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ABSTRACT

Marginality is a theme which pervades the social existence of merchant seamen. Work takes place in a setting without long term personal commitments to job, to place, or to co-workers. On the beach, social relations tend toward the transitory, and where long term relations are established, the seaman is forced to partial participation. This research explores the influence of this occupation on social marginality and social integration of its members. Data were collected using a survey instrument from a sample of 251 seamen, both officers and crew. Factors determining variance in levels of alienation are examined, as well as the effects of life as a merchant seaman on family organization and community participation. Supplementary qualitative data from participant observation and depth interview are also used. A typology of the lifestyle adaptations and social identities of merchant seamen are developed. Implications of industry changes for the occupational lifestyle are discussed.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This study develops a typology of the life-style adaptations and social identities of merchant seamen as related to their orientations and identification with occupation on the one hand and their familial and communal ties on the other. It is hoped that this research will lead to a better understanding of the merchant seaman and his lifestyle. Both maritime unions, shipping companies and the families of seamen can benefit from an increased level of understanding. If unions and shipping companies can improve the family and communal life of seamen then they are more likely to remain in the occupation. A stable work force is of benefit to everyone.

As a result of this research, it is hoped that the seaman's relationship to his family and community will be more clearly defined. As a consequence of this increased understanding there should be an improvement in these familial and communal ties.

As the son and close relative of several long time seamen and as a seaman for seven years, I have personal commitment to this research. It is my purpose to help all to better understand the seaman as a person and for the seaman to better understand himself and the reasons for his actions. Both union and non-union shipping companies can
make use of this data to better understand the merchant seaman.

The field of maritime sociology is small and the part that deals with deep-sea merchant seamen is only a small percentage of the field. It is with deep personal interest and professional commitment that I attempt to explore a new focus on an old tradition in American life; the merchant seamen.

The research design for this study makes use of many different methods. Several qualitative strategies and a review of the literature are used to construct a theoretical model. This model is used to generate twelve prediction statements. The data gathered from the results of a questionnaire, constructed by the researcher, are used to test the accuracy of these statements. The final objective of this research is to produce a "grounded theory" of occupationally induced marginality.

This introduction is Chapter I. An historical section titled "History of a Marginal Occupation" is Chapter II. It describes the historical development of seafaring as a marginal occupation. Chapter III, "The Seamen as a Social Type: The Development of a Theory of Occupationally Induced Marginality," is the theoretical section. It contains a review of the literature, interlaced with the data obtained in the interviews, as well as the author's personal experience. The conclusion of this chapter contains the twelve
prediction statements. Chapter IV is the methodological section. The findings are in Chapter V. Chapter VI is a descriptive elaboration of the effects of sea life; it contains data from both the questionnaire and the interviews, as well as the personal experience of the researcher. Chapter VII contains the conclusions and implications of the research.
CHAPTER 11
HISTORY OF A MARGINAL OCCUPATION

A man in jail...was at least safe from drowning, and he had more room, better food, and better company.

Jesse Lemisch, Jack Tar in the Streets

In the ancient world, shipping was centered for the most part within the area of the Mediterranean. At this time the position of the seaman was of a chattel slave. He suffered under the double burden of having the hardships of life at sea, added to his role as slave. The lot of the ancient seaman, whether in Rome, Greece, Carthage, Phoenicia or elsewhere ranged from that of sadistic and murderous cruelty to the barely endurable (Hohman, 56: 3).

After the collapse of the Roman Empire came the slow ascent from slavery to serfdom. Codes of maritime law evolved to govern the relationships between shipowners, shippers, masters and crews. From these, the maritime regulations of Barcelona, known as the Consolato del Mare, emerged and were widely observed. But like other medieval statues they were mainly concerned with the protection of owners, vessels, cargoes and the upholding of the authority of the master. Little heed, if any was given to the crew except to sanction barbaric and primitive punishment for misconduct and dereliction of duty (Hohman, 1956: 4-13; Dillon, 1961: 9-13).
Before the Middle Ages were too far advanced Baltic and North Sea maritime codes began to evolve; the Maritime Laws of Wisly. These North European codes were based on a master-servant relationship, rather than as an outgrowth of slavery and serfdom. Punishment was indeed savage on Nordic ships, but the Nordic concept of individualism allowed the individual a degree of freedom and responsibility. Seamen were even allowed the opportunity to share in the profit making of the voyage. The medieval seaman was subject to laws which were brutally severe and which showed no interest in either his welfare or his existence. Full time employment was improbable; many seamen supplemented this with shore side work (Hohman, 1956: 4-13; Dillon, 1961: 9-13).

The 15th and 16th centuries were the era of colonization which followed and brought a demand for larger, faster and more dependable ships which meant full time better trained seamen. Seafaring began to take on the attributes of a full-fledged separate occupation. From the codes of Wisly, the rolls of Oliron and the Hanseatic League codes, there developed French, British and American maritime laws of the 18th century. Best known of these were the British Navigation Acts of 1729, which triggered our Revolutionary War. This was the precursor of the basic American maritime legislation of 1790. As the 19th century began a social consciousness was awakening, thereafter came a stream of acts. The emphasis on punishment in shipboard discipline
metamorphosed slowly into paternalism during the 19th century. The 20th century brought provisions for health, safety and welfare. But this struggle of the seamen was an excruciatingly slow process (Hohman 1956: 4-13; Dillon, 1961: 9-13). By the mid-19th century he had been deprived of all of his civil rights, both ashore and afloat.

The men who sailed American ships at the dawn of our country were protected by no law. What laws they had were only to protect the ship and its profits (Raskin, 1967: 1). Indeed, this extraordinarily harsh collection of laws support the claim of a former merchant seaman, Frederick Olmstead, that American seamen are faced with more deplorable conditions and misery and are ruled more by threats of force than any other civilized workers of the world (Olmstead, 1904; Ubbelohde, 1960: 20, 159-160). This system spawned brutality, degradation and corruption that long outlived the system of slavery ashore (Raskin, 1967: 1).

Eighteenth century Americans believed that these men who went to sea and continued on to become "old salts" were men with little hope of success ashore. They were outcasts, who left the land in fear and flight. They were considered dissenters from the American mood. Their goals differed from those ashore. They were rebels (Lemisch, 1968: 374).

In 1792 Alexander Hamilton called for the establishment of marine hospitals. This introduced the relatively new humanitarian concept of protecting a useful and needy class of
citizens, the seamen, from want and misery (Straus, 1950: 11-21, 110-114). Just as they were the first to receive federal medical care benefits, merchant seamen were among the first beneficiaries singled out for the charitable efforts of the more affluent citizens. The merchant seaman became a deserving unfortunate (Healey, 1936). But the study of these seamens' missions, church institutions and so called friends societies which were established in coastal ports throughout the country during the 19th century, reveals dual motives of defending a rootless, unsocialized band of men from ruthless exploitation, but at the same time,

...protecting the good society from the threat of invasion by a rough, unattached, and potentially dangerous element, who were looked upon as a necessary evil; necessary for commerce but a potential threat to the well-being of wives and daughters (Straus, 1950: 11).

The sailing era culminated in the magnificent California and China clippers of the mid-19th century. However at the same time this steady improvement in shipping was accompanied by an equally steady deterioration in the quality of crews, especially in the United States. Speed and space were at a premium; this required more manpower being put in smaller quarters (Hohman, 1956: 7).

The 1800's brought a farther decline in the caliber of the American merchant seaman. He is described as drunken, quarrelsome, and mutinous. By the end of the century, hobo
crews were the norm. Poor crews added to bad working conditions, created by money hungry shipowners and captains, bred even poorer crews and worse conditions. A description in 1874 by a surgeon of the United States Marine Hospital Service:

No prison, certainly none of modern days, so wretched but life within its wall is preferable, on the score of physical comfort, to the quarters and the life of the sailor on the vast majority of merchant ships. No goal dietary so meagre, no penal servitude so exacting, no exertion of authority so unrestrained and brutal, no such utter want of care and forethought for health and life of convict or felon, as are the rule, and not the exception, for the man before the mask, would be tolerated, if comprehended, by the community (Taylor, 1923: 24).

More and more crews were composed of misfits. These lazy and incompetent seamen had to be driven like animals to work. Misused on the sea, they became easy prey for the crimps, prostitutes and saloonkeepers on the beach (Dillon, 1961: 11). He was seen as wild and irresponsible; society could not be bothered with his plight. The American merchant seamen gave rise to a way of life that bred land sharks that catered to their needs. They were themselves a reckless and rootless lot who were indeed a different class. To the American citizen of 1850, the seaman was either a drifting no-good or a witless child (Dillon, 1961: 10).

...if we think of Jack Tar as jolly, childlike, irresponsible, and in many ways like the Negro stereotype, it is because he was treated like a child,
a servant, and a slave. What the employer saw as the necessities of an authoritarian profession were written into law and confirmed by culture; the society that wanted Jack dependent made him that way, and then concluded that that was the way he really was (Lemisch, 1968: 43-44).

These seamen ashore gradually emerged as a recognizable group of workers with characteristics and problems which differentiated them sharply from people on the beach. On the beach they were exploited by the crimps, boarding house master, prostitutes and saloonkeepers.

Seamen in port were usually off duty or between jobs, and thus had a vacation psychology which was greatly intensified by the reaction from the limitations and privations of one voyage just concluded and the prospect of another in the offing; they were in a holiday mood which led easily to irresponsibility, recklessness, drunkenness and excesses of all kinds; they were strangers, itinerants, and travelers, with a corresponding sense of anonymity; they were naive and inexperienced in the ways of commerce and of landmen in general and they had neither the opportunity nor the background for building up the defenses of self interest or for practicing the virtues of shrewd bargaining; and they had insistent needs, all of which had to be supplied in a hurry, for clothing, shelter, food, drink and supplies on the one hand and for gayety and entertainment on the other (Hohman, 1956: 8).

Groups arose to "help" the seamen while ashore. A vicious system of commercialized exploitation arose as well as already mentioned charitable and religious organizations to cater to these insistent seamen "needs." Unfortunately these religious men and women who founded missions, chapels
and Ladies Seamens' Protective Societies never understood these men nor did the reckless and rootless young seamen off ships understand them. The seaman was interested in women and booze, not salvation (Dillon, 1961: 12).

Because it was so difficult to obtain seamen during this period, shanghaiing was resorted to. A practice of obtaining blood money became common. Blood money was a fee charged by a shipping crimp for supplying drugged and intoxicated seamen on board a ship (Standard, 1947: 21). Shanghaiing continued to be an important source of the labor supply until it was prohibited by Federal statute in 1906 (Goldberg, 1958: 11; Dillon, 1961).

Shipping crimps were actually boarding housekeepers, but they controlled the labor market. Seamen were given advances in the form of board, lodging and liquor. The crimp could then keep the sailor's belongings for his debt. The shipping master would then advance to the crimp the amount of the seamens' debt, thereby securing the services of the seamen. Gradually the shipping crimp gained too much power in the control of labor. The Shipping Commissioner's Act of 1872 eliminated these practices, but also provided that he be imprisoned for desertion. The real effect of this 1872 law was to guarantee the ship's owner a crew (Standard, 1947: 21-11).

From these early days until the mid 1930's when unionism gained strength, there was little change in the way
merchant seamen got their jobs aboard ship (Raskin, 1967: 19). A government report in 1887 describes the lot of the seaman as one of economic exploitation engendered by isolation and disorganization. As for remedies, efforts were made by these same well-meaning individuals and church institutions to aid the seamen in improving themselves, but not eliminate the causes for their unfortunate status. This view was rationalized by the popular theory, "that the seamen were a naturally improvident lot given to loose living and could not be expected to care for themselves (Goldberg, 1958: 12). A statement by Andrew Furuseth, who was known as the emancipator of the seamen, in 1900 supports this hypotheses.

The Japanese, the Chinese, the Malay, the European, all may come...These men came from anywhere, with any or no kind of skill or experience...Our merchant marine is therefore manned by the residuum of the population, not only of our country and race, but of all countries and race (Goldberg, 1958: 10-11).

As late as 1897, the Supreme Court in the Arago case declared that the Thirteenth Amendment outlawing involuntary servitude did not apply to seamen (Raskin, 1967: 1). The majority opinion held that:

from the oldest historical period the contract of the sailor has been treated as an exceptional one, and involving to a certain extent, the surrender of his liberty during the life of the contract ... (Goldberg, 1958: 15).
The merchant seaman was indeed a class apart from the rest of society. He was an outcast ashore to all but those out to rob him. At sea he was under the tyrant's heel. They were bound by the iron laws of the sea which made the seaman, once he had signed on the ship, virtually the property of the master (Raskin, 1967: 1). Despite these injustices dealt to seamen, they were slow to unionize; 1803 was the first protest and not until 1878 was the first seamens' union formed. The reasons for their lack of organizing ability are those same obstacles that contribute to their marginality today. Seamen were constantly on the move. They were in close contact with only a handful of their shipmates and separated from the rest of their fellows. Seamen were further divided by race, language, national and sectional background (Raskin, 1967: 2). Still today it remains an ethnically diverse occupation.

All statutes relating to compulsory labor were stricken out in 1867 with the sole exception of those laws relating to seamen. Seamen were treated as a separate class because they were looked upon as reckless individuals who could not look out for their own interests. This became an inherent part of the law (Goldberg, 1958: 15). An analysis of past maritime labor legislation reveals that the seamens' interests have been more and more closely safeguarded. The theory of maritime law is that the seaman is the nation's ward, and is not capable, without the advice and protection
of the government of entering into contracts. In 1893 Justice Storey (Brown vs. Lutt) described them as wards of the court.

Seamen are protected and need counsel; because they are thoughtless and require indulgence; because they are credulous and complying and are easily overreached ... although not technically incapable of entering into a valid contract, they are treated in the same manner as courts of equity are accustomed to treat young heirs (Goldberg, 1958: 15).

The most rigid scrutiny is instituted into the terms of every contract in which they engage... any sacrifice of rights on one side which is not compensated by extraordinary benefits on the other... the bargain is unjust... and advantage has been taken of the situation of the weaker party (Wissman, 1942: 8).

The law has been a policeman to the seamen's own unresponsibility and a reformer to those who would exploit him, it has sought to balance a stern discipline with an equally stern paternalism, much like a child. Both of these tendencies have existed side by side since 1790 although the disciplinarian attitude dominated during the first half of this period; that of protector has gained steadily and become the dominant force (Hohman, 1956: 20-21).

At the turn of the century the chief "beef" of seamen unions was the legal status of seamen. Under the terms of his contract, the seaman was subjected to a form of involuntary servitude, both his person and his earnings were under the control of his employers or creditors. In 1915 the fierce determination of the first president of the
International Seamen's Union, Andrew Furuseth, led to the Seamen's Act of 1915, called the Magna Carta of the Sea. No longer was there a penalty for desertion. No longer could creditors collect the seamen's wages.

Seamen could leave their jobs, in any safe harbor, just as workers on land could do. They gained control over their own bodies and were granted sovereignty over their own persons. This freedom of movement and of action carried with it a spiritual value which was vital in the building of character and self respect (Hohman, 1956: 34). Until the passage of this Seamen Act, seamen were with the sole exception of some peonage labor in the south, the only United States citizens who could still be compelled to fulfill a civil employment contract under penalty of imprisonment (Wissmann, 1942: 6).

The original Social Security Act of 1935 excluded merchant seamen from its major provisions for old age annuities and unemployment compensation (Hohman, 1956: 77; Cullison, 1982: 20). The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 produced a program of laborer reform which was expected to improve materially the conditions of life and work at sea. Life at sea has been improved one thousand fold since the 1800's. This is reflected in that the principal concern for seafaring labor in the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, was more jobs for its members (Heine, 1976). The rest had been fought for and won in the past.
The social position of the seaman has always been a marginal one. One of the goals of maritime unions has always been to raise seamen to first class citizenship as workers and as members of the community (Raskin, 1967: 41). Seamen service organizations have done relatively little. Much like Rooney's (1980) mission stiffs, they must fail to remain in business. Therefore, they have always treated the symptoms of the seaman's low social position, not the cause.

He was a slave, serf and then servant, but all had degrees of freedom. When other men were free he was not. This legal status of the seamen was always their chief cause of concern and the main cause of their lowly social standing. Adapting a quote from Hohman (1956: 20) in 1938, Alex Cullison in 1982 (1) an official with the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, further explains the marginal status of merchant seamen.

The merchant seamen is a civilian, but in several ways his life resembles that of a soldier. The signing of the shipping articles places him in a position which is strikingly similar to a short term of enlistment. He has narrowly prescribed duties, obligations and responsibilities, as well as rights and privileges; he must formally sign away his freedom of action for a given time. This irregular status, part civilian and part military, has naturally demanded constant restatement and redefinition.

The harsh or at best paternalistic laws that historically have governed seamen were supported by a structure whose purpose was to assure a relatively cheap and docile
supply of labor. The 1930's brought forth an era of sea­farer protest that made docile and cheap incompatible terms. A labor force cannot be mistreated and then expected to respond in every national emergency. Although seamen have, they have used these times to advance their position.

The merchant seamen no longer offers a cheap supply of labor. His skills have become too technical to attract qualified men with the lure of low wages. He has agreed to be docile but only for higher wages, better living conditions and more jobs. When he refused to continue to be a cheap and abused supply of labor, the industry went to foreign flag vessels to make their exaggerated profits.

The American merchant seamen is a civilian, whose services are badly needed during times of war. He seems to be "not so needed" during times of peace. He is like a soldier who is treated well only when there is war, forgotten during peace. The problem is that the industry must be maintained at a war ready level at all times. This could be done by forcing American goods to be shipped on ships manned by Americans, not foreigners. But the industry with government support has again ignored the peace time seamen, maintaining at all costs its historically two faced policy.
CHAPTER III

THE SEAMAN AS A SOCIAL TYPE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF A THEORY
OF OCCUPATIONALLY INDUCED MARGINALITY

Then I came to realize that men build themselves personalities as they build houses -- to protect themselves from the world. But once they have built a house, they are forced to live in it. They become its prisoners.

Colin Wilson, The Outsider

Introduction

This study is an analysis of life as a merchant seaman. The goal is to show how this lifestyle effects the development of identity and its effect on family and community associations. The seaman coming ashore after a long trip to sea has missed the patterns of life which guide and mold those on the beach. Consequently, the seaman's life is a lonely one. Alienation and anomie become commonplace for the long time seaman (Sherar, 1973: xi).

This research investigates the lifestyle of the American merchant seaman from three methodological perspectives. The sociology of direct experience and participant observation; the author is a former merchant seaman, in addition his father and several other members of his family were merchant seamen. It is this experience with which he uses to guide his "return" to the occupation. Indepth interviews have been conducted with several current and
retired merchant seamen, as well as union officials and others in the maritime industry. Lastly, a structured questionnaire has been distributed. (See Appendix A). This is used for descriptive as well as statistical analyses to determine the affect of years at sea and being away from home has on the seaman.

This study also analyzes the changing status of seamen as an occupational group. The old time carefree seaman is the image held by the shore side layman. This research sees this old timer as a vanishing breed. Although most present day seamen perform some of these "old time" behaviors, they are indeed a different group. Sea daddy, as these old time seamen will be called is not a marginal man; he is "satisfied" with his status. The new merchant seaman is typically a member of a marginal group because he is, unlike sea daddy, in the process of assimilation into the shore side culture.

There indeed may be some sort of self selection process among seamen. Men who are loners, come from broken or bad home settings or that have no family or friends at all, may be more likely to select seafaring as a career (Sherar, 1973: 15-16). Who else would voluntarily place themselves in this isolation? Whether he is marginal to begin with or not, the years at sea either create or extend this condition.
The seaman's life at sea is different from his life ashore. His life is a constant transition. For his success in making money the seaman rejects, neglects, or is excluded from the forms of interaction necessary to convert his rewards into positive status specific self evaluations. He finds it difficult to establish and/or maintain relationships and enjoy the security and permanence of such friendships. He has neither the time nor the opportunity to work at establishing such close associations (Sherar, 1973: 18). His associations, as a rule, are conditional, limited, temporary and superficial (cf. Lemert, 1967: 119-132). This superficiality, in many cases, passes for friendships. The seaman gradually is drawn farther and farther away from life on the beach. The results of the inherent problems of loneliness and alienation, as the seaman attempts to overcome his marginal status, is the theme of this research. Indeed marginality is a theme which pervades the social existence of merchant seamen (Sherar, 1973). Like Park's (1950: 345-392) and Stonequist's (1961) marginal man, Simmel's (1971: 143-149) and Schutz's (1976: 91-105) stranger, and Schutz's (1976: 106-119) homecomer, the merchant seaman typically is not a fully integrated member in any social world in which he participates.

The stranger is one who tries to be permanently accepted or at least tolerated by the group which he approaches.

To him the cultural pattern of the approached group does not
represent a tested system of recipes (to define situations) because he does not partake in the historical base by which it has been formed. The cultural pattern of a group is a designation for all the folkways, mores, laws, habits, customs, etiquette, fashion, etc., which characterize any social group at a given moment in history. The fact that these patterns are ever-changing is of importance in understanding the social position of the seaman.

The stranger therefore, approaches the group as a newcomer. He may be willing and able to share the present and future with them but he remains excluded from such experiences that make up its past. The stranger interprets this new social environment using his old recipes brought from his old group; the group from which he wishes to leave for entrance into this other group. He consequently loses his bearings in this new group.

The adaption of the stranger to this other group is a continuous process of inquiry into the cultural pattern of the new group. If this process of inquiry succeeds, then these patterns become a matter of course, an unquestionable way of life. He is no longer a stranger.

