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AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN SELECTED COUNTIES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Marguerite R. Howie, Robert L. Phillips, Jr., and Sharon L. Wade
South Carolina State College
Orangeburg, South Carolina

ABSTRACT

Industrial development can provide hope and opportunity for residents of a community. Whether advantageous or not, it brings about various community changes such as job opportunities, population growth, higher tax base and the need for more public utilities. It is questionable as to whether industrialization alleviates or causes social, economic and political problems. Furthermore, the previously mentioned changes may also affect a community/county when an industry leaves the area. Industrialization prompts a need for researchers to focus on the impact of industry within rural/urban counties, such as Charleston, Colleton, Edgefield, Greenville, Horry, Jasper, Richland and York.

In an effort to answer various queries concerning industrial development, researchers are asking (1) What happens when an industry leaves a community? and (2) What are the feelings of residents towards industries in their area? This research attempts to answer the aforementioned queries in a study of industrial development in selected areas of South Carolina.

1This is a revised version of a paper originally presented at the 1983 annual meeting of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists, Atlanta, Georgia. The research was supported by funds from the 1890 Research program, South Carolina State College.
RESEARCH BACKGROUND

In earlier years, South Carolina may have been considered a state that survived mostly through the use of agricultural resources. But today, as the state continues to grow and change with the times, its outlook for the future appears to be towards industrial development. Industrial development is defined as new manufacturing facilities entering an area where they did not exist previously. According to Governor Richard Riley's State of the State Address (1983), South Carolina is in the midst of an industrial revolution that demands a new approach to economic development, education and government. Industrialization may be that "new approach" for residents/communities where agriculture is becoming obsolete if development is located in their particular area.

Gradually, industrial development has been shifting from the Northern states. An abundance of empirical work published in the 1970's (Sternlieb and Hughes, 1975; U.S. Bureau of Census, 1979) has confirmed three main locational trends: (1) the intrametro shift from central city to suburban locations; (2) the regional movement from the old manufacturing belt of the Northeast and Midwest to the South and West; and finally, the shift from metro to nonmetro locations. Sheler (1982:103) hypothesizes that this new migration trend has also lured many Northerners to the South and West by the promise of a better life. In a study by Howie, Phillips and Wade (1982), evidence was found to substantiate Sheler's premise and which identified "push" and "pull" factors that motivated this reverse migration flux.
Demographer Claude C. Harden (1970) scanned the four regions within the United States during the period of 1962-1969 in an effort to isolate variables attributing to the decentralization of industry from urban areas to non-metropolitan areas. He found that the South and West experienced tremendous industrial growth into rural areas.

The industrial revolution that is emerging in the South during the last third of the twentieth century affects not only labor and unions, but present manufacturing facilities in the area. Involved, also are taxpayers who are being asked to finance rescue efforts on new training operations, investors anxious about losing money in dying industries, schools, and students who have yet to choose vocations (Sheler, 1982: 53).

Nevertheless, with the shift of industrialization to heavily endowed urban areas or economically depressed rural areas of the South, how many community residents actually receive employment? Oftentimes, industries transfer many employees from other facilities. Many studies indicate that local residents receive very few new positions (Gray, 1969; Little and Lovejoy, 1979; Lovejoy, 1980; Nolan and Heffernan, 1974; Summers et al., 1976). The lack of employing more local residents may be due to limited job skills and educational attainment. But if the local unemployed workers are largely undereducated and lacking in work skills—as is true in most underdeveloped areas—some means must be found to provide them with remedial education and specialized training in order to make them attractive to the new employer (Gray, 1969: 26).

Conversely, Richard Hough and John Clark (1969) concluded that the
majority of employment goes to local workers, not in-migrants. If such were true, then what do the in-migrants contribute that is not exploitive of the indigenous population? Research is needed to resolve the problems that the polarity of these postulates presents.

One may consider industrialization to be an asset to community residents, especially if the work force encompasses the unemployed and underemployed. Success with industrial jobs depends partly on the individuals' skills. Some areas may require federal, state or local aid to retain workers who lack the skills to make the transition into the new vistas of industrial development. The magnitude of the rapid change and the cultural lag inherent therein have been articulated by President Reagan's State of the Union Address (1983) and Governor Riley's State of the State Address (1983). Each of them called for training and retraining the unemployed and underemployed workers for high-technology jobs in the future. Employment will be found in areas that require workers to think more and use their hands less such as health care, computers, engineering, physics, law and accounting.

