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CHAPTER I
THEORETICAL OBJECTIVES

Statement of the Problem

The Marxian sociological paradigm poses many questions which have not been thoroughly empirically answered. While social change and class conflict are basic themes within Marxian theory, the various factors which precipitate social change and class conflict have not been thoroughly empirically researched. Perhaps the central academic and political question confronting the Marxian paradigm is what is the condition and what are the prospects of class consciousness among the American working class. Whether or not any section of the American working class is capable of developing the revolutionary consciousness necessary to precipitate fundamental social change can only be answered by investigating what circumstances and political and social attitudes inhibit or facilitate the development of class consciousness among workers. It is incumbent upon the Marxian sociological paradigm to attempt to identify what, if any, strata of the working class has class consciousness, and to identify what conditions promote or inhibit working class consciousness. While the Marxian paradigm suggests that the economic and
social insecurity among workers, generated by capitalism, is a necessary prerequisite for the development of alienation, class consciousness, and radical attitudes, Marx and Engels never contended that economic insecurity, in and of itself, is sufficient to radicalize workers (Marx and Engels, 1964:86). The empirical question which confronts the Marxian paradigm today is among what segment of economically insecure workers, with what characteristics, is class consciousness and other radical or conservative political and social attitudes most likely to develop.

There is probably no group of workers who are more objectively economically insecure than unemployed workers. Thus, if economic insecurity is insufficient, in and of itself, to generate working class consciousness, then it seems reasonable that an investigation of the political and social attitudes of unemployed workers from diverse occupational, racial, educational, etc., backgrounds may provide information concerning what the other factors are, aside from economic insecurity, which may generate class consciousness. It is for this reason that an empirical investigation of the political and social attitudes of unemployed workers may provide a confirmation or a negation of many Marxian assumptions about the working class and its attitudes, especially its class consciousness.
Though several studies have demonstrated that unemployment results in workers attaining higher levels of radicalism, class consciousness, and alienation than before being unemployed (Centers, 1949; Leggett, 1964; Zeitlin, 1966; Hamilton, 1967), there is insufficient knowledge about which specific segments of the unemployed, e.g., skilled or unskilled workers, old or young, have what particular social and political attitudes and to what extent. Although most of the evidence supports the conclusion that unemployment increases radicalism, there is also some contrary evidence that unemployment does not lead to any kind of radicalism among the unemployed (Wilcock and Franke, 1963). This dissertation attempts to empirically and theoretically test some of the questions left unanswered or ambiguous by previous studies concerning the effect of unemployment on the political and social attitudes of the unemployed from a Marxian perspective.

In addition to presenting some theoretical questions and answers concerning the development of radical political attitudes among the unemployed from a Marxian perspective, knowledge of the political and social attitudes of the unemployed is of special relevancy today because of the enormous social problem of unemployment. For as it has recently been reported:
Unemployment is rising and production is falling faster than at any time since the Depression, and the situation is certain to grow worse. (Time, 1975:20)

The current economic crisis of our country, the increasing unemployment, rising prices, and the fuel and energy shortages, are, as reported in the mass media, having serious consequences for the social lives of most Americans. Current reports suggest that massive economic and social dislocations, the subsequent psychological, civil, and domestic problems of the unemployed, and the governmental responses to the problems of unemployment are beginning to effect changes in the social and political attitudes of the unemployed (The New York Times Magazine, February 9, 1975). The unemployed appear to be questioning long held assumptions about the work ethic, refusing to equate unemployment with personal failure and shifting the blame for their present condition to the "system". Some of the unemployed, as reported by the news media, are even talking about committing crimes in order to obtain food or money. Talk about the need for revolution is also being expressed by some of the unemployed (The New York Times Magazine, February 9, 1975). George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, succinctly summarized the potential impact of continued high rates of unemployment when he said:
Continued high unemployment is a time bomb ticking in the foundation of this society. In 6 percent of America's families, the head of the household is unemployed. The average unemployment now lasts 15 weeks - 50 per cent higher than a year ago, and it is getting longer. And high unemployment is forecast to continue for the rest of this decade, aggravating old social problems and creating new ones. (1975:10)

Significance

Because of the numerous social problems which may be engendered by unemployment it is incumbent on sociologists to study the attitudes of the unemployed with an eye towards informing social policy. Tiffany, Cowan, and Tiffany have suggested that inadequate social policies which fail to meet the problems of the unemployed are the result of the "lag in the use of social science knowledge" (1970:17-18). As Tiffany, Cowan, and Tiffany have stated concerning the social problems of unemployment:

Possibly two reasons account for the absence of sound social policies. First, we do not have adequate knowledge in the social sciences to solve our racial, urban, or unemployment problems. Social science is, at best, embryonic in its development and, like most new sciences, has been forced into a posture of first fostering concern for its own development (at the expense of concern for social-action programs). Second, what knowledge we do have is not properly communicated so that policy makers can make adequate use of it. (1970:18)
Perhaps more effective social policies for dealing with the problem of unemployment and the problems of the unemployed can be generated if more knowledge about how specific segments of unemployed individuals perceive the sources and consequences of their unemployment is made available. After all, the problem of unemployment is not fundamentally a statistical or "economic" problem; it is a profound human problem. It is ultimately the conscious, feeling, and opinioned individuals who must be considered when dealing with the problem of unemployment.

Previous Research

**Class consciousness and radicalism**

John Leggett, working with the assumption that unemployed workers are structurally less secure in the economic and social realm, hypothesized that unemployed workers will have high degrees of class consciousness (1964). Leggett also hypothesized that the insecure economic status of being unemployed combined with being a member of a marginal racial group would result in even higher degrees of class consciousness among the unemployed. Leggett's study confirmed his hypotheses that the unemployed were more class conscious than the employed, and members of marginal racial groups who were also union members had the highest levels of class consciousness.
consciousness. Leggett's study suggests numerous hypotheses concerning the unemployed which today take on added significance during this period of national economic crisis.

However, others have pointed out that unemployment does not lead to class consciousness. Wilcock and Franke conclude from their study of the attitudes of the unemployed that:

...there was surprisingly little radicalism or rejection of the social and economic system. Many accepted economic insecurity as a part of the American way of life, and few had very specific ideas about what could be done to help them in the labor market. (1963:93)

Also Aiken, Ferman, and Sheppard have pointed out:

(Although some)...studies suggest that economic insecurity associated with unemployment should lead to negativistic political orientations and to some limited radicalism and class consciousness, ...wide-spread radicalism and Marxist-style class consciousness have not been the response to unemployment in American society. (1968:92)

Nevertheless, Zeitlin in his study of Cuban workers, has argued that:

...the recurrent unemployment and underemployment and the consequent "state of anxiety" of the Cuban workers in pre-revolutionary Cuba later became a significant determinant of their support for the revolution and its leadership... (1966:36)
Zeitlin hypothesized that the longer an individual's unemployment in pre-revolutionary Cuba the greater the individual's support of the Cuban revolution. He also hypothesized that unemployed blacks would have given greater support to the revolution than whites. Zeitlin's two hypotheses were confirmed.

Richard Centers in his class study, *The Psychology of Social Classes* (1949), found that "Radicalism increases...proportionally as the time that people who have been out of work is lengthened..." (1949:176-179). However, Centers also found that often people who have been unemployed for a year or more sometime in the past are frequently politically conservative. Thus, Centers concluded that it is "the person's present status and role that seem to determine his orientation more than anything else" (1949:179).

Richard Hamilton's study of French workers (1967) concluded with the finding that: "Radicalism among workers - but not among white collar employees - varies directly with increased unemployment" (1967:200). In terms of the long range effects of having been once unemployed, Hamilton found that once an individual develops radical opinions as a consequence of being unemployed, those opinions are usually persistent even when the individual's life situation improves. Hamilton found no support for the "demoralization" theory, which
contends that unemployment leads workers to feel depressed and pessimistic.

In a more recent study of American workers' dissatisfaction, Sheppard and Herrick (1972) found that, "Workers with unemployment experience are slightly more alienated than those without any joblessness, but only if they are in low-level tasks" (1972:98). In regard to political party preferences, individuals with unemployment experience tended to prefer the Democratic party over all other political parties.

**Self-esteem**

The psychological effects of unemployment may be so debilitating that the development of class consciousness or any radical attitude may not be possible. Of all the problems facing working class individuals, unemployment and its debilitating psychological, social and economic effects, is perhaps one of the most serious. Several authors have pointed out (Eisenberg and Lazarsfeld, 1938; Komarovsky, 1940:81; Tiffany, Cowan, Tiffany, 1970:62; Wilcock and Franke, 1963:91; Braginsky and Braginsky, 1975) that in our culture a person's job is an integral part of a person's self-esteem and often provides the sole organizing principal for the individual's social behavior and attitudes. The condition of unemployment may have a shattering effect on an
individual's self-esteem, consequently increasing the possibility of personality and behavioral problems (Braginsky and Braginsky, 1975). Also, of the many social roles an individual plays and takes daily, the work role often sets the parameters, in terms of opportunity, time, interest, and resources, of other social roles. Unemployment often leaves the individual without the central organizing function of the work role. Given the dominant ideological and structural nature of our economy, (wherein the male is often the central "bread-winner" of a family) unemployment is especially destructive to a man's self-esteem. As Komarovsky has pointed out:

...for most of the men in our culture, work is apparently the sole organizing principle and the only means of self-expression. The other interests that existed in the lives of these men - active sports, hobbies, political and civic interests, personal and social relations - turned out to be too weak and insignificant for their personalities to furnish any meaning to their lives. (1940:81)

But the loss of a socially meaningful role such as the work role probably weakens the social identity and self-esteem of any individual, male or female, single or married, young or old. Unemployment disrupts the role sets of individuals and probably has serious consequences for the individual's orientating frames of reference for the self and his social interactions with
his family, peers, and government and business institutions.

As a recent report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare states:

The tension generated by chronic money shortages is raised to even higher levels if the husband also experiences intermittent or prolonged unemployment. There is always the question in everyone's mind that his being unemployed may be "his own fault". He is "surplus man" around the house, because the sharp division of labor in the lower-class family gives him a minimally active role in housekeeping and child-rearing, and because the wife feels he should be out working or looking for work. And since unemployment in low-income households is often a reality and always a prospect - or even if he works steadily, he may not be bringing home enough to live on - the man is constantly vulnerable to the definition, his own or others' or both, that something is wrong with him, that he does not want to work, or if he is working, that he is simply not worth enough to be paid a living wage. (1973:182-183)

Additionally, as Frank Furstenburg points out, after reviewing 46 studies relating work experience and family life:

...economic uncertainty brought on by unemployment and marginal employment is a principal reason why family relations deteriorate. (1973)

The loss of self-confidence, feelings of uselessness, and lower self-esteem precipitated by unemployment often increase as the length of time being unemployed
increases (Wilcock and Franke, 1963:166). A generalized sense of social and political alienation may result when the unemployed individual is no longer able to anchor the criteria of his self-concepts in the industrial, social, and political institutions which when employed provide the individual with the criteria needed to maintain his self-esteem. Consequently, unemployment may result in the alienation of the individual because the condition of unemployment creates a disjunction between self-esteem maintenance needs and those institutions which supply the criteria for maintaining self-esteem (Faunce, 1968:94). Unemployment may also negatively effect self-esteem and generate alienation, because with unemployment may come the loss of "self-direction", i.e., a sense of helplessness and powerlessness which would not be as strong when one is working and thus "paying" and "making" one's own way (Aiken, Ferman, Sheppard, 1968:2; Tiffany, Cowan, Tiffany, 1970:76).

The Problems of Previous Research

Perhaps the greatest weakness of previous studies of the social and political attitudes of the unemployed is the inadequate samples of unemployed workers studied. As early as 1938, Eisenberg and Lazarsfeld pointed out concerning research on the unemployed that:
Western culture is by no means a uniform entity, and a study of subgroups within it will probably reveal that unemployment has different effects on different groups. (1938:374)

However, it appears that most researchers of the unemployed have been limited in their ability to generalize findings because their samples of unemployed workers did not reflect occupational, social class, age, sex, and background characteristics. Many of the contradictory findings regarding class consciousness and radicalism among the unemployed may also reflect the different responses of different segments of the working class to unemployment.

While some researchers are able to point out, for instance, that unemployment does not severely affect the psychology of lower-class individuals (Eisenberg and Lazarsfeld, 1938) and other researchers find that the self-esteem of middle-managers, engineers and skilled semi-professionals are severely affected (Braginsky and Braginsky, 1975), there have been very few studies which could test such assumptions within the same sample of unemployed workers. And while it has been pointed out that the chronically unemployed, "see themselves as undesirable, doubt their own worth, often feel anxious, depressed and unhappy, and have little faith or confidence in themselves", (Tiffany, Cowan,
Tiffany, 1970:92) there is little knowledge about the effects of current unemployment, resulting from structural economic failure, on the highly employable.

Objectives of this Study

The major differences of this study of the political and social attitudes among the unemployed is that it seeks to analyze the basic social and political attitudinal differences of the different segments of the unemployed rather than comparing employed workers with unemployed workers in general. Such research will be possible because of the unique nature of the current sample which represents a cross section of all unemployed workers from various job backgrounds, different work histories, skills, ages, races, and incomes in a northern industrial city. The diverse strata backgrounds of the current sample of unemployed workers provides an unusual opportunity to study the intra class correlates of the political and social attitudes of the working class. This is especially important, as Horowitz points out:

Because for so long we have been accustomed - in the social sciences at least - to speak of workers in terms of upper, middle, and lower sectors of the working class, we have forgotten that this designation is based on the considerations of class. Also, since most of our statistics are in the form of occupa-
tions, the data we have on the labor force in the United States is limited to considerations of income and work performance, with little data on intra-class factors. (1972:516)

Secondly, because this study is concerned with discovering what political and social attitudes may inhibit or facilitate class consciousness, such attitudes as political alienation, authoritarianism, political party preference, and self-esteem will also be examined. These other attitudinal variables are, at least theoretically, related to class consciousness as will be argued later.

Thirdly, this study is not concerned with the chronically unemployed, but rather with the highly employable worker who finds himself suddenly economically dislocated because of the recurrent structural failures of American Capitalism.

Fourthly, this study provides an empirical test for many of the domain assumptions of the Marxian sociological paradigm. It also provides for a testing of the strength and open-endedness of the Marxian paradigm's explanatory powers. And lastly, this study may shed some light on the much debated question as to whether the Marxian paradigm has anything to offer to our understanding of 20th century American capitalist society.

Because the essential concern of this dissertation
is to provide answers to some questions raised by the Marxian paradigm, it is necessary to reexamine the original assumptions of the Marxian paradigm. The problem of the development of working class consciousness subsumes other fundamental questions of a philosophical, psychological, and historical nature. Consequently, if a contemporary study of the attitudes of the unemployed is to be of any value to the Marxian paradigm, an examination of Marxian theoretical conceptions is necessary to provide a theoretical framework for interpreting the empirical findings of this study of the attitudes of the unemployed.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The attempt to examine and analyze the attitudes of the unemployed must be framed and anchored in some theoretical setting in order to have theoretical and methodological direction. For the purposes of this dissertation the theoretical framework of the Marxian paradigm is utilized. This chapter will deal with an examination of the Marxian paradigm in terms of its domain assumptions and major theoretical components.

The choice of the Marxian paradigm as the sociological framework to be tested and utilized to explain and interpret an empirical study of the attitudes of the unemployed is appropriate for several reasons. Central to the theoretical concerns of Marxism are the issues of the development of class consciousness, social class, alienation, ideology and the effects of the economic crises of capitalism on workers. All these issues are germane when one examines the attitudes of unemployed workers. Marx himself considered economic insecurity, as manifested in unemployment, to be one of the factors which might precipitate alienation, class consciousness, and radical ideology among the working class.

Despite the often voiced contention by many con-
temporary non-Marxian "academic" sociologists that the Marxian paradigm is not sociological or at least irrelevant to the studies of the "Modern" world (Tiryakian, 1975:5-9), Marxism was and is inextricably tied to the development of Western sociology. Marxism provides a legitimate sociological alternative to both the Weberian and Durkheimian traditions which dominate sociology today. As several authors point out, Marxian sociology, Durkheimian sociology, and Weberian sociology developed as intellectual and moral responses to the rise of industrialization (Zeitlin, 1968; Gouldner, 1970; Giddens, 1971).

The origin of modern sociological thought is to be found in the writings of Saint-Simon which serves as one of the major common sources of Western sociology, whether Marxian, Durkheimian, or Weberian (Zeitlin, 1968). However, with the emergence of Marxism, a major change in sociology was to develop. As Gouldner points out:

A major structural characteristic of Western sociology develops after the emergence of Marxism; following this, Western Sociology is divided into two camps, each with its own continuous intellectual tradition and distinctive intellectual paradigms, and each greatly insulated from or mutually contemptuous of the other. After the sprawling genius of Saint-Simon, Western Sociology underwent a kind of "binary fission" into two sociologies, each differentiated from the other both theoretically and institutionally, and each the reverse or
mirror image of the other. One was Comte's program for a "pure" sociology, which, in time, became Academic Sociology, the university sociology of the middle class, that achieved its fullest institutional development in the United States. The other was the sociology of Karl Marx, or Marxism, the party sociology of intellectuals oriented toward the proletariat, which achieved its greatest success in Eastern Europe. (1970:111)

There has arisen recently, however, a development and utilization of the Marxian paradigm by "academic" sociologists which reflects not only an appreciation of the paradigm's analytical and empirical strengths, but also the recurring crises of modern capitalism and the resulting radicalization of large masses of the American people, including sociologists. The Marxian paradigm provides not merely a theoretical framework in which to explain empirical "facts", but it can also provide a framework for the entire methodological act of research. Charles Anderson in his current Marxian introductory sociology text contends that:

The social theories of Karl Marx (1818-83) provide the student of industrial society with valuable conceptual and intellectual tools for comparison, analysis, and interpretation. As used in sociology, the Marxist perspective is not a political program or strict ideology. Rather, it is a set of general orienting statements and working tools with which to study social phenomena. Beyond this, Marxist theory contains a great many research propositions holding various degrees of validity.
Marxism draws upon other perspectives and theories just as non-Marxists may gain insights from Marxism. Marxist sociology sets forth an interpretive framework within which the social analyst can organize his or her thinking about developments and changes within industrial society. (1974:57)

Consequently, Marxism may be conceived as a general social science paradigm including within its parameters anthropological, psychological, economic, political and sociological concepts and theories. Many of the conceptual and theoretical foundations already contained in the Marxian perspective will be utilized in this study of the contemporary attitudes of the unemployed. Of special relevance will be the Marxian theories of social classes, superstructure, substructure, ideology, alienation, and class consciousness.

