and Citizenship: A Report on British Race Relations* (London, Oxford University Press for the Institute of Race Relations, 1969).

W. G. Runciman, *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966).

M. A. Schwartz, *Trends in White Attitudes towards Negroes* (Chicago, National Opinion Research Centre, 1967).

P. B. Sheatsley, 'White Attitudes Towards the Negro', in T. Parsons and K. Clark (eds.), *The Negro American* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966).

M. Sherif, 'The Concept of Reference Groups in Human Relations', in M. Sherif and M. O. Wilson (eds.), *Group Relations at the Crossroads* (New York, Harper and Row, 1953).

T. Shibutani, 'Reference Groups as Perspectives', *American Journal of Sociology* (**60,** 1955).

A. E. Siegel and S. Siegel, 'Reference Groups, Membership Groups, and Attitude Change', *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* (**55,** 1957).

C. R. Smith, L. Williams, and R. H. Willis, 'Race, Sex, and Belief as Determinants of Friendship Acceptance', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (**5,** 1967).

A. J. Spector, 'Expectations, Fulfilment, and Morale', *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* (**52,** 1956).

D. D. Stein, 'The Influence of Belief Systems on Interpersonal Preference', *Psychological Monographs* (**80,** 1966).

D. D. Stein, J. A. Hardyck, and M. B. Smith, 'Race *and* Belief: An Open and Shut Case', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (**1,** 1965).

E. Stern and S. Keller, 'Spontaneous Group Preference in France', *Public Opinion Quarterly* (**17,** 1953).

S. A. Stouffer, E. A. Suchman, L. C. DeVinney, S. A. Star, and R. M. Williams, Jr., *The American Soldier* (Vol. 1) *Adjustment During Army Life* (Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1949).

H. M. Strauss, 'Reference Group and Social Comparison Processes among the Totally Blind', in H. H. Hyman and E. Singer (eds.), *Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research* (New York, Free Press, 1968).

J. W. Thibaut and H. H. Kelley, *The Social Psychology of Groups* (New York, Wiley, 1959).

H. Tingsten, *The Problem of South Africa* (London, Gollancz, 1954).

R. H. Turner, 'Role-Taking, Role Standpoint, and Reference Group Behaviour', *American Journal of Sociology* (**61,** 1956).

P. L. van den Berghe, 'The Dynamics of Racial Prejudice: An Ideal-Type Dichotomy', *Social Forces* (**37,** 1958).

P. L. van den Berghe, 'Race Attitudes in Durban, South Africa', *Journal of Social Psychology* (**57,** 1962).

R. M. Williams, Jr., *Strangers Next Door* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1964).