With high-technology growing rapidly, the impact will greatly affect occupations that have existed for centuries and Howard University sociologist, John Reid (1982) found that unemployment among blacks is 20.2 percent, more than twice the 9.3 percent rate of whites. Forty percent of black workers have white collar jobs, but more than fifty-four percent of white workers have escaped blue collar occupations. It is obvious from these figures that nonwhites are under-represented in the work force due to the traditional practice of employing them in unskilled/semiskilled positions.
Nevertheless, the overall impact of industrial development is that it will be beneficial to the community and its residents, thus ensuring more jobs and better incomes for the labor force. The more money that new employees spend in the community, the greater the impact. The industry must create additional income within the community, rather than distributing most of their payrolls outside the community or merely replacing old jobs and other sources of income (Brinkman, 1973: 72). Indirectly, there will be some change in schools and churches although social participation and leisure patterns will not be affected greatly. The most direct impact will be on the income and levels of living of plant employees (Bertrand and Osborne, 1959: 1134). According to Governor Riley (1983), the future for full-time, permanent employment depends on the state's ability to expand and attract service industries, information industries, food processing industries, commerce and small businesses of every kind. What, indeed, is the impact of such changes as viewed by the people who live with these changes? Are they in reality change agents or change victims? An analysis of our research attempts to answer some of these queries.

THE SAMPLE

The data for this research on industrial development were collected from eight counties in South Carolina during the summer of 1982. The counties were stratified by rural/urban. A county with a central city and a population of at least 50,000 was designated as urban while a county without a central city and a population of 2,500 or more persons but less than 50,000, was identified as rural. Four counties from each
category were randomly selected. The rural counties which evolved were Colleton, Edgefield, Horry and Jasper, while the urban counties included Charleston, Greenville, Richland and York.

A total of 600 interviews (a sample of 551 would be adequate in that it would yield a confidence interval of a ± 5% error rate) were collected by personal interviewers trained by our research staff. Of the sample, 240 (or 40 percent) were black and 360 (or 60 percent) were white with 75 interviews from each county. The male population was 202 (or 33.6 percent) and the female population consisted of 398 or two-thirds of the respondents.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data from the 600 questionnaires were tabulated and analyzed in order to determine the significance of relationships between the independent variables (race and residency: i.e., urban or rural) and the dependent variable (the twenty-four items on the questionnaire) through the utilization of Chi square ($X^2$) analysis. The Gamma coefficients were used to obtain the degree of association or strength of their relationships.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The data on age revealed that 39.6 percent of the sample population fell within the 20-29 and 30-39 categories. Respondents in the 60-69 and 70 plus age groups comprised 26.6 percent of the sample. There was a fairly even distribution of age among all of the age levels, with the greater number (140 or 23.4 percent) in the 30-39 age group. There is no statistically significant difference on the age variable.
The variable, education, showed that 60 percent of the sample population had completed high school. Whereas 9.7 percent had completed no more than the sixth grade and 30.3 percent a seventh through eleventh grade education. However, 11.7 percent of those responding had obtained a college degree and 13.1 percent had at least attended college.

It is interesting to note that 9.7 percent of the respondents in the 0-6 grade category correlates with the 10.9 percent in the 70 plus age category. Thus, there is a strong positive relationship between age and education with a correlation coefficient of $r = .804$. The attributing factor might have been limited higher educational facilities and inaccessible financial means of utilizing these during an earlier time period.