The seaman, because of his job, is unable to maintain this continuous process of inquiry. His time spent on the beach is continually being interrupted by trips to sea. For the majority of seamen these trips are made with new people and/or on a new ship. He may again be a stranger. He
wishes to become a part of the shore side community but does not. In effect he is a stranger to both worlds. Like the stranger he wishes to leave one group for the other, but he is unable to cast off the role of seaman because of the nature of his occupation. The stranger as portrayed by Schutz (1976) and Simmel (1971) is an individual attempting to join a group which is not and never has been his own. Consequently, all seamen may not fit the typical definition. The homecomer of Schutz (1976) however expects to return to an environment of which he "always had" and so he thinks still has an intimate knowledge of.

The home is the place to which a man intends to return when he is away from it. To feel at home, expresses a high degree (if not the highest) of familiarity and intimacy. Life at home means to have in common with others a section of time and space, and interests based upon underlying homogeneous systems of relevance. These are a part of one's own autobiography; an element of his personal history. What he is, what he grew to be and what he will become are co-determined by his taking part in the relationships which prevail within the home group.

This is the context of the home social structure for the man who lives in it. It changes entirely for the man who leaves home. He has stepped into another social structure not covered by the schemes of reference for life at home. He no longer participates in its experiences,
consequently his development within these schemes of reference has come to a standstill.

There are still means of communication; the letter, and phone calls. But these presuppose that each party is the same as the one each left behind. This assumes that life will continue to be what it has been so far. But other things will have become important for both, old experiences are reevaluated; new ones are inaccessible to the other, which have become part of each other's life.

The reasons for these changes in each partner's system of relevance is the change in degree of intimacy.

The term intimacy designates... the degree of reliable knowledge we have of another person or a social relationship, a group or a cultural pattern. Intimate knowledge enables us to interpret what he means and to forecast his actions and reactions... But separation conceals the other behind a strange disguise, hard to remove (Schutz, 1976: 113).

The degree of intimacy is experienced differently by the one absent and by the home group. The home group continues its daily life, within its customary pattern, experiencing change and adapting itself to these changes. The home group may have other goals and other means for achieving them. The man who leaves, experiences this same process. The homecoming at its worst represents a meeting of strangers. At best, the solution of transforming these different personal histories into a recurrent one remains an unattainable grasp toward the ideal.
The ... fact that we grow older, that novel experiences emerge continuously ..., that previous experiences are permanently receiving additional interpretative meanings in the light of these... experiences, which have, more or less, changed our state of mind -- all of these basic features of our mental life bar a recurrence of the same (Schutz, 1976: 115).

One can never bathe twice in the same river nor walk the same road, are philosophical notions which convey the same message. The homecomer returns with memory of past experiences, but these experiences now have other meanings to those at home. In short, the home he left is not the home to which he returns; nor is he the same man who left. This holds true no matter what the length of absence; the difference will be in degree, not kind.

The marginal man is one whom fate has condemned to live in two societies. He is a cultural hybrid on the verge of two different patterns of group life, not knowing to which of them he belongs (Park, 1928). He stands on the margins of two cultural worlds, but is fully a member of neither. The seaman is marginal because he has ventured away from his original cultural group and entered into another social world. There are three possibilities for this person (Gordon, 1954: 1964). He can return to the original group--homecomer; he can attempt to become assimilated into the new group--stranger; or a third possibility is that there is the gradual formation of a subsociety composed of marginal men
Marginal individuals can establish and live their lives in a marginal group, hardly knowing that they are doing so. They are not aware of their marginality, by virtue of living together in a somewhat insulated life and are made up of people of the most diverse background who have in common, nothing but their marginality (Hughes, 1949).

For the individual in the marginal group all is normal. He knows nothing else. Within the confines of his own group he is completely at home and at ease; it is here that he carries on the major part of his actions (Goldberg, 1941). The seaman experiences periods of transition and conflict when he tries to reenter the shore side community. While all of us experience periods of transition and conflict, this period for the marginal seaman tends to become permanent (Park, 1928).

The seaman lives in two worlds. But he is only marginal to one; the role he plays to family and community. The role of the seaman is itself a marginal role - a member of a marginal group.

A marginal role is an imperfectly institutionalized one, which means that there is some ambiguity in the patterns of behavior legitimately expected of a person filling the role, and that the social sanctions attending the role tend to be inconsistently applied (Wardwell, 1952: 340).
Because of the marginal nature of his occupation, institutionalized social bonds have significantly less regulatory power over these individuals.

Membership in a marginal group is not a position in limbo as Park and Stonequist portray it (Antonovsky, 1956). The seaman is integrated into a group of marginal men and he is marginal to the shore side culture. For the seaman, work takes place in a setting without long term personal commitments to jobs, to place, or to co-workers. On the beach, social relations tend toward the transitory, and where long term relations are established the seaman is forced to partial participation.

The seaman is not a marginal individual in the sense Park defines it, because he is a participant member of a marginal culture. The norms and behavior patterns which he has absorbed and made a part of himself, over a long period of years, are inadequate to meet new situations. These new definitions are imposed on a mature personality, consequently he retains his old marginal culture perspective in this new situation and usually remains for the rest of his life a marginal man. The marginal culture may give the individual definitions of his situation that are inadequate. Inadequate in the sense that they conflict or are in contrast with definitions provided him by the other cultures or cultures in which he is attempting to participate. The seaman is poised between two cultures. But for him this is
normal, not marginal. He knows nothing else (Goldberg, 1941). It defines his relationship with the shore side society and the traditional seaman culture.

The kind of social world created by the interaction of marginal men, their attempts to overcome the stranger role to family and community, and their attempts at being a successful homecomer are the problems looked at in this research. The seaman is between two worlds; the ship and the shore. His remaining at sea for such long periods makes him incapable of full participation in the shore side culture. The adaptations of these men as a group forms a marginal culture. (There are even subcultures within the marginal culture aboard ship.) He is unlike the marginal man as defined by Park and Stonequist, but similar to Goldberg's qualification of their concept (1941).

Goldberg (1941) sees people between two cultures forming a marginal culture to deal with their marginality. The seaman is between two worlds since he spends time in both; one contains his livelihood, the other his family, friends and community. A marginal culture develops from the interaction of this group of men attempting to settle this intra-world conflict. This, of course, presupposes that there is a "pure seamen" culture composed of men with no ties to the shore and no wish to have any (sea daddy). He has undergone "cumulative socialization" into the old seamen culture (Bankston, et al., 1981). Individuals who fit this
description are few; anachronisms from the rough, care free, drunken and perhaps romantic past of the merchant marine. These men are atypical, the marginal group being the more numerous.

**Becoming A Seaman**

**Getting In**

As is true of virtually any occupation, there are a variety of pathways to becoming a merchant seaman, but there appears to be six that are predominant. First, many enter because they have relatives which are seamen. This seems to be the mode. Second, "foreigners," who may or may not be United States citizens often become seamen because it offers a situation in which they may associate with many of their own and can be paid well for minimal job skills. Third, many are retired or ex-Navy or Coast Guard personnel. They typically have skills and experience that allow them higher starting positions. A fourth group is best described as "drifters." They drift in and ship out only when their circumstances force them to it. Often they are semi-transients and sometimes are pairs of men who "hang together" shipping out, and living and traveling together when on the beach. Typically, these men only take relief jobs because this qualifies them for unemployment compensation after completing the relief.

A fifth group is made of those younger men in officers unions, who have graduated from maritime academies. They
typically have not remained in the occupation very long. But as the technology of merchant vessels becomes more complex, this may indeed become the dominant group. A trend which has started already, particularly among engineers is to operate its own training school for cadets. This produces trained engineers with a sense of loyalty and attachment to both the occupation and the union (cf. Bassis and Rosengren, 1975).

A small group of older men make up a sixth group. These men are typically entering into a second career because of death of a spouse, selling their business or retirement from another profession. They are relatively well off financially and will only ship as long as they enjoy it. A response from one such man about why he was going to sea was,

> Have only been shipping one year...
> Will continue sailing as long as I like it. My two children are grown and self supporting. I enjoy the work, on ship I have met many nice and worthwhile men, same as the men I worked ashore with. Sailors seem to be loners more than the average person ashore. Started on ships for a change in career. So far so good. Big advantage for me on ship is no commuting like 9 to 5 shore job. Being single, I have no dishes to wash or food to prepare.

Regardless of origins, the first step in the entrance process is obtaining a seaman's passport ("Z card") from the Coast Guard (a formality), and then joining a union in order to secure employment. Obstinately, seamen's unions have
an open admittance policy, but this is misleading. The new seaman is put in one of several strata, with jobs passing down from one to another if no one accepts them. Through this structure, "book members" (the highest group, which have been full-time seamen for several years) are protected from job loss to lower members. While having the appearance of a brotherhood of equals with an "open-door" policy, there is little "brotherhood" at all. In fact, the structure of the unions, as well as the occupation, generally functions to produce competition, suspicion, and isolation in its members. A union official commented to me that there is such a lack of brotherhood, if a strike were called, he doubts if he could get enough men to man a picket line.

Getting On: The Social Organization of the Union Hall

All jobs begin with a competitive bidding process in the union hall. Upon entering a union crew hall in a large city, the seaman is confronted by probably the most ethnically diverse occupation in the country. Although dominated by white and black Americans, the seaman must be cognizant of the differences between himself and many of the others. There has been a tremendous influx of Spanish-speaking and Oriental people (particularly Filipinos), although officer unions are still dominated by native whites. Nevertheless, it is the nature of the occupational structure which alienates the seaman from his companion workers, not the cultural diversity.
The merchant seaman does not start his trip on board ship, but within the confines of the union hall. "Catching" a ship, working on one, getting off, and spending time on the beach are all part of a cycle he will complete many times in his career. It is a process which brings him and his co-workers together spatially, and simultaneously separates them socially.

Formally, jobs are obtained by "bidding" on them at the union hall. The bid is made with a registration card that bears a date, job title, and group status. Members of lower status groups successfully bid only on jobs passed by those in higher groups. Seamen are, then, inherently competitors for work. But this is not the only method used to catch a ship. There are also "less than fully legitimate" schemes the occupational insider may utilize. For example, when ships with unionized crews reach port, a union "patrolman" comes aboard to determine what jobs will be open. Available jobs are then to be returned to the union hall for full-members to bid upon. Jobs on a particular ship, however, can be put on the board in the hall at different times. Thus, the number appearing may be deceiving. A job or jobs may be held back to the last job call when most people have left, or at least those wanting that particular ship have. In this way, the patrolman is able to aid in obtaining jobs for some, while "playing it safe." A not so safe alternative is simply not to allow the job to return to the hall at
all. Nevertheless, even if a member were to discover a job was gained without bid, to protest he must report it to another union official who is also a member of the official political union "family." Needless to say, the practice goes unchallenged since most seamen understand the system and realize that they may manipulate it at some time as well. The accepting of this system has an historical base in the old hiring system that pre-dated unions. The occa­sional honest man in the old hiring system was usually dumped by his colleagues as a threat to the racket. Every seaman who worked had made use of the corrupt structure (Raskin, 1967: 19).

Another manipulative strategy of getting on is "throw­ing a job back in." If a seaman wants a job but does not have a registration card that is "old enough" to get one, he may work a deal with someone with an old card. When and if the seamen with the older card gets the job, he holds it until a few minutes before the last job calls are made, then returns the job ticket to the dispatcher. The fellow with the newer card then has a better chance since the job is unexpected and some who might have taken it have left for the day.

Between jobs, depending on the availability of jobs and his ability to manipulate the system, the seaman may spend from hours to months in a union hall. When he is there, he will for the most part be among strangers and
mere acquaintances. Seamen have few, if any, long term friendships with other seamen. He experiences social isolation and seclusion for much the same reason that Lemert (1967: 123) notes with respect to the systematic check forger. His seclusiveness,

... is reinforced by high mobility, which necessarily makes his contacts and interactions of a short-lived variety, he simply does not have the time to build up close relationships with the people he meets.

The seaman waiting between hourly job calls generally sits around the hall engaging in what seems to be meaninglessness conversation. However, he may pick up valuable information regarding ships, available jobs, and overtime. In fact, the real purpose of those extended conversations are nothing more than means of extracting information. In the union hall the seaman experiences the loss of social identity. He cannot depend on these personal associations for social and psychological support. Moreover, his ability to get good jobs depends on knowing more and having more "connections" than the next fellow, and manipulating the system. His union hall conversations are best described as interpersonal "extractions." Each "stranger" probes the other for information, hoping he will reveal some vital information such as who may be planning to get off a ship at the last minute, or which ships will pay a lot of overtime. Neither participant is committed to the other, but are only
concerned with knowledge to be obtained from such interaction. Each gives a cynical performance (Goffman, 1973: 18) in that he is deluding his audience for purposes of self-interest. Aside from extended information probes and meaningless small talk, the seaman is withdrawn. He has become a loner in a group of loners who will soon be cast together for an extended period of time. If the seaman does not reside in a port city or if shipping is not good in the port in which he does reside, he will need to rent a room until such time as he does catch a ship. This assumes, of course, that he does not have a permanent ship. Typically he will spend all his days in the union hall and his evenings alone, either sight-seeing, reading or going to a movie. One seaman said he went to two or three movies a day. Until he either gets a job or runs out of money he will remain in this situation. If he lives close enough he may go home on the weekends. When he does get a job, there will always be a guy in the hall who makes his living driving seamen to the doctor and to their ship; regardless of where it is.

Going to Sea

Pre-Entrance Binge

Once the seaman knows he has a ship, he typically engages in a "celebration" of self-indulgence. Such a pre-entrance binge is likely common of persons who foresee prolonged deprivation (cf. Hulme, 1957: 7), but for the
seaman it is a life-long, though cyclical experience. It is a recurring personal rite of passage through which the seaman accepts his occupationally imposed exile from the routine lifestyles of those permanently on the beach. There is the resentment of the voyage ahead and the realization that he is withdrawing himself from the major social world that exists ashore.

Virtually all seamen report to varying degrees some sort of self-indulgent ritual before returning to sea. Perhaps the most hedonistic are the young and single with alcohol, sex, and perhaps drugs of dominating interest in the days before shipping out. If the seaman has no dependents, he can with little reservation spend all of his money because the ship, as a total institution, will soon take care of all his needs. This cyclical pattern of intensified and destructive consumption for many seems to be a major obstacle to long term accumulation of wealth. Whatever surplus remains after a prolonged stay on the beach is rapidly used with little thought of its conservation for future needs. The pre-entrance binge of the married seaman may be more conservative, but both he and his family come to expect it. As time progresses, these seem to become a routine family crisis period, with both the seaman and his family experiencing a sense of relief when he is finally extricated from the home scene.

The definition of the situation which seems universally to motivate the pre-entrance binge is the regarding of time
at sea as a prison sentence soon to be served. Many of those we interviewed used this very analogy without the interviewer suggesting it -- practically all agreed this was a valid comparison. As one remarked: "It's just like going to jail, at least that's the way you see it. I even cross off the days at sea on the calendar just like a convict does."

A shipboard observer would quickly agree to the general nature of the binge. It is not unusual to find a number of drunks aboard ship at sailing and several men missing their first sea watches. Moreover, there is an apparent correlation between the length of the expected trip and the number of drunken crew and the severity of their intoxication. But along with the resentment and realization of this sentence, these departures are also looked to with great anticipation. The sea offers to the seaman a form of relief, to be clear of the land and its hurried existence (Sherar, 1973: 13).

Channel Fever

Expectations build up with the possibility of going ashore. The seaman experiences what he calls "channel fever." The longer the stay at sea the greater the "fever," but channel fever is at its peak when the seaman comes into home port. This anticipation may last for days or only for the final hours. But it is always the same good feeling. Everyone is in good spirits for this sentence has ended.
The period at sea is one of tensions. These tensions... mount as the ship starts... its homeward journey. There is a tremendous anticipation. The dream starts: going home, seeing a wife and children, a new romance, the anticipation of something unknown and exciting that may happen; this time life shore or at home will be different... The actual anticipation is often more intense than the real situation (Sherar, 1973: 21).

The Characteristics of the Occupational Community of the Seaman

... the division of labor... passes far beyond purely economic interest, for it consists in the establishment of a social and moral order sui generis. Through it, individuals are linked to one another. Without it, they would be independent. Instead of developing separately they pool their efforts. They are solidary, but it is a solidarity which is not merely a question of the short time in which services are exchanged, but one which extends much further... societies created by the division of labor cannot fail to bear its mark (Durkleim, 1946: 61).

The merchant seaman spends the greater part of his working life at sea. Here he lives within the physical structure of the ship; often within the confines of his department, his watch and his rank. These men come together by chance. They are of different ages, interests, outlooks and backgrounds. Here each is cut off from the circumstances and ways of life on the beach.

The relationships that are derived from working and living with others are social relationships and form the basis for the development of an occupational community.
(MacIver, 1942: 6). It is the pattern of past practices which provide a focus for present methods of organization and a pattern of life for a member of an occupation. This pattern places the worker within the context of his workgroup; it determines his social status, styles and forms of social activity and his attitudes towards, and expectations of, society in general and his community in particular. Where occupations and community are not in step, there will be pressures on the individual to renounce one or the other. In a larger society, "community values" (social values) and seafaring values diverge considerably (Fricke, 1973a: 3-4).

In complex societies there are opposing social forces; differentiation and integration (Behrend, 1957; Baldamus, 1951; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967: 8-20). Differentiation is a function of the division of labor; skills or occupations become highly specialized and consequently differentiated from other skills or occupations. Integration is implied by the word system; since any social system must operate as a whole.

These two forces must exist in equilibrium if a social system (community or occupation) is to operate.

For the seafarer the initial differentiation is that posed by the environment of his work; physical separation from society ashore and working in a mobile community set the seafarer apart from the landsmen of the same age and socioeconomic characteristics (Fricke, 1973b: 145).
The level of technological change has effected the division of labor of the crew so that the density of communal links has been effected (Moreby, 1975). Homogeneous groups within the ship crews are few; consequently they are not large enough to retain an identity within the larger shore society; there is not an occupational community ashore (Fricke, 1973a: 5).

The differentiation on board the ship that is due to... socioeconomic inequalities is largely overcome by integration through the social structure of each rank and status. However, this integration rarely extends to the community ashore, since the differing backgrounds of the seafarer militate against it (Fricke, 1973b: 146).

This differentiation is further extended on the ship between skills, departments and among those who work different times (Moreby, 1975). Integration into each of these subcultures of the shipboard community requires the acceptance of the respective subculture and associated behaviors. This involves the identification of self with other seafarers and the acknowledgement of common social norms and goals. This emphasis upon the occupational group further increases the differentiation between the seafarer and life ashore. Consequently there are few integrating mechanisms for linking the seaman with the shore side society (Fricke, 1973b: 146).

Thus, choosing the sea as a career can be seen as a choice between communities. The shore community becomes
threatening to the self identity of the seaman, while the shipboard community is not (Fricke, 1974).

Each return from a trip reminds the seaman he is a man living between systems (Orbach, 1977: 263). Shore people go to work each day with the same set of colleagues. A feature of work ashore is seeing the same old faces. The seaman, who changes ships, goes home on vacation and returns to a new ship with new men. Consequently the membership of his working group is continually changing. He is uncommitted to work place or colleagues. Neither does he see management as friendly, having little contact with them (Moreby, 1975: 161-162).

Ship assignments and group memberships are seen as temporary affairs, consequently there is a reduction in the degree of understanding a seaman has about his job and in the amount of effort he puts into developing harmonious relations and shipboard friendships (Moreby, 1975: 158).

This world afloat is an artificial world, seamen refer to it as a "floating prison" where for the duration of the return voyage, life must be lived with fellow shipmates, regardless of whether they are personal friends or not... Although friendships do grow and develop aboard, they are rarely more than superficial or transitory. Seamen live in a world of changes, and one in which there is always turnover. After each voyage there is a turnover of crew from ship to ship, and voyage to voyage. Except for occasional cases men remain with
a ship for no more than a year, so that the roots, so necessary for a sense of permanency and security are rarely put down or have a chance to grow and develop (Sherar, 1973: xi).

Because of the physical closeness of such a small community and the constant turnover of membership, many seamen express a desire "not to get too close" to other crewmen; maintaining that there is a need to defend one's private life (Herbst, 1968). They cannot physically withdraw from the ship, so they tend to withdraw inwardly and may relieve their tensions in fantasy, drugs or in alcohol.

These factors of limited interaction, enforced intimacy, the feeling of being between systems, group pressure to maintain social norms and the desire of each crewmen to preserve some part of his personal space, work in combination with one another to produce consistent behavior patterns and subcultures. These can be seen as adaptions to the seafaring process (Orbach, 1977: 265).

The development of powerful subcultures, especially among ratings and officers and between departments, can be seen as a collective protective strategy or individual modes of adaption. This exists to limit or curb the effects of power or formal authority implicit in the division of labor. (The formal para-military authority of the officers which backed by powerful legal sanctions is also based on this division of labor.) These solutions can be viewed as a form
of ritualism, in which social distance especially across officer/rating and deck, engine and steward departments, is used as a protective device by all sides in this caste-like social division (Nolan, 1973: 89).

The seaman, aboard ship, is a captive to his occupational status to an inordinate degree. His pattern of life both on duty and during free hours is a consequence of occupational standing, to an extent not characteristic of most jobs. He does not go home to sit at the "head of the table," but rather in his occupational designated mess hall; where he eats, sleeps and spends his free time depends on his job. The shore side worker, can lose his occupational identity in the impersonality of an industrialized-urban society. The concentrated and compact nature of the ship's community makes each man's occupational identity known to his shipmates; an identity from which he does not escape (Cassel, 1957).