However, there has been a great deal of reinterpretation of the original assumptions of Marxism, and consequently perhaps much distortion of what Marx and Engels actually stated. Thus it becomes necessary in this study not only to present the basic assumptions of Marxian theory, but also to document that presentation with the original statements of Marx and Engels. The documentation of original Marxian assumptions thus becomes a part of the research tasks and contributions of this study.
Marxian Methodology

While Marx and Engels never worked out a fully systematic methodology, in the sense of specific research methods, they did provide Marxism with basic methodological assumptions and premises which have framed the research of all subsequent Marxists. One of the basic premises which frames the Marxist method is as Marx and Engels stated:

The premises from which we begin are not arbitrary ones, not dogmas, but real premises from which abstraction can only be made in the imagination. They are the real individuals, their activity and the material conditions under which they live, both those which they find already existing and those produced by their activity. These premises can thus be verified in a purely empirical way. (1964:31)

The second basic methodological premise of Marxism is that the dialectic logic must be used to link empirical concepts. This dialectic logic simply refers to the idea that:

...the world is not to be comprehended as a complex of ready-made things, but as a complex of processes, in which the things apparently stable no less than their mind-images in our heads, the concepts, go through an uninterrupted change of coming into being and passing away, in which, in spite of all seeming accidents and of all temporary retrogression, a progressive development asserts itself in the end. (Engels, 1935:54)
Marxists consequently are not intrinsically opposed to such social science techniques as research surveys or statistical analysis. Indeed, some contemporary Marxists go so far as to state:

The distinguishing feature of Marxism is not that it invents and uses some new-fangled method of its own, quite different from the method evolved, used and approved in the normal conduct of the sciences, but that it develops and applies scientific method universally, and that includes drawing conclusions about men, human society and human affairs. Marxism seeks to apply scientific ways of understanding to everything that comes within human ken, including humanity itself. (Cornforth, 1968:40)

Indeed, Marx himself was clearly one of the earliest of empirical social scientists. In April, 1880, he had developed a questionnaire to measure the work and political attitudes of French workers. Twenty-five thousand copies of the questionnaire were printed by the French Socialist newspaper, Revue Socialiste (Fedoseyev, 1973:568). And, of course as is well known, Marx spent years in the British Museum Library reviewing the empirical statistics on labor and economic development contained in the British Government "Blue Books".

What is, however, distinctive about Marxian social science is the types of theoretical concepts contained in its "methodology". This is important, for as Blumer
points out concerning theory and methods:

Throughout the act of scientific inquiry concepts play a central role. They are significant elements in the prior scheme that the scholar has of the empirical world; they are likely to be the terms in which his problem is cast; they are usually the categories for which data are sought and in which the data are grouped; they usually become the chief means for establishing relations between data; and they are usually the anchor points in interpretation of the findings. (1969:26)

The Marxian paradigm retains an historical and evolutionary imagination which enables it to give depth and meaning to its research efforts, in the sense of not merely reporting or describing isolated empirical findings. For as critics of non-Marxian sociology contend, most of modern sociology is merely a collection of data without theoretical analysis or at best, collections of data with limited empirical generalization (Osipov, 1969:47).

The theoretical and methodological utility of the Marxian perspective is especially appropriate for a study of the unemployed, because such a study must of necessity deal with many of the basic domains of social life which the Marxian paradigm is particularly concerned with.

However, when utilizing the sociological propositions of Marx, we must keep in mind that Marx was not
professionally a sociologist nor did he define himself as such. Although Marx held a Ph.D in philosophy from the University of Berlin, he did not consider himself a philosopher. While many of his writings deal with economic matters, he was not an economist. Marx was, as his life long friend and collaborator, Engels, described him, before all else a revolutionary. In other words, Marx was a Marxist, i.e., a revolutionary who studies social reality holistically rather than in disjointed analyses, and who attempted to utilize knowledge to change reality. Nevertheless, I have attempted to abstract from the works of Marx and Engels propositions which are specifically of a sociological nature. But it should be reiterated that Marx made no attempts to develop any formal systematic and grand sociological theories. Most of his writings were polemical in nature and reflect ongoing debates between himself and his political opponents.

Marxian Image of Man and Society

The Marxian image of man is relevant to a study of the attitudes of the unemployed because it addresses itself to the fundamental question of whether the consciousness of men, and consequently their attitudes, are merely reflections of economic conditions or independent forces. A Marxian explanation of the social
conditions which influence the political and social attitudes of workers, and which in turn is influenced by attitudes, must be informed by a basic understanding of the Marxian image of society. For it is from the assumptions of the Marxian image of society that the concepts of social class, ideology, alienation, and class consciousness are developed.

The image of man within the Marxian paradigm is one which views man as both subject-object. For Marx, men are the active and creative producers of their social and culture worlds. What distinguishes men from all other living organisms is that they consciously labor to produce their means of subsistence (Marx, 1964:31). However, men consciously labor and create under specific historical and social circumstances already in existence - these circumstances themselves being the creation of past generations of men and women. As Marx said:

> Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past. (Selsam and Martel, 1970:67)

For Marx, men are not motivated principally by economic gain, as many distorted interpretations of Marxism contend. Man, in Marx's view, is as equally motivated by ideas and ideals as he is by material, individual or class, interests. In the Marxian paradigm,
man is considered to be a thoroughly social being by definition. As Marx puts it:

Even when I carry out scientific work, etc., an activity which I can seldom conduct in direct association with other men - I perform a social, because human, act. It is not only the material of my activity - like the language itself which the thinker uses - which is given to me as a social product. My own existence is a social activity.

(Bottomore and Rubel, 1956:77)

Another popular distortion of the Marxian image of man holds that Marx had neglected or under-emphasized the role of man's purposeful and conscious abilities in accounting for social interaction and social change. Marx never held such a one-sided image of man. Marx's emphasis on the necessary need for class consciousness to precipitate a revolutionary change clearly indicated his recognition of the role of conscious activity in social change. The importance of consciousness for Marx is also indicated by his belief that "false consciousness" among the working class could prevent social change. Thus for Marx, men and their activity are not simple reflexes of economic mechanisms nor are men mindless, unconscious social robots.

In summary, Marx held an image of man which stressed:

1) man as both producer and product of social reality;
2) man as a conscious active producer, yet sometimes
dominated by false consciousness;
3) man as motivated by ideas and ideals in addition to more mundane and material interests;
4) man as a thoroughly social being.

The Marxian image of society follows from Marx's conception of man. For instance, Marx said:

The social structure and the State are continually evolving out of the life-process of definite individuals, but of individuals, not as they may appear in their own or other peoples imagination, but as they really are; i.e., as they operate, produce materially, and hence, as they work under definite material limits, presuppositions and conditions independent of their will.
(Marx and Engels, 1964:36-37)

It is the totality of interested relationships which gives rise to society. However, Marx held a realist image of society, in that, once interested productive relationships are patterned over time (structured) they have a reality and coercive power over the particular social relationships that give rise to them. Thus Marx stated:

In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to
which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being determines their consciousness. (Marx, 1904:11)

And while Marx emphasized the evolutionary and revolutionary nature of social change, i.e., he viewed society as process, he also appreciated the integrated and stable quality of society. As Zeitlin points out:

Indeed, Marx is an example par excellence of a theorist who sought to develop a unified theoretical approach.

...While Marx recognized the interest conflicts of classes, and the relationships of exploitation and domination among them, he recognized equally that force and coercion were not the sole elements accounting for the successful domination of the subjected class. By now everyone knows how important ideology was to Marx's conceptual framework. Time and again he emphasized that the ruling ideas of a society in a given epoch are the ideas of the ruling class. The class that controls the means of material production also controls the means of mental production, and is thereby able to impose its values and ideas upon those who control neither. Marx was aware that values and ideas facilitate enormously the dominance of the ruling class's definition of reality - false consciousness, as Marx called it.

As this indicated, Marx was neither a conflict theorist nor an integration theorist. For he was as far from value consensus as he
was from a perspective emphasizing force and coercion to the exclusion of ideas, beliefs, values, and norms. (1973:116)

Social Class

The Marxian paradigm is often regarded as a type of "conflict" theory by non-Marxian sociologists (Turner, 1974:79). While the conflict of social classes is certainly a vital part of the theoretical foundation of the Marxian paradigm, the appellation of Marxism as a "conflict" theory is misleading because it distorts and narrows the scope of the analytic strength of the Marxian paradigm. Conflict takes second place to the centrality of the concept of social class in the Marxian sociological paradigm, subsequently the Marxian paradigm might be more accurately described as a "class" theory or a class analysis theory of society, rather than a conflict theory. Not only is the Marxian conception of social class central to the paradigm's analysis of social evolution, conflict and change, but it is also central to the Marxian epistemology and theories of social psychology and the sociology of knowledge. This is so because while Marx was to say that "social being determines consciousness", it is more precisely an individual's social class membership (social being) which circumscribes the parameters of
an individual's consciousness and attitudes. A Marx-
ian explanation of the political and social attitudes
of members of the working class who are unemployed
certainly must be based on the assumptions of Marx and
Engels regarding social classes.

As to the central importance of Marx's concept of
social class to his paradigm, Dahrendorf points out:

Indeed, the greatness and fatality
of his work become apparent in Marx's
theory of class. In this theory, the
three roots of his thought are join-
ed. Marx adopted the word from the
early British political economists;
its application to "capitalists" and
"proletarians" stems from the French
"utopian" socialists; the conception
of the class struggle is based on
Hegel's dialectics. The theory of
class provides the problematic link
between sociological analysis and
philosophical speculation in the work
of Marx. Both can be separated, and
have to be separated, but in this
process the theory of class is cut
in two; for it is as essential for
Marx's philosophy of history as it
is for his analysis of the dynamics
of capitalist society. (1959:8)

However, as Marx himself was to admit, he was not the
first to utilize a class analysis of society, although
he was to improve upon it. Marx stated:

And now as to myself, no credit is
due to me for discovering the exist-
ence of classes in modern society nor
yet the struggle between them. Long
before me bourgeois historians had
described the historical development
of this class struggle and bourgeois
economists the economic anatomy of the
classes. (Marx and Engels, 1934:55)
There is, of course, today a great deal of controversy surrounding the Marxian conception of social class. Often critics accuse Marx of imposing, a priori, Hegelian triads on social reality, thus implying that the notion of dichotomous antagonistic social classes are metaphysical constructs (Schumpeter, 1962:19-20). Other critics of Marx accuse him of over-simplifying the stratified reality of industrial society. Others argue that contemporary industrial society is no longer divided into discrete antagonistic classes, but rather into continuous interrelated strata (Tiryakian, 1975). The best method of clarifying exactly what Marx had to say concerning social classes, is to permit him to speak for himself. Marx described some of the characteristics of his conception of class when he stated:

In so far as millions of families live under economic conditions of existence that separate their mode of life, their interests and their culture from those of the other classes, and put them in hostile opposition to the latter, they form a class. In so far as there is merely a local interconnection among these small-holding peasants, and the identity of their interests begets no community, no national bond, and no political organization among them, they do not form a class. (Anderson, 1974:50)

This definition suggests that a social class must be characterized by both objective and subjective criteria. However, as Anderson points out concerning this
particular definition:

The above does not mean, however, that social class is an all-or-nothing entity. It is a matter of degree as to how many of the criteria will be present in a given case, and also a matter of degree with each separate criteria. The greater the number of criteria present and the greater the intensity of each, the greater is the class as revolutionary potential. (1974:51)

Contrary to the Weberian conception of social status, which uses such criteria as income, education, power and prestige to determine an individual's location in the stratification system of a society, the basic objective criteria in the Marxian paradigm for determining an individual's social class membership is that individual's relation to a society's social means of production. For purposes of historical and sociological analysis, Marxism maintains that there are at least five basic social classes in capitalist societies. The ruling class, also called the capitalist or bourgeoisie, owns and controls the social means of production and controls, directly and indirectly, the political state. Individuals who have an ambiguous relation to the social means of production, i.e., they neither own, control or work with the social means of production, but instead are basically self-employed and rely essentially on their own initiative and unique abilities, e.g., doctors, lawyers, professors, etc., to make a living, constitute
the middle class. Individuals who do not own or control the social means of production, and for whatever reasons must sell their labor power in exchange for a wage by working with the social means of production constitute the working class or proletariat. Those individuals who are involved in the productive work of agriculture, but do not own the major social means of production constitute the peasantry and farming class. A class similar to the middle class in that it has an unclear relation to the social means of production, but on the other hand, engages in no established productive activities, is the lumpen-proletariat, e.g., criminals, bums, hippies, etc., (Marx and Engels, 1968:35-45; Marx, 1966:885-886).

Despite whatever differences might exist in terms of income, education, prestige, etc., i.e., status, between individuals with similar relations to the social means of production, it was a basic assumption of Marx and Engels, that individuals sharing a similar relation to the social means of production would basically share similar cultural and economic interests. While it was also assumed that similar relations to the social means of production influences the formation of class consciousness, there was and is little empirical evidence that this assumption is correct.

It may be the case that individuals in the same
social class, but with different statuses, e.g.,
occupations, education, etc., do not perceive their
political and economic interests in identical ways.
This question confronting the Marxian paradigm is one
of the basic questions this dissertation will empir­
ically attempt to resolve. That is, do all unemployed
workers share a similar political and social conscious­
ness generated by their similar precarious economic
situation or do differences in status, i.e., education,
race, age, etc., account for differences in attitudes
among members of the same objective social class.

It must always be kept in mind that Marx was not
an academic sociologist concerned with simply develop­
ing theories of social stratification. Marx's studies
of capitalist society were concerned essentially with
the dynamics of social change. In this regard,
Lopreato and Hazelrigg point out about Marx's theory
of class:

Far from wishing to describe in detail
an existing state of society and all
factors that accounted for that state,
his chief concern was with isolating
"certain laws" of social development
and forces inherent in that develop­
ment - which is to say that Marx's
theory was dynamic and analytical
rather than static and descriptive.
(1972:21)

Consequently, Marx's theory of social class must be
understood in terms of the historical analytic purposes
it was intended for and for which it can be used today. That is, as an analytic concept to account for the historical and structural changes of industrial capitalist societies and as a sensitizing theoretical framework for contemporary empirical studies of social classes. As Dahrendorf contends:

...it is sufficient to emphasize that for Marx the theory of class was not a theory of a cross section of society arrested in time, in particular not a theory of social stratification, but a tool for the explanation of changes in total societies. (1959:19)

For Marx, the gradations of strata within a social class were secondary, in explaining social change and individual attitudes, to the aggregates of families and individuals which had specific relations to the means of production. The means of production in Marx's view were the motive power of society and social change. Consequently, Marx and Engels could argue for heuristic purposes that:

Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses...this distinctive feature: it has simplified the class antagonism. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat. (1968:36)

The crystallization of class boundaries and antagonisms, however, is contingent on the maturation of two
factors: objective structural conditions and subjective consciousness. While the criteria of a social class for Marx are essentially and primarily objective structural criteria, as is clear from the entire text and trend of his social thought, subjective factors such as a peoples' recognition of their objective social class and class interests are necessary for the full maturation of class boundaries and structural change. Marx said:

Economic conditions had first transformed the mass of the people of the country into workers. The combination of capital has created for this mass a common situation, common interests. This mass is thus already a class as against capital, but not yet for itself. In the struggle, of which we have noted only a few phases, this mass becomes united, and constitutes itself as a class for itself. (Marx, Poverty of Philosophy, no date: 166)

Not only is structural maturation and social change dependent on the working class becoming a class for itself, but as C.W. Mills stressed over and over again, the individual can not understand the larger historical scene and its meaning for his inner life and external career without becoming conscious of his position within a social class (1959:3-7: 1951:xx). Thus the analysis of class consciousness becomes a significant factor in comprehending industrial society and social change, and in providing individuals with
biographical anchoring in and understanding of the relation between their life chances and their social world.

Some argue, nevertheless, that Marx's conception of class is an a priori scheme imposed on social reality which over simplifies that reality (Schumpeter, 1962:19-20). These critics first of all forget that Marx was not interested in a static and descriptive report of "status" differences in society; but rather, Marx was concerned with historical dynamics. Secondly, such critics are often not aware of Marx's recognition of numerous strata in society which were, however, not relevant for his "ideal" model of social change. Marx's argument was that the various strata were tending more and more to be concentrated in the central classes which constitute modern societies based upon the capitalist mode of production. Of the intermediate strata, Marx said:

In England modern society is indisputably most highly and classically developed in economic structure. Nevertheless, even here the stratification of classes does not appear in its pure form. Middle and intermediate strata even here obliterate lines of demarcation everywhere. However, this is immaterial for our analysis. (1966:885)

Of course, the intermediate strata within social classes is not immaterial for the purposes of this
study. The investigation of the status correlates of various levels of class consciousness and other political and social attitudes among unemployed workers is important for examining under what conditions certain segments of the working class become radicalized. Nevertheless, the Marxian conception of social class provides an historical and structural analytic framework by which a broader historical and structural interpretation of the attitudes of unemployed workers can be attempted.

An empirical investigation of the class consciousness and other political and social attitudes of economically and socially insecure members of the working class may provide needed information about whether the American working class is a fully "mature" social class in the Marxian sense. Additionally, such an investigation can perhaps contribute to answering the question of whether an individual's objective social class membership is sufficient to account for that individual's consciousness or whether there are other objective and subjective factors which contribute to the formation of an individual's consciousness. These will be some of the theoretical questions that this dissertation will empirically attempt to answer.
Sociology of Knowledge

Because an analysis of the political and social attitudes of unemployed workers fundamentally involves a philosophical question of the relation of consciousness, knowledge, and attitudes to social existence, the Marxian sociology of knowledge becomes relevant to such an analysis.

