

Hanging Tongues: A Social Encounter with the Assembly Line

WILLIAM E. THOMPSON
Emporia State University

This qualitative sociological study analyzes the experience of working on a modern assembly line in a large beef plant. It explores and examines a special type of assembly line work which involves the slaughtering and processing of cattle into a variety of products intended for human consumption and other uses.

Working in the beef plant is “dirty work,” not only in the literal sense of being drenched with perspiration and beef blood, but also in the figurative sense of performing a low status, routine, and demeaning job. Although the work is honest and necessary in a society which consumes beef, slaughtering and butchering cattle is generally viewed as an undesirable and repugnant job. In that sense, workers at the beef plant share some of the same experiences as other workers in similarly regarded occupations (for example, ditchdiggers, garbage collectors, and other types of assembly line workers).

Couched within the symbolic interactionist perspective, this study focuses on the daily activities of the workers. These activities must meet the work demands of their employer and enable the workers to construct and perpetuate a social world of work in a way meaningful to them. Specifically, this study analyzes how workers interact with one another on the job, how they cope with the strains of the work, how they maintain a sense of self-worth, and how they develop and maintain informal norms in regard to consumer spending. These spending patterns lead to a financial trap which prevents most workers from leaving the employ of the plant.

THE SETTING

The setting for the field work was a major beef processing plant in the Midwest. At the time of the study, the plant was the third largest branch of a corporation which operated ten such plants in the

United States. It employed approximately 1,800 people. In addition to slaughtering and processing cattle for beef, the plant also produced pet food, leather for the wholesale market, and a variety of pharmaceutical supplies which were derived from various glands and organs of cattle. This particular plant had operated for twelve years and was considered a stable and important part of the community in which it was located.

Approximately 350 employees worked on the “A” shift on “Slaughter” and were the subjects observed for this research. The most intensive observation focused on the twelve members of the particular work crew to which I was assigned. Of the 350 employees, approximately one-third were Mexican-Americans, two-thirds were white, and two individuals were Native Americans. No blacks worked on this shift. Only five women worked on the “A” shift: a nurse, a secretary, and three federal inspectors; all the line workers were male. A few blacks and several women worked in the Process division. The explanation given for the lack of women lineworkers in “Slaughter” was the hard physical labor and the nature of the jobs associated with slaughtering. Although pursued, an adequate explanation for the lack of blacks in the slaughter division was never provided.

METHOD

The method of this study was nine weeks of full-time participant observation as outlined by Schatzman and Strauss (1973) and Spradley (1979, 1980). To enter the setting, the researcher went through the standard application process for a summer job. No mention of the research intent was made, though it was made clear that I was a university sociology professor. After initial screening, a thorough physical examination, and a helpful reference from a former student and part-time employee

2 *Hanging Tongues: A Sociological Encounter with the Assembly Line*

of the plant, the author was hired to work on the Offal crew in the Slaughter division of the plant.

THE WORK

The physical exhaustion of assembly line work at the beef plant was extreme. Certain jobs on the line required more physical exertion than others, but the strain of assembly line work went beyond physical exhaustion. As a worker on the line at Ford put it, “The work is always physically exhausting ... but the real punishment is the inevitability of the line” (King, 1978, p. 201). The inevitability of the line indeed; the line speed on the kill floor was 187. That means that 187 head of cattle were slaughtered per hour. At any particular work station, each worker was required to work at that speed. Thus, at my work station, in the period of one hour, 187 beef tongues were mechanically pulled from their hooks; dropped into a large tub filled with water; had to be taken from the tub and hung on a large stainless steel rack full of hooks; branded with a “hot brand” indicating they had been inspected by a USDA inspector; and then covered with a small plastic bag. The rack was taken to the cooler, replaced with an empty one, and the process began again.