His social environment consists of these same people to whom he has a clearly defined work relationship. This and the fact that there is a high degree of turnover makes it expedient to stick to titles instead of learning new names. This is graphically expressed in the habit of addressing both officers and crew according the position they hold (i.e. Chief, Bosun, Third, Steward, Mess, BR, etc.). Those who have the same titles (i.e. AB's) may avoid these designations and are addressed by name or hometown.
The practicality of using job title in designating a person, is dependent upon the fact that most people on board ship have titles which are not shared by anybody else, at least no one on the same watch (Aubert and Arner, 1958).

The consequences of this "forcing of military life" upon civilians for extended periods has, of course, produced a class consciousness. This is evident in new crew union contracts with shipping companies which provide for "similar" accommodations for officers and crew. (That is now possible because of the reduced number of men on newer ships needing less space and also because crewmen skills have also had to be upgraded.) This class consciousness was particularly evident during the 1930's (and up to the time they were accepted into the engineers and the mates unions) among the radiomen's quest for officer's status (Cassels, 1957). The union's preoccupation with achieving officer status for its members exceeded all other demands they made on shipping companies. This can only be understood, fully, with knowledge of the stringency of the hierarchial structure aboard ship. The far-reaching implication of this occupational structure is brought on by the ship's 24-hour a day society.

There is no greater class-conscious group than seamen and, although radio operators have been the most democratic and friendly of all, they have been forced to fall in line with the fetish of rank in order to avoid humiliation. (Statement of Radioman's Union official during 1930's quest for officer status; see Cassel, 1957.)
The consequence of this structure aboard ship is that each man has his identity, his feeling of who he is, verbally and symbolically linked to his occupation, not only during his working time, but also outside of it (Aubert and Arner, 1958). Conversely, this status aboard ship is not carried ashore.

The seaman eats, sleeps and spends his leisure time in places defined by his work position onboard ship. The officers do not eat nor associate with the crew. This is particularly severe for them for they are isolated even further, since there are so few of them and social and job separation exists between departments (Moreby, 1975; Aubert and Arner, 1958).

This isolation will increase as reductions in the size of crews on modern ships will make it harder to develop interpersonal relations (Moreby, 1958). Herbst (1968) sees a larger proportion of the crew becoming isolated and the possibility of collegial activities during work and leisure periods becoming minimized. These modern ships spend little time in port which further adds to the isolation of the seaman as well as denying him the opportunity to get ashore for sight-seeing or relaxation (Moreby, 1975).

Sleeping quarters are separated among officers and between officers and crew by decks. Crew members of different departments are clustered together as much as possible (Fricke, 1973a; Richardson, 1956). Quarters are
furnished and sized according to rank, officers have always had private rooms and alcohol available (Clark, 1968). Crew members, until recently on some passenger ships, had up to six in a room.

There are separate mess halls for the officers and crew. On large ships, especially passenger ships, there may be several mess-rooms in which officers and crew are again subdivided, in military style. In the "normal" crew mess hall, there is usually one side for the deck and the other for the engine department. Within the deck department day workers, bosun, carpenter, who have a higher "rank" than watchstanders usually eat together and separate from the others. Within the engine crew, electricians and other day workers also eat apart from watchstanders (cf. Aubert and Arner, 1958).

Passenger ships, particularly, make explicit this division. Officers who wish to purchase "dress whites" can eat with the passengers. Even if they eat in their own mess hall they can order from the passenger menu. (Ratings cannot). The officers can mingle with the passengers (in full sight of the crew if they wish). The crew members view a sign, which is usually attached to a fence like railing blocking entrance, that reads "No Crew Members Beyond This Point."

The merchant marine has always had a hierarchical tradition. Since the days of sailing ships, seamen have
found themselves divided and subdivided into occupational groupings. There was, of course, always the major division between officers and crewmen. On board ship this line of cleavage between officers and crew is so distinct that common interests are likely to be ignored. Friction between the two groups is a matter of common occurrence (Wissman, 1942: 4). This friction was very evident in the interviews and at union meetings. But there were also substrata; below the captain were various ranks of deck officers - first, second and third mate. Below these licensed officers the crew were differentiated as petty officers, able-bodied seamen, and ordinary seamen. The social status implications of these occupational levels were reinforced by government licensing. Consequently a man's craft on board ship determined not only the social stratum to which he was assigned but also his rank within this political hierarchy.

The steam ship added the engine room staff which further differentiated the structure. The addition of the radioman added another rung to the ladder. (At first the radioman was a crewman, then in-between and now an officer) (Cassels, 1957). Trade unions have perpetuated this separation.

When trade unionism came to the maritime industry the major groups chose to organize separately. On the West Coast where the first stable unions occurred, the deck sailors, the firemen, and the stewards had formed three craft unions by 1901. Fore-runners of the present day officers' unions
also reach back into the nineteenth century. An antecedent of the National Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots (usually referred to as the MMP...) was established for deck officers in 1887; the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association (...MEBA) dates from 1875. The pattern of labor organization which emerged in the maritime industry merely formalized a work force segmentation which rested on craft and status and therefore antidated unions (Cassels, 1957: 353-354).

Over the years, the unions have institutionalized these old barriers. Added to this were the radioman's unions, which have recently merged with the MMP and MEBA. The MEBA had refused to consider the radioman as an officer and he was denied merger previous to this. Crews are organized by the National Maritime Union and Seafarers International Union, depending on the company involved.

This division between officers/crew across departments can be described using Miller and Rice's task and sentient groups (1967). Task groups are job related and sentient groups are those to which people feel they belong and for which they feel loyalty and identification. Aboard ship, each watch (composed of the deck officer and deck ratings; and the engineer and engine ratings) forms a task group. But the sentient groups are the deck officers, engineers, engine ratings, and deck ratings. The sea watch situation doesn't allow much contact among sentient group members because of the four hours on, eight off structure. Consequently temporary friendships develop among task group members. This task group can extend across departments
since watches will meet before and after worktime for coffee and night lunch and possibly during the watch. In port, though when sea watches are broken, these temporary friendships of the task group "disappear" and members seek the company of other members of their "natural" sentient group. (Moreby, 1975: 86).

A further consequence of dilution of occupational community and the division of labor on board ship is a lack of shared experience and hence the reinforcement of communal identification... the difference in experience of life at sea is frequently so great that no cohesion of the crew as an occupational group occurs... The lack of affective ties is a function of the division of labor, lack of communal support and the frequency with which crews change their membership (Fricke, 73a: 5-6).

The sentient group divides officers even further. Similar to the differences Janowitz (1962) saw between officers who came through the ranks with battlefield experience and those who came through administrative routes, seamen also divide. Mates can either be products of the foc'sle (worked their way through the ranks) or graduates of a maritime academy. The differences in life experiences of these men are apparent. These differences produce a differentiated social structure aboard ship, in the union halls and on the beach. These divisions are extended for the engineers who may come from any of three backgrounds. Like the mates they can have worked their way up or graduated from an academy. But added to this is the union training school, which trains engineering cadets who have
neither the work experience of the former crew member nor the academic credentials of the academy graduate. (cf. Bassis and Rosengren, 1975). Some academy graduates interviewed said that they felt total social isolation, having no other members on board that would fit into their sentient group.

The divisions that exist were apparent from both the observations and the interviews. Officers who had not come up through the ranks saw the crew as some lower strata who did not possess the mental capacity to advance. Conversely those who had worked their way up saw these crew members as not wanting to move up. They did not see any "differences in ability," their comment was, "He did not want to get his license," or "He does not want the responsibility."

Engineers who graduated from the union training school saw the maritime academy graduate as an intruder into their realm. This merely extends the social division that exists since union school graduates are more likely to come from working class backgrounds. Maritime academy graduates receive both a B.S. degree and their engineer's license, while the union school graduates only receive the license. These differences that exist between the two groups have resulted in considerable friction between both the seaman and the institutions they represent.

As the industry proceeds with more technologically advanced ships, the officer who made it through the ranks
will become rare. This will likely increase the officer/crew differences that already exist, since there will be no shared work experience, but increase the solidarity between officers because of similar backgrounds. All the ships of the not too distant future, will likely have no crew members in the engineer rooms and because of the modern type of loading and unloading cargo, deck departments will be reduced also. The fact that crews are being reduced to smaller and smaller numbers further ensures these officer/crew differences, since there are fewer jobs available in which the crew member can serve the allotted time to sit for a mate or engineer license.

This frequency of crew change or "replaceable part manning" (Hebert, 1968; 1974) further reduces the seaman's attachment to his work place and adds to the lack of occupational community (Moreby, 1975: 162; Wissmann, 1942: 4).

The Ship as a Total Institution

Going to sea is like going to jail with the added peril of drowning.

Mark Twain, Famous Quotations

Life on a ship has been described as a total institution (Goffman, 1968; Nolan, 1973; Zurcher, 1965; Aubert and Arner, 1958). Sherar (1973: 12) uses the term total environment. The ship claims a monopoly of the life space of the individual and isolates him to a high degree from intercourse with the outside world, in that there is
both geographical and social isolation from other universes of meaning and action (Nolan, 1973: 88).

It is a 24-hour a day society with all aspects of life being lived out within the narrow physical confines of the ship. All activity is undertaken in the ever present company of others and for the devotion of the voyage there will be little chance to escape constraining pressures and sanctions (Nolan, 1973: 89; Orbach, 1977: 261-263; Goffman, 1957).

Goffman (1961: 13) defines a total institution as a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administrated round of life.

Merchant ships fit this definition, but there is one characteristic that appears to qualify this definition; merchant ships unlike prisons and most mental hospitals are voluntary. But a ship is only voluntary to the point of sailing, once you pull off from the dock, you are there until you are "allowed to leave." This point is brought out in a tragedy that occurred on a ship I was on.

We were nearing the end of the Mississippi River and a messman wanted to get off. He said he "could not stand a trip." He knew the captain wasn't going to let him off. A short while later, he jumped from one of the large window portholes into the river. His body was never found. The ship would have been back in New Orleans in eight days.
The point here is that the seaman does not view it as voluntary. They, like prisoners, continually count the days until their return home. Their sentence, like those of mental patients and prisoners, commands the absence of certain things that they are accustomed to, i.e. women.

Ships offer a breakdown of the barriers ordinarily separating sleep, play and work. All members of the crew are under the same authority; all activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all activities occur at certain times, meals are on a schedule. This "batch-living" is seen in direct contrast to family life, for those who eat and sleep at work with a group of fellow workers, can hardly sustain a meaningful domestic existence (Goffman, 1961: 6-11).

Peculiar to total institutions, and particularly unlike the beach, the seaman is subject to a 24-hour a day job evaluation. On the ship the seaman may be terminated for being drunk or causing trouble during his off hours. Fighting and homosexual activity are automatic termination cases. Ironically more severe things done on the beach are not known, consequently judgement is passed without knowledge of these.

This makes for an abnormal evaluation process, particularly since it is being done by a group of people who "know" only under these unusual circumstances. Once "accused" the word spreads quickly; he remains stigmatized
for the remainder of the trip by people he cannot get away from.

The seaman experiences certain types of difficult situations; inhibition and deprivation being the worst of these. Inhibition is a physical or psycho-social state which prevents the individual from doing what he wants to do. On a ship this takes the form of limited personal space, limited choice of social and leisure activity and most of all separation from family and friends. The rules, orders and prohibitions which control life on board ship in an almost military manner represents another inhibition (Horbulewicz, 1973: 68).

There is a severe limitation of choice and action by both work schedules and work hierarchy. The seaman is continually surrounded by other seamen and even leisure time offers no place of "secure privacy." There are too few ways of escape from the demands of work and shipmates (Nolan, 1973: 92).

Going to sea deprives the satisfying of needs for relaxation, sexual gratification, emotional contact, security and personal interests and inclinations (Horbulewicz, 1973: 69). The "totality" of the ship causes the seaman to experience what Sommer (1959) calls dis-cultur-uation; an untraining which renders him temporarily incapable of managing certain features of daily life on the beach. The ship creates and substains a particular kind of strain between the seaman and the beach.
The seaman is not able to acquire some of the habits currently required to be socially successful in the wider society. The longer the disculturation process continues the more inadequate he is in regulating certain aspects of daily life on the beach when he gets back to it (Goffman, 1961: 13).

The Social Identity of the Merchant Seaman

To be rooted is perhaps the more and least recognized need of the human soul... A human being has roots by virtue of his real, active, and natural participation in the life of a community, which preserves in living shape certain particular treasures of the past and certain particular expectations for the future.

Simone Weil, The Need for Roots

Seamen seem to fall into one of three types. First, there are those who situationally withdraw (Bankston, et al, 1981: 282). These men retain an orientation to the "outside world," i.e. to life on the beach. This is a small minority of ship's crews. This type mostly keeps to himself, talks little, reads a lot, keeps out of trouble, volunteers for nothing, seldom gets drunk, dresses better and has more luxuries than other seamen (he manages his money somewhat better). He might be said to be "playing it cool" (Goffman, 1961: 61-65). He bears a remarkable similarity to prisoners who are "doing time," i.e. who make the best of their situation while in prison, adapt to its
deprivations, but retain a more desirable commitment to a life outside (Irwin, 1970: 67-75).

At first, it would seem that this type should be the majority given the "anonymous" nature of ship life. But the ship does have an organizing influence through which socially distant persons find themselves developing mutual support in opposition to the depersonalizing system that has forced them together; a community of common fates is produced (Goffman, 1961: 56). A second type, then, emerges. This type may be termed a "colonizer" (Goffman, 1961: 63). A colonizer is a person who must relocate in a distant place, but retains some connection to his parent society. The colonizer must, in a sense, make a new world in a new context, and most seamen fit this type. The seaman's identity becomes progressively inconsistent with shore life and his commitments to that life style are eroded (cf. Wallace, 1965: 163-172). Again, an analogy may be made to the effects of prison life. A convict may, ...

...lose his orientation to the outside community, take on the convict categories, and thereby fall into jailing. This occurs when the individual has spent a great deal of time in prison and/or returned to the outside community and discovered that he no longer fits in the outside world. It is difficult to maintain a real commitment to a social world without firsthand experience with it for long periods of time (Irwin, 1970: 76).

The seaman experiences much the same as he colonizes the ship, and interestingly he cannot cease to reject the
structural source of his identity. Not to do so is to admit he is no longer integrated with a conventional world. Thus, the ideological gathering post is in the form of the complaint. There are three steps to this **colonization process:**

1. Commitment to seaman lifestyle. Life on a ship is very easy; pay is good, so is the food and no one works hard. Your room is cleaned and bed is made everyday. Most seamen never had these things before, so they become committed to this lifestyle.

2. The seaman soon learns that you cannot admit to liking these conveniences. People who stay on the same ships year after year are called homesteaders (Aubert and Arner, 1968). Homesteader is a negative term because it means that a person "must like" shipboard life. Homesteading appears to conflict with the traditional identity of the seaman, to which they all aspire; to be carefree and irresponsible. Steady employment does not fit this role. Consequently, seamen "make-up" excuses as to why they are making another trip; such as they have spent all their money on women and booze; this fulfills the role. Conversely, those who dwell on their family or friends ashore are generally teased for being homesick (Orback, 1977: 274). So the seaman, in a sense, must deny commitment to all but the role of the seaman.

3. The seaman learns to complain. You complain about the things you are actually satisfied about. (They don't
like the brand of soap; the free laundry room is too hot; the bed isn't made right; my second steak tonight wasn't good; or the bread isn't hot enough.)

Seamen must deny their commitment to these conveniences. The seaman has become a colonizer who feels obliged to deny his satisfaction with the institution because if not he would have to admit his commitment. The denial of satisfaction becomes functional because it sustains an elementary solidarity among a group of strangers who are otherwise bound only by their technical interdependencies (Hanna, 1981).

The ironies of this colonization process are that the absence of women is not used as an organizing complaint. Thus, a real penance is avoided. And even more ironic is that these complainers made second trips and even become homesteaders. They confess that they are only doing it for the money.

The colony thrives on failure. None of the men are interested in the solving of any of these problems. The complaint is the available source of unity. The colony is an organization whose success depends on failure. Members view the complaint as the only means of combating the situation. Only through failure does the organization continue. The complaining seaman is much like Rooney's (1980) mission stiffs. A continual supply of both are necessary for the "success through failure" of their respective organization.
Complaining is a form of association for seamen. It increases solidarity among the crew and provides a mechanism for the socialization of members (Hanna, 1981). Complaining provides the seaman with a mechanism for relating to one another. The stressful situation aboard ship, in which "strangers" are forced to live together, is partially relieved through the complaining process. Morris (1974: 112-115) comments on the use of the complaint as a strategy to cope with the stressful problems of imprisonment and its function as a transmitting device for prison culture.

It creates a common bond. Seamen who do not complain are looked upon as strange; but most quickly learn to join the association. Those with these "common experiences" form temporary social relationships. Not to join the "complaining association" excludes one because it highlights what seems to be common interests in the form of "already shared social experience."

Similar patterns are seen in the military (Merton and Kitt, 1950). Inexperienced troops desire to affiliate themselves with those who had experience in battle, consequently they are influenced by association with soldiers with combat experience. The seaman who does not complain is thought to lack in these already shared experiences, and hence is not one of us.

Erickson (1976: 136) elaborates on this relationship between a stressful situation and the emergence of the
complaint. In his analysis, he remarks about the unusual uniformity of the complaints and their sounding almost rehearsed. The seaman's complaints can also be called rehearsed, since he is told what to complain about by more experienced actors. Complaining becomes a pattern of interaction for the seaman that has little to do with the content of the complaint.

Forms of associations are closely tied to the practical interests of the interactants at the initial and relatively unorganized stage of development. (Levine, 1971). For the union seaman, the complaining has emerged from the historical patterns of employer abuse that occurred in the industry. (For history, see Standard, 1947; Hohman, 1956; Goldberg, 1958; Schneider, 1958; Larrowe, 1959; Collins, 1964; Raskin, 1967; Kilgour, 1975; MEBA, 1975; Cullison, 1982; Taylor, 1923; Weintraub, 1959). Once gaining these hard-fought for and deserving rights, seamen saw the complaint as a vehicle for letting all know that they were not satisfied with what was. So you complained a lot and hoped to get a little more. It also served a solidarity function as it set apart us, the union, from them, the shipping company (cf. Mechanic, 1962; Kornblum, 1974: 101). At this point the things complained about are closely tied to the practical interests of those doing the complaining (Hanna, 1981).

But for a form of association to evolve beyond this initial stage, the process must persist beyond the content
that precipitated it and the particular individuals engaged in it; otherwise the form (complaining) will vanish with the passage of time (Simmel, 1964; Von Wiese and Becker, 1932; Levine, 1971).

Originally the complaint served as a generating solidarity among seamen. Now the complaint, as a form of association, has gained an existence independent of the content it initially evolved from. Participation in the form becomes an end in itself (Hanna, 1981). Complaining for the seaman has taken on a life of its own, independent of changes in content.

The complaint is the badge of commitment to seamen shipboard culture. It identifies and temporarily brings these individuals into a social unit. Complaining may also increase the solidarity, even if only momentarily, among these actors who do not hold common experiences or those who may never realize whether their experiences are similar (Hanna, 1981: 305).

The seaman never stops complaining because of the costs of withdrawing from the association, which continues to be mutually beneficial to the participants, even though they are no longer really complaining. Thus the complaint has become institutionalized for the shipboard seaman, because it helps him deal with the problematic nature of shipboard life. Cast together for a period of time these strangers find, in the complaining process, a statement of common
experience, solidarity and a mechanism for the socialization of new members.

Sea daddy represents a total commitment to the seaman's lifestyle. While other seamen still hope to be integrated into the shore side society upon each return to the beach, sea daddy does not. While other seamen try to remain oriented to two worlds, sea daddy does not. The seaman playing it cool does not become involved in the marginal culture of the ship. For him the ship is merely an extension of the beach. For sea daddy, the beach and the ship are all an integral part of his lifestyle. The old time seaman who still lives the life of a sailor and does not wish to become assimilated into the shore side society is a vanishing breed. The greater majority of seamen are members of a marginal group. Sea daddy for the marginal seaman is a negative reference group. For the seamen "playing it cool," both are negative references. For sea daddy these others are representative of what has caused the demise of the seafarer.

These three groups are involved in a complexity of identifications involving positive and negative relationships to the larger group, merchant seamen. Because they are in the same situation, the ship, shifting loyalties and relationships have developed resulting in the formation of these three sub-groups. Sea daddy is representative of the public image of the seaman. Each of the three groups of seamen are representative of a continuum of integration into
the traditional seaman's lifestyle. Each is a member of a different social world. Each is not comfortable in the world of the other. Neither can accept the perspective of the other, indeed it does not even make much sense to them. (Lindesmith, 1977: 437-460).

Sea daddy will one day disappear, but his influence will not.

Old systems rarely die, or even fade away. Total disintegration and a movement of components out into entropy and randomness happens seldom. Rather do they regroup - with something old and something new, much that is borrowed, and many things blue, black white and tan. Historical data indicate that no society - regardless how dire the catastrophe that befalls it - ever simply abandons its traditional culture. The old leaves significant marks upon the new (Monane, 1967: 161.).

The influence of sea daddy as a negative reference group was apparent in almost every interview. Each seaman would express his rejection of the traditional seamen's culture by, in some way, telling me that seamen have changed. Some typical responses were:

Seamen don't keep a room in the back of the bar anymore. Seamen aren't the same as they used to be. A different class of man is shipping out now. There are not many of those old-timers around anymore.