Sociology of knowledge "seeks to analyze the relationship between knowledge and existence" (Mannheim, 1936:264). This rather broad definition of the sociology of knowledge is characteristic of the field itself which has been concerned with numerous varieties of independent social variables, such as social class, status, role, social structure, social relations, etc., and their relation to numerous dependent variables such as sensations, perceptions, ideas, ideologies, beliefs, science, etc. Needless to say, the general concerns of the sociology of knowledge overlaps the concerns of social psychology. The focus of social psychology has been in the ways in which membership in a social structure or group affects the individual's behavior and psychology and how in turn the individual's behavior and psychology can affect the social structure or group (Lindesmith and Strauss, 1968:3). Undoubtedly, an analysis of the political and social attitudes of
the unemployed must be informed by a sociology of knowledge and a social psychology. If we are to comprehend the relation of a section of a social class to its attitudes, i.e., its 'consciousness', it will be of great help to have such an analysis of attitudes anchored within a sociology of knowledge and social psychological framework. Bottomore and Rubel have pointed out:

Marx was, in fact, one of the originators of the sociology of knowledge, though in his eyes it was primarily a critical theory, intended to prepare the way for the constitution of a rigorous social science. (1956:24)

The Marxian paradigm does contain the elementary basis for such a framework. As already indicated, there was an implicit sociology of knowledge assumption contained in Marx's concept of social class. The working class does not become a cohesive solidified class until it becomes conscious of itself, i.e., becomes a class for itself. The implication was that structural factors would increasingly put the working class through experiences, e.g., unemployment, which would enable it to develop class consciousness. One might initially get the impression that Marx was suggesting a mechanical determinism wherein one's social location and experience automatically determine one's attitudes. However, for Marx the determinants of social consciousness
involve an amazingly complex set of variables under the rubric of 'social relations'. The flavor of Marx's "sociology of knowledge" is indicated when he stated:

Upon the different forms of property, upon the social conditions of existence, rises an entire superstructure of distinct and peculiarly formed sentiments, illusions, modes of thought and views of life. The entire class creates and forms them out of its material foundations and out of the corresponding social relations. The single individual, who derives them through tradition and upbringing, may imagine that they form the real motives and the starting-point of his activity. (1968:119)

Marx was positing that a social class creates, on the foundation of its material existence, certain views of life peculiar to that class or segment of that class' experience. There is, consequently, a type of determinism in Marx's paradigm. It must not be forgotten that for Marx social or material existence meant the totality of social relations, including the traditions and ideologies from the past held in the minds of man and expressed in their interaction.

Not only did Marx have an implicit sociology of knowledge but he also provided the seeds for a social psychology. For Marx, the individual's psychology is socially constructed out of the web of social experiences and relations the individual has, and in turn, social reality is created by individuals objectifying
their subjectivity. Marx and Engels expressed this idea when they stated:

Men are the producers of their conceptions, ideas, etc., - real, active men, as they are conditioned by a definite development of their productive forces and of the intercourse corresponding to them, up to its furthest forms. (1964:37)

Substructure and Superstructure

Marx and Engels developed two theoretical constructs to explicate the relations between social existence and consciousness; these two constructs are the superstructure and substructure of society. These concepts are relevant to an analysis of the development of class consciousness and other political and social attitudes because they provide a macro level explanation of the relation of ideas, ideologies, and attitudes which men hold to the structural social and economic roles which men play. The construct substructure refers to the totality of productive social relations necessary for a given society to perpetuate itself physically; Marx calls this totality of productive social relations the mode of production. The construct superstructure refers to the totality of social relations and attitudes which are secondary and dependent on the substructure. The superstructure includes such social relationships as those involving socialization and education, and
consequently, includes the various ideologies and attitudes given, exchanged, and internalized by the individuals of a given society.

The relation between the substructure and superstructure is one which is reciprocal; however, the substructure has more weight in the interaction primarily because of its life sustaining functions. Thus the substructure often circumscribes the parameters of the superstructure. To express this idea in simpler language, while belief systems and attitudes influence the nature of social relationships, the primary social relationship necessary for producing life sustaining needs, i.e., labor-productive relations, conditions belief systems and attitudes. For example, before a society engages in philosophy it must sustain itself physically.

Often Marx and Engels have been accused of positing a unidirectional causation scheme on social reality, wherein the substructure automatically and mechanically determines the superstructure (Bierstedt, 1970:530-531). In light of this misunderstanding it is necessary to quote Engels at length regarding the relation of the substructure to the superstructure. Engels stated:

According to the materialist conception of history the determining element in history is ultimately
the production and reproduction in real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. If therefore somebody twists this into the statement that the economic element is the only determining one, he transforms it into a meaningless, abstract and absurd phrase. The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure - political forms of the class struggle and its consequences, constitutions established by the victorious class after a successful battle, etc. - forms of law - and then even the reflexes of all these actual struggles in the brains of the combatants: political, legal, philosophical theories, religious ideas and their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form. There is an interaction of all these elements in which, amid all the endless host of accidents (i.e., of things and events, whose inner connection is so remote or so impossible to prove that we regard it as absent and can neglect it) the economic movement finally asserts itself as necessary. Otherwise the application of the theory to any period of history one chose would be easier than the solution of a simple equation of the first degree. (Marx and Engels, 1934:475)

There was for Marx and Engels no simple unilateral cause and effect relationship between a society's substructure and superstructure. Ideas, ideologies, alienation, and class consciousness are not to be viewed as mere epiphenomena. Rather, Marx and Engels contended that the superstructure and substructure interact in a reciprocal manner, with the substructure,
however, having more weight historically in that inter-
action. The presence or non-presence of various forms
of consciousness is thus essential for analyzing
society. That this was so for Marx and Engels is clear
in their theories concerning ideology, alienation, and
class consciousness.

Ideology

Marx and Engels argued that in the development of
societies abstract ideas and systems of ideas also
develop, but often these systems of ideas come to
appear to the thinker as completely independent of
social conditions. These systems of abstract ideas
are ideologies. Marx and Engels wrote:

We set out from real, active men,
and on the basis of their real life-
process we demonstrate the develop-
ment of the ideological reflexes and
echoes of their life-process. The
phantoms formed in the human brain
are also, necessarily, sublimates of
their material life-process, which is
empirically verifiable and bound to
material premises. Morality, reli-
gion, metaphysics, all the rest of
ideology and their corresponding forms
of consciousness, thus no longer
retain the semblance of independence.
They have no history, no development;
but men, developing their material
production and their material inter-
course, alter, along with this their
real existence, their thinking and
the products of their thinking. Life
is not determined by consciousness,
but consciousness by life.
(1964:37-38)
Marx and Engels contended that the dominant ideology of a society is composed of the ideas and values of a society's ruling class. They also contended that the ideas and values of the ruling class reflect, directly and indirectly, the material interests of that class. Marx and Engels state it this way:

The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas; i.e., the class, which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas; hence of the relationships which make the one class the ruling class, therefore, the ideas of its dominance. (1964:60)

A society's ruling class thus does not simply rule through the exercise of physical force, but rules also through the use of ideological hegemony. What better way to control the behavior of men than by controlling their minds. If working class individuals can be socialized into believing in the rightness and justice of capitalistic social arrangements, then the exploitation of the worker can take place with the cooperation of the worker himself.

Assuming that Marx and Engels are correct, then
other classes, particularly the working class, will find it difficult to develop consciousness of its own positions and interests. If in contemporary society the ruling class controls the mass media and the institutions of learning, then an intervening variable is introduced between the relation of one's objective social class position and the formation and content of one's belief systems. That intervening variable is the ideology of other social classes, which may inhibit the development of working class consciousness.

Alienation

The understanding of the development of class consciousness and other political and social attitudes among the unemployed requires a basic appreciation of the necessary attitudinal requisites for the generation of radicalism among workers. One of the main attitudinal requisites of class consciousness is alienation from the institution of capitalism.

For Marx the growth of capitalism and its division of labor was to generate among the workers a condition of alienation. Recognition and feelings of loss of control over one's own life activity, at first, in its immediate expression at the point of production, and secondly, in a more generalized sense, a loss of
control over the political institutions which legitimize and control property and wealth relations, were for Marx necessary prerequisites for workers to develop class consciousness. The economic exploitation of the workers and their resulting economic insecurity was not sufficient to produce radicalism among the workers. Bendix and Lipset point out the important role of the conception of alienation to Marx's paradigm when they state:

Marx believed that the alienation of labor was inherent in capitalism and that it was a major psychological deprivation, which would lead eventually to the proletarian revolution. This theory of why men under capitalism would revolt, was based on an assumption of what prompts men to be satisfied or dissatisfied with their work. Marx contrasted the modern industrial worker with the medieval craftsman, and - along with many other writers of the period - observed that under modern conditions of production the workers had lost all opportunity to exercise his "knowledge, judgment and will" in the manufacture of his product. To Marx this psychological deprivation seemed more significant even than the economic pauperism to which capitalism subjected the masses of workers. (1966:10)

While Marx heralded the historically revolutionary role played by the capitalist division of labor, he criticized and condemned the division of labor for creating the class antagonisms which tear society asunder and which result in the negation of the indi-
vidual and in the rise of alienation. What could be considered the positive integrative consequences of the capitalistic division of labor, Marx and Engels summarized in the *Communist Manifesto* as follows:

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world-market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, drawn all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilization.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the town. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population - as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idicy of rural life.

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, centralised means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands.

The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. (1968:38-40)

Thus capitalism does for Marx have integrating functions. However, Marx was more concerned with the enormous disruptive and alienating nature of capitalism. Marx said of one of the disruptive consequences of the division of labor:

...the division of labor implies the
contradiction between the interests of the separate individuals or the individual family and the communal interest of all individuals who have intercourse with one another.

...the division of labor offers us the first example of how, as long as man remains in natural society, that is, as long as a cleavage exists between the particular and the common interest, as long therefore, as activity is not voluntary, but naturally divided, man's own deed becomes an alien power opposed to him, which enslaves him instead of being controlled by him.

(Marx and Engels, 1964:44)

Marx viewed the division of labor as a mechanism which stifles the individual. While the capitalist views an increasing division of labor as a progressive rationalization of productive forces, the worker becomes literally an appendage of a machine. Specialized productive roles divide the workers from one another and from each worker's own sense of mastery of his own labor. For Marx, the division of labor under capitalism does not promote increasing social integration, for instance, as in the form of organic solidarity as it does for Durkheim. On the contrary, because the division of labor under capitalism reduces the skill of the worker and consequently reduces the value of his labor power and thus the wages he receives, the division of labor must subsequently contribute to social antagonism and not integration. As Marx contended:
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...as the division of labor increases, labor is simplified. The special skill of the worker becomes worthless. He becomes transformed into a simple, monotonous productive force that does not have to use intense bodily or intellectual faculties. His labor becomes a labor that anyone can perform. Hence, competitors crowd upon him on all sides, and besides we remind the reader that the more simple and easily learned the labor is, the lower the cost of production needed to master it, the lower do wages sink, for like the price of every other commodity, they are determined by the cost of production.

(Marx and Engels, 1968:92)

Because the worker under capitalism does not own or control the social means of production, he does not own or control the tools and materials with which he labors. Thus while the worker utilizes productive, and sometimes creative, forces which enable him to transform his environment, these productive forces confront him as alien objects not of his own making, but as powers dominating him. These forces of production exist essentially not to fulfill the material and spiritual needs of the working class, but rather to fulfill the ambitions and profits of the capitalist class. For given the legal and social arrangement of capitalism, the major social means of production are legally the private property of the capitalists. Workers are consequently denied free access to society's forces of production and thus engage the means of production not
as masters but rather as replacable parts of a productive system.

It is for these reasons that the labor activity itself becomes an alienating activity. Going to work is an external need, a means forced on the worker by the structural (contractural) arrangements of capitalism. As Marx stated it:

The relation of labour to the act of production within the labour process... is the relation of the worker to his own activity as an alien activity not belonging to him; it is activity as suffering, strength as weakness, begetting as emasculating, the worker's own physical and mental energy, his personal life or what is life other than activity - as an activity which is turned against him, neither depends on nor belongs to him. Here we have self-estrangement... (1961:73)

It follows that if the forces of production are an alien power to the worker then the products of his labor become products alien to him. The fruits of the worker's own labor are not felt to be the result of his own creative endeavors, for the products of his labor are the property of his employer. Ironically, the worker must even pay the capitalist to regain the products that he, the worker, has produced. And often these products, through the ideological manipulation of the capitalist, come to dominate the life and identity of workers who come to believe that they must acquire this or that new product.
Marx described this form of alienation in the following way:

...the object which labour produces - labour's product - confronts it as something alien, as a power independent of the producer. The product of labour is labour which has been concealed in an object, which has become material: it is the objectification of labour. Labour's realisation is its objectification. In the conditions dealt with by political economy this realisation of labour appears as loss of reality for the workers; objectification as loss of the object and object-bondage; appropriation as estrangement, as alienation. (1961:69)

The alienating labor of the worker affects a basic change in the life of the worker and his relations with other men. Because the worker divides his identity and life activity up into completely isolated dimensions, the alienation he suffers as a worker affects his image of himself as a person. Being an appendage of a machine or a cog in an industry or business is bound to influence one's mental and physical habits and condition the nature of social relations one has outside one's role as a worker. Thus Marx considered the worker also alienated from his "species being", i.e., his essential nature, and from other men. Marx believed that alienated labor turns:

Man's species being, both nature and his spiritual species property, into a being alien to him, into a means to his individual existence. It estranges man's own body from him, as it does.
external nature and his spiritual essence, his human being. An immediate consequence of the fact that man is estranged from the product of his labour, from his life-activity, from his species being is the estrangement of man from man. 
(1961:77)

The alienation of man from man, and man from the products of his life activities becomes ultimately expressed in a general alienation from the dominant political system and relationships which give legitimacy to capitalism's division of labor, power, and wealth, i.e., from the state (Mandel, 1971a:181). Since the alienative conditions of the worker is precipitated by bourgeois political institutions, the abolition of alienative conditions must involve the political emancipation of the workers. As Marx put it:

From the relationship of estranged labour to private property it further follows that the emancipation of society from private property, etc., from servitude, is expressed in the political form of the emancipation of the workers; not that their emancipation alone was at stake but because the emancipation of the workers contains universal human emancipation - and it contains this, because the whole of human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to production, and every relation of servitude is but a modification and consequence of this relation. 
(1961:81-82)

But the abolition of alienation and the capitalistic division of labor requires a consciousness among the
workers of their economic and political interests. A consciousness which presupposes an alienation from the productive social and political institutions of capitalism, but a consciousness whose development requires more than just alienation. For alienation from the social roles one must play and from the political institutions of capitalism, without a consciousness of the source of that alienation and a vision as to how to eliminate that alienation, would probably lead only to apathy and feelings of hopelessness rather than revolutionary action.
CHAPTER III
CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS

The Classical Position

While one of the most common criticisms of the Marxian paradigm is that Marxism is a type of economic determinism in which economic factors are the only essential factors in explaining social life and social change, the role which the concept of class consciousness plays in the Marxian analysis of society certainly refutes any such criticism. Without consciousness men do not make their own history, and certainly without class consciousness a ruling class cannot effectively rule and a working class cannot effectively challenge the rule of the capitalists. For Marx, it was not simply the economic crises and economic insecurity of unemployment, and the threat of unemployment which propels the working class into revolutionary action. Objective economic and social factors are only one side of the history of social change, the other side is working class consciousness and all it implies - theory, ideology, motivation and organization.

As the Marxian economist Ernest Mandel has pointed out:

...there can be neither an "automatic" overthrow of the capitalist social
order not a "spontaneous" or "organic" disintegration of this social order through the construction of a socialist one. Precisely because of the uniquely conscious character of the proletarian revolution, it requires not only a maturity of "objective" factors (a deepgoing social crises which expresses the fact that the capitalist mode of production has fulfilled its historic mission), but also a maturity of so-called subjective factors (maturity of proletarian class consciousness and of its leadership). If these "subjective" factors are either not present, or are present to an insufficient extent, the proletarian revolution will not be victorious at that point, and from its very defeat will result the economic and social possibilities for a temporary consolidation of capitalism. (1971b:2)

The question of class consciousness subsumes the issues of ideology and alienation, and helps to clarify the Marxian position on the relationships of a society's substructure and superstructure. On the one hand, the extent to which the working class is dominated by the ideology of other classes will inhibit the development of class consciousness among workers. On the other hand, the alienation of workers from the political institutions of capitalism should enhance the conditions necessary for the development of working class consciousness.

While Marx believed "That social existence determines consciousness," social existence was meant to include far more than merely economic factors. Of the
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inhibiting role which ideas could play in the process of social change, Marx stated:

Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past. The tradition of all the dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brain of the living. And just when they seem engaged in revolutionising themselves and things, in creating something that has never yet existed, precisely in such periods of revolutionary crisis they anxiously conjure up the spirits of the past to their service and borrow from them names, battle cries and costumes in order to present the new scene of world history in this time-honoured disguise and this borrowed language. (Marx and Engels, 1968:9)

For Marx, social existence included the totality of social relationships in which men enter and the various traditions, ideologies, and knowledge which define the parameters of the given social relationships of social existence. But in the more particular domains of politics, class struggle, and social change, Marx recognized the power consciousness, especially class consciousness, possessed to "determine" social existence. However, the relationship between social existence and consciousness is not one of unilateral cause and effect, but rather of dialectical interaction, wherein, what is at one moment effect becomes at a later moment cause.

Despite the important role which the concept of
class consciousness plays in the Marxian paradigm, Marx and Engels said relatively little directly about the specific nature and development of working class consciousness. However, Marx was to distinguish two conditions of the working class, first as a "class in itself", i.e., as defined by its objective position and condition within the structure of capitalism and secondly, as a "class for itself", i.e., a class cognizant of its own interests. This distinction of a "class in itself" and a "class for itself" meant for Marx that the objective conditions of the working class were insufficient in themselves to foster working class consciousness. Working class consciousness, however, could be generated by the political struggles through which the working class would have to defend its interests.