WORKER SOCIAL RELATIONS

Worker social relations were complex. As could be expected, the various roles occupied by workers in the plant greatly influenced the types of interaction which occurred among them. The major occupational roles at the beef plant were manager, foreman, nurse, federal meat inspector, and line worker. The hierarchical structure of personnel was clear-cut from the company’s viewpoint. Plant superintendent, general manager, and other executives were, of course, at the top of the status hierarchy. However, since their offices were separated from the work floor (and they rarely ventured there), their interaction with labor personnel was virtually non-existent. When interaction did occur, it was usually on a one-way basis—there was a clear superordinate/subordinate relationship.

Management’s link to labor personnel was the foreman. He personified management on the work floor. His main duties were to assign jobs to his crew members and supervise their work activities. In addition, however, the foreman was often required to perform physical labor. Thus, he had to know all the jobs performed by his crew should a

worker be absent or have to leave the line unexpectedly, the foreman was required to take over his responsibilities. The foreman often fulfilled the laborer role and worked alongside the rest of the crew. Ironically, though higher in status and “in charge” of the crew, the foreman periodically performed all the duties of a laborer at lower pay.

Foremen worked on monthly salaries, whereas laborers worked for hourly wages. When laborers worked overtime, they were paid “time-and-a-half.” When foremen worked overtime, it was gratis to the company. This pay differential was usually compensated for at the end of the year when profit-sharing dividends of foremen far exceeded those of laborers. Since foremen’s dividends were based on the production of their crews, they tended to push their crews to the maximum. The foreman role was somewhat analogous to that of the “overseer” on slave plantations in the ante-bellum South (Stampp, 1956). He did not have the status nor reap the benefits of the company owner, yet became the “driver” of those who produced the work and profits. In a sociological sense, the foreman at the beef plant emerged as the classic example of “marginal man” (Stonequist, 1937); he was in fact neither management nor labor, and not fully accepted by either.

The general attitudes of the laborers toward the foremen were those of dislike and mistrust. Even when certain workers knew a foreman on a friendly basis in a social context outside the plant, their relations inside the plant were cool. A scenario I personally saw acted out on several occasions by several different workers involved a foreman stopping to talk to a worker in a non-work related, seemingly friendly conversation. The worker would be smiling and conversing congenially, yet the moment the foreman turned to walk away, the worker would make an obscene gesture (usually involving the middle finger) behind the foreman’s back, so that all other workers could clearly see...

Social relations between laborers were marked by anonymity. While virtually all the workers on the kill floor knew each other on sight and knew who performed what job, it was not uncommon for two workers who had worked alongside each other for ten years to know only each other’s first names—and that only because it was written on a piece of plastic tape on the front of their hard hats. As Berger points out, “... technological production brings with it *anonymous social relations*” [italics in original] (Berger, et al., 1974, p. 31). Similarly, an auto assembly line worker lamented, “I’ve been here for

over a year, and I hardly know the first names of the men in the section where I work” (Walker & Guest, 1952, p. 77). The nature of the work on an assembly line almost negates the possibility for social interaction during the work, and consequently creates a certain anonymity among the workers.

Though anonymous, the workers also shared a sense of unity. Work on the line could best be described as “uncooperative teamwork.” Because the assembly line demanded coordinated teamwork, to some extent, the work became “one for all.” Yet, at the same time, since each worker had a separate specialized task, the work became “every man for himself.” Workers occasionally helped each other *out of the hole* when they fell behind, but it was done more because it slowed their own work, than because they wanted to help a fellow worker. Still, the help was appreciated and almost always reciprocated.

Beyond sharing labor occasionally, a more subtle sense of unity existed among the workers; a sense that “we are all in this together.” Just as an auto worker indicated, “The monotony of the line binds us together” (King, 1978, p. 201), the beef plant workers apparently shared a common bond. The workers referred to themselves as *beefers* and each individual *beef*er shared something in common with all others. The hard work, danger of the job, and ambivalence toward the company and its management, all seemed to unite the workers in spirit. The line workers in the beef plant constituted an “occupational culture” as described by Reimer (1979, p. 24) in his study of construction workers....