Sea daddy may be a vanishing breed, but for the modern day seaman, he will disappear none too soon. Although sea daddy will soon disappear, he will long afterwards remain the public ideal of the seaman.
Family and Community Relationships

Timothy Glynn - Please contact your sister, Kay. Mother has passed away and other sister is very ill. Urgent.

Charles William Johnson, Jr., whose family has not heard from you since 1946, or anyone knowing his whereabouts. Urgent.

NMU Pilot, February 1982

Lindberg Flowers, FWTE-5637 - Please contact your wife Ruthie Flowers. She hasn't seen you in 14 years, and it's very important.

NMU Pilot, July 1982

John D. Vazquez, Ret., who formerly sailed aboard the SS Brazil, husband of Hilda Vazquez and father of John Joseph Vazquez - Please contact your daughter-in-law Evelyn Vazquez. She has been trying to contact you for several years.

NMU Pilot, March 1982

Gosta A. Pettersson, Bk. No. 68314, or Gus Pettersson, whose last known ship was the M/S Aquarius of the U.S. Lines in Feb. 1980, or anyone knowing his whereabouts - Please contact your niece Christina Petterson, Soderakersuagen 37 S-14138 Huddings, Sweden, or after June 15, 1982: Eksharad, Sweden. Your family is worried about you.

Jose Antonio Rodriguez - Please contact your daughter, Doris Jean Rodriguez Suarez. She hasn't heard from you in 18 years and is very anxious to contact you.

NMU Pilot, May 1982
Anyone knowing or who has sailed with AB Clifford W. Brande, on the SS United States, 1964; SS Santa Barbars, 1967; SS Mormacdraco, 1969-70; SS Export Freedom, 1973 and 1975; SS Cherry Valley, 1976 and SS Texaco Minnesota, 1977 - Please call David Lichter collect as soon as possible.

NMU Pilot, June 1982

A major aspect of the seaman's family is a lifestyle punctuated by comings and goings, departures and returns, separations and reunions. The single, inescapable fact for the seaman's family is that seamen go to sea. It is therefore axiomatic that a career seaman's family must function within the context of separation, actual or potential, for 20 years or more (cf. Decker, 1978: 113).

In Paths of Loneliness, Wood (1953: 27) lists as isolated types the seaman, peacetime soldier, miner, logger, hobo, and the migrant worker. These occupations are associated with homelessness. The largest group of occupationally homeless persons are the migratory workers. For these people, home is where the work is (Shotwell 1961). They are severely isolated from the communities in which they work (Bahr, 1973: 26). His migrancy also separates him for his community of origin. Migrancy reduces to almost nothing the chance to develop the feeling of belonging to a stable community (Shotwell, 1961: 35-37).

For the working seaman, home is where the work is, on a ship. Being on ship effectively cuts off many social contacts and the possibility of taking part in many shore
activities. It lessens the opportunity of establishing and maintaining meaningful social relationships (Nolan, 1973: 91; Sherar, 1973). Nolan (1973: 92) sees the inability to control outside events, namely those involving his family, as being a severe deprivation.

Domestic and family situations cannot be immediately influenced due to lack of information and communication facilities. Within the family... both everyday running and most important decisions must be taken by individuals other than the seaman.

The idea of the deprivation of normal family relations pervades the seafaring literature. Healy in 1936 discusses the problem of the home of the seaman being constantly interrupted by long voyages.

The result is a household depending upon the wife and the mother to maintain ordinary discipline. One can only conjecture regarding the sex life of the husband. In foreign ports he is shrouded with the Gyges ring of anonymity. This in conjunction with the pent-up demands for sexual relations must play havoc with the seaman's physical and psychological reaction toward his home. The home is therefore denormalized by the frequent absence of the wage-earner seeking sexual satisfaction outside of conjugal relations (Healey, 1936: 67-68).

Fricke supports Healey's position by stating:

Seafaring is a hell of a life for a married man with a family and more so for those at home. It's the wives that deserve all the praise being father and mother while their husbands are away at least nine months of the year (Fricke, 1973b: 135).
The career seaman must if he is to retain links with community and a stable family life seek a compromise. He must seek a suitable accommodation of both family and occupational needs. The research indicates that the choice of wife and the locale of his home influences the possibility of making the sea a career (Hill, 1972; Horobin, 1957; Pearlman, 1970; Stiles, 1972; Sherar, 1973: 24-29).

A wife who can enjoy the nearness and support of kin-folk and is used to a measure of independence in managing family affairs will allow the seaman to remain in his occupation because he is able to integrate family and occupation (cf. Decker, 1978). But as Fricke (1973) points out:

this accommodation of needs is only suitable in a relatively stable social environment, since it presupposes a pattern of voyages... which allows a family to function successfully (Fricke 1973b: 48).

Life at sea is certainly not conducive to maintaining stable family ties. It takes an extraordinary kind of man and family to stabilize such relationships under the strained conditions of seafaring life. Research indicates that his chances for a successful marriage are poor (Sherar, 1973: 24-29). This research supports that conclusion. This problem of being away from family is perhaps what forced seamen to demand increased vacation periods (up to six months a year in some companies). This increased time with family comes at the expense of less shore time in port.
and less men aboard ship. These later two situations being the results of modern technology within the shipping industry (Moreby, 1975).

Men go to sea and experience some social change; consequently they come back slightly different men. Even these small differences are accentuated when they are confronted with the change his family and community have experienced since his departure. He returns from his isolation on the ship to his isolation on the beach. While he was away family and friends were making new acquaintances and friendships, children were growing; styles and fashions were changing.

The one who was there in the system while it was evolving may be less aware of the changes which have taken place but at the same time may be better able to understand or make sense of the results of those changes when confronted with them. The man returning or the outsider on the other hand even if he can make sense of the changes, has not himself been changed by them in the same way as someone who has evolved with and in many cases has been the cause of those changes (Orbach, 1977: 277).

Veterans, returning to their families after being away for as little as six months, come with a distorted view of how things had been when they left. While he may recognize changes in himself, he is apt to forget that those who were at home have also changed (McCublin, et al, 1975a: 303; Cuber, 1945; Baker, et al, 1968). Additionally new experiences have influenced his perception of home, while
those at home remember him as he was in the past (Schuetz, 1945). The effect of these absences are cumulative for those who remain seamen. It also makes him unsure of other's feelings toward him because of what is to him a constantly changing behavior (cf. Cuber, 1945).

If the seaman returns home to a smoothly running household, it was the mother who maintained it. The waiting wife functioning as head of the household matures, develops greater independence and self confidence while providing a life for her family in the absence of a husband (cf. McCublin, et al, 1975b). After the initial week or so in port the husband starts getting in the way. Wives frequently remark "It's nice to have him home, but it's good to have him gone." Husbands frequently remark "It's nice to be home, but it's good to be gone." (Tunstall, 1962; Anderson, 1972). Research done with returning servicemen indicates that reintegration into the family system is a major stress factor requiring an extensive effort on the part of the family as well as of the returning serviceman (Brown, 1944; Cuber, 1945; Griffith, 1944; Hill, R., 1945).

The process of reunion is an extremely complex process that involves the reestablishment of bonds of coherence and family unity. Of these the husband-wife relationship, the division of labor within the home, the relocation of roles and the revitalization of father-child relationships are paramount. Conversely the adjustment to the husband's
leaving involves the process of closing out the husband's role in order for the family to develop a more functional and efficient pattern of operation (Hill, R. 1949).

Research tends to emphasize that the nuclear family in today's society is in relative isolation from supporting social networks while it attempts to cope with societal demands (Burgess and Locke, 1953; Parsons and Bales, 1955). Consequently carrying out the normal functions in today's family becomes extremely dependent on the existence of a well functioning family unit, that includes a normal complement of parents (Herbst, 1960). But for the seaman's family, both husband and wife have become used to a lifestyle which operates smoothly (out of necessity) without the other's presence. Men must get to know their families after each trip. It becomes hard to maintain a stable, intimate relationship on the basis of 4-6 months contact per year. Instead of performing in a normative role or roles of the father/husband, the seaman becomes peripheral to the day to day functioning of the family (Orbach, 1977: 279).

Orbach (1977: 279) cites the example of the seaman - father as disciplinarian. The mother continuously threatens the children with harsh discipline from the father when he returns. But the father, upon his return, does not wish to appear as a heavy to his children during his stay at home. Consequently, the mother's control falls apart during his stay. Children may catch on to these threats and never obey
the mother; this is the conclusion of the observations of this author and perhaps the reason for the high rate of deviance among the children of those seamen observed. The wife considers this as an interfering aspect of the husband's stay. The love and affection she needs from her husband is soon balanced by the inconvenience of his presence (cf. Isay 1968; cf. Metres, et al, 1974).

Single seamen have even less of a chance to maintain intimate relationships. He must "relearn" about a person each trip, if indeed he has the skills and connections to gain introductions with prospective partners. The single seaman is especially vulnerable because he is out of it in terms of understanding how to deal with women. These understandings depend on his knowing fads, styles in dress, preferred social spots, etc.. Orbach (1977: 282) compares him to the man, who after being married for several years, gets divorced and must relearn the game. In short, he does not know how to act. Taken together over a long period of time, this lack of understanding becomes a considerable lack of experience. He gradually loses the ability to navigate in the speed and confusion of the shore environment, as opposed to the slow pace of the ship.

Nolan sees the lack of social stimuli in the restricted access to newspaper, television and radio as adding to this lack of information (stimuli) gained (1973: 93). The lack of sensory stimuli can be added to this, which can possibly
lead to an emotional decline (Spitz, 1945). Nolan makes the analogy between solitary confinement in prison and shipboard life, their common connection with sensory deprivation.

Gresham Sykes in *Society of Captives* (1964) specifies many of the pains of imprisonment: one of which is the deprivation of heterosexual relations. On ships, the loss is not as great as in prison, but can be understood as relative deprivation; that is, relative to shore side occupations. However, this deprivation refers not only to intercourse but also to the lack of meaningful male/female social interaction (cf. Decker, 1978).

Sykes sees women as significant others that provide much of what Cooley (1902: 182–187) has called the "looking glass self." To be cut off from the company of women and be deprived of heterosexual relations may give rise to anxiety about a person's masculinity. Visits to ports can provide the seaman with relief from such feelings. This can be seen as one of the reasons (overcoming doubts about his sexual identity) for the seaman frequenting several whore houses or having a "steady woman in port" and always letting the crew know this (Nolan, 1973: 91).

Most married seamen make huge psychological payments for going to sea. These payments are experienced in the form of role conflict between being a family man and a seaman (wage earner). They earn reasonably high wages by being away from home. The conflict is actually between what
they are doing (earning high wages) and what they would like
to do (have a job making the same high income, but which
allows them to come home each evening) (Moreby, 1975: 193;

Perhaps one of the reasons why most seamen try to quit
several times and would if not for the money, is this
inability to maintain an intimate relationship and maintain
his expected roles. Consequently he develops guilt about
being in an occupation which creates this. Seamen always
bring gifts home for everyone; perhaps to relieve this guilt
(Sherar, 1973: 27). These gifts turned my father's
homecoming into an event. On expected arrival day home
patterns change abruptly, the house is cleaned, the wife
dresses up (Stoddard, 1978). One of the first events upon
entering the house is the opening of gifts. These gifts
were always very different from anything anyone else had.
No other kid I knew had huge hand carved model ships, tiger
skin rugs or an elephant tusk. My mother was probably one
of the few people who had a 150 pound statue of budda that
was carved out of a tree. We were a different kind of
family. We were a seaman's family. The moment you walked
into our house and saw all the gifts he had brought home for
all those years you knew it. During the course of this
research I was invited into the home of an old seaman who
had been shipping since 1939. The decor was a personal
history of his 43 years as a seaman.
Research indicates that separation from family causes the greatest stress (Moreby, 1975: 158; Lantis, 1968: 578; Benjamin, 1970; Horbulewicz, 1973; Decker, 1978). Seamen regard their occupation as inferior because of the deprivation of normal family life. (They also do not consider this to be compensated for by income.) Perhaps indicating why men rarely stay at sea when other shore based employment is available (Moreby, 1975; Hagg, 1971; Fraser, 1960). In short, men go to sea because of the rewards they receive for doing so (Orbach, 1977: 188; Moreby, 1969: 1975). These rewards have decreased relatively in recent years (Horbulewicz, 1973: 71).

For all seamen... married and unmarried alike... the increasing mechanization and specialization of ships are unilaterally changing the payment/reward pattern. A number of seamen, especially the younger members, experience this as a breach in the psychological contract they entered into when they applied to go to sea; that is, the implicit understanding they had that, by going to sea, they would have the opportunity to get ashore in foreign ports, see the sights and have the occasional taste of adventure (Moreby, 1975: 193).

The seaman today spends very little time ashore in foreign ports; the greatest part of his working life is spent at sea. He will soon realize that the ship is his world, not foreign lands, nor strange people and their cultures. He will spend the greater part of his time ashore in bars, that become mere extensions of the ship and its isolated community. In short he soon finds out that the
romance and thrill of seafaring is greatly exaggerated. He becomes exposed to the stress and boredom of the occupation (Bassis and Rosengren, 1975).

Horbulewicz summarized his research in regard to such conditions (1973: 72-73).

1. Work in sea transports takes place in conditions of stress.

2. The principle stressor is the social-emotional separation from one's closest persons.

3. This separation causes:
   a. deprivation of emotional contact needs,
   b. deprivation of information,
   c. deprivation of socio-emotional support from family in the isolated psychosocial ship community.

The effects of such a deprived situation vary and can become permanent.

The result of these deprivations is that in the less rigid, but relatively more complex social milieu ashore, the seaman may appear to others as immature. He may feel uneasy and have difficulty in communication, consequently he feels out of place and not understood (Nolan, 1973: 194). Research supports the fact that a great many seamen find difficulty in getting along ashore (Sherar, 1973).

This difficulty in getting along ashore will become apparent when the seaman retires. Shore side workers have an easier time with retirement because of roots in the community and he retains the same friends and social ties,
consequently he does not experience such a disruptive change (cf. Bellino, 1970). Some of the specific problems in retiree adjustment are (cf. Bellino, 1969):

1. adjustment to the loss of occupational role and social position. (This problem is particularly severe among the higher officers on the ship.)

2. adapting to a shore side way of life.

3. integration into a permanent community after a life of transiency.

4. adjustment to a new and perhaps more intense pattern of family interaction.

These problems were seen to be a result of poorly developed social skills caused by the restrictions of the ship. This is probably the reason for a lot of retired seamen hanging around the union hall. Many of the retired seamen interviewed said they found the hall more socially comfortable. The union hall, as an extension of the ship, lessens the adjustment the seaman needs to make to a shore side existence. It also means that he remains integrated in the seafaring community. But this also reduces the chances that he will become integrated into a permanent community ashore, since he has no need to adapt.

The seaman sees himself as being able to compete, because of his high salary, in the acquisition and display of various status objects. They are particularly vulnerable to conspicuous consumption. Research shows seamen see themselves as competitive in social standing because of this high salary (Orbach, 1977: 286-287).
While conspicuous expenditures are important means of locating a person with reference to others, close observation of interaction reveals that these are necessary rather than sufficient factors for the purpose. They establish position in a particular group within a stratum or social category. The seaman enacts the form but not the substance of social roles. He lacks contact with reference groups which could validate these roles. In effect he assumes an identity based on superficial appreciations. One may say that his whole life's experiences act counter to his wishes, his dreams, and therefore to his ideals (Sherar, 1973: 32).

His high earnings are a source of personal validity with which he cannot part -- it is his major measure of self worth. In sociological terms, there is an inherent difficulty in establishing and maintaining identity by reference to purely extrinsic rewards. When he admits this, he is in effect admitting that his way of life makes impossible a stable relationship with family or friends. A parallel identity problem was noted by Lemert (1967: 119-132) with respect to the systematic check forger, whose lifestyle, in similar form, also creates a marginal man, a permanent stranger.

The seaman has a need (as do most of us) for the sense of security which social recognition and contact with one's family and friends and their approval furnishes. Whether he
recognizes this need, and is able to remedy it, is indeed another question.

This is significant in that it shows the degree of social deprivation a person will accept when he blindly recognizes wealth to be the sole symbol of social achievement. The seaman represents a unique form of deviant behavior that is difficult to recognize as such. Merton (1968: 189) addresses this problem when he spoke of over-conformity as a form of deviance. His concern was with the social consequences of a heavy emphasis upon monetary success as a goal in a society which has not adopted its structure to the implication of this emphasis.

Parsons (1951: 476-477) includes types of compulsive conformity as behavior not socially defined as deviant but that is deviant. It is deviant in the sense that it represents departures from expectations and lacks the innovation necessary for success in a changing environment. The typical merchant seaman displays such conformity and lack of innovation.

On the ship the seaman is seen as mature and responsible; ashore he is seen as immature and lacking in social skills. (This is something often noted about ex-convicts.) He lacks any extensive repertoire of alternative responses, social actions and categorizations which are adequate for the more complex patterns of social relations and interactions on the beach. Consequently he
may play the simple role of the stereotypic seaman. He is more able to navigate socially in the more stable and predictably stratified environment of the ship (Aubert and Arner, 1969).

On the ship the seaman is at home and sure of his position, work, skills, duties and responsibilities, it is only ashore that a sense of difference and separateness become noticeable (Nolan, 1973: 95).

The ship presupposes that, within his occupational domain, the seaman is a mature and responsible man. But in other respects, the ship's community permits and encourages to a certain extent, a certain childlike dependence and lack of responsibility. His food is brought to the table, he is called for work, his bed is made and room is cleaned by someone else, he doesn't have to drive to work, he does not have to worry about dressing properly as most shore workers do. In short, he is devoid of all responsibility except work itself, and in this regard, he is protected by powerful maritime unions. He goes to foreign ports in which he has no serious social responsibility for his actions. The seaman develops an ambivalent relationship to responsibility, possibly indicating why dissatisfied seamen nevertheless decide to remain in their occupation, instead of making an attempt to settle ashore (Aubert and Arner, 1958).

This lack of responsibility has generated the notion of the carefree seaman. Seamen enjoy the myth of being
carefree, so they periodically exhibit some of these behaviors.

Many of these behaviors and their accompanying myths are reactions to their deprivations and isolations at sea and the inadequacies they feel ashore. Reactions to this are brought forth in the form of conspicuous consumption, their myth as seamen, and its attendant behaviors (Orbach, 1977: 287).

This may aid his identification as a seaman, but it also causes feelings of deprivation. Indeed his prolonged experience in the total institutional setting of the ship has led to a relative deprivation of alternative roles, opportunities and interactions (Nolan, 1973: 95).

A seaman ashore is out of his element, ill adapted to his environment and uncomfortably aware of a sense of strangeness and a lack of orientation. There is a feeling of restraint, of attempted adjustment to unfamiliar routines and uncertain expectations (Hohman, 1952: 201).

Augmented by his lack of community ties these unfamiliar routines quickly drive the seaman back to the union hall. The union hall becomes a comforting place. For the seaman it is the least alien place in the topsy-turvy world ashore. The union hall has replaced the seaman's bar as the place for social comfort. Many seamen never get beyond the union hall. The longer he is a seaman the further he is drawn from life on the beach. The union hall becomes an extension of the ship. He is a paradox. He
doesn't like being on a ship and he doesn't like being off of it. An old seaman waiting in a union hall summed it up,

I come back and I am glad to be back; then I see all these same people who work on the beach doing the same things. They don't have any time off and no money to spend. Always the same story. You think after you went away and seen the world and come back something would have changed. I get bored with the beach, and I don't know how they can stand their lives. I feel superior to them.

He then pauses and adds,

But I know as soon as I get at sea, I'll want to come back.

Bored with this strange mundane environment he returns to the ship for the security of his familiar colony.

After a period at sea, they return to family and/or friends. When they get tired of that; when the strangeness of all the rules and regulations of life on the beach and the humdrum doings of everyday, close in on them, there is the next trip, that will once again take them away from it all (Orbach, 1977: 288; Moreby, 1975: 32; Sherar, 1973: 14-18).

The ephemeral quality of interpersonal relations generates a problematic identity for the seaman. The seaman continually expresses a dislike for ships for there are limits to which a society of strangers may be significant to the self. Even so, life on the ship becomes more desirable than life on the outside. On the ship he is at least comfortable, sure of his position and skills and the
expectations of others. Life at sea is different from life ashore. The longer he lives on the sea the more different he becomes.

Geographic mobility causes loneliness and isolation, which are psychologically harmful. We need to be bound by close social ties with other men. This necessitates a close intimacy with other men, a community of feeling and an intimate living together. Without this we remain a stranger. An increase in mobility decreases the chances of such intimacy. He becomes less and less attached to anything and to anybody. He begins to remind us of a person driven by the wind. He becomes free and as a consequence, lonely as a socially unattached atom (Sorokin 1959: 522-523).

Conclusion: The Focus of The Study

When men go to sea they make concessions (i.e. absence from home). These are in addition to the physical and mental efforts and effects associated with seafaring. In order to compensate for these concessions, they seek extraordinary kinds of compensation (i.e. money, see the world).

Most seamen make immense psychological concessions when they go to sea; they make these concessions in the form of conflict between their job - which compensates them with high wages because they are away from home and what most of them would like to be doing - find a job which offers them
the same high wages but allows them to return home each day (Moreby, 1975).