While the working class is by its strategic position in an objective condition to develop class consciousness, which in its highest form would be what Marx and Engels called "communist consciousness", members and segments of other social classes may also come to realize that capitalism must be overthrown. For example, Marx and Engels stated:

(The working class is a class)... which has to bear all the burdens of society without enjoying its advantages, which, ousted from society, is forced into the most
decided antagonism to all other classes; a class which forms the majority of all members of society, and from which emanates the consciousness of the necessity of a fundamental revolution, the communist consciousness, which may, of course, arise among the other classes too through the contemplation of the situation of this class. (1964:85)

The argument that Marx and Engels made concerning consciousness in general was not that consciousness is a mere mechanical reflection of the substructure of society, but rather, consciousness is influenced and the parameters of its development circumscribed by the socio-historical frameworks in which conscious men find themselves (Marx and Engels, 1964:37). Indeed, Marx and Engels contended that consciousness has through history gained increasing independence from the limitations imposed upon it by a society's mode of production. With the increasing division of labor, and the subsequent division of material and mental labor the independence of consciousness increases. As Marx and Engels put it, with the division of material and mental labour:

From this moment onwards consciousness can really flatter itself that it is something other than consciousness of existing practice, that it really represents something without representing something real; from now on consciousness is in a position to emancipate itself from the world and to proceed to the formation of "pure" theory, theology, philosophy, ethics, etc. (1964:43)
But, while class consciousness may not simply be a reflection of economic conditions and needs, its development or inhibition is influenced by the stage of societal and productive conditions of different stages of capitalist development (Marx and Engels, 1964:37). For instance, Engels explained the limitations of the first forms of working class consciousness, i.e., as expressed in the theories of the Utopian Socialists, Owen, Saint-Simon and Fourier, as being circumscribed by the immaturity of capitalist development. The capitalistic economy and its subsequent class division had not ripened. Consequently, consciousness of the class injustices of capitalism were also immature because they were unable to fully grasp the implications of mature capitalism. As Engels stated:

To the crude conditions of capitalistic production and the crude class conditions corresponded crude theories. The solution of the social problems, which as yet lay hidden in undeveloped economic conditions, the Utopians attempted to evolve out of the human brain. Society presented nothing but wrongs; to remove these was the task of reason. It was necessary, then, to discover a new and more perfect system of social order and then impose this upon society from without by propaganda, and, wherever it was possible, by the example of model experiments. These new social systems were doomed as Utopian; the more completely they worked out in detail, the more they could not avoid drifting off into pure phantasies. (1968:34)
The ingredients of a fully developed working class consciousness would have to include not only a recognition of economic needs and interests, but also a more generalized cognition of the working class's political interests. For after all, the economic arrangements and property relationships characteristic of capitalism are legitimated and perpetuated by political institutions and safeguarded by the coercive power of the state. Marx and Engels argued that the working class must organize themselves not only in trade unions which protect and further their economic interests, but the working class should become conscious of their more general political interests and thus organize themselves politically as well as economically. In this regard Engels stated about the English workers:

...there are plenty of symptoms that the working class of this country is awakening to the consciousness that it has for some time been moving in the wrong groove; that the present movements for higher wages and shorter hours exclusively, keep it in a vicious circle out of which there is no issue; that it is not the lowness of wages which forms the fundamental evil, but the wages system itself. This knowledge, once generally spread amongst the working class, the position of trades unions must change considerably. They will no longer enjoy the privilege of being the only organizations of the working class. At the side of, or above, the unions of special trades there must spring up a general union, a political
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Marx was concerned that the workers would limit their consciousness and organization to dealing with everyday "bread and butter" issues, i.e., the economic effects of capitalism instead of dealing with the structural causes of their everyday economic problems. Marx stated:

At the same time, and quite apart from the general servitude involved in the wages system, the working class ought not to exaggerate to themselves the ultimate working of these every-day struggles. They ought not to forget that they are fighting with effects, but not with the causes of those effects; that they are retarding the downward movement, but not changing its direction; that they are applying palliatives, not curing the malady. They ought, therefore, not be exclusively absorbed in these unavoidable guerilla fights incessantly springing up from the never-ceasing encroachments of capital or changes of the market. They ought to understand that, with all the miseries it imposes upon them, the present system simultaneously engenders the material conditions and the social forms necessary for an economical reconstruction of society. Instead of the conservative motto, "A fair day's wages for a fair day's work!" they ought to inscribe on their banner the revolutionary watchword, "Abolition of the wages system!" (Marx and Engels, 1975:4)
The Leninist Contribution

It was not until the leaders of the first Marxist inspired revolution were confronted with actually trying to take power that the issue of the nature and development of class consciousness received clarification. It was in the context of a debate between certain Russian Marxists and Lenin, that Lenin, in defending the original ideas of Marx and Engels on the role of class consciousness in social change, clarified theoretically the nature and development of class consciousness as prerequisite for successful revolution.

It is Lenin's clarification that there are two basic types of working class consciousness: trade union consciousness and political class consciousness, which not only provides theoretical clarity to the Marxian analysis of the development of class consciousness, but also provides conceptual distinctions more readily empirically investigatable.

At the turn of the present century, a split had developed in Russian Marxist groups over the theoretical and practical issue of the relationship between the economic tasks and the political tasks of the working class and the role of a revolutionary party (Lenin, 1969:32-34). This split reflected, on the part of one of the opposing tendencies, a basic rejection of the
core of Marx and Engels' understanding of the nature of consciousness in human society in general, and especially the role of working class consciousness as necessary for a societal change from capitalism to socialism. This tendency which rejected the basic Marxian position on the nature of consciousness Lenin labeled "Economist", because its supporters believed the working class would automatically, through its "economic" struggles, develop the class consciousness and socialist understanding necessary for the workers to make a revolution (Lenin, 1969:34). Lenin forcefully attacked these ideas on the basis of three key aspects of the thought of Marx and Engels. Firstly, the Economist's view concerning the relation of ideas and the development of class consciousness to the structural socio-economic foundations of society was mechanistic (Lenin, 1969:37); and such a mechanistic interpretation of social reality is in direct contradiction with the explanation Marx and Engels gave concerning that relation (Marx and Engels, 1968:692-693). Secondly, the Economists were guilty of assuming spontaneity, i.e., they believed that not only would the workers develop sufficient class consciousness in their economic roles, but this development would take place spontaneously without the intervention of conscious revolutionaries (Lenin, 1969:35). Thirdly, the
Economists neglected the need for the role of theory in elevating the consciousness of the workers (Lenin, 1969:39). They felt that Marxists should limit their agitation to purely concrete economic problems of the workers and not offer them any theoretical analysis of the social and political nature of capitalism (Lenin, 1969:35-39).

Lenin countered the assertions of the Economists by re-emphasizing the importance of revolutionary initiative and consciousness, which Marx and Engels stressed was necessary to bring to the workers from outside of their economic struggles by revolutionaries (Lenin, 1969:24-29). The very existence of a revolutionary movement, Lenin maintained, was partly the result of the development of revolutionary theory (Lenin, 1969:25). Revolutionary theory had not been predominately developed by workers who, because of their circumscribed social roles and positions, neither had the time nor experience to develop revolutionary theory. Rather, revolutionary theory had been developed by persons usually outside the working class or those whose class position was temporarily suspended, e.g., students. Lenin explained this when he stated:

The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade-union consciousness, i.e., the conviction that it is necessary
to combine in unions, fight the employers, and strive to compel the government to pass necessary labor legislation, etc. The theory of socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical, and economic theories elaborated by educated representatives of the propertied classes, by intellectuals. By their social status, the founders of modern scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, themselves belonged to the bourgeois intelligentsia. In the very same way, in Russia, the theoretical doctrine of Social-Democracy arose altogether independently of the spontaneous growth of the working class movement; it arose as a natural and inevitable outcome of the development of thought among the revolutionary socialist intelligentsia. (Lenin, 1969:31-32)

While workers did react to the abuses of capitalist economic exploitation and oppression more or less blindly, i.e., without understanding the origins and structure of capitalism, the destruction of machinery and the early revolts and strikes of Russian workers in the 1890's only served as an initial awakening among the workers. But, as Lenin says, "the workers were not, and could not be, conscious of the irreconcilable antagonism of their interests to the whole of the modern political and social system," i.e., they did not have political class consciousness (1969:31) The task, according to Lenin, of revolutionaries and the revolutionary party is to spread interpretations and clarification among the workers concerning the political and
social nature of capitalism and the vision of socialism contained within the potentials of industrialism (Lenin, 1969:54-64).

Thus, while Lenin, as Marx and Engels, maintained that the economic interest and productive roles which different classes play in history may be decisive in molding the social structure of particular societies, this did not necessarily imply that the purely economic struggles of workers and their corresponding trade union consciousness were of prime importance in establishing the political and ideological revolution required for the emancipation of the working class (Lenin, 1969: 69-72). The class consciousness of the working class must be elevated above the limited consciousness of their immediate economic interests and struggles, i.e., trade union consciousness, to an all-encompassing political and theoretical level.

The economic determinism of the Economists was, Lenin contended, a submission to "bourgeois" forms of sociological thought (1969:39). The "bowing to spontaneity" of which certain Economists were guilty resulted in an image of man as simply an object, waiting to be set into motion by some "objective" economic force. Marx and Engels' image of man, as indicated earlier, depicted man not only as an object conditioned and shaped by objective economic, social, and cultural
factors, but also as a subject who has consciousness, is creative and volitional and consequently, who can play a significant part in making his own history. The Economists also implicitly held a reductionist and ahistorical concept of human social life and development. Marx and Engels recognized that the social structures of any given society were far more than the sum of the various elements of the economic interactions and relationships of individuals.

The social structure of a society was, for Marx and Engels an emergent whole, a social phenomena *sui generis*, whose nature and workings could not be reduced to the nature of its component elementary parts (Marx and Engels, 1968:692-701). The Russian Economists, however, viewed the vast array of superstructural formations, especially political ideologies and struggles, simply as the mechanical reflex of the elementary economic machinations of capitalism. As the Economists were fond of saying, "Politics always obediently follows economics." (Lenin, 1969:37). This mechanistic reductionism led the Economists to hold an ahistorical image of society which negated the dialectical-historical interplay of substructure and superstructure. It resulted in a metaphysical and ahistorical freezing of a particular conjuncture of history at points in which the substructural variables appear to be not
merely the ultimate and decisive variables, but the only variables. Lenin contended that this kind of ahistorical reductionism is far removed from the sociological thought of Marx and Engels. Indeed, the above mentioned images that the Economists held in regard to society were nominalistic, in that the whole emergent properties of a social system, especially the interaction of the substructure and superstructure, seem to be merely a label, while the only reality of society, for them, seems to have been the mechanical sum of individual economic phenomena.

This practical debate which Lenin had with the Economists provided the Marxian paradigm with a clearer understanding of the complexity of the development of working class consciousness. Perhaps, much of the contemporary debate and contradictory empirical findings about the existence and level of class consciousness among the American working class can be clarified by utilizing Lenin's distinction between trade union consciousness and political class consciousness. It may be the case that when some social scientists contend that the working class has no class consciousness, they really mean that the working class has no political class consciousness. On the other hand, when others argue that the working class is class conscious it may be the case that the working class has only trade union
consciousness. Discovering what segments of unemployed workers have or have not what types of class consciousness will be one of the objectives of this study.

Class Consciousness and the American Worker

As Lenin had warned, one of the major obstacles to the development of full-fledged working class consciousness was limitation of workers' struggles and consciousness to merely everyday economic issues. If workers, employed or unemployed, could not elevate their concerns above an elementary pre-occupation with their economic insecurity under capitalism, they never would be able to overthrow capitalism.

There have been various theories expounded to explain the limited class consciousness of the American workers. The contributions of Perlman, 1928, Marcuse, 1964, and Mandel, 1969, perhaps best represent the major themes concerning class consciousness and the American worker.

Selig Perlman has argued that "...the only acceptable 'consciousness' for American labor as a whole is a 'job consciousness', with a 'limited' objective of 'wage and job control'" (1928:169). Perlman contended that effects of the American class system, especially the generation of class conflict and class consciousness, in the Marxian sense, were mitigated by the special
characteristics of American society. First, according to Perlman, the American working class lacks "psychological cohesiveness" because it is not a "settled" class (1928:165). By this Perlman meant that there is relatively more chance of social mobility in American society than there is in Europe. Consequently, there are more opportunities for working-class individuals to change their status and thus to view life chances in individual terms rather than in class terms. Secondly, historically early political enfranchisement of the working class has lead workers to believe they have some political power and input in running the political institutions, thus obscuring in their minds the nature of class politics. Thirdly, immigration of foreign workers into America generates animosity between American born workers, who believe their jobs may be taken by the newcomers, and working class immigrants. Fourthly, as a consequence of immigration of workers from diverse national and ethnic backgrounds, there are sharp cultural, linguistic, religious, and racial barriers to the cohesion of the American working class and to the development of a unified American working class consciousness. For Perlman, it was the very nature of American society and government, its "openness" and pluralism which made not only political or revolutionary class consciousness unlikely, but also
made "Marxian" theories about class conflict and class consciousness inapplicable.

More recently Herbert Marcuse (1964) has argued that the American working class is not capable of being an agency of social change nor of developing class consciousness. The never ending technological revolution of advanced capitalism, according to Marcuse, has produced a material abundance, because of automation requires fewer workers, and provides new forms of social control through the mass media (Marcuse, 1964:1-9). The working class has become integrated structurally and ideologically into the capitalist system through a "highly effective scientific management of needs, demand and satisfaction" (Marcuse, 1967:410). Ideological domination of the working class, and thus the negation of class consciousness, is achieved when the working class finds the satisfaction of its needs within the framework of the market-commodity system. As Marcuse puts it:

If the worker and his boss enjoy the same television program and visit the same resort places, if the typist is as attractively made up as the daughter of her employer, if the Negro owns a Cadillac, if they all read the same newspaper, then this assimilation indicates not the disappearance of classes, but the extent to which the needs and satisfactions that serve the preservation of the Establishment are shared by the underlying population. (1964:8)
Modern advanced capitalist society controls the working class with the carrot of commodity consumption, thus, "people recognize themselves in their commodities; they find their soul in their automobile, hi-fi set, split-level home, kitchen equipment" (Marcuse, 1964:9), and not in identification with economic and political interests of their social class. Consequently, capitalist society is not characterized by class or ideological conflict and whatever negative criteria may develop is transformed into terms and behavior which is acceptable and accommodating to "proper" and legitimate" channels. Society is thus characterized by one-dimensionality of thought and action. Marcuse states:

Thus emerges a pattern of one-dimensional thought and behavior in which ideas, aspirations, and objectives that, by their content, transcend the established universe of discourse and action are either repelled or reduced to terms of this universe. They are redefined by the rationality of the given system and of its quantitative extension. (1964:12)

Ideological opposition to capitalism in the form of working class consciousness is replaced by "Happy Consciousness" among the working class. This "Happy Consciousness" reflects, as Marcuse puts it:

...the belief that the real is rational, and that established system, in spite of everything, delivers the
goods. The people are led to find in the productive apparatus the effective agent of thought and action to which their personal thought and action can and must be surrendered. And in this transfer, the apparatus also assumes the role of a moral agent. Conscience is absolved by reification, by the general necessity of things. (1964:79)

Because Marcuse believes that the working class cannot develop class consciousness and thus cannot be an agency for radical change, he believes that perhaps intellectuals, students, and oppressed minorities may be a new agency for radical change. What is needed is not working class consciousness but, according to Marcuse, a general consciousness among all social classes and status positions for radical change. Marcuse states:

The development not of class consciousness but of consciousness as such, freed from the distortion imposed upon it, appears to be the basic prerequisite for radical change. (1967:417)

Ernest Mandel, however, provides completely different interpretations of the nature of the American working class and its potential for class consciousness. Mandel maintains that there are three characteristics of the working class which are the objective roots of its revolutionary potential; these characteristics of the working class are: "its key role in the productive process, its basic alienation, and its economic exploitation" (1969:10). Contrary to the interpretations of
Perlman and Marcuse, Mandel contends that:

If we examine the long-term trend, there is no doubt that the basic process is one of growing homogeneity and not of growing heterogeneity of the proletariat. (1969:13)

As capitalism develops the differences between white collar and blue collar, professional, skilled and semi-skilled, grows not sharper, but becomes minimal. Thus capitalism increases numerically the ranks of the working class and mass production and global corporations standardize the life experience of the different strata of the working class rather than diversifying their life experience and interests. The ideological domination of capitalism over the working class, is for Mandel, insufficient to erase the alienation workers experience everyday at the point of production. There can be little doubt that what a worker does and experiences eight or nine hours a day, five or six days a week, fifty weeks a year, will influence his consciousness and behavior, no matter how many records he listens to or how many beers he drinks and T.V. shows he watches. Mandel states:

In the last analysis the question boils down to this: Which force will turn out to be stronger in determining the workers' attitudes to the society he lives in, the mystifying ideas he receives, yesterday in the church and today throughout TV, or the social reality he confronts and assimilates day after day through
practical experience? For historical materialists, to pose the question this way is to answer it, although the struggle itself will say the last word. (1969:19)

Empirical Studies

As indicated earlier there is contradictory evidence concerning the existence or non-existence of class consciousness among American workers, especially among the economically insecure workers who are unemployed.

These contradictory findings may be a result of inadequate selection and sampling of unemployed workers from different occupational, educational, age, and socio-economic backgrounds. The fact that some unemployed workers are more class conscious than others may reflect occupational, educational, socio-economic, and age differentials. A second factor which might account for these discrepant findings is the inadequate and sometimes contradictory manner in which class consciousness has been theoretically conceived and methodologically operationalized in previous research.

Although class consciousness is a central concept in research concerning social conflict and social change, it has often been the case that sociologists have failed to utilize the theoretical guidelines of the Marxian paradigm in which the concept of class consciousness finds its most elaborate theoretical development and
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and practical use. As Lopreato and Hazelrigg point out:

...the problem of class-consciousness formation has escaped systematic analysis at both the purely conceptual and the empirical level, with the result that our knowledge of it has advanced very little beyond the scattered observations, and sometimes misconstructions, of Marx's would be interpreters. (1972:122)

As Lasswell (1965) suggests, equating class consciousness with simple class identification or class awareness of economic interests often results in components of class consciousness being substituted for class consciousness itself. Too often this appears to have been essentially the case in previous research on class consciousness (Centers, 1949; Rosenberg, 1953; Landecker, 1963; Lewis, 1965; Leggett, 1968). The frequent conceptualization of class consciousness as simply an awareness of basic economic interests obscures the socio-political and cognitive developmental nature of class consciousness as originally conceived by Marx and further developed by Lenin.