Another uniting element regarding worker social interaction was the process of sharing meaningful symbols. *Language* emerged as one of the most important symbols at the beef plant (Mead, 1934). As Hummel (1977) suggests, in most bureaucratic organizations a language exists to facilitate communication among those within the organization and to exclude those outside it. As Reimer (1979, p. 78) points out, “For a worker to be fully integrated into a work group and its culture, he must literally know how to communicate in the language of the group.” A brief description of the slaughter process in the argot of a *beef*er will illustrate the point:

After *herders* send in the beef, a *knocker* drops them. The *shackler* puts them on the chain so the *head droppers*, *splitters*, *boners*, *trimmers*, and the rest of the *chain*

gang can do their jobs. As long as *the man* doesn’t reject a lot and you don’t run into a lot of *down time*, it’s easy to stay *out of the hole* and get *some sunshine* time at the end of the shift.

Despite special argot, the excessive noise from the machinery and the requirement that all employees wear ear plugs made *non-verbal gestures* the primary form of communication. Exaggerated gestures and shrill whistles were used to get a fellow worker’s attention. The “thumbs up” sign indicated everything was alright, whereas “thumbs down” meant one was *in the hole*. One of the most interesting means of non-verbal communication was to beat knives against the stainless steel tables and tubs used throughout the plant. This clanging signified either that a break in the line was coming or that the men on slaughter had quit “knocking.” The first person on the line to see the upcoming gap would begin clanging his knife against metal; the next worker picked up on this, and so on down the line, until the entire line was clanging unbelievably loudly. My work station was situated so that when the clanging began it was exactly 35 minutes until the end of the line would reach me. Since there were no clocks on the kill floor and talk was virtually impossible, this procedure served as an important time indicator for all workers in regard to breaks, lunch and quitting time. This ability to communicate a sense of time to fellow workers also served to symbolically regain an element of control that management had taken from the workers by virtue of not installing any clocks on the kill floor.

COPING

One of the difficulties of work at the beef plant was coping with three aspects of the work: *monotony, danger, and dehumanization*. While individual workers undoubtedly coped in a variety of ways, some distinguishable patterns emerged.

Monotony

The monotony of the line was almost unbearable. *At my work station, a worker would hang, brand, and bag between 1,350 to 1,500 beef tongues in an eight-hour shift.* With the exception of the scheduled 15 minute break and a 30 minute lunch period (and sporadic brief gaps in the line), the work was mundane, routine, and continuous. As in most assembly line work, one inevitably drifted into daydreams (e.g., Garson, 1975; King, 1978; Linhart,

4 *Hanging Tongues: A Sociological Encounter with the Assembly Line*

1981). It was not unusual to look up or down the line and see workers at various stations singing to themselves, tapping their feet to imaginary music, or carrying on conversations with themselves. I found that I could work with virtually no attention paid to the job, **with my hands and arms almost automatically performing their tasks**. In the meantime, my mind was free to wander over a variety of topics, including taking mental notes. In visiting with other workers, I found that daydreaming was the norm. Some would think about their families, while others fantasized about sexual escapades, fishing, or anything unrelated to the job. One individual who was rebuilding an antique car at home in his spare time would meticulously mentally rehearse the procedures he was going to perform on the car the next day....

Danger

The danger of working in the beef plant was well known. Safety was top priority (at least in theory) and management took pride in the fact that only three employee on-the-job deaths had occurred in 12 years.¹ Although deaths were uncommon, serious injuries were not. The beef plant employed over 1,800 people. Approximately three-fourths of those employed had jobs which demanded the use of a knife honed to razor-sharpness. Despite the use of wire-mesh aprons and gloves, **serious cuts were almost a daily occurrence**. Since workers constantly handled beef blood, danger of **infection** was ever-present. As one walked along the assembly line, a wide assortment of bandages on fingers, hands, arms, necks, and faces could always be seen.