The majority of the dependent variables were of Likert type items to assess the attitudes held by the respondents on industrial development and its impact. Each of the 24 questionnaire items addressed these attitudes.
TABLE 1. Summary of Chi Squares and Gamma's for Variable 1-24 by Race and Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Race $x^2$</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Residency $x^2$</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Industrial growth in this county has been accomplished by a significant improvement in levels of household income.</td>
<td>27.07*</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There seem to be more jobs available in manufacturing indust. in this county than agriculture.</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>68.74*</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indus. plants have a tendency to hire blacks in low or median skilled labor jobs.</td>
<td>119.08*</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indus. plants have a tendency to hire whites in skilled and managerial or executive jobs.</td>
<td>132.82*</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>39.05*</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In this county more whites are qualified for skilled and managerial or executive jobs than are blacks.</td>
<td>69.98*</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>31.1*</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When hiring persons from outside of the county or state to work in new indust., which groups are more likely to be hired in skilled and managerial or executive jobs?</td>
<td>123.66*</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>40.73*</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The construction of major roads and highways has been a major contributing factor to growing industrialization in this county.</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>47.48*</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The availability of adequate public education facilities has been an important attraction influencing industries to locate in this county</td>
<td>13.2*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>45.57*</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Local manufacturing plants offer well-supported training programs for their employees.</td>
<td>44.9*</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant beyond the .05 level.
Table 1 continues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Race ( X^2 )</th>
<th>( G )</th>
<th>Residency ( X^2 )</th>
<th>( G )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Industries in this county have generally been relatively free of water and air pollution problems.</td>
<td>13.7*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>32.67*</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The impact of indus. has a negative effect on the environmental qualities of this community.</td>
<td>22.42*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>22.6*</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Prospective workers for manufacturing plants in this county are generally attracted from the rank of the high sch. and graduate.</td>
<td>11.14*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>14.8*</td>
<td>-.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Industries in this area provide a significant number of job opportunities for residents of this county.</td>
<td>11.6*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>12.35*</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. In this community, employees in industries provide a greater level of output than employees of other counties.</td>
<td>22.9*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>22.9*</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Industrial development can assist communities in alleviating various social problems.</td>
<td>39.9*</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>16.39*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Industrial development can assist communities in alleviating various economic problems.</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Industrial development can assist communities in alleviating various political problems.</td>
<td>12.15*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>20.15*</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The medical facilities and services in this county are adequate in fulfilling the needs of industrial employees.</td>
<td>39.19*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>9.75*</td>
<td>-.178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant beyond the .05 level
Table 1 continues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. The residents in this community take pride in welcoming new industries to this county.</td>
<td>11.76*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>9.92*</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The absence of labor unions is considered as being a contributing factor to productivity to many industries in this county.</td>
<td>16.65*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>16.32*</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It is possible for a single industry to make decisions that will significantly increase or decrease population growth in this county.</td>
<td>16.6*</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>8.75*</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. An event often associated with industrial growth is the return of former residents when a new plant locates into a community.</td>
<td>16.8*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>15.92*</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Many unemployed individuals are leaving this community in the 1980's because local jobs or type of jobs desired are not available.</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>43.20*</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Which group do you think labor unions are more attractive to in this county? (Race choices)</td>
<td>115.08*</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.28*</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistical significant beyond the .05 level.
Analysis of the data indicated that there exist significant relationships with the independent variables. As summarized in Table 1, however, the Gamma coefficients on the majority of the variables were low or negligible.

For the most part, the analysis will focus on those variables with Gamma coefficients of .25 or higher with the independent variables, race and residency. Further, descriptive analysis is used for interpretation in order to achieve a more precise picture of these relationships. The Likert type variables were collapsed into agree and disagree responses, with the percentages reported.

There were no statistically significant relationships ($x^2 = p > .10$) between race and the following variables: availability of jobs—industry vs. agriculture (2), effect of major highway arteries (7) and industrial development and economic problems(16). The first three variables have a low negative degree of association, while variable 23, relationship of egress to lack of jobs for which persons qualify, has a positive association which is very negligible (Gamma = .09).

Residency (rural-urban) and the dependent variables concerning local industrial training programs (9), industrial development and economic problems (16) and the effects of industrial policy on local population growth (21) were not statistically significant. The Gamma coefficients are again very minute.

Variables concerning black employment in industry-semi-skilled jobs (3), white employment in industry-skilled and white collar jobs (4), pattern of hiring from other counties or states (6), availability of
medical care to industrial employees (18) and group attraction to labor
unions (24) by race and variables dealing with availability of jobs—
industry vs. agriculture (2), black employment in industry—semi-skilled
jobs (3), white employment in industry—skilled and white collar jobs (4),
qualification of whites and blacks for skilled and white collar jobs
(5), effect of major highway arteries (7), educational facilities and
industrial growth (8) and industrial pollution not in evidence (10), by
residency were statistically significant (p ≤ .05) and had Gamma coeffi-
cients of .25 or higher.

Of the variables on industrial development, all were statistically
significant (p ≤ .05) in relation to the independent variable, race,
with some exceptions. The variables concerning availability of jobs—
industry vs. agriculture (2), effect of major highway arteries (7) and
relationship between industrial development and economic problems (16)
indicated that no significant relationship exists; that is, none of the
statistical tests were significant at the ten percent (p ≤ .10) level
for chi-square test of independence.