Some sociologists (Glantz, 1958; Portes, 1971) have, however, acknowledged the importance of a political dimension of class consciousness. For example, as Glantz points out:

Indeed, it would appear that class consciousness can emerge only when an individual is aware of his politico-economic interests, and in such
a way that he recognizes his unity with others and the general nature of class opposition.
(1958:376)

However, when this political dimension has been analyzed it often has been measured essentially in terms of a preference for the Democratic party (Centers, 1949; Glantz, 1958), rather than in terms of a socio-political awareness of wealth, power distribution, and a preference for a socialistic social system.

As indicated earlier, class consciousness as defined in the Marxian paradigm, especially as elaborated by Lenin (1969), consists ideally of both economic and political aspects, i.e., "trade union class consciousness" and "political class consciousness". For Marx and Lenin, true class consciousness involved not only class identification and awareness of economic class interests, but also involved a generalized awareness of the socio-political realities which produce and sustain the conditions of the working class (Marx and Engels, 1975; Lenin, 1969).

In addition to being influenced by sampling limitations and conceptual inadequacies, the inconsistent findings of previous research concerning the effect of unemployment on class consciousness may be a result of inadequate theoretical clarification of the factors which facilitate the development of class consciousness.
For example, the objective condition of being unemployed is not, in and of itself, sufficient for the development of class consciousness. However, as Marx has pointed out, unemployment removes the worker from the productive process and facilitates the development of alienation and estrangement from the socio-political system. As discussed earlier, such a process of alienation and estrangement would seem to be a necessary condition for the development of class consciousness (Marx, 1965: 644-646). Thus unemployment, although not necessarily directly related to class consciousness, does facilitate the development of the alienation necessary for the eventual development of class consciousness. Previous research (Aiken et al., 1968; Centers, 1949; Sheppard and Herrick, 1972; Leggett, 1964; Zeitlin, 1966) has demonstrated that unemployment does result in some increases in alienation. If this is the case then we would expect an increase in class consciousness among unemployed workers who become alienated from the socio-political system.

One of the concerns of this dissertation is to provide a reexamination of the relationship of unemployment, either directly or indirectly, to class consciousness. Since an adequate reexamination of the relationship between unemployment and class consciousness would seem to be, at least in part, dependent
on the conceptual distinction between economic (trade union) and political aspects of class consciousness; another concern of this dissertation is to empirically test the validity and utility of a conceptual distinction between trade union consciousness and political class consciousness.
CHAPTER IV
MARXISM AND THE UNEMPLOYED

While the economic insecurity of the working class is one of the necessary requisites for that class becoming alienated from the institutions of capitalism and becoming radicalized, little has been written about what Marx had to say specifically about the role of the economic insecurity caused by unemployment among workers in generating radicalism. Does unemployment among the workers precipitate increasing alienation and class consciousness or does the worker's removal from the productive process increase the worker's feelings of despair and apathy? These are questions which apparently have received little attention by the Marxian paradigm. Consequently, it is necessary to examine exactly what Marx had to say on these issues.

In Capital, Marx viewed economic insecurity, particularly unemployment, as one of the inherent structural products of the capitalistic mode of production. Marx used both the concepts of surplus population and industrial reserve army to refer to that part of the working class which was unemployed (Marx, 1965:628). The concepts of surplus population and industrial reserve army were central to Marx's analysis of the contradictions of
capitalist society. Indeed, these concepts played an im-
portant role in what Marx considered to be one of the "absolute laws" of capitalistic development. As Marx stated:

The greater the social wealth, the func-
tioning capital, the extent and energy of its growth, and therefore, also the absolute mass of the proletariat and the productiveness of its labour, the greater is the industrial reserve army. The same causes which develop the expansive power of capital develop also the labour-power at its disposal. The relative mass of the industrial reserve army increases therefore with the potential energy of wealth. But the greater this reserve army in proportion to the active labour army, the greater is the mass of a consolidated surplus-population, whose misery is in inverse ratio to its torment of labour. The more extensive, finally, the lazarus-layers of the working class, and the industrial reserve army, the greater is official pauperism. This is the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation. Like all other laws it is modified in its working by many circumstances, the analysis of which does not concern us here. (1965:644)

For Marx, the accumulation of capital progresses with a constant qualitative change in its composition. With the increasing rationalization of production (e.g., automation), and thus the production by each individual worker of relatively more wealth, there is consequently an increase in constant capital (land, machinery, factories, etc.) and a decrease in the need for variable capital (Human labor power) (Marx, 1965:629). It is
this structural decrease in the need for variable capital which results in an increasingly larger and larger surplus population and industrial reserve army, i.e., in the number of unemployed and the people they support. As Marx put it:

...it is capitalistic accumulation itself that constantly produces, and produces in the direct ratio of its own energy and extent, a relatively redundant population of labourers, i.e., a population of greater extent that suffices for the average needs of the self-expansion of capital, and therefore a surplus-population. (1965:630)

While the unemployed and unemployment are a consequence of structural features of capitalistic developments, the unemployed and unemployment also fulfill certain "functions" for capitalistic society.

1) Unemployment creates a mass of workers which can readily be exploited for the sudden development of new industries, without detracting from the general level of production in established areas. As Marx put it:

But if a surplus labouring population is a necessary product of accumulation or of the development of wealth on a capitalist basis, this surplus-population becomes, conversely, the lever of capitalistic accumulation, nay, a condition of existence of the capitalist mode of production. It forms a disposable industrial reserve army, that belongs to capital quite as absolutely as if the latter had bred it at its own cost. Independently of the limits of the actual increase of population, it creates, for the changing needs of
the self-expansion of capital, a mass of human material always ready for exploitation. With accumulation, and the development of the productiveness of labour that accompanies it, the power of sudden expansion of capital grows also; it grows, not merely because the elasticity of the capital already functioning increases, not merely because the absolute wealth of society expands, of which capital only forms an elastic part, not merely because credit, under every special stimulus, at once places an unusual part of this wealth at the disposal of production in the form of additional capital; it grows, also, because the technical conditions of the process of production themselves - machinery, means of transport, &c. - now admit of the rapider transformation of masses of surplus-product into additional means of production. The mass of social wealth, overflowing with the advance of accumulation, and transformable into additional capital, thrusts itself frantically into old branches of production, whose market suddenly expands, or into newly formed branches, such as railways, &c., the need for which grows out of the development of the old ones. In all such cases, there must be the possibility of throwing great masses of men suddenly on the decisive points without injury to the scale of production in other spheres. (1965:632)

2) Unemployment enriches the capitalist class by enabling the capitalist class to employ fewer workers at lower wages, thus increasing profits. Additionally, those who are employed are better regulated and controlled and can thus be made to be more productive. This is possible when employed workers know that at any time they could easily be replaced by an unemployed worker.
who is anxious to make a living. Marx stated:

The condemnation of one part of the working class to enforced idleness by the over-work of the other part, and the converse, becomes a means of enriching the individual capitalists, and accelerates at the same time the production of the industrial reserve army on a scale corresponding with the advance of social accumulation. (1965:636)

and further:

...the pressure of the unemployed compells those that are employed to furnish more labour, and therefore makes the supply of labour, to a certain extent, independent of the supply of labourers. (1965:640)

3) The division of the working class into employed and unemployed may inhibit the struggle of the working class to acquire a larger share of the social wealth produced. The old strategy of "divide and conquer" is often evidenced when employed workers are so threatened by losing their jobs, that they may often turn against their fellow workers who are unemployed instead of the economic system which structurally produces their economic insecurity. Competition for the jobs that do exist may thus mitigate against the solidarity of the working class and the development of working class consciousness. Marx stated:

The industrial reserve army, during the periods of stagnation and average prosperity, weighs down the active labour-army; during the periods of over-production and paroxysm, it holds its
pretensions in check. Relative surplus population is therefore the pivot upon which the law of demand and supply of labour works. It confines the field of action of this law within the limits absolutely convenient to the activity of exploitation and to the domination of capital. (1965:639)

However, Marx suggested that if the employed and unemployed members of the working class united in common action against capital, the working class might be able to inhibit the "absolute law of capital accumulation". As Marx explained:

As soon, therefore, as the labourers learn the secret, how it comes to pass that in the same measure as they work more, as they produce more wealth for others, and as the productive power of their labour increases, so in the same measure even their function as a means of the self-expansion of capital becomes more and more precarious for them; as soon as they discover that the degree of intensity of the competition among themselves depends wholly on the pressure of the relative surplus-population; as soon as, by Trades' Unions, &c., they try to organize a regular co-operation between employed and unemployed in order to destroy or to weaken the ruinous effects of this natural law of capitalistic production on their class, so soon capital and its sycophant, Political Economy, cry out at the infringement of the "eternal" and so to say "sacred" law of supply and demand. Every combination of employed and unemployed disturbs the "harmonious" action of this law. (1965:640)
Alienation and Unemployment

Finally, Marx contended that the "absolute law of capital accumulation" results in the increased relative economic, social, and psychological misery of the working class. Of particular interest in the following statement by Marx is the connection he makes between alienation and unemployment. As Marx contended:

...when analysing the production of relative surplus-value: within the capitalist system all methods for raising the social productiveness of labour are brought about at the cost of the individual labourer; all means for the development of production transform themselves into means of domination over, and exploitation of, the producers; they mutilate the labourer into a fragment of a man, degrade him to the level of an appendage of a machine, destroy every remnant of charm in his work and turn it into a hated toil; they estrange from him the intellectual potentialities of the labour-process in the same proportion as science is incorporated in it as an independent power; they distort the conditions under which he works, subject him during the labour-process to a depotism the more hateful for its meanness; they transform his life-time into working-time, and drag his wife and child beneath the wheels of the Juggernaut of capital. But all methods for the production of surplus-value are at the same time methods of accumulation; and every extension of accumulation becomes again a means for the development of those methods. It follows therefore that in proportion as capital accumulates, the lot of the labourer, be his payment high or low, must grow worse. The law, finally
that always equilibrates the relative surplus-population, or industrial reserve army, to the extent and energy of accumulation, this law rivets the labourer to capital more firmly than the wedges of Vulcan did Prometheus to the rock. It establishes an accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, i.e., on the side of the class that produces its own product in the form of capital. (1965:644)

Thus Marx contended that as capital accumulates so does the alienation and misery of the employed and unemployed members of the working class. However, strongly implied in Marx's writing on the industrial reserve army is that the unemployed worker epitomizes the alienated worker, but to a degree different and greater than the employed worker.

The unemployed worker, the former active member of the working class logically should be even more alienated from his former life-activity and product. The conditions of unemployment increases the loss of power over the product and activity of labor; for the unemployed worker is temporarily or permanently removed from the point of production. Consequently, the unemployed worker, having been removed from the nexus of society's primary social relationships (social production), should increasingly become more estranged from his "essential being", from other men, and on the most
general level, from the social and political system which leaves him powerless. At least the alienated employed worker is still strategically positioned at the point of production, which permits the possibility of becoming unalienated by consciously seizing the means of production and thus achieving power over the product and activity of labor. In this sense then, the unemployed worker represents that section of the working class which is most divorced, i.e., alienated, from political and social control over the product and activity of labor.

However, whether the unemployed become conscious of their increasingly alienative condition or not is a question Marx leaves essentially unanswered. The answer to the question of whether the unemployed become conscious of their alienative condition is nevertheless important for the Marxian paradigm's analysis of contemporary capitalist society. The social and political alienation of the unemployed worker should be related to such questions as the degree to which different sections of the unemployed are class conscious. Also, such issues as self-esteem, authoritarianism, and political party preference should be interrelated with the alienative conditions of unemployment. The unemployed worker may suffer enormous social and psycho-
logical damage as a result of being removed from, what is at least in capitalist societies, a work role which provides income and some type of psychological orientation and meaning for one's life. Consequently, unemployed workers who view their precarious social and economic position in individual rather than class terms, may prefer "strong" leaders who can restore law and order, in the hope that at least with law and order, the unemployed worker will once again have a place in society. On the other hand, the alienative conditions of unemployment may ripen the consciousness of workers to the point at which they are willing to abandon the present socio-economic system and opt for another.

Marx said very little about what specific segments of the unemployed might have revolutionary potential, and what segments might become overwhelmed by their alienation and oppression and thus be demoralized and of little value to fostering revolution. Indeed, there is a great deal of implied ambiguity concerning the revolutionary potential of the unemployed in Marx's writing. On the one hand, as capital accumulates so does the "slavery, ignorance, brutality, and mental degradation" of the unemployed (Marx, 1965:644). One can hardly imagine individuals who are enslaved, ignorant, brutal and mentally degraded leading a revolution
for human emancipation. On the other hand, the unemployed worker is less integrated into the capitalistic work structure, has less materially and socially to lose and probably has more "free" time to engage in revolutionary activities than employed workers. Thus one could easily argue that the unemployed worker, while perhaps more alienated than the employed worker, might have more revolutionary potential as measured by high degrees of class consciousness, political dissatisfaction, less authoritarianism, more radical or liberal social and political preferences, and a more accurate class perception of the stratification system.

Marx's writings on the unemployed suggests numerous questions which should be empirically tested concerning the attitudes of the unemployed and several hypotheses regarding unemployment and alienation, self-esteem, class consciousness and political party preferences. While there is some ambiguity in the direction these hypotheses would take, there does seem to be some consensus among interpreters of Marx and various Marxists who contend that unemployment leads to increased radicalism. For example, Maurice Zeitlin points out:

That Fidel Castro believed unemployment politically significant is clear. For
example, in his speech at his trial for leading the abortive attack on Fort Moncada on July 26, 1953, he said the revolutionaries had based "their chances for success on the social order, because we were assured of the people's support..." Among "the people we count on in our struggle," he said, "are the seven hundred thousand unemployed Cubans, who want to earn their daily bread honorably without having to leave their country in search of sustenance; and the five hundred thousand rural workers who live in miserable bohios (huts), work four months of the year and spend the rest of it in hunger, sharing their misery with their children..."

And repeatedly in his speeches since coming to power, Castro has referred to the problem of unemployment, linking it with the meaning and the destiny of the revolution:

"A people that produces below its capacities, and further, where an appreciable portion of what it produces is carried off by others, is not a people enjoying the economic and social conditions that are conducive to progress and to resolving its problems. That is why our country suffered that problem of permanent unemployment...; that is why there was chronic unemployment in our country extending to several hundred thousand idle citizens; that is the reason for the ills of the Republic, which could never have been overcome if the Republic had not adopted forms of social organization and production putting human effort in harmony with the interest of the people in progress and greater production... The issue became one of the revolution having to resolve the unemployment problem and, even more difficult, to resolve it under conditions of economic aggression, embargo on spare parts, raw materi-
ials and machinery, and complete suppression of the sugar quota." (1967:52-53)

Although an unemployed worker may be alienated, and thus feel estranged from the social and political institutions of capitalism, that estrangement does not preclude the individual being class conscious. Alienation toward the capitalistic system should not necessarily lead to pessimism, low self-esteem or absolute feelings of powerlessness. Indeed, an individual would have to be estranged from, and recognize his lack of social and political power within the capitalistic system as a precondition for the individual desiring to change that system. In fact, Marx believed that the alienation of the worker could be overcome by the kind of political opposition to capitalism which class consciousness entails (1961:81-82). Class consciousness should provide a positive organizing framework for the individual's self-esteem and thus should increase the alienated individuals' positive self-esteem.

Authoritarianism

Another issue, related to the degree of class consciousness of the unemployed individual, is the "authoritarianism" of the individual. I am using the term "authoritarianism" in the same sense in which Sheppard
and Herrick have used it in their studies of worker dissatisfaction, when they stated:

By authoritarianism we mean, briefly, a person's basic preference for, or tendency toward, strong, strict leadership if in a follower position; and if in a leadership position, a preference for, or tendency toward, behavior with subordinates characterized by little tolerance for discretionary behavior on their part, and by impatience with prolonged discussion by others about his wishes or commands. Authoritarians tend to be more comfortable in order-taking (or in order-giving) situations. Authoritarian individuals also tend to be characterized by less acceptance of, or readiness for change. (1972:80)

Sociologists, like Seymour Martin Lipset, contend that economic insecurity leads to authoritarianism and radicalism (1963:113). However, Sheppard and Herrick found that authoritarian workers are more accepting of the status-quo than non-authoritarian workers (1972:81). It follows from the nature of class consciousness and traditional Marxist concerns for industrial and organization democracy that unemployed workers who have class consciousness should not be authoritarians. If authoritarianism entails strict obedience, impatience with discussion, and less acceptance or readiness for change, then it negates some of the essential features of the type of working class consciousness necessary for fundamental change. Revolutionary political class
consciousness certainly requires an acceptance and readiness for change. The basic theoretical understanding of capitalist socio-economic system required for the development of political class consciousness comes about partly as a result of a willingness to listen to and discuss new and critical ideas. The vision of a classless society and a rejection of the rigid "chain of command" in capitalist industries would probably mitigate any blind obedience to leaders among those who are class conscious. However, the stronger the integrative ties which bind the worker (employed or unemployed) to the "system", e.g., high wages, welfare benefits, seniority benefits, ideological domination, authoritarianism, etc., the less class conscious will the worker be. Marcuse speaks of the integration of the modern worker into the capitalistic system, when he says:

The prevalence of a non-revolutionary - nay, anti-revolutionary - consciousness among the majority of the working class is conspicuous. To be sure, revolutionary consciousness has always expressed itself only in revolutionary situations; the difference is that, now the condition of the working class in the society at large militates against the development of such a consciousness. The integration of the largest part of the working class into the capitalist society is not a surface phenomenon; it has its roots in the infrastructure itself, in the political economy of monopoly capitalism: benefits accorded
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to the metropolitan working class thanks to surplus profits, neocolonial exploitation, the military budget, and gigantic government subventions. To say that this class has much more to lose than its chains may be a vulgar statement but it is also correct. (1972:5-6)

Social Integration

Nevertheless, the condition of unemployment does to a large extent objectively sever many of the integrative ties of the worker to the system. The question which remains unanswered is among what segments, with which characteristics, of the unemployed are individuals less integrated and more class conscious than others. It is conceivable, for example, that among the unemployed, older individuals will have lower self-esteem, lower class consciousness, lower alienation, higher degrees of authoritarianism, and more conservative political preferences than younger individuals. This may be so because older individuals probably have had years to adjust to the abuses of capitalism, have probably invested more time, personality, and material wealth in the "system", so despite the fact that they are now unemployed, they are probably more integrated into the capitalistic system than younger individuals.