The ever increasing technology of ships is changing the concessions compensation pattern experienced by individual seafarers. Merchant ships during the sailing era had large crews, made long trips and spent long periods in foreign ports. For this they received low wages, no fringe benefits and were abused by shipping companies and their agents. The unionization and continual increased level of mechanization of ships has changed the world of the seaman. Trips are shorter; both benefits and wages are increasing; paid vacations are becoming longer; but port time is much shorter (for some ships non-existent); and crews are getting smaller. Seamen, especially new members, experience this decrease in port time as an infringement on the implicit psychological contract they entered into when they entered the occupation; which is the inferred understanding they had that by going to sea they would have the chance to get ashore in foreign ports, see the different and unusual and have a taste of adventure.

The decrease in the number of crew members causes the seaman to experience an increase in social isolation aboard ship. The consequences of this isolation are magnified by the para-military structure of the ship. Both physical and social separation exists between officers and crew members and across departments (deck, engine, steward) among these
divisions. Where seamen were once bunched together in sleeping quarters -- now each person has their own room.

The decrease in number of jobs and number of ships are making jobs more competitive. The competition further isolates the seaman. The increased competition for jobs, the reduced number in the crew, the decrease in port time and the continuing separation from family and friends are the concessions made by the seaman. Higher wages and longer paid vacations are the compensations for the seaman. Consequently, the seaman has more money and spends more time with his family; but because of the long periods of still being away from family and the totality of these absences, these concessions are still very high.

There is, and continues to be, an obvious trade off here. In the past seaman spent less time with family but had more time in foreign port and interacted with more seamen. Now the seaman is faced with smaller crews and less foreign shore time, but has more time with family. Whether or not this has made a difference in the lifestyle of the seaman remains to be seen. Differences in years in the occupation and time spent on ships should reflect the results of this trade off, if any.

The adaptations of these men aboard ship to shipboard life has historically led to the formation of a ship's culture to deal with the stresses of living a relatively isolated life. Hence -- the formation of a marginal culture by a group of marginal men.
Seamen wish to belong to the shore side society of their family and/or friends, but because of the extended absences and social deprivations they experience, they cannot. The alternative is to adopt the carefree, drunken, spend-it-all culture of the traditional merchant seaman (sea daddy). Most do not.

The product of these concessions, for the seaman, is marginality. This marginality is measured using an alienation scale. The use of alienation as a measure of marginality is conventional (Martin, et al, 1974; Strole, 1965; Hajda, 1961; Jaco, 1954; Henricks, 1982). The alienation scale measures a form of disassociation; a sense of separation of the individual from an established context of involvement (Henricks, 1982: 202).

Henricks (1982) developed a typology of human disassociation. Two of these, marginality and subordination, are pertinent to our analysis. Historically seamen have suffered from subordination. Their marginality is partially a result of this status, but the relative separation from social and psychological sources of support remains the key theme. Historically the seaman has been able to make few claims on social acceptance; he has traditionally been held in a low social place. His occupation forces him to live a large part of his life at a distance. This lack of time spent ashore has isolated him from socially sponsored meanings which would orient his
actions (Seeman, 1959). He becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy because his actions support his historically ascribed subordinate status. Consequently disassociation is a product of the seaman's vocation.

The foregoing theoretical section has suggested a number of dimensions of the occupational lifestyle of merchant seamen, which may be predicted to be determinants of varying degrees of marginality (alienation) in this population. The following predictions will be the object of the analysis to come. Other things being equal:

1. The greater the number of years of going to sea, the greater the degree of marginality;
2. The greater the time spent at sea per year the greater will be the degree of marginality;
3. The greater the length of trips at sea, the greater will be the degree of marginality;
4. The greater the status of the job on ship, the less will be the degree of marginality;
5. The greater the degree of sailing on a single ship, the less will be the degree of marginality;
6. The larger the community in which the seaman lives, the greater will be the degree of marginality;
7. Living in the community in which the seaman was raised will reduce the level of marginality experienced;
8. The higher the degree of education the lower will be the degree of marginality;
9. Organizational membership will reduce the level of marginality;
10. Religious participation will reduce the level of marginality;
11. Marriage will reduce the level of marginality;
12. Having children will reduce the level of marginality.

A number of these variables are essentially control variables: size of community; living in the same community in which they were raised, education, marriage, and whether or not the seaman has children. Other variables such as organizational membership and religious participation are seen as intervening variables because they are in fact occupationally induced. The relationship of these seven variables to marginality (alienation) is well supported by the sociological literature (Durheim, 1945; 1951; Tonnies, 1957).

The other variables: number of years going to sea; time spent per year at sea; length of trips; shipboard status; and job stability are occupational characteristics, consequently they will be treated as independent variables. The operationalization of all twelve variables appears at the end of the methodological section. In addition, several other variables will be used in a brief descriptive analysis of the effects of being a merchant seaman.
CHAPTER IV
METHODOLOGY

Direct Experience

In Plato's metaphor of the shadows in the cave, he presented the idea of people in everyday life as being like shadows cast on the walls of a cave. We are able to see the shadows, but cannot directly observe the realities which cast the shadows. But these realities are what we wish to know.

He saw the "intellectual" as the exerciser of reason and able to reveal the truth of these realities. The cave man who experiences directly can see nothing according to the metaphor. Sociological methods are representative of a continuum with the intellectual with his arm chair sociology at one extreme and the cave man at the other. As such this research represents the continuum. The sociologist should not be removed from the subject matter of his discipline (Horowitz, 1965; Clinard, 1965; Blumer, 1969). If the ultimate goal of sociology is the understanding of behavior, then the more narrow the gap between the empirical social world and the sociologist, then the greater his understanding of it.

In order to increase their understanding of human behavior, sociologists must become more involved with the phenomena of the empirical social world (Filstead, 1970: 2;

**Knowing From the Inside and the Out**

This tradition of understanding or what is referred to as qualitative methodology takes a perspective that recognizes the importance of both an inner and outer perspective of human behavior (Filstead, 1970: 4). The outer perspective assumes that the study of man's behavior is adequate to produce sociological knowledge. Interviewing and life histories are qualitative methods which assume this outer perspective. The inner perspective assumes that understanding can only be obtained by actively participating in the life of the observed and gaining insight by means of this knowing from the inside (Bruyn, 1963).

Schutz (1976) describes this process of knowing from the inside.

The observer may apprehend in a unitary and integrated manner both the manifestations of the Other's conscious processes thus manifested. This is possible because he witnesses the Other's ongoing experiences in synchrony with his own interpretations of the Other's overt conduct in an objective context of meaning. The bodily presence of the Other offers... to the observer a maximum of vivid symptoms. The world which is within reach of the observed person. There is thus a certain chance that the experiences of the world within reach on the part of the observed person roughly coincides with the corresponding experiences of the observer (Schutz, 1976: 34).

Of course the observer cannot be certain this is a total picture of the situation. If he remains only an
observer he cannot verify his interpretation of the observed experiences. He needs to compare his understanding of the observed situation with the observed's own subjective interpretation. In short, he needs to actively participate with the other (Schutz, 1976: 34).

The inner perspective places emphasis on man's ability to know himself and hence to know and understand others... thereby emphasizing one of the basic underlying assumptions of human behavior: that man, being a symbol manipulator is only understandable through the perception and understanding of those symbols that are being manipulated (Filstead, 1970: 4).

This "knowing from the inside" is not a unique style of observing the individual but is similar to various other methods such as Maclver's "Dynamic Assessment" (1973: 291-300); W.I Thomas's "Definition of the Situation" (1951: 7); and Weber's "Verstehen" (1947: 87-91).

A dynamic assessment weighs alternatives not yet actualized, sets what would be the consequences if this course were taken over against what would be the consequences if that course were taken. This weight is determined by the value system of the individual, his active cultural complex, and his personality. On the other hand, there are certain means, obstacles or conditions which are relevant to this value quest. The situation he assesses is one that he has selectively defined in terms of his experience, his habit of response, his intellectual grasp, and his emotional needs.
The definition of the situation is the crucial link that connects experience and adjustive behavior to the situation.

An adjustive effort of any kind is preceded by a decision to act or not act along a given line, and the decision of the situation, that is to say, an interpretation, or point of view, and eventually a policy and a behavior pattern. In this way quick judgments and decisions are made at every point in everyday life (Thomas, 1937: 8).

Weber's Verstehen or his "sympathetic understanding" consists of placing oneself in the shoes of another in order to understand their feelings and motives.

All interpretation of meaning, like all scientific observation, strives for clarity and verifiable accuracy of insight and comprehension. The basis for certainty in understanding can be either rational... or it can be of an emotionally empathetic or artistically appreciative quality. In the sphere of action, things are rationally evident chiefly when we attain a completely clear intellectual grasp of the action elements in their intended context of meaning. Empathetic or appreciative accuracy is attained when, through sympathetic participation, we can adequately grasp the emotional context in which the action took place (Weber, 1947: 90-97).

The observer becomes "the Other" as he engages the situation. He understands because he is participating in the performance. A correct interpretation is arrived at by comparing a number of historical or contemporary cases to the motive being investigated. The greater the understanding of the observer the greater his flexibility in wearing
these sympathetic shoes (Forsyth, 1979: 114). This method of understanding enables the sociologist to perceive and interpret human behavior at a greater depth than the outer perspective allows (Filstead, 1970: 4). But even Schutz (1976: 34-35) does not stop here. The other is a fellow man who may be questioned. The observer through his overt questioning of the other's situation, gathers adequate clues to the question whether and how his course of action is fulfilling his subjective project.

The inner perspective then is crucial for validity; an outer perspective checks the reliability of this data. Generalizations can only be made with data that is both valid and reliable. This is what qualitative methodology does; enabling the researcher to take into account the inner as well as the outer perspective of the subject(s) under investigation (Becker, 1963; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Blumer, 1969).

Retaining both an inner and outer perspective is essentially what M.S. and C.G. Schwartz (1955) describe when they speak of retrospection in participant observation.

What happens is the time interval between the event and its final recording is of the utmost importance. In retrospective observation the investigator recreates, or attempts to recreate, the social field in his imagination, in all its dimensions, on a perceptual and feeling level. He takes the role of all the other people in the situation and tries to evoke in himself, the feelings and thoughts and actions they experienced at the time the event occurred... What occurs is a type of reworking of the presentation of the phenomenon as initially registered.
In this reworking the previous data may be maintained unaltered; they may be added to or changed; significant aspects of the event may appear which were previously omitted; and connections between the segments of the event and between this event and others may appear which were previously recognized (Schwartz and Schwartz, 1955: 345).

Qualitative methodology refers to those research strategies such as participant observation, interviewing, case studies, unobtrusive measures, total participation in the activity, etc, which allow the researcher to gain knowledge about the world being investigated. These methods do not produce equivalent kinds of data, but rather, produces different kinds of data designed to answer quite different kinds of questions about the same general phenomenon (Trow, 1957).

**Intimate and Reflective Participation**

This study of merchant seamen is organized around the method of reflective participation. The author was a merchant seaman for seven years; his father was a merchant seaman for thirty-three years. As an intimate participate observer of the life of a merchant seaman, both as a member of a seaman's family and as a member of the occupation, I was able to identify myself with the life of a seaman for an extended period. I was able to gain insight into the inner life which would have been almost impossible had I not been able to eliminate social and mental distances through intimate participation (Young, 1966: 164-166). These
methods of intimate participant observation and reflective participation are not uncommon (Laslett and Warren, 1975; Anderson, 1923; Moreby, 1975; Fricke, 1974).

Nels Anderson, through his study of The Hobo (1923), remains the most dedicated follower of the principles of intimate participation. Both he and his father were participants in the hobo life.

Intimate participant observation is what Blumer calls getting into the reality reconstruction business (1969). Understanding the process of social action consists of exploring the process by which actors adjust their action on the basis of their ongoing interpretations of the world. The study of social interaction for Blumer is made from the position of the actor.

Since action is forged by the actor out of what he perceives, interprets, and judges, one would have to see the operating situation as the actor sees it, perceive objects as the actor perceives them, ascertaining their meanings in terms of the meaning they have for the actor, and follow the actor's line of conduct as the actor organizes it -- in short one would have to take the roles of the actor and see his world from his standpoint (Blumer, 1969: 73-74).

Intimate participant observation involves the participation of the researcher in a group. He is a member of this group, not because he is a researcher but because he is a true member. If the researcher later reports on this membership he is doing so as an intimate participant observer. If the researcher returns to the group to do
research, equipped with his first hand knowledge, he extends this intimate participation into reflective participation.

This is the same methodological strategy used in Schutz's retrospective interpretation (1976). The observer, may remember from his past experience a course of action similar to the one observed and recall its motive. By matching a given course of action with a given pattern of motives which he, the observer, might have if only he were performing the action himself (Schutz, 1976: 35).

This identification of the observer's past experienced motive with the other's actual motives takes place in a retrospective interpretation of the observed action. It involves the same reflect and return methodology used in this study. The author, as researcher, reflects on his past experience and returns for "observation" in order to reinterpret.

Multiple Methodology

The author of this study returned to the occupation as a researcher using indepth interviews, topical life histories, structured questionnaires, and as an observer in seamen union halls in order to refresh, possibly correct and add to his experiences as a merchant seaman and as a merchant seaman's son.

Although the structured questionnaire may seem a strange bedfellow in such a qualitative methodology, it is the opinion of many sociologists that a problem should be
examined from as many methodological perspectives as possible (Denzin, 1978: 291; Salomone, 1961). All research methods have costs and benefits. Since they differ greatly in these costs and benefits, a researcher generally finds it best to use some combination or mixture of methods (Douglas, 1976: 30; Merton and Kendall, 1946).

Each method implies a different line of action toward reality and will reveal different aspects of it. Surveys dictate a stance toward the invariant and stable features of reality, while participant observation assumes a reality continually in change and flux (Denzin, 1978: 292).

The topical life history contains aspects of both offering a total picture of a particular aspect of one subject's life, but unless done in batches has little use as a method to be used alone. Reality is an object that moves and will not permit one interpretation to be stamped on it (Denzin, 1978: 293).

Different users of the same method viewing the same phenomenon see different things. One researcher using many methodological perspectives is more able to gain many different interpretations of the same phenomenon or a more valid picture. By combining methods, the researcher is able to partially overcome the deficiencies that flow from one method (Salomone, 1961; Becker and Greer, 1957; Edwards, 1957; Klockhohn 1940). This combination of dissimilar methods to measure the same unit is called "across-method triangulation" (Denzin, 1978).
When a hypothesis can survive the confrontation of a series of complementary methods of testing, it contains a degree of validity unattainable by one tested within the more constricted framework of a single method (Webb et al., 1966: 174).

The basis of this research represents the most extreme form of indepth involvement; natural everyday experience with no thought of using the experience for scientific purposes (Young, 1966: 164). This allows the researcher to feel as members do and grasp the sense of the setting; providing direct access to cultural information.

All other methods rely ultimately though in different ways and in varying degrees, upon his own direct experience or at least that of fellow researchers whom he knows intimately, trusts, and with whom he can communicate well. In general the less direct his own experience (or that of his fellow researchers) of the things he is reporting about, the less reliable his report must be considered to be (Douglas, 1976: 108-109).

Validity, Reliability and Truth

The validity and reliability of research data are reflective of the solving of several problems. First, the researcher must be able to gather and record information that has direct relevance for their topic. The researcher must maintain a very flexible set of methodological guidelines which will enable him to take advantage of all situations where he is most likely to find the types of informants he is most interested in understanding. This
study's use of many methodological perspectives allows such flexibility.

At times the structured questionnaire seemed appropriate. This was especially helpful when a large number of seamen became available for only a short period; for example, at a union meeting. Another example of its use was to reach seamen who were in other locations. This enabled the researcher to get the opinions of a large number of men that he could not have with these other research methods. Although producing larger numbers in less time, it does so at the sacrifice of indepth knowledge. Although the questionnaire is constructed from both research and experience, it is still an inflexible instrument that lacks the depth of the interview. An interview guide was used for indepth interviews (Lofland, 1971: 75-92). The questionnaire was also used in conjunction with this guide. Not all seamen were willing to sit through an interview, but a lot were willing to talk for a few minutes and then take a questionnaire home.

The research included active and retired seamen, as well as relatives of both current and retired seamen. Union officials were also questioned. I took whatever I could get, when I could get it, for as long as I could. How many seamen one can get to sit down and talk for a couple of hours or more is impossible to determine. Seamen do not come home at night from work; they may be unemployed and
available one hour and on their way to a ship the next. Consequently, I maintained my options in all situations.

The second problem affecting the validity and reliability of research is sampling. Researchers must have confidence that their findings, whether gained through interviewing, a questionnaire or participant observation, are not typical only of those they have studied but could be generalized to others of the same group (Denzin, 1978: 77).

In this study, an availability sample was used in each union hall. Union officials were a great deal of help in both the distribution of questionnaires and in helping arrange interviews. In all, approximately 70 seamen were interviewed and 460 questionnaires were distributed among members of the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association (MEBA); the Master, Mates and Pilots (MMP); the National Maritime Union (NMU); and the Seafarers International Union (SIU). These are the four major seamen's unions.

The questionnaires were distributed in a number of cities. Union officials in New Orleans got in touch with union officials in other cities; if they were willing to distribute the questionnaires, an agreed upon number was sent to them. Each questionnaire was in a stamped envelope addressed to the researcher. The questionnaires were distributed in union halls in the cities listed in Table 1.
Table 1. Questionnaire Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number Distributed</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NMU, MEBA, and MMP distributed questionnaires at their respective union schools, located in New York for the NMU and in Baltimore for the two officer's unions. Each of these unions has only one school, consequently there are seamen there from all over the United States. This brought this research much closer to having a representative sample. Of the 202 questionnaires distributed in New Orleans, 74 were filled out and given back to the researcher in the union hall. Of the 460 questionnaires distributed, 251 were returned before the cutoff date of October 1, 1982.

All interviews were conducted in New Orleans in either the NMU, MEBA or MMP union halls. Interviews lasted from thirty minutes to eight hours. Nothing was recorded during the interviews. A recap was made after each interview.
The 251 respondents to the questionnaires represent every major port in the United States. Those ports not represented in the mail out were represented because of the union school's having seamen from all over the United States. The return rate for all the questionnaires was .55. This good rate of return was due to the extraordinary support that I received from the unions. In most cases the questionnaires were given out at monthly union meetings. Members were encouraged to fill them out by the union representatives. One union official introduced me at a meeting, encouraged the members to fill the questionnaires out and then had a break in the meeting for members to complete the questionnaires. I received 52 completed questionnaires after the meeting. My introduction to the members by union officials in the union halls was the chief reason I was able to gain the confidence of the seamen. This enabled me to conduct interviews and distribute questionnaires on future occasions.

Due to the extensive geographical area that this research was able to cover and because it included the four major maritime unions, which represent both crew (NMU and SIU) and officers (MEBA and MMP), it is felt that the sample gotten ensures a representative sample from which to draw generalizations.

Third, researchers must have confidence in their findings. They should accurately, reliably and validly
reflect the behaviors and responses that are observed and gathered. This third problem reflects the sociologist's concern for measurement (Denzin, 1978: 77). This concern for measurement is the very stimulus that brought on the use of a multimethodological response to this research.

The multidimensional design used in this research closely follows that suggested by Douglas (1976: 32).

In most settings we would like to begin as members and then move toward overt definitions of ourselves as researchers, then possibly do indepth interviews, ... then any questionnaires to get at specific details and possibly more representative findings (that is, information on a wider group than we are able to do with indepth field research).

There is an obvious basis in all our experience for trusting direct experience over all other forms of knowledge. If the concern is the experience of people, the way they feel, think and act, the most truthful reliable and complete way of getting that information is to share their experience. All other methods are indirect and are therefore compromises to be used only in supportive roles or because of practical constraints (Douglas, 1976: 111-112).

As such, the research methodology that guides this study represents the ideal and in effect, there is no compromise.

A concern in sociology is the degree to which the controls in social research affect or determine the social phenomenon we observe; this is the uncertainty principle. Because human action is determined by the meanings of the
immediate situation to the participants and because each is concerned with the controlling (presentation) of these meanings to others; it is inevitable that any attempt by outsiders to observe them will so change the meaning of the situation -- that anything they do becomes presentational (Goffman, 1973: 15, 1963: 28, 1971: 302; Douglas, 1976: 19).

This, of course, effects the outsider's image. But not all agree with it as Blumer (1969) considers human beings as straight forward, honest and cooperative participants. Blumer stands in stark contrast to Goffman's impression management. Blumer sees a society of self assured individuals. Perhaps this is why he wants no method. Despite Blumer, most researchers seem concerned about the effect of controls on interaction. These controls, pose a grave danger for sociology because if we do not know what their effects are and thus do not know how to control for the effects of controls themselves, then we run the grave danger that as controls increase they unknowingly become more important in determining what we observe (Douglas, 1976: 19).

The use of multiple methods in this research controls for such superficial analysis.

**Questionnaire Design**

The questionnaire was constructed from the researcher's experience as a seaman and as a seaman's son. In addition, the input of several members of his family who were seamen
or their immediate family was sought. The only measurements not directly related to experience are the alienation scale (Robinson and Shaver, 1970; Streuning and Richardson, 1965) and the self esteem scale (Rosenberg, 1965).

Whereas the alienation (via rejection) scale was used to measure marginality, the self esteem scale was used to measure the seaman's self concept. The instrument was pre-tested on sixteen seamen; revised and pre-tested again on seven seamen to reach its final form. The NMU and MEBA asked for certain questions to be added and they were.

Statistical Analysis

The twelve prediction statements in Chapter III will be analyzed in three ways. First contingency table analysis will be done showing each variable's relationship to marginality using two-way crosstables. Second, multiple regression analysis will be used to show the combined and controlled effect of all the variables on marginality. Lastly, because there is the possibility of intervening influences, a path model will be constructed.