In addition to the problem of cuts, workers who cut meat continuously sometimes suffered **muscle and ligament damage to their fingers and hands**. In one severe case, I was told of a woman who worked in processing for several years who had to wear splints on her fingers while away from the job to hold them straight. Otherwise, the muscles in her hand would constrict her fingers into the grip position, as if holding a knife.

Because of the inherent danger of the plant in general, and certain jobs in the plant in particular, workers were forced to cope with the fear of physical harm.² Meara (1974) discovered that meatcutters in her study derived a sense of honor from the serious cuts and injuries they incurred doing their work, but this did not seem to be the case at the beef plant. Although workers were willing to show their scars, they did not seem to take much pride in them.

Any time a serious accident occurred (especially one which warranted the transport of the victim to the hospital in an ambulance) news of the event spread rapidly throughout the plant.

When I spoke with fellow workers about the dangers of working in the plant, I noticed interesting defense mechanisms. As noted by Shostak (1980), the workers talked a great deal about workers being injured on the job. After a serious accident, or when telling about an accident or death which occurred in years past, the workers would almost immediately disassociate themselves from the event and its victim. Workers tended to view those who suffered major accidents or death on the job in much the same way that non-victims of crime often view crime victims as either partially responsible for the event or at least as very different from themselves (Barlow, 1981). **"Only a part-timer," "stupid," "careless"** or something similar was used, seemingly to reassure the worker describing the accident that it could not happen to him. The reality of the situation was that virtually all the jobs on the kill floor were dangerous, and any worker could have experienced a serious injury at any time.

Dehumanization

Perhaps the most devastating aspect of working at the beef plant (worse than the monotony and the danger) was the dehumanizing and demeaning elements of the job. In a sense, **the assembly line worker became a part of the assembly line**. The assembly line is not a tool used by the worker, but a machine which controls him/her. A tool can only be productive in the hands of somebody skilled in its use, and hence, becomes an extension of the person using it. A machine, on the other hand, performs specific tasks, thus its operator becomes an extension of it in the production process. Further elaboration on the social and psychological distinction between tools and machines has been discussed in the ecology literature (for example, Bookchin, 1972). When workers are viewed as mere extensions of the machines with which they work, their human needs become secondary in importance to the smooth mechanical functioning of the production process. In a bureaucratic structure, when "human needs collide with systems needs the individual suffers" (Hummel, 1977, p. 65).

Workers on the assembly line are seen as interchangeable as the parts of the product on the line itself. An example of one worker's perception of this phenomenon at the beef plant was demonstrat-

ed the day after a fatal accident occurred. I asked the men in the crew what the company did in the case of an employee death (I wondered if there was a fund for flowers, or if the shift was given time off to go to the funeral, etc.). One worker's response was: "They drag off the body, take the hard hat and boots and check 'em out to some other poor sucker, and throw him in the guy's place." While employee death on the job was not viewed quite that coldly by the company, the statement fairly accurately summarized the overall result of a fatal accident, and importance of any individual worker to the overall operation of the production process. It accurately summarized the workers' perceptions about management's attitudes toward them.

The dehumanization process affected the social relations of workers, as well as each worker's self-concept. Hummel (1977, p. 2) indicates that bureaucracy and its technical means of production give birth to a "... new species of inhuman beings." As noted by Perry (1978, P. 7) "there are dire consequences for someone who feels stuck in an occupation that robs him of his personhood or, at best, continually threatens his personhood for eight hours a day." However, workers on the line strove in a variety of ways to maintain their sense of worth. As pointed out by Perrow (1979, p. 4), the bureaucratic structure of the complex organization never realizes its "ideal" form because "... it tries to do what must be (hopefully) forever impossible—to eliminate all unwanted extraorganizational influence upon the behavior of its members." Reimer (1979) showed that construction workers view deviance as a fun part of their work. So, too, beefers strained to maintain their humanity, and hence, their sense of self-esteem through horseplay (strictly forbidden), daydreaming, unscheduled breaks, social interaction with other employees, and occasional sabotage.