The variable concerning availability of jobs—industry vs. agri-
culture (2), when analyzed by race, revealed that 61.3 percent of the
respondents agreed or strongly agreed that more jobs are available in
manufacturing industries than in agriculture; while 20.6 percent dis-
agreed or strongly disagreed. Another 28.1 percent were unsure or un-
decided on this variable. There is a low negative association for this
variable (Gamma = -.122) with race.

Variable 7, effect of major highway arteries, indicated that 60.5
percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that major roads
and highways had been a major contributing factor for industrial growth. Twenty-one percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed and 18.9 percent were undecided. There is a low or negligible degree of association (Gamma = -.014) with race.

The data on variable 16, industrial development and economic problems, produced by far the greatest number of positive responses of all variables. Of the respondents, 90.1 percent either agreed or strongly agreed. Only 9.9 percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that industrial development can assist in alleviating various economic problems. There is a moderate negative degree of association (Gamma = -.337).

**Unionization**

Table 2 shows that both of the variables concerning absence of labor unions and local industrial production (20) and group attraction to labor unions (24) which assess attitudes on unions by race were statistically significant ($X^2 = p \leq .05$) and there is a low degree of association for variable (20), regarding absence of labor unions and local industrial productivity, (Gamma = .16) and a moderate degree of association on variable 24 concerning which group finds labor unions more attractive (Gamma = .50). Of the respondents, 43.3 percent agreed and 20.5 percent disagreed and 36.2 percent were unsure as to whether the absence of labor union contributes to local industrial productivity. There is little or no discernible relationship between the responses for all respondents.
TABLE 2. Predicted Factor Loadings for Attitudes and Perceptions on Industrial Development Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For key to item numbers, see Table 1.

Moreover, when the data were examined by black-white responses on variable 24 concerning which group finds labor unions more attractive, black respondents were almost evenly divided as 26.0 percent replied "whites" and 24.2 percent said "blacks" were more attractive to unions. By contrast to the black respondents, the white respondents felt that they are more attractive to unions, 6.3 percent and 4.8 percent respectively. The greater number of responses by both blacks and whites was 56 percent "undecided" for whites and 38.8 percent for blacks.

Population

An examination of the data on variables dealing with the effect of industrial decisions on local population growth (21), relationship between industrial growth and return migration (22) and relationship of egress to lack of jobs for which persons qualify (23) which addressed positive and/or negative effects on population in regards to industrial development were statistically significant at the chi-square level of
Variables concerning the effect of industrial policy on local populating growth (21) and relationship of egress to lack of jobs for which persons qualify (23) have a low positive association while the relationship between industrial growth and return migration (22) has a low negative association.

There is a greater percentage of agreement by the respondents on variables concerning the effect of industrial policy on local population growth (21), relationship between industrial growth and return migration (22) and relationship of egress to lack of jobs for which persons qualify (23). The respondents felt that a single industry could make decisions which would have a significant increase or decrease in population (41 percent). They also felt that former residents would return when there is industrial growth (69.8 percent). Again, over 60 percent of the respondents felt that unemployed individuals were leaving their communities in the 80's because jobs for which they qualify were not available (61.1 percent).

**Alleviating Problems**

When the researchers viewed the data on the variables to assess the effects of industrial development on alleviating various problems, variables concerning industrial development and social problems (15) and industrial development and political (17) were statistically significant. Variable 16 which deals with industrial development and economic problems was not significant by the independent variable, race. The three types of problems identified with these variables were social, economic and political. On variable 16 dealing with industrial
development and economic problems, there is little variance among the respondents on alleviating various economic problems. There is almost a total agreement with only 16 or .03 percent disagreeing. Among the three variables, there is a low negative degree of association.

Environment

The data from the variables to assess the respondents' attitudes on the effects on industrial development on the environment were statistically significant. The variable on industrial pollution not in evidence (10) dealt with the impact of industry on air and water pollution. The respondents felt that industry has been relatively free of water and air pollution with 60 percent in agreement, while only 16 percent disagreed.

Variable (11), industry as a cause of pollution which was inversely or negatively stated, was highly significant. The respondents felt that industry did not have negative effects on the environment (56.6 percent). There is a low degree of association on both variables.