Operationalization of Variables

The variables used in the analysis are taken from the questionnaire (Appendix A). The operationalization of the variables are as follows:

1. Marginality: questions 105 through 120.

The scores of each respondent on each question were added to create a marginality index (See Appendix C for item
analysis). These total scores range from 16 to 96. For the purpose of contingency analysis, a four point scale was then created from the six point scale that appears on the questionnaire. The basis of the categories on the four point scale was that an average score of four or above on the sixteen questions was considered marginal. Therefore, total scores of 64 through 96 designate the respondent as marginal. Conversely an average score of three or less on the 16 questions was considered not marginal. Consequently total scores ranging from 16 through 48 designate the respondent as not marginal. Two other categories were created for those respondents whose average score was below four, but above three. Those respondents whose total score ranged from 57 to 63 were labeled somewhat marginal. Those respondents whose total score ranged from 49 to 56 were labeled as somewhat not marginal. For the purposes of regression analysis, the total score of each respondent will be used.

1. Not marginal: scores from 16 to 47.
2. Somewhat not marginal: scores from 48 to 56.
3. Somewhat marginal: scores from 57 to 63.
4. Marginal: scores from 64 to 96.

2. Number of years going to sea: question 2.

The variable was collapsed into five categories for the purposes of contingency analysis. For regression analysis,
the number of years at sea for each respondent was used.

(1) Zero to five years going to sea.
(2) Six to ten years going to sea.
(3) Eleven to twenty years going to sea.
(4) Twenty-one to thirty years going to sea.
(5) Thirty-one or more years going to sea.

3. Time spent at sea per year: question 4.
This variable was collapsed into three categories for the purposes of contingency analysis. For regression analysis the number of months per year spent at sea for each respondent was used.

(1) Low: five months or less of sea time per year.
(2) Medium: six or seven months of sea time per year.
(3) High: eight months or more of sea time per year.

4. Length of trips at sea: question 42.
This variable was coded in weeks. It was collapsed into three categories for the purposes of contingency analysis. For regression analysis the number of weeks of trips to sea of each respondent was used.

(1) Low: zero to four weeks per trip.
(2) Medium: five to nine weeks per trip.
(3) High: ten to thirty weeks per trip.

5. Status of the job on ship: question 15.
This variable was collapsed into two categories for the purposes of both contingency and regression analysis.

(0) Crew
(1) Officers: mates, engineers and radio operators.

This variable was collapsed into two categories for both contingency and regression analysis.

(0) Not permanent: those checking relief.
(1) Permanent: those checking either permanent or stand-by.

7. Community size: question 121.
Town size was collapsed into four categories for both contingency and regression analysis.

(1) Small: those checking either rural or 2,500.
(2) Medium: those checking either 2,500 - 10,000 or 10,000 - 25,000.
(3) Large: those checking either 25,000 - 50,000 or 100,000.
(4) Metro: those checking over 100,000.

8. Living in the community in which you were raised: question 81.
This variable was collapsed into two categories for both contingency and regression analysis.

(0) Not same as now: those who are not living in the same place they spent most of their childhood.
(1) Same as now: those who are living in the same place they spent most of their childhood.
9. Education: question 79.

This variable was collapsed into four categories for the purpose of contingency analysis. For regression analysis the years of education for each respondent was used.

(1) Grade: 11 or less years of education.
(2) High school: 12 years of education.
(3) Some college: 13 to 15 years of education.
(4) College: 16 or more years of education.

10. Organizational membership: question 33.

There are two categories for the variable. It will retain this form for the purposes of both contingency and regression analysis.

(0) No: if the respondent did not belong to any organizations.
(1) Yes: if the respondent belonged to at least one organization.


This variable was collapsed into two categories for both contingency and regression analysis.

(0) Never - seldom: those that checked they attended religious services at home either never or seldom.
(1) Often: those that checked they attended religious services at home often.

This variable was collapsed into two categories for both contingency and regression analysis.

(0) Not married: those indicating they were presently not married (single, living with someone, or other).

(1) Married: those respondents indicating they were presently married.


This variable was collapsed into two categories for the purposes of both contingency and regression analysis.

(0) None: those indicating they had no children.

(1) Children: those indicating they had at least one child.

Although quantitative analysis assumes a large part of this research, the direct indepth experience of the researcher is the crucial beginning and foundation of this research. For some researchers and at some times it is impossible. They will use other methods. At times it does not seem necessary because the general cultural experience and understanding of the researchers makes it superfluous. But at all times it remains an essential foundation and without it this research data would be discounted accordingly (Douglas, 1976: 129).
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS

Introduction

There were 12 prediction statements generated in Chapter III. These were constructed from a review of the literature, depth interviews, and the personal experience of the researcher. As stated in Chapter IV, these 12 prediction statements will be analyzed in three ways: contingency tables, multiple regression and a path model. In all three levels of analysis marginality is measured by an alienation scale, and as such the terms marginality and alienation are used interchangeably.

Introduction to Contingency Findings

The relationship between the variables in each of the twelve prediction statements using two-way contingency table analysis are displayed in Tables 2 through 13. It is realized that there is some "power" lost in collapsing much of the data to make it available for contingency analysis, but there are also a number of advantages of these tables. Tables allow percentages and distributions to be seen. Tables also do not violate any level assumptions. Lastly, these two-way crosstables enables one to view the relationships in the prediction statements, to see if indeed, they are correct, at least, without controlling for the disturbance of the others.
Contingency Table Analysis

A positive relationship between marginality and years a seaman is shown in Table 2 (Gamma=.29). There are generally higher marginality scores for those with more years a seaman. Those with 1-5 years had 17.4% marginal; 6-10 had 30.8% marginal; 11-20 had 42.2% marginal; 21-30 had 22.9% marginal; and those with 31-50 years a seaman had 60.5% marginal. An explanation for the drop in marginality scores for those in the 21-30 category may be due to the fact that seamen can retire after 20 years, with increases for each year after this. Consequently, the seaman with 20 to 30 years knows he can quit and is still young enough to start a new career. It is not unusual to find retired seamen in their late 30's. Once the seaman goes beyond 30 years, he is approaching an age at which he cannot start a meaningful second career ashore.

A relatively high positive relationship between marginality and months spent per year at sea is shown in Table 3 (Gamma=.54). Of those who spent a low number of months a year at sea, 17.4% were marginal; the medium category had 36.6% marginal and of those seamen who spent a high number of months per year at sea, 70.5% express marginality.

A positive relationship between marginality and length of trips at sea is exhibited in Table 4 (Gamma=.21). There is an increase in percentage marginal as the length of trip
Table 2. Marginality by Years a Seaman (N=251)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45.7)*</td>
<td>(16.7)</td>
<td>(31.3)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(28.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginal</td>
<td>(28.3)</td>
<td>(26.7)</td>
<td>(14.1)</td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
<td>(13.2)</td>
<td>(19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.7)</td>
<td>(26.7)</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>(8.6)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17.4)</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td>(42.2)</td>
<td>(22.9)</td>
<td>(60.5)</td>
<td>(39.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses
Gamma = .29
Chi Square = 42.43
Significant at .001 level
Table 3. Marginality by Time Spent at Sea Per Year (N=251)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>26 (56.5)*</td>
<td>42 (26.1)</td>
<td>4 (9.1)</td>
<td>72 (28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not marginal</td>
<td>8 (17.4)</td>
<td>37 (23.0)</td>
<td>5 (11.4)</td>
<td>50 (19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>4 (8.7)</td>
<td>23 (14.3)</td>
<td>4 (9.1)</td>
<td>32 (12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>8 (17.4)</td>
<td>59 (36.6)</td>
<td>31 (70.5)</td>
<td>98 (39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>46 (100.0)</td>
<td>161 (100.0)</td>
<td>44 (100.0)</td>
<td>251 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses
Gamma = .54
Chi Square = 39.46
Significant at .001 level
Table 4. Marginality by Length of Trips at Sea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(52.4)*</td>
<td>(29.9)</td>
<td>(24.8)</td>
<td>(28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not marginal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
<td>(20.8)</td>
<td>(18.3)</td>
<td>(19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(7.8)</td>
<td>(15.0)</td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(41.6)</td>
<td>(41.8)</td>
<td>(39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses
Gamma = 0.21
Chi Square = 13.40
Significant at 0.05 level
increases. Those in the low range had 9.5% marginal. In
the medium range 41.6% were marginal and of those in the
highest range, 41.8% were alienated.

A relatively high negative correlation between job
status aboard ship and marginality is displayed in Table 5
(Gamma=-.59). The higher the status, the lower the
marginality score. Of those in the crew 62.8% were
marginal, while only 26.7% of the officers were marginal.

An extremely low negative relationship between
marginality and sailing on a single ship is displayed in
Table 6 (Gamma=-.03). This low relationship may be due to
the fact that although a seaman may have had permanent jobs
most of his career, the majority of those on these ships may
not have been permanent. In effect, he is then in the same
position as the seaman making relief trips, who develops
fewer work ties. Since there is, in effect, no relation­
ship, the prediction that the greater the degree of sailing
on a single ship the less will be the degree of marginality,
has not been supported.

A moderate positive relationship between community size
and marginality is shown in Table 7 (Gamma=.25). As
community size increases, so does the percentage of those
marginal. Of those from small communities, 23.9% were
marginal; medium, 31.4%; large, 38.2%; and metro areas had
46.3% that were marginal. This, of course, is not a
Table 5. Marginality by Job Status Aboard Ship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Status</th>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>Crew</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.6)*</td>
<td>(37.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not marginal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(24.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.1)</td>
<td>(10.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(62.8)</td>
<td>(26.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses

Gamma = -.59
Chi Square = 38.85
Significant at .001 level
Table 6. Marginality by Sailing on a Single Ship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>Not Permanent</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>42 (27.1)</td>
<td>30 (31.3)</td>
<td>72 (28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not marginal</td>
<td>31 (20.0)</td>
<td>19 (19.8)</td>
<td>50 (19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>23 (14.8)</td>
<td>8 (8.3)</td>
<td>31 (12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>59 (38.1)</td>
<td>39 (40.6)</td>
<td>98 (39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>155 (100.0)</td>
<td>96 (100.0)</td>
<td>251 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses
Gamma = -.03
Chi Square = 2.49
Not significant
Table 7. Marginality by Community Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37.0)*</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(23.5)</td>
<td>(24.3)</td>
<td>(28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not marginal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(34.8)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(11.8)</td>
<td>(16.9)</td>
<td>(19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(6.6)</td>
<td>(26.5)</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23.9)</td>
<td>(31.4)</td>
<td>(38.2)</td>
<td>(46.3)</td>
<td>(39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses
Gamma = 0.25
Chi Square = 24.10
Significant at .01 level
consequence of the occupation itself, but shows the possibility of an important mitigating characteristic in the lifestyle of some seamen, specifically the higher integration of smaller communities.

A relatively low negative relationship between marginality and not living in the same community in which you were raised is exhibited in Table 8 (Gamma=-.16). Of those living in the same community in which they were raised, 35.4% were marginal, while those living somewhere else had 41.7% marginal.

A relatively high negative relationship between marginality and years of education is shown in Table 9 (Gamma=-.47). There is a decrease in the percentage marginal as education increases. Of those with a grade school education, 62.7% were marginal; high school, 50.0%; some college, 24.6%; and of those with a college education, only 7.8% were marginal. The statistics are supportive of one of the main functions of formal education that is political and social integration into mainstream culture.

A relatively high negative relationship between marginality and organizational membership is displayed in Table 10 (Gamma=-.40). Of those who belong to organizations, 18.5% were marginal; while of those who do not, 46.2% were marginal. Again, as with type of community of residence, we see the possibility of a factor which may suppress the influence of the occupation on marginality.
Table 8. Marginality by Living in the Same Community in Which You Were Raised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>Not Same</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.5)*</td>
<td>(35.4)</td>
<td>(28.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not marginal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21.2)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.6)</td>
<td>(11.1)</td>
<td>(12.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(41.7)</td>
<td>(35.4)</td>
<td>(39.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses

Gamma = -0.16
Chi Square = 3.44
Not significant
Table 9. Marginality by Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.4)*</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
<td>(40.4)</td>
<td>(45.1)</td>
<td>(28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not marginal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.9)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(24.6)</td>
<td>(31.4)</td>
<td>(19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14.9)</td>
<td>(9.2)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(15.7)</td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(62.7)</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>(24.6)</td>
<td>(7.8)</td>
<td>(39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses
Gamma = -.47
Chi Square = 51.67
Significant at .001 level
Table 10. Marginality by Organizational Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.2)*</td>
<td>(41.5)</td>
<td>(28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not marginal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.3)</td>
<td>(24.6)</td>
<td>(19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.3)</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(46.2)</td>
<td>(18.5)</td>
<td>(39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses

Gamma = -.40
Chi Square = 16.20
Significant at .001 level
A relatively moderate negative relationship between marginality and religious participation is exhibited in Table 11 (Gamma = -.24). Of those who never or seldom attend religious services at home, 43.7% were marginal; while of those who attend often, 26.5% were marginal.

A low negative relationship between marginality and marriage is shown in Table 12 (Gamma = -.14). Of those not married, 40.7% were marginal; while of those married, 37.6% were marginal. Without controls, this is in the expected direction, though marriage seems not to be an important factor in the negation of marginality.

Lastly, a low positive relationship between having children and marginality is shown in Table 13 (Gamma = .12). The prediction that having children will reduce the level of marginality has not been supported. Perhaps, the separation from one's children imposed by the occupation serves to increase the seaman's sense of isolation and hence, marginality.

Summary of Tables

Ten of the 12 prediction statements have been supported using contingency analysis. Prediction statement number five, "the greater the degree of sailing on a single ship, the less will be the degree of marginality," has thus far not been supported. There is almost no relationship. Prediction statement number 12, "having children will reduce
### Table 11. Marginality by Religious Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>Never-Seldom</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>48 (26.2)*</td>
<td>24 (35.3)</td>
<td>72 (28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not marginal</td>
<td>34 (18.6)</td>
<td>16 (23.5)</td>
<td>50 (19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>21 (11.5)</td>
<td>10 (14.7)</td>
<td>31 (12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>80 (43.7)</td>
<td>18 (26.5)</td>
<td>98 (39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>183 (100.0)</td>
<td>68 (100.0)</td>
<td>251 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses

Gamma = -.24
Chi Square = 6.23
Not significant
Table 12. Marginality by Marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>Not Married</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>28 (23.7)*</td>
<td>44 (33.1)</td>
<td>72 (28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not marginal</td>
<td>22 (18.6)</td>
<td>28 (21.1)</td>
<td>50 (19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>20 (16.9)</td>
<td>11 (8.3)</td>
<td>31 (12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>48 (40.7)</td>
<td>50 (37.6)</td>
<td>98 (39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>118 (100.0)</td>
<td>133 (100.0)</td>
<td>251 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses

Gamma = -.14
Chi Square = 6.05
Not significant
Table 13. Marginality by Having Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginality</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not marginal</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31.0)*</td>
<td>(26.8)</td>
<td>(28.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not marginal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.4)</td>
<td>(19.6)</td>
<td>(19.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat marginal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.0)</td>
<td>(10.1)</td>
<td>(12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33.6)</td>
<td>(43.5)</td>
<td>(39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of column total in parentheses
Gamma = .12
Chi Square = 3.15
Not significant
the level of marginality," has not been supported. There were higher levels of marginality for those with children.

Months spent at sea per year had a strong relationship to marginality (Gamma=.54). Months at sea is the most valid indication of time spent within the occupation, since this represents time spent on a ship and conversely time spent away from shore side lifestyles. It also means time exposed to the shipboard community. Years at sea, (Gamma=.29) and length of trips to sea (Gamma=.21), are also good but lesser indicators of seetime. A seaman could go to sea for several years, but for only a few months each year. Likewise, a seaman could make only one or two long trips a year.

Another occupational variable, status of the job on ship had the strongest relationship of all variables (Gamma=-.59). Because the seaman's occupation takes up so much of his time, his occupation aboard ship is a master status (Bankston et al, 1981). In addition, the paramilitary structure of the ship, which isolates the officer from the crew and the preferred treatment given to officers elevates his status to a position of prestige aboard ship. The high negative relationship between status aboard ship and marginality would seem to indicate that this prestige is carried ashore.

The strongest background variable was education (Gamma=-.47). This was expected because education is a mechanism for integrating people into the society of which
they are members, hence an increase in education should produce a decrease in marginality. Size of community, living in the same community in which you were raised, and marital status are other background variables whose relationships to marginality supported the predictions.

Organizational membership and religious participation are both possible intervening variables. Both the lack of organizational membership and religious participation can be seen to be the result of time spent at sea, since the seaman has less time to participate. The lack of membership is shown to have a relationship to marginality.

**Introduction to Multiple Regression Analysis**

The results of multiple regression analysis are displayed in Tables 14 through 16. These results will be compared with those obtained from contingency analysis. Those variables that affect marginality in the multiple regression analysis will be included in path analysis.

Contingency analysis required that some data be collapsed. For the purposes of multiple regression, collapsed data will no longer be used. Collapsing data results in a loss of information and should be avoided when possible. The focus of the multiple regression analysis is the evaluation and measurement of the overall dependence of marginality on the other variables. Those variables that do not add to the explanation of marginality will be deleted for the purposes of path analysis. The remaining variables
Table 14. Means and Standard Deviations (N=250)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marginality</td>
<td>59.69</td>
<td>17.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community as raised</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community size</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have children</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious participation</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational membership</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months at sea</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipboard status</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of trips</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years a seaman</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>13.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing on a single ship</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are 251 cases in the sample, but because of 1 missing case for "Same community as raised," there are 250 valid cases when this variable is included.
Table 15. Zero-Order Correlations Among All Variables (N=250)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(X₁)</th>
<th>(X₂)</th>
<th>(X₃)</th>
<th>(X₄)</th>
<th>(X₅)</th>
<th>(X₆)</th>
<th>(X₇)</th>
<th>(X₈)</th>
<th>(X₉)</th>
<th>(X₁₀)</th>
<th>(X₁₁)</th>
<th>(X₁₂)</th>
<th>(X₁₃)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marginality (X₁)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community as raised (X₂)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community size (X₃)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have children (X₄)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (X₅)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious participation (X₆)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational membership (X₇)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (X₈)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months at sea (X₉)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipboard status (X₁₀)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of trips (X₁₁)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years a seaman (X₁₂)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing on a single ship (X₁₃)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression, Marginality Dependent (N=250)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>9.586*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipboard status</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>10.479*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational membership</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>17.351*</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months at sea</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>12.625*</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>7.098*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community size</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.163*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of trips</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>2.915*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious participation</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.510*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at sea</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.857*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same community as raised</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing on a single ship</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have children</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level
will be used in path analysis, which is an application of the multiple regression technique, in order to determine the magnitude of direct and indirect causal influence that each variable has on other variables that follow it in the presumed causal order.

A good deal of variance in the dependent variable, as well as the other variables, is shown in Table 14. Zero-order relationships in the same direction and reflecting the same patterns as in the contingency tables can be seen in Table 15. There is a relatively low intercorrelation between the independent variables, although there are some relatively moderate relationships. The correlation between having children and education \((r=-.32)\) is expected; higher educated people tend to have fewer children. The relationship between years a seaman and having children \((r=.37)\) is a function of age. The relationship between years a seaman and education \((r=-.51)\) is also a function of age. Younger people, generally, are more educated and younger seamen have less years at sea. The correlation between education and months at sea \((r=-.40)\) is a function of both age and union seniority. The more educated, younger person has less seniority; consequently the more educated spend less time at sea because they cannot get a job as easily. This is due to the competitive bidding for jobs based on seniority. The correlation between shipboard status and education \((r=.38)\) is as expected. Years at sea and months at sea \((r=.39)\)
should be related; again, because of the seniority system. Lastly, the relationship between being married and having children (r=.51) is still with us.

The degree of linear dependence of marginality on the 12 independent variables is shown in Table 16. In addition, scatterplots were examined in order to visually inspect patterns. Of the 12 prediction statements, 9 are supported by the data in Table 16. Two of these variables, "sailing on a single ship," and "having children," were not supported by the other analyses either. In addition, living in the same community in which you were raised, does not add to the explanation of marginality in seamen. The nine remaining variables were all significant at the .01 level. Thus, nine of the original 12 variables contained in the 12 prediction statements have been shown to be related to marginality in seamen. These nine variables will be used to construct a causal model of marginality in seamen.

Path Analysis: Toward a Model of Occupational Marginality in Seamen

The path diagram in Figure 1 explains 42% of the variation in marginality. It also shows that the background characteristics of the respondents were just as important as the occupational characteristics in the explanation of marginality. The model shows the beta values for each of the nine independent variables relative effect on the dependent variable, marginality.
Figure 1. Path Diagram of Marginality in Seamen
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The effect of seven independent variables on organizational membership and then on religious participation are shown on direct lines to each of these intervening variables.

The strongest influences on organizational membership are: years at sea (.19); education (.16); and shipboard status (.14). The other four variables had absolute beta values below ±.10. The strongest influences on the second intervening variable, religious participation, are: marital status (.16); education (.10); and shipboard status (-.10). The four other variables had beta values below ±.10. Community size has no influence on either intervening variable.

Education, as expected, has the strongest influence among the background variables (-.21). Marital status (-.15) and community size (.11) both have moderate influences on marginality. Months at sea had the strongest influence on marginality among the occupational variables (.19). Years at sea (.11) and length of trips (.09) had moderate influences on marginality.