SABOTAGE

It is fairly common knowledge that assembly line work situations often lead to employee sabotage or destruction of the product or equipment used in the production process (Garson, 1975; Balzer, 1976; Shostak, 1980). This is the classic experience of alienation as described by Marx (1964a, b). This experience has been most eloquently expressed by an assembly line worker in Terkel's research, who stated:

Sometimes out of pure meanness, when I make something I put a little dent in it. I

like to do something to make it really unique. Hit it with a hammer. I deliberately fuck it up to see if it'll get by, just so I can say I did it (Terkel, 1974, p. 9–10).

At the beef plant I quickly learned that there was an art to effective sabotage. Subtlety appeared to be the key. "The art lies in sabotaging in a way that is not immediately discovered," as a Ford worker put it (King, 1978, p. 202). This seemed to hold true at the beef plant as well. Although sabotage did not seem to be a major problem at the beef plant, it did exist, and there appeared to be several norms (both formal and informal) concerning what was acceptable and what was not. The greatest factor influencing the handling of beef plant products was its status, the formal norms were replete with USDA and FDA regulations and specifications. Foremen, supervisors, and federal inspectors attempted to insure that these norms were followed. Further, though not an explicitly altruistic group, the workers realized that the product would be consumed by people (even family, relatives, and friends), so consequently, they rarely did anything to actually contaminate the product.

Despite formal norms against sabotage, some did occur. It was not uncommon for workers to deliberately cut chunks out of pieces of meat for no reason (or for throwing at other employees). While regulations required that anything that touched the floor had to be put in tubs marked "inedible," the informal procedural norms were otherwise. When something was dropped, one usually looked around to see if an inspector or foreman noticed. If not, the item was quickly picked up and put back on the line.

THE FINANCIAL TRAP

Given the preceding description and analysis of work at the beef plant, why did people work at such jobs? Obviously, there are a multitude of plausible answers to that question. Without doubt, however, the key is money. The current economic situation, the lack of steady employment opportunities (especially for the untrained and poorly educated), combined with the fact that the beef plant's starting wage exceeded the minimum wage by approximately \$5.50 per hour emerge as the most important reasons people went to work there.

Despite the high hourly wage and fringe benefits, however, the monotony, danger, and hard phys-

6 *Hanging Tongues: A Sociological Encounter with the Assembly Line*

ical work drove many workers away in less than a week. During my study, I observed much worker turnover. Those who stayed, displayed an interesting pattern which helps explain why they did not leave. Every member of my work crew answered similarly my questions about why they stayed at the beef plant. Each of them took the job directly after high school, because it was the highest paying job available. Each of them had intended to work through the summer and then look for a better job in the fall. During that first summer on the job they fell victim to what I label the “financial trap.”

The “financial trap” was a spending pattern which demanded the constant weekly income provided by the beef plant job. This scenario was first told to me by an employee who had worked at the plant for over nine years. He began the week after his high school graduation, intending only to work that summer in order to earn enough money to attend college in the fall. After about four weeks’ work he purchased a new car. He figured he could pay off the car that summer and still save enough money for tuition. Shortly after the car purchase, he added a new stereo sound system to his debt; next came a motorcycle; then the decision to postpone school for one year in order to continue working at the beef plant and pay off his debts. A few months later he married; within a year purchased a house; had a child; and bought another new car. Nine years later, he was still working at the beef plant, hated every minute of it, but in his own words “could not afford to quit.” His case was not unique. Over and over again, I heard stories about the same process of falling into the “financial trap.” The youngest and newest of our crew had just graduated high school and took the job for the summer in order to earn enough money to attend welding school the following fall. During my brief tenure at the beef plant, he purchased a new motorcycle, a new stereo, and a house trailer. When I left, he told me he had decided to postpone welding school for one year in order “to get everything paid for.” I saw the financial trap closing in on him fast; he did too....