In order to explore further general associations of attitudes and perceptions of the respondents, a high-order statistical technique (factor analysis) was utilized. It was postulated that five factors would emerge among the twenty-four items or variables. The five posited factors on industrial development included the following:

Factor I. Economic. Items which addressed the economic impact of industrial development as perceived by the respondents.

Factor II. Environmental. Items assessing the effects of industrial development on the environment.
Factor III. Job Description. Perceptions of discriminations in relationship to employment by existing industries and future industrial development.

Factor IV. Community Attributes for Industrial Development. Items designed to ascertain the respondents' view of community resources as attractions for industrial developers.

Factor V. Unions. Items designed to ascertain the respondents' evaluation of unions as being attractive to promotion of industrial growth.

A factor analysis was run on predictions as presented in Table 3.

Utilizing the varimax rotation, three factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0: (used as a minimum criterion) emerged. These factors combinatorically accounted for only 72.0 percent of the variance (see Table 3).

TABLE 3. Varimax Factor Loadings of Attitudes and Perception Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>2.7227</td>
<td>1.7343</td>
<td>1.2960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Variance Explained</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfactor Correlations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1884</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4135</td>
<td>-.3487</td>
<td>.6771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The varimax rotated factors produced three factors, which we projected as predicted factors. The varimax factor and the predicted factor I were similar as both were economic indicators. Item (16) industrial development and economic problems, and (23), relationship of egress to lack of jobs for which persons quality were discarded because they failed to discriminate.

Factor II of the varimax factors and factor III of the projected factors, (job discrimination), matched with the exception of item 5 which failed to discriminate. Item 5 had a 90.1% disagreement among the respondents. The two items which addressed unions remained the same and thus becoming factor 3 on the varimax rotation. These two items clustered as expected.

Factor II (Environment) and factor IV (Community Attributes) did not appear. However, there were several items with moderate correlations concerning industry as a cause of pollution (11), availability of medical care to industrial employees (18), local attitudes toward industrial growth and relationship between industrial growth and return migration (22) but the weights are not sufficient to warrant inclusion in the respective factors.

The data presented supports the significance, through factor analysis of the 24 items which assessed attitudes on industrial development, the three projected factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 using varimax rotation. Together these three factors accounted for 71.8 percent of the total variation among the items. Most loadings tended to be rather strong (.70 or higher), and no cross-loadings appeared. The
simple structure of factor analysis clearly supports the assumption that economics, job discrimination and unions identify a wide range of attitudes and perceptions on industrial development.

Correlation coefficients were developed between race and residency on each of the factors represented by factor scale scores. The analysis confirmed a linkage between industrial development and the economic factor. Also, the relatively high loading and correlation on the job discrimination factor is of particular interest, inasmuch as it is significantly associated with perceptions of industrial development held by the respondents.

The findings concerning industrial development are as follows: 1. it has been accompanied by improved levels of income (59.8%); 2. it provides a significant number of job opportunities (56.0%); 3. more jobs are available in industry than agriculture (61.3%); 4. major roads and highway have been a major contributing factor for industrial growth (60.5%); and 5. residents in the eight counties researched take pride in welcoming new industries (83.8%).

On the other hand, there seems to be a diversity of opinions regarding the merit of unions. That is, 43.3 percent of the respondents agreed that the absence of labor unions is considered as being a contributing factor to productivity to many industries, while 36.2 percent were unsure and 20.5 percent disagreed. The attraction to unions by racial categories was left unresolved as 14.3 percent felt that whites favored unionism, while 12.7 percent of all respondents considered blacks to be more inclined to support the unions.
SUMMARY

The future orientation of political leaders toward high technology in the South and the reality expressed by the respondents indicate that attitudes toward industrial development in this geographical area are favorable.

On the basis of our research findings, when an industry leaves a community there is a significant decline in the number of jobs available and there is a mass exodus. Such is the trend which results in an influx of persons in counties researched due to industrial expansion.

None of the industries attracted to the rural/urban counties here were perceived by the inhabitants as posing hazards to the environment in regard to air and water pollution. However, there has been some controversy about specific industries having a negative effect on fishing and resort areas in sections of Colleton and Richland counties. This negative aspect did not surface in the responses of the majority of the participants on our interview schedules.

The effect of industrial development on the social, economic and political problems was assessed by our respondents as being nebulous as far as social and political issues were concerned. They did perceive industry as being significant to the enhancement of rural and urban areas that are no longer stimulated by an agricultural economy.
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