A more direct structural integrative bond is the nature of the job which the unemployed individual pre-
viously held. Individuals who held skilled or professional jobs probably found greater social identification with the "system" than those who previously held unskilled jobs. Also, the skilled unemployed worker has a greater probability of finding a new and satisfying job faster than the unskilled and unemployed worker. The economic insecurity of unemployment and the resulting loss of status would probably effect the self-esteem of the skilled worker more than that of the unskilled, who has adjusted his self-image to the vicissitudes of capitalism.

Finally, there is the ideological domination of the ruling class over the working class which often seems to obscure the real class nature of capitalistic society in the minds of workers and among the unemployed the source of their unemployment. Myths about America being essentially a middle class society having no classes at all are prevalent. Also, the Protestant "work ethic" perpetuates the myth that the sources of unemployment are not structural but essentially personal.

**Economic Insecurity**

As indicated earlier, the achievement of class consciousness by the working class is pivotal in the Marxian paradigm for understanding class conflict,
revolution and social change. Indeed, as Lukacs has put it:

...the fate of the revolution (and with it the fate of mankind) will depend on the ideological maturity of the proletariat, i.e., on its class consciousness. (1968:70)

However, the working class does not develop class consciousness automatically. There are both objective and subjective factors which must necessarily be present if the working class is to develop class consciousness. The objective factors arise from the historical-structural development and contradictions of capitalistic societies. These objective factors can be summarized under the rubric of "economic insecurity". Leggett suggests that economic insecurity takes at least three forms:

...agrarian-industrial mobility (as in the case of uprooted workers), tenuous occupational positions (as among the unemployed), and membership in a marginal racial or ethnic group (as in the case of Negro blue collar workers). (1968:8)

In accord with the assumptions of the Marxian paradigm, Leggett assumes that the economic insecurity of the working class generates both the conflict between capital and labor, and working class consciousness. For example, Leggett states:

...economic dislocations create friction between employees and workers
which engenders the development and reinforcement of working-class consciousness. (1968:6)

Nevertheless, objective factors, such as unemployment, while they might establish the necessary conditions for the development of class consciousness, are not in themselves sufficient causes for the development of class consciousness.

Consequently, unemployment in itself may not be a sufficient cause of radicalism among workers. Thus, from the Marxian position there must be the intervention of working class organizations, such as unions or political organizations, to increase class consciousness among the working class.

Another possible source of high degrees of class consciousness, which combines both objective and subjective factors is, as Leggett suggests (1968:8), membership in a marginal racial or ethnic group. With the advent of, for example, black nationalism in the last two decades, many black workers have gained an appreciation of their double oppression as workers and members of a minority racial group which suffers the abuses of racism. This awareness of racial oppression should increase the likelihood that workers who are members of racial minorities will have higher degrees of class consciousness than those who are not doubly oppressed.
Is Marx's analysis of unemployment as a product of the structure of capitalism valid today? There is some evidence that it is. In a recent work dealing with the international power of multi-national corporations, Barnet and Muller state that:

The fundamental crisis of the American labor movement is a crisis of human obsolescence. In the global reorganization of production, the American worker has less and less of a role because the American standard of living requires wages which have priced him out of the world labor market and also in part because of automation. Both are contributing significantly to increasing structural unemployment. Even though labor is still a critical component in production, and competition in cutting wage costs is in many industries the key factor in the drive for higher profits, there is less work for human beings to do in the production process than in the past, at least as modern capitalist society defines work. Since production is an activity more efficiently carried out by a few than by many, the byproduct of efficiency and increased productivity is the superfluous man whose only social function is to consume. (1974:323)

Not only is global reorganization or production causing unemployment, but it also weakens labor's ability to protect its own interests. As Barnet and Muller further state:

...the continuing exodus to the export platforms of the underdeveloped world is creating problems for the American labor movement in addition to structural unemployment. Corporate organ-
ization on a global scale is a highly effective weapon for undercutting the power of organized labor everywhere. (1974:308)

However, according to Barnet and Muller, the global corporations are aware of the political threat which may be generated among unemployed workers and thus are prepared to support various welfare measures to inhibit political opposition. Barnet and Muller put it this way:

The global corporations...tend to have liberal views on adjustment assistance. They recognize that the pockets of unemployment which they leave behind represent a serious political problem for them, one they are happy to solve with the taxpayer's money. Thus the U.S. Chamber of Commerce proposal for worker benefits is far more generous than the Administration proposals and is remarkably close to what the unions are demanding. (1974:321)
CHAPTER V
FORMALIZATION OF HYPOTHESES

In previous chapters I have attempted to provide an outline and discussion of many of the domain assumptions and concepts of the Marxian paradigm, especially with an eye as to how those assumptions and concepts might be utilized to guide an empirical investigation of the social and political attitudes of the unemployed. In this chapter, an attempt will be made to construct a bridge between the theoretical concerns discussed in the first four chapters, and the methodological concerns of empirically testing many of the assumptions of the Marxian paradigm and providing a contemporary empirical study of the effects of unemployment on workers' attitudes.

Hypotheses will be grouped in major categories around the major dependent attitudinal variables under investigation. In later chapters each hypothesis will be empirically tested individually and also as part of larger systems of independent and dependent variables investigated through path analysis.

Class Consciousness

As I have indicated in earlier chapters, class
consciousness is perhaps the central attitudinal concept and variable within the Marxian paradigm. The Marxist conception of class consciousness reflects the convergence of epistemological, social psychological, sociology of knowledge concerns, and the theoretical concerns of social change and revolution. Working class consciousness presupposes and subsumes other political and social attitudes which are necessary prerequisites for the development of working class consciousness.

C.W. Mills suggested some of the necessary ingredients of class consciousness when he stated:

Class consciousness has always been understood as a political consciousness of one's own rational class interests and their opposition to the interests of other classes. Economic potentiality becomes politically realized: a 'class in itself' becomes a 'class for itself'. Thus for class consciousness, there must be (1) a rational awareness and identification with one's own class interests; (2) an awareness of and rejection of other class interests as illegitimate; and (3) an awareness of and a readiness to use collective political means to the collective political end of realizing one's interests. (1951:325)

Working class consciousness thus incorporates not only class identification and awareness of economic interests but also a class's more general political interests. While Marx and Engels warned that workers should not limit their struggles or consciousness to
everyday "bread and butter" issues, it was Lenin who provided a theoretical clarification between the type of class consciousness limited to basic economic interests and the type of class consciousness which involves the recognition of the working class's more general socio-political interests. Lenin called these two types of class consciousness trade union consciousness and political socialist class consciousness, respectively. Consequently, if there is any working class consciousness among the unemployed, it is important that the Marxian paradigm test whether there is empirically a distinction between trade union consciousness and political class consciousness and what might be their different correlates among the unemployed. Much of the inconsistent findings about the extent of class consciousness among the unemployed may reflect the failure to conceptually and empirically distinguish between trade union and political class consciousness. These considerations lead to the formalization of the following "nonrelational" single variable hypothesis:

**Hypothesis Ia:**

Class consciousness empirically consists of two dimensions: trade union consciousness and political class consciousness.

While the ideal working class conscious individual should have relatively high degrees of both trade union
consciousness and political class consciousness, as Lenin pointed out, the consciousness of most workers would be limited to trade union consciousness unless there are economic conditions and political influences which raise their class consciousness to a more general political level. Consequently, possible differential factors, as suggested by theoretical considerations, must be empirically examined to determine what are the empirical correlates of trade union and political class consciousness among the unemployed.

Trade union consciousness, while a recognition of basic class economic interests, can often become politically conservative; if basic economic interests are imagined to be, or are in fact, met wholly or partially within the framework of a capitalistic economy. As C.W. Mills puts it:

The upsurge of trade unionism, involving as it does about one-third of the people at work, might be taken as an indication of a rudimentary form of political insurgency. But trade unionism, as we have seen, does not typically question prevailing symbols, has not typically involved counter-symbols. Its usual demands are for a larger slice of the going yield, and its conscious expectations are short-run expectations of immediate material improvements, not of any change in the system of work and life. (1951:331)

Unemployment in itself may be an insufficient condition for the development of a more radical class
consciousness which links working economic interests with political rejection of capitalism. If most workers believe that their unemployment situation would be resolved within the framework of the present socioeconomic system or is essentially an economic problem, it is likely that they would view their unemployment in economic terms, i.e., trade union terms.

Hypothesis Ib:

Among the unemployed, the greater the length of unemployment, the greater the trade union consciousness.

There are several factors which may politically and socially integrate unemployed workers into the dominant system and thus limit their class consciousness to trade union consciousness. Such factors as older age, higher education, higher social class identification, job type, being less politically alienated, and more authoritarian, may serve to offset in the minds and lives of many unemployed workers any radical responses to their unemployment.

For older individuals who have spent years adjusting out of necessity to the vicissitudes of capitalism, it may be materially and psychologically difficult to transcend conceiving of protecting their individual and class interests in any other fashion than in essentially economic terms. The ideological domination of the
ruling class may be much more influential among older workers who for many years have been subject to it, than for younger workers who simply haven't been around as long. Older workers will often have long established social and work ties in which they find some direction and meaning for their lives and thus are probably less likely to want to radically change the present socio-economic system. Consequently, older workers will be more concerned with their individual everyday economic interests and the immediate economic interests of their class.

Hypothesis Ic:

Among the unemployed, older individuals will have more trade union consciousness than younger individuals.

Workers who have invested time and money in pursuit of education may not even have trade union consciousness because they believe they can protect their interests, individually, instead of collectively. This may be so because such individuals may be dominated by "bourgeois" ideology, especially in the sense of believing that even if unemployed, their chances of getting a job are better because of their higher education. If the Marxian assumption that the ruling class not only owns the material means of production, but also the means of mental production, i.e., schools, universities, mass
media, etc., is correct, then those individuals who are most influenced by the ruling class's ideologies should be the least class conscious.

Hypothesis Id:

Among the unemployed, individuals with higher education will have less trade union consciousness than those with lower amounts of education.

Unemployed workers who identify themselves as belonging to the middle class or upper class, would probably not even have the elementary working class consciousness to be trade union conscious. While being able to properly identify the objective social class to which one belongs is not sufficient in itself for having class consciousness of any kind, proper class identification is a necessary component of class consciousness.

Hypothesis Ie:

Among the unemployed, individuals who identify themselves as members of the working class will have higher degrees of trade union consciousness than individuals who identify with other social classes.

Workers who have professional type jobs may define themselves in other than class terms, even elementary ones, and thus have little trade union consciousness. As was indicated in earlier chapters, the Marxian paradigm provides little information about how individuals in the different strata of the working class will define their social and economic interests. However, the
Marxian paradigm does assume that an individual's objective position in the productive system does greatly influence the consciousness of the individual. Unemployed workers who had professional jobs may perceive their problems in individual rather than in class terms. This may be so because professionals, unlike unskilled or skilled workers, are often less tied to the collective rhythm of a factory or assembly line and have relatively more individual "freedom" on the job.

Hypothesis If:

Among the unemployed, individuals who had professional jobs will have less trade union consciousness than individuals with skilled or unskilled jobs.

Workers with high degrees of trade union consciousness would most likely be more politically alienated than those with less trade union consciousness. To define oneself highly in trade union terms should produce some political alienation toward most capitalist political institutions because such institutions are basically negative toward militant trade unions. Additionally, the very existence of trade unions indicates that capitalist political institutions are insufficient to protect workers' economic interests.

Hypothesis Ig:

Among the unemployed, individuals with high degrees of trade union consciousness will be more politically alienated than individuals with lower degrees of trade union consciousness.
Lastly, workers with high trade union consciousness may be more authoritarian than those with low trade union consciousness because they recognize more clearly their threatened economic interests and may be more inflexible in their attitudes toward life and their strategies for protecting their threatened economic interests. The political rigidity of authoritarianism may reflect a fear of "rocking the boat", and thus losing what little economic security one has. Thus while workers who are alienated from the present political institutions of capitalism may have high degrees of trade union consciousness, they may prefer "law and order" capitalist political solutions to their threatened economic situation rather than radical solutions.

Hypothesis Ih:

Among the unemployed, individuals with high degrees of trade union consciousness will be more authoritarian than individuals with low degrees of trade union consciousness.

Political Class Consciousness

As discussed earlier, Lenin maintained that for the development of political class consciousness, workers would have to develop a deeper understanding of capitalism than the elementary understanding generated by their every day economic problems. Unemployed individuals who are politically class conscious should recognize that their interests transcend everyday
economic issues and should thus reject the socio-
political institutions of capitalism. Because simple
economic deprivation, as manifested in unemployment,
is probably not sufficient in itself to produce poli-
tical class consciousness, other factors, which may
represent less material and psychological integration
into the dominant socio-political system, may be
necessary to generate political class consciousness
among the unemployed.

Hypothesis II:

Among the unemployed, as length of unemployment
increases there will be no increase in degree
of political class consciousness.

Young unemployed workers, because of their rela-
tively limited work experience, and consequently, their
lesser material and psychological investment in the
dominant system may be more likely to develop political
class consciousness than older workers. Young workers
are probably less dominated by ruling class ideologies
and are more open to new ideas. Consequently, young
workers may be more willing and able to accept social
change than are older workers. Most young workers have
not gone through the struggles of older generations of
workers to establish trade unions, and thus their per-
ception of how to protect their individual and class
interests may transcend simple trade union strategies.
Hypothesis Ij:

Among the unemployed, younger individuals will have higher degrees of political class consciousness than older individuals.

As argued earlier, individuals who, for whatever reason, have been unable to pursue higher education, may be less ideologically integrated into the dominant system and also have less support of the dominant system because they perceive their opportunities for advancement limited by their educational attainments. Consequently, such individuals may be likely to develop political class consciousness.

Hypothesis Ik:

Among the unemployed, individuals with lower education will have more political class consciousness than individuals with higher education.

Individuals who identify themselves in terms other than as members of the working class or describe their former occupational status as professional would probably be less inclined to reject the socio-political institutions of capitalism, even when unemployed, because they do not define their interests, political, economic, or otherwise, in working class terms. As argued previously, proper identification of one's objective social class membership is a necessary prerequisite for any type of class consciousness. Those working class individuals who held jobs relatively not
similar to the jobs held by most workers will probably have less working class consciousness than other workers, and certainly should have less political class consciousness.

Hypothesis II:

Among the unemployed, individuals who identify themselves as members of the working class will have higher degrees of political class consciousness than individuals who identify with other social classes.

Hypothesis Im:

Among the unemployed, individuals who had professional jobs will have less trade union consciousness than individuals with skilled or unskilled jobs.

Unemployed workers who are members of racial minority groups suffer not only from the economic insecurity of unemployment but in most cases from the experience of institutional racism. Minority group workers are in many cases less psychologically and socially integrated in the dominant socio-political system and consequently should have higher degrees of political class consciousness than white workers.

Hypothesis In:

Among the unemployed, individuals who are members of racial minorities will have more political class consciousness than individuals who are members of the white race.

The recognition for a radical rejection of capitalist socio-political institutions requires a great deal
of cognitive and political flexibility which would probably mitigate against high degrees of authoritarianism among individuals who are highly politically class conscious. In addition, as previously argued, political class consciousness involves a rejection of the authoritarian social and work relationships which exist under capitalism and desire to achieve a more equitable social system not characterized by rulers and followers.

Hypothesis Io:

Among the unemployed, individuals who have low degrees of authoritarianism will have higher degrees of political class consciousness than those with high degrees of authoritarianism.

It would be a cognitive and attitudinal contradiction if unemployed workers who were politically class conscious were not also highly alienated politically. Consequently, high political alienation should be a necessary attitudinal prerequisite for political class consciousness. As indicated earlier, Marx and Lenin contended that political alienation would be a necessary prerequisite for the development of revolutionary consciousness. For how could a worker desire to abolish the socio-political institution of capitalism without first being alienated from those institutions?

Hypothesis Ip:

Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly
politically alienated will also be highly politically class conscious.

While significant relationships between trade union and political class consciousness and various selected variables have been presented in hypothesis form, this study will also be concerned with the total effect of systems of variables on both types of class consciousness. Of special concern will be what combinations of integrative social or non-integrative social variables will yield higher or lower trade union and political class consciousness among the unemployed.

Political Alienation

Political alienation may be generated not only by a lack of belief in the efficacy of a political system, but political alienation may also reflect the height of dissatisfaction with the more general socio-political arrangements of society. This may be so because it is the political institutions which safeguard the legal, social, and industrial arrangements of capitalist society. It would seem reasonable to assume that individuals who find themselves in alienative legal, social, and industrial circumstances, because of their racial status, social class membership, limited education or condition of unemployment, would be highly politically alienated. Individuals who are less socially, economically and politically integrated into
the dominant socio-political system should have higher degrees of political alienation than those individuals and groups which are socially, economically and politically integrated into the dominant system. As the individuals' time of unemployment increases, and thus his economic and social insecurity, that individual should become increasingly politically alienated.

Hypothesis IIa:

Among the unemployed, the greater the length of unemployment, the greater the degree of political alienation.

Aside from being unemployed, there are several variables, which, as discussed in previous sections are often indicators of lesser social, economic, and political integration into the dominant socio-political system. These variables are membership in non-white racial groups, youth, membership in the working class and having less than a high school education.