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There are at least three interwoven phenomena in this study which deserve further comment and research.

First is the subtle sense of unity which existed among the line workers. Because of excessive

noise, the use of earplugs, and the relative isolation of some work areas from others, it was virtually impossible for workers to talk to one another. Despite this, workers developed a very unsophisticated (yet highly complex) system of non-verbal symbols to communicate with one another. Hence, in a setting which would apparently eliminate it, the workers’ desire for social interaction won out and interaction flourished. Likewise, the production process was devised in such a way that each task was somewhat disconnected from all others, and workers had a tendency to concern themselves only with their own jobs. Yet, the line both symbolically and literally linked every job, and consequently every worker, to each other. As described earlier, a system of “uncooperative teamwork” seemed to combine simultaneously a feeling of “one-for-all, all-for-one, and every man for himself.” Once a line worker made it past the first three or four days on the job which “weeded out” many new workers, his status as a *beef* was assured and the sense of unity was felt as much by the worker of nine weeks as it was by the veteran of nine years. Because the workers maintained largely secondary relationships, this feeling of unification is not the same as the unity typically found on athletic teams, in fraternities, or among various primary groups. Yet it was a significant social force which bound the workers together and provided a sense of meaning and worth. Although their occupation might not be highly respected by outsiders, they derived mutual self-respect from their sense of belonging.

A second important phenomenon was the various coping methods employed by workers in a dehumanizing environment to retain their sense of humanity and self-worth. “There are high human costs in dirty work for the person who performs it” (Perry, 1978, p. 6). Either intentionally or inadvertently, the assembly line process utilized at the beef plant tended to reduce the laborers to the level of the machinery with which they worked. On assembly lines, workers are typically regarded as being interchangeable as the parts of the machines with which they work. As an auto worker put it, “You’re just a number to them—they number the stock and they number you” (Walker Guest, 1952, p. 138). Attempts to maximize efficiency and increase profits demand the sacrifice of human qualities such as uniqueness, creativity, and the feeling of accomplishment and self-worth. Meara (1974) found that one of the sources of honor for the meatcutters in her study was that, despite the fact that their job was viewed as undesirable, it was commonly acknowl-

edged that it was a skilled craft and thus allowed control of their work. As she indicates:

Occupations provide honorable and dishonorable work. Those who participate in a generally dishonored kind of work have the opportunity to find honor in being able successfully to cope with work which others may define as dirty. Honor is diminished when autonomy in the work is restricted by others in ways not perceived to be inherent in the nature of the work (Meara, 1974, p. 279).

The workers in the beef plant experienced very little autonomy as a result of the assembly line process. Therefore, their sense of honor in their work had to come from other sources.

The beef plant line workers developed and practiced a multitude of techniques for retaining their humanness. Daydreaming, horseplay and occasional sabotage protected their sense of self. Further, the prevailing attitude among workers that it was “us” against “them” served as a reminder that, while the nature of the job might demand subjugation to bosses, machines, and even beef parts, they were still human beings.

Interestingly, the workers’ rebellion against management seemed to lack political consciousness. There was no union in the plant, and none of the workers showed any interest in the plant becoming organized. Despite all the problems of working at the plant, the wages were extremely good, so that the income of workers in the plant was high, relative to most of the community. Even the lowest paid line workers earned approximately \$20,000 per year. Thus, the high wages and fringe benefits (health insurance, profit-sharing, etc.) seemed to override the negative aspects of the daily work. This stands in stark contrast with research in similar occupations (Garson, 1975 Linhart, 1981).

A third significant finding was that consumer spending patterns among the beefers seemed to “seal their fate” and make leaving the beef plant almost impossible. A reasonable interpretation of the spending patterns of the beefers is that having a high income/low status job encourages a person to consume conspicuously. The prevailing attitude seemed to be “I may not have a nice job, but I have a nice home, a nice car, etc.” This conspicuous consumption enabled workers to take indirect pride in their occupations. One of the ways of overcoming drudgery and humiliation on the job was to sur-

round oneself with as many desirable material things as possible off the job. These items (cars, boats, motorcycles, etc.) became tangible rewards for the sacrifices endured at work.