Shipboard status may be considered a background, as well as an occupational variable. This is due to the unique structure of the industry. Some seamen come into the industry as graduates of maritime academies or training schools; this would seem to reflect a background variable. Other seamen have worked their way up to these higher status positions, making it an occupational variable. But because
these training schools and academies have, as their sole function, the training of maritime officers, they are seen as a part of the professionalization of the seaman; consequently shipboard status is treated as an occupational characteristic. Shipboard status has a relatively strong influence on marginality (-.21). Subordinate status apparently amplifies the isolating effect.

Organizational membership has a relatively strong influence on marginality (-.21). Religious participation has a very moderate influence (-.08). As supported by the other methods of analysis, belonging to organizations, in particular, reduces marginality in seamen.

The results of these findings indicate that the longer the time the seaman spends at sea, the more marginal he becomes. His marginality is seen as a result of his lack of participation in shore side society; conversely, this means an increased amount of time spent within the marginal culture of the ship. The level of the seaman's marginality is mediated by certain background and extra-occupational variables, as the sociologist would expect.

The question now is how does marginality, as an independent variable, effect world view and lifestyle. In other words, what are the consequences of marginality. The following chapter will attempt to identify and describe these influences.
CHAPTER VI

A DESCRIPTIVE ELABORATION OF THE EFFECTS OF BEING A SEAMAN

Introduction

Further elaboration of the problem is here presented through description and correlation analysis of marginality (as measured by alienation) with other dimensions of the seaman's social life. In a sense, this involves the revelation of parallel features of marginality in the lifestyle of seamen and strictly speaking cannot be viewed as determined by that marginality. In many cases it is like the chicken and the egg analogy; which one came first cannot always be determined. It is assumed the association between the variables included in this chapter are consequences of seafaring as an occupation. As will be seen, the pervasive correlations between social integration measurements and marginality give validity to this research's concept of marginality in seamen.

This chapter will use 23 variables which are taken from questions on the questionnaire. The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient will be used for correlation analysis. Spearman's \( r_s \) requires that the variables be at least ordinal level. These data satisfy that requirement. The descriptive analysis will be done with the data gathered in the interviews, as well as the personal experience of the researcher. Each of the 23 variables will be analyzed under one of the following four categories: effects on family
life; attitudes toward (hostility) seafire and seaman; general social integration; and economic integration. These questions were chosen because they were seen to be valid indicators of the four categories above. The correlations of all these variables with marginality were found to be significant, at least, at the .01 level. None of the 23 variables selected has more than two missing cases.

**Effects on Family Life**

There were five variables used as measures of the effects on family life.

(1) How often does the seaman see relatives? (Question 14)

(2) Does he see women in other ports? (Question 41)

(3) How well does he know his wife or girlfriend's friends? (Question 68)

Variables four and five are measured by the degree to which he agrees or disagrees with the respective statement.

(4) Seamen do not have as close a relationship with their family as men who work on the beach. (Question 90)

(5) I will be glad when I am no longer going to sea so I can spend more time with my family. (Question 98)

Seamen, due to the nature of their occupation, do not see relatives as often as someone who works on the beach. The seaman, because of his long absences may lose these kinship bonds, thus reinforcing his marginal status. But
some seamen reported their relatives did not want to see them because they were seamen. The idea one comes away from the interviews with is that those seamen who say they do not see relatives do not because they do not fit in well with them. The longer they stay at sea, the longer they are exposed to the seafaring culture; consequently the greater the cultural differences between them and their relatives. When relatives came over to our house my father would leave. If our relatives knew he was home they would not come. As one seaman put it, "my family does not speak to seamen, I have not seen any of them in 20 years."

There was a moderate relationship between marginality and not seeing relatives ($r_s = .21$). This indicates that those who were marginal were less likely to see relatives. Of the respondents, 15.2% reported they never saw relatives; 41.7% seldom saw relatives and 43.4% said they saw relatives often.

Whether or not the seaman sees women in other ports can be considered a consequence of his marginality. The time spent at sea, for the single seaman, removes him from the opportunity for establishing and learning to maintain relationships. The more he sees prostitutes, the less he is able to establish and maintain normal relationships. Those married men who see prostitutes are indeed sharing a very personal part of their life with a "stranger," rather than a spouse. Some married seamen, on steady runs, have women
that they "keep." They were in fact maintaining two households.

There are many seamen who do not use prostitutes; 31.5% of this sample. There was a moderate correlation between marginality and seeing women in other ports ($r_s = .26$). It is the personal experience of the researcher that very few seamen do not use prostitutes. It is so widely accepted in the seamen lifestyle, and indeed, they are very "cheap."

When these questionnaires were given out at a union meeting in New Orleans, the agent told the members to direct their attention to question number 41.

...This survey will not have your name on it anywhere. So you do not have to lie. So all of you can check off yes to this question because we know we all do.

The response from the members was loud laughter.

Some of the younger seamen, and especially those officers who were graduates of maritime academies, said they did not see women in other ports. They saw this as somehow destroying the relationship they have with a steady girl or spouse. Most of these younger men interviewed, who had a steady girl friend in home port, said they did not intend to ship out very long. Each had a goal to accomplish and then were going to quit and get married. They saw the seamen lifestyle as being incompatible with family life. Of course there was the mate, about 55 years old, who had married a woman 23 years old. He did not see other women because, "my wife has the best pussy in Alabama, I couldn't get nothing
like that in no whore house." He does not appear to be a true exception.

How well a seaman knows his wife's or girlfriend's friends indicates how well he is integrated into their life. There was a negative relationship between marginality and knowing your wife or girlfriend's friends ($r_s = -0.38$). Of the respondents, 20.9% said they did not know them at all; 9.2% only knew their names; 39.8% only knew them a little and 30.1% knew them very well. Many of the seamen interviewed said their wife's friends did not come around when they were home. The friend would call; the wife would tell them he was in.

The wife of the seaman lives in two worlds - one with her husband and the other without him. She tends to not mix them because she knows from experience they are not compatible. Wives, of seamen interviewed, say that they become torn between friends and husband. My own mother was glad to see my father, but after a few days she was glad to see him go. While interviewing my father and uncle during this research, they brought up the fact that they felt unwelcomed in their own home and, at times, wanted to go back to sea.

The next variable is very much related to the one just discussed. A total of 64.9% of the respondents agreed in some degree with the statement, "Seamen do not have as close a relationship with their family as men who have a shore
side job." This statement is supported by the fact that nearly one-third of the seamen with children said they knew their children either a little or not much. Many children of seamen never really know their fathers. It was not until my father was 62 years old and retired seven years that we had a meaningful conversation. In many ways, he is still a stranger to me.

When seamen come home things change; friends and relatives do not come over and the family puts on a facade of everything being alright. No one brings him their problems, they do not want to bother their father who is only home a few months of the year. These findings reveal that the seaman perceives this lack of closeness.

During the interviews, I met a former shipmate who had become a longshoreman. His father had also been a seaman. He quit because he wanted to spend more time with his child.

...I want to do things my father never did, take him fishing, watch him play sports, maybe I'll even join a parent's club at school. I just don't want my kid growing up without a father.

Further support came from the high correlation between marginality and those who agreed with question number 90 ($r_s = .58$).

The last variable discussed in this section is the statement, "I will be glad when I am no longer going to sea so I can spend more time with my family." Of the
respondents, 68.5% agreed in some degree with this statement. There is a moderate correlation between marginality and those who agreed with this statement ($r_s = .22$). This relationship is in the expected direction. Many younger seamen stated this quite plainly in the interviews. They did not want to waste their lives on the water. Others said they saw the difficulty in maintaining both a stable family life and a life at sea. But each also was trying to seek a compromise between making money and spending enough time with their family.

There were older seamen who, although they knew they did not have a close relationship with their family, still would not be glad when they were no longer going to sea. They know that when they quit, they will not fit in. The differences in the degree of correlation between marginality and these latter two statements bring out this dilemma that the seaman faces. This is why so many old timers who have long since retired constantly return to the union hall.

Recently a maritime union moved their hall from downtown to an area on the outskirts of the city. Most of the complaints about the move came from retired seamen who claimed it was too far to come by bus. These retired men are coming to a hiring hall. Here they are not strangers or outsiders. Here they are amongst their fellow seamen, whose lifestyles and world views are more likely to be similar to theirs.
Seamen, due to their marginality, do not have a close relationship with their family and relatives. His marginality causes him to see prostitutes in other ports and retreat to the comfort of the union hall in home port. Those who are not marginal (as measured by alienation) are more likely to have close relationships with their families and relatives. Consequently, these same men are less likely to see women in other ports and less likely to spend their home port time in the union hall.

Attitudes Toward (Hostility) Sealife and Seamen

There were nine measures used as indicators of attitudes toward sealife and seamen.

1. Do you want to change to a shore side occupation? (Question 18)
2. Do you want to change your occupation, if you could make the same money on the beach? (Question 19)
3. Would you want your son to become a seaman? (Question 21)
4. Would you be upset if your daughter married a seaman? (Question 25)
5. Is your wife or girlfriend friends with the wives or girlfriends of other seamen? (Question 32)
6. Would you mind if your wife were friends with another seaman? (Question 66)
7. The degree to which he agrees or disagrees with the statement, "other seamen make good friends." (Question 92)
(8) If you had it to do all over again would you become a merchant seaman? (Question 69)

(9) The degree to which he agrees or disagrees with the statement, "going to sea is like going to jail." (Question 87)

There was a low relationship between marginality and wanting to change to a shore side job ($r_s = .14$). One-third of the respondents indicated that they wanted to work on the beach. But when asked if they wanted to change if the job paid as much as they were making as seamen, $59.0\%$ answered "yes." The correlation with marginality also increased ($r_s = .23$).

Seamen realize the sacrifices they make for the money they earn. Most will tell you they only do it for the money. One of the distorted perceptions of sealife that the public has is that seamen go to sea for the adventure it provides. The fact that $61.8\%$ of the respondents agreed in some degree with the statement, "The adventure and thrill of going to sea is not as great as it is made out to be," suggests that this is not the case. These figures show most do it for the money, and they would quit if they could find a job paying the same money on the beach. Perhaps this is why so many quit and return to the occupation. Seamen constantly look for the opportunity to work on the beach. There is more to it than money, however, as one seaman put it, "I tried working ashore but I just couldn't stand it."
Several seamen interviewed reported quitting several times but always returning.

...I ship out for the money, nothing else, everytime I find a job on the beach making good money I try it... but I just don't like it on the beach.

The seaman does not like it because he does not fit in.

There was a moderate relationship between marginality and not wanting your son to become a seaman ($r_s = .30$), indicating that the more marginal the seaman is the less likely he is to want his son to become a seaman. Only 29.5% of the respondents wanted their sons to become seamen; 9.2% said it was his choice and 61.4% said they did not want their sons to become a seaman. As one seaman put it, "I would let my son be anything but a seaman."

The next question, "would you be upset if your daughter married a seaman?", had a higher correlation with marginality ($r_s = .37$), indicating that the more marginal the seaman is the more likely he is to be upset if his daughter would marry a seaman. One-third of the respondents said they would be upset if their daughters married a seaman. A deck officer reported, in an interview, that he would only be upset if his daughter married an unlicensed seaman. This may reflect the extreme status consciousness that exists aboard ship. Another comment was, "wouldn't you be upset if your daughter married a seaman?"

It is evident, from these answers, that seamen do not hold their jobs in very high regard. It might also be added
that these were hypothetical questions for those with no children. Controlling for children would likely increase these percentages.

There was a low correlation between marginality and the wife or girlfriend not being friends with the wives or girlfriends of other seamen ($r_s = .16$). Only 21.5% of the respondents said their wives or girlfriends were friends with the wives or girlfriends of other seamen. There was a moderate relationship between marginality and not wanting your wife or girlfriend to be friends with other seamen ($r_s = .30$). A total of 37.8% of the respondents answered that they did not want their spouse or girlfriend to be friends with another seaman. The data gotten in the interviews supports this finding. Seamen generally said they did not wish to associate with other seamen outside of the workplace. Some expressed concern over the caliber of women that many seamen had for wives or girlfriends. Others said quite bluntly that any association, no manner how indirect, that increased the possibility of a seaman coming over to his house while he was gone was to be avoided. The following comments were typical of those gotten in the interviews.

...I just don't want anybody coming around my family when I'm not home. Especially some seaman. If he had a wife and kids and I knew them it would be alright. But I still wouldn't want him coming over alone when I'm not there. You get my drift.

Another comment,
...Seamen don't generally make great choices on wives. I bet every guy in this hall is divorced at least once. I got enough family problems without my wife hanging around with some of these women.

There was a moderate relationship between marginality and answering that seamen did not make good friends ($r_s = .31$); 38.2% said that seamen did not make good friends. Many of the seamen interviewed even said they did not want to be friends with other seamen.

...I do things in foreign ports that I do not want my family to know about, if I am friends with another seaman and bring him around the house, he might slip and let my family find out some of these things I do.

Another seaman said,

...Other seamen do not make good friends because most of them are divorced and act crude, that is the reason that I never brought my wife to sea.

A widow of a seaman reported that when her husband died she did not call the union nor the shipping company until after the funeral. She just did not want any seamen around. The author's father, in 33 years as a seaman, only brought seamen into his house twice. Both times it was for lunch when they were in a nearby shipyard.

One can suppose that the reason for this lack of friendship among seamen, and the low regard that they have for their fellows, is marginality. The seaman on the beach is ill at ease, having another in the same position merely
magnifies the other's marginality and most likely will spoil his performance.

One-third of the respondents answered they would not do it all over again. There was a moderate relationship between marginality and those who would not become seamen again ($r_s = .32$). As stated before, a lot of seamen when given the opportunity to make the same money on the beach will try it out, but few remain. The seaman may want to change his occupation, but the longer he stays the less likely he is to make a successful adjustment.

Finally, in what may seem to be the ultimate evaluation, 46.2% of the respondents agreed in some degree that going to sea was like going to jail. There was a high correlation between marginality and agreeing with this statement ($r_s = .50$). One of the first things that confronted this writer when he started going to sea was that nobody likes being on the water. A lot cross off a calendar, like a sentence in jail. But after a while you find yourself in the same boat, and eventually you acquire the additional burden of not liking the beach very much either.

General Social Integration

There were five indicators used as measures of general social integration.

(1) Number of friends. (Question 22)

Variables two through five are measured by the degree to which he agrees or disagrees with the respective statement.
(2) When I am at sea I wish I were at home.  
(Question 85)

(3) When I am at home I wish I were at sea.  
(Question 86)

(4) There are times when you are home that you feel like a stranger or an outsider.  
(Question 91)

(5) I feel different then people who work on the beach.  
(Question 93)

There was a relatively high negative relationship between number of friends and marginality ($r_s = -0.44$), indicating that the more marginal one is the less friends he has. Of the respondents, 21.9% reported they knew no one whom they considered a best friend. The seaman’s lack of friends may be even greater than this, however. Nearly one-third of the seamen who listed people as best friends saw them less than ten times in the last three years. One old retired seaman told me he had lots of best friends. But further conversation revealed he had not seen any of these people in 15 years. My father had no friends. He listed four men as friends he had not seen or spoken to in over 20 years. A widow of a seaman interviewed said her husband had no friends. Many seamen said the longer they shipped, the more they found themselves losing friends.

...Each time I would come back, they would have other friends that I didn't know. Sometimes they were doing something. Gradually I began to feel very uncomfortable around them and I didn't call or go around. Neither did they.

Another seaman,
I think I began to get on their nerves because I would come in with a lot of money and I wanted to party. They couldn't afford it and besides those assholes had to work. I finally came to the conclusion that they ain't worth a shit. Now I come in, hang around the house, go to the hall and then ship. I'll get my kicks in foreign ports.

Over 78% of the respondents agreed in some degree with the statement, "when I am at sea I wish I were home." There was a moderate relationship between marginality and agreeing with this statement ($r_s = .24$). A total of 47.8% agreed with the statement, "when I am at home I wish I were at sea. But here there was a much higher correlation with marginality ($r_s = .45$).

Most seamen would be expected to agree with the first statement. The increase in the relationship with marginality should be expected with the second statement. Those seamen who do not fit in well with shore side society, wish to quickly return to the comfort of their floating colony.

The next two statements are perhaps the best measurements of the effects of marginality. A figure of 62.2% of the respondents agreed in some degree that there are times when you are home that you feel like a stranger or an outsider. There was a high correlation with marginality ($r_s = .53$). A sum of 78.9% of the seamen agreed in some degree that they feel different than people who work on the beach. There was a moderately high correlation with marginality and agreeing with this statement ($r_s = .36$).
The seamen, who spend the majority of their lives within the marginal culture of the seamen, know that they do not fit in with shore side society. Nearly all seamen interviewed recognized the price they had to pay for making high wages. What these findings reveal is that, indeed, these higher wages are not buying acceptance. As discussed in the theory section, when the seaman realizes he cannot buy status or acceptance, he comes to grips with his marginal status. Most seamen said they sought a compromise, but most admitted they had failed to reach one. When one feels like a stranger or an outsider, he retreats to a place where he is an insider; union halls and ships.

**Economic Integration**

There were four variables used as indicators of economic integration.

1. Are you buying a home? (Question 71)
2. Do you own any investment property? (Question 74)
3. Do you invest in stocks and bonds? (Question 75)
4. Do you have a savings account? (Question 76)

There were no strong relationships between marginality and not participating in any of these measures of economic integration. Those who did not own any investment property had the highest correlation with marginality ($r_s = .25$); not investing in stocks and bonds ($r_s = .19$); not buying a home
(r = .16); and not having a savings account had the lowest correlation (r = .15). All these variables are in the expected direction, as are all the others in this descriptive analysis.

The problem with expecting these measures of economic integration to have a strong association with marginality became apparent to this researcher during the interviews and while reflecting upon his time spent as a seaman. There were several seamen interviewed who belonged to several organizations, had many friends and were generally well integrated into the community. These men answered yes to all of the measures of economic integration. But there are also another group of men who would also answer yes to these four questions. These men are not well integrated into their communities. They have few, if any, friends and belong to no organizations. These seamen save and invest their money. They had swallowed the Protestant ethic hook, line and sinker. They save for tomorrow. They firmly believe that money buys them status. They are the complete opposite of the type labeled "sea daddy."

This researcher has known a few seamen who fit this type. One was a wiper, who was in his 60's. This was only his second ship. He had stayed on the first one 27 years. He was a very wealthy man, but also one of the most isolated I ever met. Another of these men was a fireman on a passenger ship. He caught the ship in New York in 1943. He
too saved and invested his money. During the interviews it was learned that he had been declared unfit for duty on this same ship he had been on for 33 years. He kept telling everyone there were spirits in the engine room. Every once in a while he would refuse to go on watch because of these spirits. Both of these men would have answered yes to all of these measures of economic integration. A scale was not necessary to see that these men were marginal.

Seamen, relatively speaking, are a bizarre lot of men. Marginal would be a complement in a lot of cases. One seaman said the reason he always made short trips was because he could not take the weirdos for more than two weeks at a time. The quiet shipmate may be a typical American with a wife, a mortgage and a kid; or he may be a Cuban who lost everything when Castro came to power; or he may be an ex-con; or a guy with a heroin habit; or an undercover agent for the treasury department. This researcher shipped once with a guy who had to be locked in a room because of the effects of alcohol. The next time I saw him he was a chief mate. The point is that things are not always as they appear. The peculiarities of any phenomenon can only be revealed through intimate participation. Sea daddy is such a peculiarity.

Sea daddy is anachronism. He cannot be measured because there are not enough of his kind. He is the old guy, an expert at his craft, who takes the younger seaman
and teaches him his craft. He is all that remains of the traditional seaman. He is the drunken, spent-it-all old salt, who owns nothing and does not care to do so. He is disappearing, but he is a characteristic of the occupation that seems to umbrella public opinion. Modern day seamen look forward to the day when he is publically declared a relic.

_Sea Daddy: An Excursus Into An Endangered Social Species_

I'm the wandering son with the nervous feet, that never were meant for a steady beat; I've had many a job for a little while, I've been on the bum and I've lived in style; And there was the road, stretching mile after mile, and nothing to do but go.

H. H. Knibbs, Songs of the Out Lands

The following is a brief description of three men who fit the sea daddy type:

_Case I: J. H._

J. H. was a retired chief petty officer. He was a bosun when I knew him. His residence, when he was not on a ship was a room in the back of a bar near the wharf. All his belongings were either in that room or aboard ship. His navy retirement check and all his other mail went to the bar. He stayed there at night when we were in home port. When we came into New Orleans, J. H. went straight to the bar, opened his mail, signed over his retirement check to the bar in order to cover his tab and then immediately started running up a new one. No one could buy a drink when
J. H. was drinking. He would drink all night and work all day.

We were on a steady 21 day run, hitting the same ports each trip. Upon arrival in each foreign port, the same cab driver would meet J. H.; again he would drink and work. It seemed that he only slept at sea. He would spend all of his money and then borrow some more. He was good friends with the cab driver. He even bought clothes for his family. The cab driver would stay with J. H. the entire time in port.

But characteristic of all sea daddies, J. H. was as equally skilled at his craft as he was at spending his money and having a good time. He was the best at what he did. He had a pride in his skills and it showed in his work. His was respected by all the officers and the crew. J. H. ran the deck department, the chief mate just drew his pay.

J. H. died aboard ship in his bunk one night in home port. He had been out all night, the next day a son of one of the AB's needed blood, J. H. gave. That night he went back out drinking and for some reason came back to the ship to sleep. He died that night.