Because many of the social and political institutions of capitalism are afflicted with varying degrees of racism, non-white workers have historically and currently suffered even greater social and economic insecurity than white workers. Consequently, non-white workers are often more alienated from the political institutions of capitalism than are white workers. In fact, several social scientists have found blacks had
greater reservation about the effectiveness of American political institutions than white workers (Aiken, Ferman, and Sheppard, 1968:142-143; and Sheppard and Herrick, 1972:6-7).

Hypothesis IIb:

Among the unemployed, non-whites will have greater degrees of political alienation than whites.

Young workers are often the first to be fired and the last rehired and thus are not likely to be satisfied with present social and political institutions. As the report of a special task force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled *Work In America* pointed out, young workers are more affluent and better educated than their parents and consequently less willing to accept social and political institutions which may thwart their rising expectations (1973:43-45). One would expect that young workers who become unemployed may be more alienated than older workers who may have more moderate expectations of political institutions.

Hypothesis IIc:

Among the unemployed, young individuals will have greater degrees of political alienation than older individuals.

Working class individuals who identify with other social classes will probably not identify with the economic and political interests of the working class. But
individuals who do identify with the working class are more likely to be politically alienated because they may realize that their social and economic interests are not always met by the political institutions of capitalism.

Hypothesis IIId:

Among the unemployed, individuals who identify themselves as members of the working class will have higher degrees of political alienation than individuals who identify with other social classes.

One would also expect that individuals with a minimum education may be alienated from political institutions they cannot understand or which appear not to serve their needs. Aiken, Ferman and Sheppard found this to be true in their study of unemployed workers (1968:94-95). These authors suggested that lower education attainment gives workers less, "sense of mastery and comprehension of political processes", and hence leads to more political alienation (1968:94).

Hypothesis IIle:

Among the unemployed, individuals with less than high school education will have greater degrees of political alienation than individuals who have a high school education or more.

Individuals who are authoritarian may be among those who are also highly politically alienated. Such individuals may be alienated from current political institutions because they perceive these institutions
as being ineffective in solving current social problems from a conservative standpoint. Highly authoritarian individuals may be politically alienated not because they hold a radical critique of the current political institutions, but because they perceive these institutions as not being strong and strict enough. Sheppard and Herrick (1972) found authoritarianism to be positively related to political alienation for reasons similar to the ones discussed above.

Hypothesis IIif:

Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly authoritarian will also be highly politically alienated.

Authoritarianism

In previous sections I have indicated in hypothesis form what causal relationships authoritarianism may have with such variables as trade union consciousness, political class consciousness, and political alienation. In this section I am concerned with formulating hypotheses in terms of what independent variables are effecting authoritarianism as a dependent variable.

Lipset, in his classical analysis of the making of an authoritarian, contends that the authoritarian's:
...education attainment is less than that of men with higher socio-economic status, and his association as child with others of similar background not only fails to stimulate his intellectual interests but also creates an atmosphere which prevents his educational experience from increasing his general social sophistication and his understanding of different groups and ideas. Leaving school relatively early, he is surrounded on the job by others with a similarly restricted cultural, educational, and family background. Little external influence impinges on his limited environment.

All of these characteristics produce a tendency to view politics and personal relationships in black-and-white terms, a desire for immediate action, an impatience with talk and discussion, a lack of interest in organizations which have a long-range perspective, and a readiness to follow leaders who offer a demonological interpretation of the evil forced (either religious or political) which are conspiring against him. (1963:114)

Lipset points out that the social situation of lower class individuals is one which presupposes them to see politics in black and white terms and consequently to have a very rigid political outlook (1963:89). According to Lipset, simple rigid black and white political outlooks among lower class individuals makes them more susceptible to authoritarianism.

Hypothesis IIIa:

Among the unemployed, individuals who identify themselves as members of the lower class will be more authoritarian than individuals who identify with other social classes.
The simplified political outlook of the lower class may also be the result of their low levels of educational attainment.

Hypothesis IIIb:
Among the unemployed, individuals with less than a high school education will be more authoritarian than individuals with a high school education or more.

Sheppard and Herrick (1972:81) have suggested and found a relation between authoritarianism and unskilled jobs. The boredom and repetition of unskilled jobs may be a contributing factor of a worker's political and psychological attitudes. The rigidity and simplicity of unskilled jobs may become reflected in a worker developing authoritarian attitudes.

Hypothesis IIIc:
Among the unemployed, individuals who previously held unskilled jobs will be more authoritarian than those who held skilled or professional jobs.

Older workers may be more rigid and less tolerant of different opinions and new ideas than younger workers. After all, if workers under capitalism are oppressed and live alienative lives, those workers who endured this oppression and alienation for years may have resigned themselves to the authority and legitimacy of capitalist institutions.

Hypothesis IIIid:
Among the unemployed, older individuals will be
more authoritarian than younger individuals.

Political Party Preference

Preference for a political party or no preference for any political party may represent one of the ultimate expressions of the combination of various life experiences and social and political attitudes of the unemployed. For it is in a preference or no preference for a political party that individuals may indicate the social and political channels they believe must be utilized to further their interests and express their opinions. While there is often a considerable difference between the perceived orientation of a political party and a party's actual program or policies once in power, it is probably the perceived orientation of a political party which is the basis of an individuals' preference for that party.

Richard Centers in his classical study, *Psychology of Social Classes* (1949), found that:

Support for the Republican - a traditionally conservative party - is strongest in precisely those strata that have the most to gain by maintenance of the status quo, i.e., in the business and professional groups. Such support is much less in evidence in the lower occupational strata. (1949:65-66)

Centers also found that manual workers preferred
the Democratic party over all other parties (1949:60). John Leggett in his study of class consciousness among workers found that workers who are highly class conscious prefer the Democratic party, as did non-white and unionized workers (1968:122).

Aiken, Ferman, and Sheppard in their study of the voting preferences of the unemployed, found that unemployed workers overwhelmingly preferred the Democratic party over all other political parties (1968:102-103). Sheppard and Herrick made a similar finding in their more recent study of worker dissatisfaction in the 1970's (1972:106-108). Indeed, as Sheppard and Herrick put it:

...unemployment experience is the best predictor of how much the workers choose the Democratic Party over the Republican Party... (1972:106-107)

As previous research seems to indicate, preference for the Republican party appears to be an indication of conservativism or satisfaction with the present order by certain segments of the working class.

Hypothesis IVa:

Among the unemployed, the greater the length of unemployment, the less the preference for the Republican party.

While preference for the Democratic party appears to serve as an indication of worker dissatisfaction, certainly preference for Socialist/Communist parties
would also indicate a dissatisfaction with present socio-economic and political conditions. For after all, it is Socialist/Communist party platforms which offer the most radical alternatives to the present system.

Prolonged periods of unemployment must certainly generate some dissatisfaction among unemployed workers and, consequently, as the length of unemployment increases, there should also be an increase in preference for the Democratic party and Socialist/Communist parties over the Republican party.

Hypothesis IVb:

Among the unemployed, the greater the length of unemployment, the greater the preference for the Democratic party and Socialist/Communist parties.

The review of previous findings also suggests the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis IVc:

Among the unemployed, individuals who identify themselves as members of the working class will have a greater preference for the Democratic party rather than Republican party.

Because trade union consciousness is a "conservative" type of working class consciousness, which is more concerned with short term economic interests rather than sweeping social change, and because the trade union movement has traditionally preferred the Democratic party over all other parties (Horowitz,
1972:518), those workers who are highly trade union conscious will probably prefer the Democratic party.

Hypothesis IVd:
Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly trade union conscious will prefer the Democratic party over the Republican party.

It would be expected that individuals who have high degrees of political class consciousness would prefer political parties which are perceived as politically representing the interests of the working class or which seek to mitigate the socio-political abuses of capitalism. While the Democratic party is often perceived as such a party, the Marxian paradigm would certainly expect that workers with the highest degrees of political class consciousness would prefer Socialist/Communist parties.

Hypothesis IVe:
Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly politically class conscious will prefer Socialist/Communist parties over all other parties.

Because authoritarianism represents a basic preference for strict leadership and a "law and order" philosophy, one would expect that highly authoritarian individuals will prefer the American Independence party of Wallace which often represents itself as the "law and order" party.
Hypothesis IVf:

Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly authoritarian will prefer the American Independence Party of Wallace over all other parties.

The relationship of political alienation to political party preference may be a very complicated one. On the one hand, one might expect that individuals who are highly politically alienated will reject all political parties because they believe the electoral system is unresponsive to their needs, or simply because highly alienated individuals are apathetic. On the other hand, highly alienated individuals may be only alienated toward the present political leadership (in this case, the Republican party), and thus prefer the Democratic party or Socialist/Communist parties. Nevertheless, even a preference for the Democratic party or Socialist/Communist parties reflects some belief that the political process is worth participating in. Consequently, while many politically alienated workers may prefer parties of the "left", the most highly alienated will probably have no political party preference.

Hypothesis IVg:

Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly politically alienated will have no political party preference.
Self-Esteem

In this section self-esteem will be treated as a major dependent variable and it is for this reason that self-esteem was not introduced earlier as contributing to other dependent variables. Unemployment disrupts the normal life activity of most people and thus probably has serious consequences for the individual's orientating frames of reference for his self. Wilcock and Franke found (1963), in their study of the unemployed, that with increasing unemployment workers lose their self-confidence, feelings of usefulness, and positive self-esteem. As discussed earlier, unemployment removes the worker from his work role which provides him with much of the criteria upon which rests his self-esteem. Thus it should come as no surprise, as Braginsky and Braginsky found (1975), that the condition of unemployment has a shattering effect upon the workers' self-esteem, and consequently increases personality and behavioral problems.

Hypothesis Va:

Among the unemployed, the greater the length of unemployment the lower the self-esteem.

However, the effect of unemployment may be less for those accustomed to economic insecurity. Among groups who are generally subjected to economic insecurity,
unemployment will probably not effect their self-esteem (Eisenberg and Lazarsfeld, 1938). Consequently, workers who have not experienced severe economic insecurity prior to being unemployed may find the condition of unemployment more shattering to their self-esteem than workers who are used to economic insecurity. Workers who identify themselves as middle class probably do so because they feel that economically and socially they are average and a lot better off than most. It is these "middle class" workers who would probably be more disoriented by unemployment than workers who identify with the lower or working classes.

Hypothesis Vb:

Among the unemployed, individuals who identify with the middle class will have lower self-esteem than those who identify with other social classes.

Along the same lines, individuals who previously held professional jobs, jobs which may have provided greater personal identity than unskilled or skilled productive jobs, may find the condition of unemployment more damaging to their self-esteem than those not previously holding professional jobs. The study conducted by Braginsky and Braginsky found:

...that unemployed men, mainly middle-manager, engineers, and skilled semi-professionals, increased their sense of impotence as they continued in the jobless state. (1975:72)
Hypothesis Vc:
Among the unemployed, individuals who previously held professional jobs will have lower self-esteem than those who held skilled or unskilled jobs.

Individuals who have attained a high school education or more probably have had better success in making a living previous to being unemployed and should have a better chance of getting a new job than individuals with less than a high school education. However, the social and economic insecurity of being unemployed probably has a greater negative impact on those with a relatively high educational attainment because the relatively higher self-esteem they held when employed is now threatened.

Hypothesis Vd:
Among the unemployed, individuals with a high school education or more will have a lower self-esteem than those with less than a high school education.

Lipset has argued that workers who are authoritarian are usually those with impaired personalities and low self-esteem (1963:114-116). If the authoritarian seeks direction from external strong leaders it may be because such a person has little regard for his own abilities, and is thus characterized by low esteem.

Hypothesis Ve:
Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly authoritarian will have lower self-esteem than those with low authoritarianism.
Whatever the effects of length of unemployment are on workers' self-esteem, those individuals who understand the problem of unemployment as essentially a socio-political problem would probably have higher self-esteem than those individuals who view unemployment as a personal problem.

Hypothesis Vf:

Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly politically alienated will have higher self-esteem than those with low political class consciousness.

Being politically class conscious should enable the individual to understand that his current unemployment is not the result of any personal failure, but rather a failing of the social system. Also, political class consciousness should provide workers with a sense of direction for their lives and a heightened sense of self-esteem when they realize they may have the power to radically change society.

Hypothesis Vg:

Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly politically class conscious will have higher self-esteem than those with low political class consciousness.
CHAPTER VI
RESEARCH DESIGN

Sample

The population for the current study consists of approximately 9000 individuals collecting unemployment insurance benefits at the Michigan Employment Security Commission Office in Kalamazoo County, Michigan, during the last two weeks of August, 1975. Eligible recipients collect benefits every two weeks. Thus, in order to insure sampling of the total population, data were collected on a daily basis for a two week period. Every twelfth individual was approached and asked to complete a self-administered questionnaire containing 124 items (see Appendix). All respondents were given a brief introduction and an explanation of instructions. Respondents were also provided with a clipboard and pencil. A systematic sample of 389 individuals was obtained. In all, 580 individuals were approached while they waited in line for their bi-weekly benefit checks. Of these 580 individuals, 131 (22.6%) declined to respond to the questionnaire and 60 (10.3%) returned partially completed questionnaires. The completed questionnaires (389) constitute a 67% response rate. However, the actual number of cases for a particular
analysis may be less than 389 due to uncodeable and missing responses on certain items. The actual number of cases on which an analysis is based will be noted.

The current sample is not restricted to a single occupational or demographic category of the working class but represents individuals from diverse occupational and demographic backgrounds. The maximum length of time the unemployed workers in the sample can collect unemployment insurance is sixty five weeks. This sixty five week unemployment insurance coverage is derived from three sources. For the first twenty six weeks the revenue for unemployment benefits comes from state unemployment tax on employees payroll finances benefits. The revenue for the next thirteen weeks comes from Federal-State extended benefits funds, while the remaining twenty six weeks of unemployment benefits is supplied by Federal Supplemental Benefits (Killingsworth, 1976:17). The economist Killingsworth offers a concise statement concerning the duration, extent, and cost of unemployment benefits when he states:

In general, the maximum duration for any recipient is 65 weeks, or approximately 15 months. By the best estimates available, the U.S. spent a total of $12.1 billion on all of the main unemployment compensation programs in fiscal year 1974-75, and it is estimated another $20.6 billion
will be spent in fiscal year 1975-76. During most of calendar 1975, between 6 and 7 million workers were receiving benefits. In the closing months of the year, the number of claimants showed a downward trend, partly as a result of exhaustion of eligibility. (1976:14)

The sample does not, however, represent unemployed individuals who have used up their unemployment insurance benefits or who are otherwise ineligible to collect benefits.

The selection of a sample of unemployed workers collecting unemployment insurance instead of selecting a sample of the "chronically" unemployed or the "hidden" unemployed, was made for theoretical and methodological reasons. Most unemployed workers do collect unemployment benefits, and to be eligible for unemployment benefits workers must have had steady employment prior to being unemployed and must be willing to actively seek employment. If certain Marxian assumptions about the relation of unemployment to class consciousness and other political and social attitudes among workers are to be investigated, it would be appropriate to draw a sample of unemployed workers who, under better economic conditions, are usually employed. Such a sample of unemployed workers may be more sensitive politically and socially to the impact of unemployment on their lives.
than the so called "chronic" unemployed, who are often unemployed because of physical or other personal characteristics specific to themselves.

From a methodological point of view, drawing a sample of unemployed workers from the unemployment insurance lines facilitates an otherwise impossible task of attempting to locate and then randomly select a sample of unemployed workers in an entire county. Additionally, drawing a sample of unemployed workers from unemployment insurance lines provides a sample of unemployed workers from a great diversity of occupational, industrial and demographic backgrounds. The lack of a diversified sample has been a limitation of most other studies of the attitudes of the unemployed.

Selected Characteristics of the Sample

The unemployed workers studied are young, the average age of the respondents is 28 years and 186 (47.8%) of the respondents are 24 years of age or younger. Although most of the respondents are young, there are no significant differences in the duration of unemployment among various age groups. For many of the respondents unemployment and the collection of unemployment insurance is a relatively new experience. Slightly over 50% of the respondents report having been unemployed only once or not at all during the past ten years (or
since entering the labor market). A substantial majority of the respondents (56.8%) report that they have not previously collected unemployment insurance benefits. An additional 22.6% (N=88) of the respondents report having collected only once in the past. Only 1% (N=4) of the respondents identified themselves as members of the upper class, 56% (N=216) as members of the middle, 31% (N=120) as members of the working class and 7% (N=26) as members of the lower class. In regard to education, 2% (N=6) of the respondents have an 8th grade education or less, 11% (N=41) have completed grades 9 through 11, 40% (N=157) have a high school degree, 32% (N=123) have some college education and 15% (N=62) have a college degree.

Occupationally, a majority of the respondents (56.5%) indicate that they had been employed in skilled occupations and 10.8% (N=42) of the respondents indicate that they were employed in professional occupations. Less than 30% of the respondents report being previously employed in unskilled occupations. The previous unemployment record and self-reported occupations of the respondents indicates that the current sample of unemployed are highly employable rather than chronically unemployable individuals. In terms of other demographic characteristics, 62.2% (N=242) of the respondents are male, 37.8% (N=142) are female.
Racially, slightly less than 10% of those completing questionnaires are minority group members. This low minority group representation was unexpected and no explanation is available for this fact. In addition, 51.9% (N=202) individuals in the current sample are union members, while 46.3% (N=180) individuals report that they are not union members, and 1.8% (N=7) did not report their union status.

As indicated in Table 6.1, the unemployment rate for the Kalamazoo - Portage SMSA for August 1975 was 12,000 individuals unemployed, representing 9.6% of the labor force. While the Kalamazoo - Portage SMSA unemployment rate exceeds the national rate by a wide margin, the rate for the state of Michigan, 13%, was much larger than either local or national rates.