The problem, of course, is that the possession of these expensive items required the continual income of a substantial paycheck which most of these men could only obtain by staying at the beef plant. These spending patterns were further complicated by the fact that they were seemingly “contagious.” Workers talked to each other on breaks about recent purchases, thus reinforcing the norm of immediate gratification. A common activity of a group of workers on break or lunch was to run to the parking lot to see a fellow worker’s new truck, van, car or motorcycle. Even the seemingly more financially conservative were usually caught up in this activity and often could not wait to display their own latest acquisitions. Ironically, as the workers cursed their jobs, these expensive possessions virtually destroyed any chance of leaving them.

Working at the beef plant was indeed “dirty work.” It was monotonous, difficult, dangerous, and demeaning. Despite this, the workers at the beef plant worked hard to fulfill employer expectations in order to obtain financial rewards. Through a variety of symbolic techniques, they managed to overcome the many negative aspects of their work and maintain a sense of self respect about how they earned their living.

Endnotes

1. One of the deaths occurred during the second week of my study when a crane operator’s skull was crushed between the frame of the crane and a steel support beam.
2. For example, one of the most dangerous jobs in the plant was that of *shackler* who reached down and placed a chain around the back leg of a kicking 2,000 lb. steer only seconds after it had been slaughtered. This worker was constantly being kicked or battered with flying steel chains and hooks. The *shackler* was paid 10¢ per hour more than other workers on the kill floor, because of the extremely dangerous nature of the job.

References

- Balzer, R. (1976). *Clockwork: Life in and outside an American factory*. Garden City: Doubleday.

8 *Hanging Tongues: A Sociological Encounter with the Assembly Line*

- Barlow, H. (1981). *Introduction to criminology* (2nd ed.). Boston: Little, Brown.
- Berger, P., Berger, B., & Kellner, H. (1974). *The homeless mind: Modernization and consciousness*. New York: Random House-Vintage Books.
- Bookchin, M. (1972). A technology of life. In T. Roszak (Ed.), (pp 247–259). New York: Harper and Row.
- Garson, B. (1975). *All the livelong day: The meaning and demeaning of routine work*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Hummel, R. P. (1977). *The bureaucratic experience*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- King, R. (1978). In the sanding booth at Ford. In J. Perry & F. Perry (Eds.), *Social problems in today's world*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Linhart, R. (1981). *The assembly line* (M. Crosland, Trans.). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Marx, K. (1964a). *Economic and philosophical manuscripts of 1844*. New York: International Publishing. (Original work published 1844).
- Marx, K. (1964b). *The communist manifesto*. New York: Washington Square Press. (Original work published 1848).
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meara, H. (1974). Honor in dirty work: The case of American meatcutters and Turkish butchers. *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, 1, 269–282.
- Perrow, C. (1979). *Complex organizations: A critical essay* (2nd ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Perry, S. F. (1978). *San Francisco scavengers: Dirty work and the pride of ownership*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Reimer, J. (1979). *Hard hats: The Work world of construction workers*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Roethlisler, F. J. (1941). *Management and morale*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Schatzman, L. & Strauss, A. F. (1973). *Field research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Shostak, A. (1980). *Blue collar stress*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Stampp, K. M. (1956). *The peculiar institution: Slavery in the ante-bellum South*. New York: Random House-Vintage Books.
- Stonequist, F. V. (1937). *The marginal man*. New York: Scribner.
- Terkel, S. (1974). *Working: People talk about what they do all day and how they feel about what they do*. New York: Pantheon.
- Walker, C. R., & Guest, R. H. (1952). *The man on the assembly line*. Cambridge: Harvard Press.