The owner of the bar was stuck with his tab, the cab driver lost a good customer, the whores certainly missed him and he owed money to a lot of his shipmates. The bar closed for a day with a black wreath on the door. The cab driver cried when we told him. It did not seem to make much difference to the whores. We could not find any family. He
died broke. The bar owner and his shipmates took care of the funeral.

**Case II: Hicks**

Hicks was another one of those spend it all seaman. The name sea daddy originates with Hicks, as he was nicknamed this by the crew. We had paid off, from a trip to Vietnam, in San Francisco. We would then go coastwise and return to San Francisco before leaving for Vietnam again. Hicks paid off with $9,300.00. He took his money and a few belongings and left in a cab. He would rejoin the ship upon our return to San Francisco. His last comment before getting in the cab was:

> I'm going to the bank open a savings account, get a room, then I going to get drunk, stay drunk and chase pussy until you fellows get back.

When we got back, in about three weeks, Hicks was on the dock. He was dressed in a very fancy doorman's uniform, with an equally fancy high hat. There was a long sword stuck in his belt. He waved his hat to the deck gang when they were close enough to see him. There he stood; ripped out of his mind, flat broke, and no suitcase. When he came aboard he went straight to the galley. We gave him the name sea daddy.

He had no regrets. He said he would do it again and again because chasing pussy and getting drunk was what it was all about.
Case III: John

I had made one trip with John before I interviewed him. The thing I remember about him aboard ship was a book of pictures he had taken of naked women around the world. When interviewing him the subject quickly got around to women.

When I met John in the hall he was wearing an Hawaiian shirt, red pants, green shoes and an African safari hat. He carries a hand purse of money with which he gambles. A lot of seamen carry these; it is a handy way to hold on to your discharges, union book and shot card.

John has been married six times and has lived with several other women. He started shipping out, in 1939, to get something to eat and a place to stay. John enjoys going to sea, but despises the new breed of seamen, who only want a free ride.

Where else could you see the world and get some money in your pocket. I have never been sick except for two doses of the clap. I've been sunk three times and fucked 400 women in 50 different countries. The women are different in every country. That's the trouble with seamen today, they can't fuck. No salt in their veins.

On the subject of women again, John commented on the idea of bringing his wife to sea.

Absolutely no, she would be too much trouble. I would be bowl-legged from fucking her, so I would be too tired to work. When I was working I would have to worry about her fucking another seaman. Then when I got in port I could not do what I wanted to.
John goes to sea for the money and the chance it gives him to do things he could not do otherwise.

These three men and those others who can be considered sea daddies have some typical characteristics. They are skilled at their craft, always show up for their watch or work, take great pride in their performance and see the modern seaman as lacking both in skills and commitment to the occupation.

Sea daddy enjoys the seaman lifestyle, which is probably why he will never retire. Booze and whores are as common to him as the wife, kids and TV are to those on the beach. Like Hicks said, getting drunk and chasing pussy is what it is all about. He enjoys the work, the good times and the freedoms that going to sea provides. He spends all his money and has no regrets. A wife and a car are the last thing he wants. When he is in home port, he rents a room or perhaps like J. H. he has a room that he keeps.

He has little to show in the way of property for his years at sea. What he does have though, is a wealth of experience, that is available only to those that have traveled the world and seen and taken part in the sights and "evils" that each place provides. Only the seaman is in a position to enjoy the pleasures of the peasants, but also have enough money to partake in the finer things of life. These are the men that novels are written about. These are the men that the public has come to know through the media.
The new breed of seamen are trying to change the image that sea daddy has conveyed to the public. Sea daddy sees the new seaman as just another offshore worker. He does not have any style.
CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this research was to explain the influences that being a merchant seaman has on marginality (as measured by alienation) and the social integration of its members. This research has also investigated the lifestyle adaptations and social identities of merchant seamen as related to their orientation and identification with their occupation on the one hand and their familial and communal ties on the other. For the merchant seaman, work takes place in a setting without long term personal commitments to job, to place or to co-workers. On the beach social relations tend toward the transitory and where long term relations are established, the seaman is forced to partial participation. Because of the marginal nature of his occupation institutionalized social bonds have significantly less regulatory power over these individuals. This research has shown that marginality is a theme which pervades the social existence of merchant seamen.

Figure 2 serves as a heuristic device, a summary model of the centrality of marginality in the life of American merchant seamen. This research has shown that the longer the time the seaman spends at sea, the more marginal he becomes (all things being equal). His marginality is in a sense mediated by certain social and background characteristics. The seaman's marginality has also been
Figure 2. A Heuristic Model of the Cause and Effects of Marginality in Seamen
shown to be a product of his lack of participation in voluntary organizations.

The influence of the seaman's marginality on integration with family and extended kinships, general social integration, economic integration and on causing hostile attitudes toward both the occupation and other seamen has been identified and described. The more marginal the seaman, the lower the levels of integration and the more hostile his attitudes toward his job and his co-workers.

This research has not avoided the circular nature of marginality in this model. This model assumes that marginality is the catalyst in the seaman's low level of integration into shore side society. This lack of integration, in turn, increases marginality.

**Implications for Further Research**

This model of occupationally induced marginality in merchant seamen also serves as an indicator of further research which needs to be conducted. The model shows a relationship between social and background characteristics and familial, social and economic integration, as well as attitudes toward the occupation. A relationship is also shown between occupational characteristics and these same four variables. A circular relationship is also shown between these same four variables and participation in voluntary organizations.
This researcher has assumed, for heuristic purposes, that the seaman begins his career as a member of a family and community in which he has social recognition and routine contact. There is some literature that contends the occupation attracts marginal men. If further research produces such a consideration this does not negate the model, but merely the rearrangement of its parts.

This research has attempted to present a holistic description of marginality in seamen. The notion that the placement of the variables in the model could change upon further research is inconsequential. This relevance of the model for further research is that it contains implications for elaborating a number of relationships.

Epilogue

This research has identified marginality as being a central theme of the seaman's lifestyle. The result of the seaman's marginality has been shown to be: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, cultural estrangement, social estrangement and estrangement from work. It appears the seaman's marginality derives particularly from a sense of normlessness. He is, in essence, accepting "illegitimate means" to realize culturally prescribed goals. He gives up a huge portion of his life in order to make money. For this success in making money he experiences feelings of estrangement between himself and the social system ashore.
In effect, he loses control over means of directing his life and experiences disaffection with the goals of the broader society.

The lifestyle of the merchant seaman has caused alienation, but this lifestyle is changing. Newer ships have smaller crews and the ships of the future will have even a smaller number of men running them at any one time. As these crews become smaller and smaller, the seaman will spend more and more time alone aboard ship. This increasing automation of ships will also bring less port time, indeed, these new techniques for loading and unloading have already made port time nonexistent for some ships. At the same time vacation time is ever increasing.

The seaman of the future will perhaps spend an increasing amount of time with his family. The result of this increased time spent with family should create more of a sense of belonging to the shore side society. The disappearance of port time and reductions in manning scales brings less exposure to the seamen culture. No longer will he be able to go ashore in foreign ports. His interaction with other seamen aboard ship will be reduced significantly. One could speculate that the marginality of the lifestyle of the seaman, as has been explained here, will be reduced. But the question is what will be the trade off for reduced marginality. The effects of this increased isolation aboard ship is a question for future research.
It would seem to this researcher that the merchant seaman is becoming more and more like the offshore oil rig worker. He goes to work on a structure whose location makes little difference because he does not get off of it, except when his "tour of duty" is over. The employment cycle of the oil industry, where the worker works a number of days or weeks for an equal number of days off, will in all likelihood be adapted by the maritime industry. This is already being used by some non-union shipping companies and it is the understanding of this researcher that some union companies have started to use it. If indeed, this type of work schedule is used, the hiring hall concept will no longer be viable. Hence, what has been a mechanism for bringing seamen together will be eliminated. In effect another reduction in the amount of interaction among seamen and consequently less exposure to the marginal lifestyle of the seaman.

Another aspect of these crew changes that brings the seaman closer to offshore worker status is the concept of utility. One of the major victories for unionism was that a man was assigned to a special job. No longer could he be moved around to do any menial task. But the utility concept has crept back in. Crewmen are now hired to work both on deck and in the engine room. If seamen think that this is going to stop here then they are blind to the bold handwriting on the wall. The merchant seaman is coming full
circle; he is losing his bargaining power. The future may again bring ships full of "utilities" or as they are called in the oil field "roustabouts." As sea daddy said, he is becoming just another offshore worker.

The merchant seaman is clearly a changing occupation. A young man now entering the occupation does not have a very bright future. The industry has stayed on a feast or famine cycle. War brings feast; peace brings famine. What is needed is a constant demand for seamen. Although there has been constant rhetoric from the Federal Government for a revitalization of the American merchant marine, little has been done.

The future will bring ships with even further reductions in manning scales. Only a miracle can save the fate of the American seaman. Only a war, up until now, has given his union the competitive edge in bargaining. Only a war can save the peace time seaman from rotting away on the beach while his skills atrophy.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THIS FORM

AN OCCUPATIONAL STUDY OF MERCHANT SEAMEN

The following questions have been designed by Craig J. Forsyth, a former merchant seaman, (now working on his doctoral degree at Louisiana State University) in an attempt to find out as much as possible about life as a seaman. His father and several of his relatives were also merchant seamen all of their working lives. Nowhere on this questionnaire will you be asked to give your name. If you find that any of these questions do not apply to you or you would prefer not to answer them, leave it blank. Your full cooperation will greatly add to making this project a success. Please, Do Not write your name anywhere.

1. Are you retired or still shipping out?

2. How many years have you been (were you) a merchant seaman?

3. If retired, how many years have you been retired?

4. How many months per year are (were) you usually at sea?

5. Do (Did) you take a family vacation every year?
   Yes   No

6. How many months per year do (did) you spend with your family?

7. How many times have you been married?

8. How many times have you lived with a woman that you were not married to?

9. Please answer the following questions about your marital history.

   | Form of Union | Time Lived With | Number of Children |
   | Married | Live In | Years | From this Relationship |

   ________________  ________________  ________________

   ________________  ________________  ________________

   ________________  ________________  ________________

   ________________  ________________  ________________

   ________________  ________________  ________________
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10. What is your marital status now?
   Single ___   Married ___
   Living with Someone ___   Other (specify) ____________

11. When something breaks at your home when you are (were) away, who would be the first person your wife would call?
   Relative ___   Friend ___
   Repairman ___   Other (specify) ____________

12. If an emergency occurs when you are (were) away who would be the first person your wife would call?
   Relative ___   Friend ___
   Other (specify) ____________

13. Does (did) your wife see a close relative of yours or of hers at least twice a week?
   Yes ___   No ___

14. When you are in port how often do (did) you see relatives?
   Often ___   Seldom ___   Never ___

15. What job do (did) you usually have aboard ship?

16. Check the members of your family who are or were seamen.
   None ___   Fathers ___
   Uncle ___   Brothers ___
   Sons ___   Cousins ___
   Grandfather ___   Other (specify) ____________

17. Did any person help you get started in the merchant marine?
   Yes ___   No ___

18. Do (Did) you want to change your job to something else, instead of being a seaman?
   Yes ___   No ___
19. If you could find a job making the same money on the beach as you do (did) as a seaman, would you quit going to sea?  
Yes____ No____

20. What occupation would you want your son (or if you had a son) to have?__________________________

21. Would you want your son (or if you had a son) to become a seaman?  
Yes____ No____

22. How many people do you consider to be "best friends" of yours?____

23. Please give the following information about your "best friends."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City they live in</th>
<th>Are they seaman (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Years known</th>
<th>How often seen in past three years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. What job(s) have you had besides being a seaman? If seaman all of your working life, check here____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of work</th>
<th>How old were you</th>
<th>Why did you leave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. If you had a daughter would you be upset if she married a seaman?  
Yes____ No____
26. In the last 10 years (of your working life) how many times have you been with your family on these occasions?

Christmas____  Thanksgiving____
Wife's birthday____  Wedding anniversary____
Birth of a child____  Wedding of a child____

27. Do (Did) you bring gifts home to your family and/or friends?

Every port____  Often____
Seldom____  Never____

28. How often do (did) you call home when on a trip?

Every port____  Most ports____
Seldom____  Never____

29. How often do (did) you write letters to family and/or friends?

Each port____  Most ports____
Seldom____  Never____

30. What proportion of your base pay do (did) you send home? (Circle nearest percentage)

100%  90%  80%  70%  60%  50%  40%  30%  20%  10%

31. When you are (were) at home who tells (told) your children what to do?

You____  Wife____
Both of you____  Others____

32. Is (was) your wife/girlfriend close friends with the wives or girlfriends of other merchant seamen?

Yes____  No____
If yes, how many?____
33. List the organizations you belong to.  
If none, check here____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>How often do you attend meetings?</th>
<th>Do you hold office?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. What do (did) you do when you are (were) in home port and who do (did) you do it with?  
(Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>with other seamen</th>
<th>with friends other than seamen</th>
<th>with family</th>
<th>alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. hunting and fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. visit family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. play cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. go to bars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. visit friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. sporting events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. religious services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. watch T.V.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. go to movies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Who lives with you in your house?  
(Check all that apply)

Wife____    Woman who is not your wife____  
Parents____  Children____  (How Many?____)  
Other relatives____  Male friend____  
Other (specify)____

36. Do you feel it will be (is) difficult to live on the beach after retirement?  
Yes____  No____

37. When you became a merchant seaman did you feel that this would be your life's work?  
Yes____  No____

38. Do (Did) you expect to remain a merchant seaman for the rest of your working life?  
Yes____  No____

39. What do (did) you consider to be the 3 "best" things about being a merchant seaman?  (Circle 3)

1. pay
2. see the world
3. get away from the fast pace world
4. get away from people
5. get away from your family
6. free room and board
7. time off
8. you enjoy the work
9. chance to do things you couldn't do if you were home
10. meet different people

40. What do (did) you consider to be the 3 "worst" things about being a merchant seaman?  (Circle 3)

1. being away from family and friends
2. missing special events
3. feeling as though you are not a part of what is going on when you return
4. inability to maintain a good relationship with your wife or girlfriend
5. the loneliness of ship-board life
6. the actual work you do
7. not being able to belong to organizations
8. people look down on seamen
9. feel as though you do not have any real friends
10. lack of privacy
41. Do (did) you take out or "see" women in ports other than your home port?
   Yes___   No___

42. How long are (were) most of your trips?___

43. Check the statement that best describes your jobs as a seaman.
   Mostly stand-by night relief___
   Mostly relief jobs___
   Permanent jobs___

44. Check the statement that best describes the type of ship you are (were) usually on.
   Coastwise tanker___   Foreign-going tanker___
   Freighter___   Passenger ship___

45. What is your religion?
   Catholic___   Protestant___
   Jewish___   Other (specify)____________

46. In what religious faith were you raised?
   Catholic___   Protestant___
   Jewish___   Other (specify)____________

47. How often do you attend religious services?
   At Home   In Foreign Ports
   Often___   Often___
   Seldom___   Seldom___
   Never___   Never___
48. Questions 48 to 65

Listed below are some things that people may think are good or bad about being a seaman. Please check the box that best describes your feelings about your job as a seaman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Does Not Make a Difference</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48. The pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. See the world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Getting away from the fast pace world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Get away from people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Get away from your family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Free room and board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Time off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. The work you do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Meeting different people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Chance to do things you could not do if you were home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Being away from family and friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Missing special events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Feeling as though you are not a part of what is going on when you return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Your ability to keep in touch with friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62. Inability to maintain a good relationship with your wife or girlfriend

63. Loneliness of shipboard life

64. Lack of privacy

65. Not being able to be as active as you would like to be in organizations and clubs

66. Would you mind if your wife or girlfriend were friends with another seaman?
   Yes___ No___

67. How well do you feel you know your wife's or girlfriend's friends?
   Very well___ A little___
   Only their name___ Not at all___

68. How well do you feel you know your children?
   Very well___ Well enough___
   A little___ Not much___

69. If you "did it all over again" would you become a merchant seaman?
   Yes___ No___

70. When in home port, how long is (was) it before you get (got) bored with life on the beach?
   Less than a week___ 1 or 2 weeks___
   3 or 4 weeks___ A month or more___
   Never got bored___
71. Are you currently buying a home?  
   Yes____ No____  
   If yes, how many years have you been paying on the mortgage?____

72. Do you own a home?  
   Yes____ No____

73. Are you currently buying any investment property such as rental property or land?  
   Yes____ No____

74. Do you currently own any investment property?  
   Yes____ No____

75. Do you invest in stocks or bonds?  
   Yes____ No____

76. Do you have a savings account?  
   Yes____ No____

77. What is your sex?  
   Male____ Female____

78. What is your age?____

79. Circle highest grade completed in school.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
   1 year of college 2 years of college
   3 years of college college graduate

80. What is your place of birth? (state or country)
   _______________________

81. In what place did you spend most of your childhood?  
   _______________________

82. Where do you live now?______________________________

83. Where have you lived most of your working life?  
   _______________________

84. Are you a graduate of any maritime academy or training school?  
   Yes____ No____  
   If yes, name of school______________________________
TO WHAT DEGREE DO YOU AGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85. When I am at sea I wish I were at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. When I am at home I wish I were at sea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Going to sea is like going to jail (serving a sentence).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. I feel that I am a good person, as good as other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. I feel that there are a lot of good things about me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Seamen do not have as close a relationship with their family as men who have a shore side job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. There are times when you are home that you feel like a stranger or an outsider.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Other seamen make good friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. I feel different than people who work on the beach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. The adventure and thrill of going to sea is not as great as it is made out to be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Alcoholism is a widespread problem among seamen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Drug abuse is a widespread problem among seamen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Gambling is a widespread problem among seamen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. I will be glad when I am no longer going to sea so I can spend more time with my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. On the whole I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. At times I think I am no good at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. These days a person does not really know who he can count on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. There is not much chance that people will really do anything to make this country a better place to live in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO WHAT DEGREE DO YOU AGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107. Success is more dependent on luck than real ability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. It is hard to figure out who you can really trust these days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. It is hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. There is little use writing to public officials because they are not really interested in the problems of the average man.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. There are so many ideas about what is right and wrong these days that it is hard to figure out how to live your life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. So many people do things well that it is easy to become discouraged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. Things are changing so fast these days that one does not know what to expect from day to day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO WHAT DEGREE DO YOU AGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116. Most people do not realize how much their lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret by others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. Few people look forward to their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118. Our country has too many people who can do little to raise their standard of living.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. It is usually best to tell your superiors or bosses what they really want to hear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. People do almost anything if the reward is high enough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. Which one best describes where you live? (Check one)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or city with population of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500 - 10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000 - 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. What is your ethnic identification? (If you prefer not to answer, leave it blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
123. What kind of car(s) do you own?

Make________________ Year________________

Make________________ Year________________

Make________________ Year________________

124. If you could bring your wife (or if you had a wife) with you on a trip to sea, would you?

Yes___ No___
APPENDIX B
INTERVIEW GUIDE

Occupational Study of Merchant Seaman

1. Characteristics (age, hometown, marital status)
2. Employment status (retired, seaman, quit)
3. Background (how he got started, years of service, father a seaman)
4. Employment history (length of trips, kinds of ships, rank, longest period without work, other occupations)
5. Family's opinion of his job
6. His opinion of other seamen
7. His opinion of seafaring
8. Cyclical nature of his occupation (union hall-ship-home)
9. Relationship to friends and community (how often sees friends, closeness of relationship, organizations)
10. Plans for future
11. Shipboard life (relationship to other seamen-friendships formed and for how long, coping with isolation, short term nature of relationships, other seamen as friends, friendships with people in other departments, officer-crew friendships)
12. Idea of going to sea (like going to jail)
13. Places visited and things they have done
14. Traditional role of seamen
15. Changing role of seamen
Marginality was measured using an alienation scale developed by Streuning and Richardson (1965) which they conceptualized as a measure of felt rejection and emotional distance from group life. The scale consists of 16 Likert-type items, five of which were developed from Srole's alienation scale, and the others conceptualized from the theories of Marx, Durkheim, Fromm and Merton (Robinson and Shaver, 1970: 184). The item responses from this sample of seamen were analyzed by inter-item correlations and single item correlations with total scores.

Table 17 contains the inter-item correlation matrix of all 16 items. Examination of these relationships reveals an overall high association between items. All correlations are statistically significant at the .001 level.

The individual item correlations with the total scores (minus the item score) is presented in Table 18. All of these relationships are also statistically significant at the .001 level.
Table 17. Inter-Item Correlations of the Marginality Scale (N=251)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>105</th>
<th>106</th>
<th>107</th>
<th>108</th>
<th>109</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>111</th>
<th>112</th>
<th>113</th>
<th>114</th>
<th>115</th>
<th>116</th>
<th>117</th>
<th>118</th>
<th>119</th>
<th>120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. Marginality Scale Item Means, Standard Deviations, Range and Correlations With Total Scores (N=251)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r*</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 105</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 106</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 107</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 108</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 109</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 110</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 111</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 112</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 113</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 114</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 115</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 116</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 117</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 118</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 119</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 120</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All relationships are significant at the .001 level
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The author was born in New Orleans during the Truman administration. He was educated in a New York Catholic elementary school and a New Orleans public high school. He was awarded his B.A. from the University of New Orleans in 1977. He received his M.A. degree from the same university in 1979. He is at present a candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Sociology at Louisiana State University.
EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: Craig J. Forsyth
Major Field: Sociology
Title of Thesis: The Lifestyle of Merchant Seamen: A Sociological Analysis of Occupationally Induced Marginality

Approved:

[signatures]
Major Professor and Chairman
Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

[signatures]

Date of Examination:

December 20, 1982