As indicated by Chart 6.1, layoffs, both the local and national levels, have dropped from their 1975 peak quarters. However, the 6,000 initial claims in Kalamazoo during the third quarter of 1975 still exceeded by about 50% the year previous total. Thus the current sample was drawn at a time of relatively high national, regional and local unemployment, undoubtedly reflecting the downturn in the economy and the substantial inflation of the time.
## Table 6.1

**Employment and Unemployment**  
Kalamazoo-Portage SMSA 1970-1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total labor force</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Unemployment No.</th>
<th>% of labor force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>108,500</td>
<td>102,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>101,800</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>111,400</td>
<td>105,800</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>115,500</td>
<td>110,600</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974 January</td>
<td>117,200</td>
<td>111,300</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>118,500</td>
<td>111,200</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>120,900</td>
<td>113,300</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>120,300</td>
<td>113,800</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>120,600</td>
<td>114,700</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>122,400</td>
<td>114,900</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>120,800</td>
<td>113,700</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>113,600</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>122,600</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>116,100</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>122,300</td>
<td>114,700</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>121,900</td>
<td>112,800</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975 January</td>
<td>125,400</td>
<td>114,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>124,800</td>
<td>111,700</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>125,900</td>
<td>112,100</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>125,900</td>
<td>112,100</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>125,900</td>
<td>112,500</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>127,900</td>
<td>112,600</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>126,400</td>
<td>113,300</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>124,700</td>
<td>112,700</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>126,900</td>
<td>115,400</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 6.1

Unemployment Insurance, Initial Claims United States and Kalamazoo Area by Quarter. 1969 - 1975
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Measurement

I Length of unemployment

The main measure of an individual’s length of unemployment was the individual’s self-reported time in days, weeks, and months that he has been currently unemployed. An additional measure of unemployment which was used is a unemployment-work ratio measure. The unemployment work ratio was computed as the proportion of time an individual has been unemployed during his total working career.

II Class Consciousness

A nine item class consciousness scale was developed which reflects the two conceptual dimensions of working class consciousness, trade union consciousness and political class consciousness, as conceived in the Marxian paradigm. Economic affiliation and interests of the "trade union" dimension of working class consciousness was measured by four items. Affiliation items were:

Working people should stick together to protect themselves.

Working people make all the things we need to live.

Economic class interest items were:

Unions are one good way for workers to protect themselves.

When workers go on strike for higher wages, this is good.
The socio-political dimensions of working class consciousness was measured by five items. Recognition of unequal power distribution was measured by:

The ruling class has all the power.

Under Capitalism the workers have little power.

An individual's attitude toward wealth redistribution was measured by the following item (response alternatives: yes, don't know, no). This item was one of the key criteria for determining working class consciousness in Leggett's important study of working class consciousness (1968):

Do you think the wealth of this country should be redistributed to all equally?

An individual's attitude toward capitalism and socialism was measured by two items:

Capitalism is a bad social system.

Socialism is a good social system.

To examine the soundness of the conceptual distinction between trade union consciousness and political class consciousness, the scores on the nine working class consciousness items were intercorrelated (product-moment) and factor analyzed by the principal axes technique (Rummel, 1970). Unities were employed as communality estimates and only factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 were retained for subsequent rotation. The two factors thus obtained were rotated to orthogonal
simple structure using the varimax criterion of rotation (VandeGeer, 1971; Rummel, 1970; Nunnally, 1967). The two rotated factors account for 43.9% of the total item variance (Factor I, political class consciousness - 26%; Factor II, trade union consciousness - 17.9%).

Interpreting the rotated factors in terms of variables with the highest loadings indicated that the first factor represents political class consciousness and the second factor represents trade union class consciousness. Two scales, described above, were made up of items with substantial loadings (.40 or greater) on the same factor. These two scales were used as measures of trade union and political class consciousness in subsequent analyses.

These nine items were scored on a Likert type scale, to provide an attitude continuum index, with high values (2) being assigned to "agree" responses, low values (0) to "disagree" responses and one (1) assigned to "uncertain" responses. Based on the results of factor analysis, two composite scale scores were produced by summing and averaging response values for all items assigned to the same scale. The scale called Political Class Consciousness Scale has a alpha reliability coefficient of .69 and the Trade Union Class Consciousness Scale has an alpha reliability coefficient of .48. The alpha reliability coefficient provides a measure of the internal consistency of responses to the
items in the scales.

III Political preference

The political preferences of the unemployed are measured by individual responses to selected items on the self-administered questionnaire completed by respondents in this study. Political party and presidential candidate preference were measured by two items asking the respondent to indicate the party and the presidential candidate he thinks he will vote for in the 1976 presidential election.

IV Political alienation

A series of items, used in previous research (e.g. Sheppard and Herrick, 1972), dealing with perception of political effectiveness, confidence in one's fellow man, and confidence in the fate of the "average man" were included in the questionnaire. Based on the intercorrelation of responses to these items, three items were selected for inclusion in a general alienation scale. The three items are:

There's little use in writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.

People like me don't have any say about what the government does.

These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on.

A four-point Likert scale ranging from strongly
agree to strongly disagree was used. A value of 4 was assigned to a strongly agree response with decreasing values being assigned to the other alternatives; strongly disagree was assigned a value of 1. The response scores on all three items were summated and averaged to produce a general alienation score. High scores represent high alienation. The alienation scale used in this research has a alpha reliability coefficient of .67.

The first two items clearly represent what Seeman (1959) calls "powerlessness" - a feeling that one's own behavior has little influence on the outcomes being sought by the individual. The third item may be a measure of "meaninglessness" (Seeman, 1959) - a feeling that satisfactory predictions of outcomes can not be made. The current scale seems to measure the extent to which an individual feels able to control and to predict future events.

V Authoritarianism

The authoritarianism scale utilized in this study was adapted from Sheppard and Herrick's (1972) study on worker dissatisfaction. By authoritarianism, Sheppard and Herrick meant a tendency for an individual to have a preference for obedience, strict leadership and strong leadership with little tolerance. The items making up Sheppard and Herrick's authoritarianism scale and the one utilized in this study are:
The most important thing to teach children is absolute obedience to their parents.

Any good leader should be strict with people under him in order to gain their respect.

A few strong leaders could do more for this country than all the laws and talk.

A four point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree was used. A value of 4 was assigned to a strongly agree response with decreasing values being assigned to the other alternative; strongly disagree was assigned a value of 1. This authoritarianism scale has a alpha reliability coefficient of .49.

VI Self-Esteem

A modified version of Rosenberg's self-esteem was utilized to measure an individual's self-esteem. This modified version was suggested by Kaplan and Pokorny's (1969) empirical use of Rosenberg's self-esteem scale. Kaplan and Pokorny, through factor analysis, discovered that Rosenberg's scale was not unidimensional and contained both a self-defensiveness scale and a self-derogation scale. Kaplan and Pokorny suggested utilization of the self-derogation as a stronger measure of self-esteem. Consequently, the following 6 items make-up the self-esteem scale utilized in this study.

All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
I wish I could have more respect for myself.
I certainly feel useless at times.
At times I think I am no good at all.

A four-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree was used. A value of 4 was assigned to a strongly agree response with decreasing values being assigned to the other alternatives; strongly disagree was assigned a value of 1. The response scores on all items were summated and averaged to produce a general alienation score. High scores represent low self-esteem. This self-esteem scale has a alpha reliability coefficient of .74.

Statistics

A variety of statistical techniques have been utilized to analyze the data. Those techniques are factor analysis, alpha reliability coefficient, path analysis, two way analysis of variance and contingency table analysis.

Because factor analysis is a method for ascertaining whether a large number of items may be reduced to a smaller number of common factors, it was utilized to test whether there was an empirical basis for the theoretical distinction between trade union consciousness and political class consciousness. The use of factor analysis in the present study was not to generate
post hoc any scale, but rather to test scales derived from theoretical considerations.

Factor analysis selects variables that are highly intercorrelated and integrates them into common factors which may represent common theoretical and empirical constructs.

The scores in the nine class consciousness items were intercorrelated (product-moment) and factor analyzed by the principal axes technique which determines whether resulting factors are orthogonal (uncorrelated). Principal axes technique has the advantage of being able to extract a maximum amount of variance as each factor is measured (Kerlinger, 1973:667-668). The resulting two factors of the nine class consciousness items were rotated to orthogonal simple structure in order to arrive at the "best" ways of the viewing the variables in n-dimensional space (best fit), using the varimax criteria of rotation. The varimax is, according to Kerlinger, "probably the best method of analytic (computer) orthogonal rotation" (1973:680), because it maximizes the sum of variances of squared loadings in the columns of the factor matrix.

Alpha reliability coefficients was utilized because they provide a measure of the internal consistency of responses of the items in scales. As Cherlin and Bourque explain:
...alpha is... assumed to be a measure of the ratio of the amount of item covariance in a scale to the total amount of variance in the scale, with the coefficient adjusted always to fall between 0.0 and 1.0. The computational formula applied, which assumes unstandardized items and which allows for missing data is:

\[
\alpha = \left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i} \sigma_{x_i}^2}{p \sigma_x^2}\right)
\]

where \(\sigma_x^2\) = the variance of the score on item \(i\); \(\sigma_x^2\) = the variance of the scale score formed by taking the mean of the raw item scores; and \(p\) = the number of items in the scale. (1974:576)

The alpha reliability coefficient was utilized to provide a measure of the internal consistency of responses to the items in the following scales: trade union consciousness, political class consciousness, political alienation, authoritarianism, and self-esteem.

Path analysis was used to test the plausibility of causal models, indicating the interaction of sets of significant selected variables, for the development of class consciousness, political alienation, authoritarianism and self-esteem. In the case of class consciousness, in order to facilitate comparability, the same causal models were utilized for both trade union and political class consciousness.
Path analysis was selected because while it is based on regression analysis, it offers a more graphic presentation of the interrelation between variables. Also, path analysis is an attempt to demonstrate the direction of causality among a set of variables; and a concern for causality is central to Marxian assumptions.

According to Babbie, there is a "striking" similarity between the interpretation of a path model and the use of the multivariate elaboration model (1973:327). This is achieved in the path model through the analysis of the standardized regression coefficients arranged in a logical schematic.

Two-way analysis of variance (Friedman test) was utilized to test whether there were different significant mean scores on the trade union consciousness, political class consciousness, political alienation, authoritarianism and self-esteem scales between different groups of unemployed workers.

Analysis of variance is based on the ratio of the squared differences between group means to an estimate of the variance of all scores.

In addition, chi-square contingency table analysis was used to examine the relation between political party preferences and selected variables. Given the nominal variables of political party preference contingency
table analysis was deemed the most appropriate method. Significance level utilized was equal to or less than .05.

Qualifications

There are two basic issues which are important to consider in regard to the design of this study. The first issue is a methodological one; are survey research techniques viable methods of investigating such "dynamic" phenomena as working class consciousness and other social and political attitudes? The second issue involves the behavioral implications of survey research findings; are responses to questions in a survey really indicative of the present and future behavior of respondents?

These issues, which would confront any survey based study of working class consciousness, have been recognized at least by one investigator of class consciousness, Michael Mann, when he stated:

If class consciousness is essentially dynamic it is obvious that conventional, static social survey techniques will not illuminate it very well. We learn from them that in normal situations most workers are confused in their economic and political beliefs. That is true even of the majority of more "advanced" labor forces, like those in northern Italy or France. But this does not enable us to predict their reactions in crisis situations. As their normal consciousness contains elements drawn
from the most disparate ideologies, their anger in a crisis might be channeled into nationalism, fascism, racism, socialism, anarchism or indeed into intensified confusion? So in order to understand revolutionary consciousness we need additional dynamic evidence. (1974:531)

However, as discussed in chapter two, Karl Marx, himself, was one of the first social scientists to utilize a questionnaire to measure the class consciousness of workers (Fedoseyev, 1973:568). Thus in principle the Marxian paradigm has no inherent objection to the use of survey research. But, the question which remains is whether pencil and paper indicators of working class consciousness are indicative of possible future revolutionary behavior on the part of workers. The behavioral implications of a study of working class consciousness would certainly be more controversial, from the Marxian point of view, if a particular study found no indication whatsoever of class consciousness among unemployed workers.

This study is perhaps limited by not having indicators of actual political behavior of the unemployed, but the Marxian paradigm does provide a theoretical basis for suggesting the political direction which social and political attitudes of workers may go. The Marxist economist, Ernest Mandel, for example, states:

...trade union consciousness is in and by itself socially neutral. It is
neither reactionary nor revolutionary. It becomes reactionary when the system is capable of satisfying trade-union demands. It creates a major revolutionary potential once the system is no longer capable of satisfying basic trade-union demands. Such a transformation of American society under the impact of the international competition of capital is today knocking at the door of U.S. capitalism. (1970:523)

What the behavioral consequences would be for workers having some degree of political class consciousness would, as far as the Marxian perspective is concerned, be contingent on the intervention of revolutionary organizations, which could provide political leadership for the working class. From Lenin's perspective if workers did not have the prerequisite political class consciousness there would certainly be no basis upon which to build a revolutionary movement (Lenin, 1969:25). Thus, the behavioral implications of the present study will be, as in the case of all attitudinal studies, at best, problematic.
CHAPTER VII
FINDINGS

Whether or not there are in fact two major dimensions of working class consciousness, as suggested by Lenin, must be the starting point of any analysis of the various factors which may contribute to the development of working class consciousness. The nine items developed for this study to measure various aspects of working class consciousness were factor analyzed in order to test the non-relational hypothesis:

Hypothesis Ia:

Class consciousness empirically consists of two dimensions: trade union consciousness and political class consciousness.

The results of the factor analysis (see Table 7.1) lend empirical support to the conceptual distinction between trade union consciousness and political consciousness as implied by Marx and Engels (1975) and Lenin (1969), and as suggested by some sociologists (Glantz, 1958; Portes, 1971).

As anticipated, the factor analysis of the responses to the nine class consciousness items yielded two major statistically independent dimensions. An examination of the items with appreciable loadings (≥.40) of the first factor (items 5-9, Table 7.1)
reveals a universe of content strongly supportive of the theoretical arguments made in earlier chapters regarding the nature of political class consciousness.

The second factor is defined in terms of items 1-4 with appreciable loadings ($\geq .40$) and supports the contention that these items do reflect a universe of content reflecting components of trade union consciousness.

In addition to suggesting a distinction between these two components of class consciousness, the Marxist paradigm suggests that the ideal type of working class consciousness would consist of a positive combination of both high trade union and high political class consciousness. However, except in the ideal case, it is likely that individuals will have working class consciousness as reflected in various combinations of trade union and political class consciousness. The results of the factor analysis lend support to this contention. The statistical independence (orthogonality) of the trade union (second) factor suggests that high scores on the trade union scale can be associated with either high or low scores on the political class consciousness scale. Although the results would seem to support the contention that class consciousness will be reflected in various combinations of the components of class consciousness, caution is warranted before
Table 7.1
Rotated Factor Matrix: Class Consciousness Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Trade Union</td>
<td>h²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Working people should stick together to protect themselves.</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Working people make all the things we need to live.</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unions are a good way for workers to protect themselves.</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When workers go on strike for higher wages this is good.</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Under Capitalism workers have little power.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Capitalism is a bad social system.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The ruling class has all the power.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Socialism is a good social system.</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The wealth of this country should be redistributed to all equally.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
such an interpretation is made. Although the factors obtained in a factor solution may be uncorrelated (orthogonal), estimates of factor scores - in this case, the derived composite scale scores - are not necessarily uncorrelated (Nunnally, 1967:327). In fact, in this case there is a .35 correlation between scores on the two scales.

Various researchers (Centers, 1949; Leggett, 1964; Zeitlin, 1966; Hamilton, 1967) found that unemployment generates a great deal of class consciousness among the unemployed. To empirically establish the prevalence of class consciousness among the current sample of unemployed workers, subjects were classified into four categories on each class consciousness scale based on deviations from the mean scale score: Low (more than one standard deviation below the mean), Moderately Low (less than one S.D. below), Moderately High (less than one S.D. above), and High (more than one S.D. above).

The mean and standard deviation of each scale are presented in Table 7.2. Based on this categorization, a cross-tabulation of individuals in relation to their relative scores on each scale was obtained (see Table 7.3). Of the 52 individuals who score high on political consciousness, only 10 (19.2%) also score high on trade union class consciousness. Twenty-two (42.3%) of these 52 individuals score Moderately High,
### Table 7.2

Mean Scale Scores and Standard Deviations for Working Class Consciousness Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale*</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale values ranged from zero to two with high scores indicating high class consciousness on each scale.

### Table 7.3

Cross Tabulation of Individuals on the Basis of Scores on Trade Union and Political Class Consciousness (N=378)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Trade Union Consciousness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately High</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Low</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total does not equal 389 due to the presence of some uncodeable or missing responses on the items utilized for the two class consciousness scales.
16 (30.8%) score moderately low, and 4 (7.7%) score low on the trade union scale.

Although these results indicate that few individuals in the current study have the ideal type of class consciousness in which high trade unionism is subsumed under high political consciousness, 120 respondents (32%) score in the moderately high to high trade union and political class consciousness categories. The results presented in Table 7.3 do indicate the presence of some type of class consciousness among a substantial portion of the sample. For example, 178 respondents (47.1%) score above the mean (1.25) on the trade union scale. Since the mean is somewhat above the neutral category on the scale (score of one), this figure tends to underestimate the number of individuals who have some degree of trade union consciousness.

On the political scale, 215 individuals (56.9%) score above the mean. Since the political scale mean (.92) is somewhat below the value for the neutral category, this figure may overestimate the number of individuals who are high in political class consciousness. If we exclude those individuals who score below the mean on both scales, we find that 72.7% of the respondents have class consciousness as represented by scores above the mean on one or both of the presently used scales. These results do provide some empirical
support that many unemployed workers do have some degree of class consciousness. Indeed, at least 32% of the respondents have relatively high working class consciousness, as indicated by having a combination of both moderately high - high trade union consciousness and moderately high - high political class consciousness.

Trade Union Consciousness

While there is considerable class consciousness among the unemployed, the question remains as to what are the correlates of trade union and political class consciousness and do these types of class consciousness relate to length of unemployment. As can be seen from Table 7.4, as current length of time unemployed increases there are no significant increases in trade union consciousness among the unemployed. This relationship is also evidenced in Figure 7.1 where the path between length of unemployment and trade union consciousness is not significant. Statistical significance at the .05 level for a path coefficient is determined if the path coefficient is equal to or greater than twice the coefficient's standard error. As indicated by the path between ratio of time unemployed to work career and trade union consciousness in Figure 7.2 (path coefficient = .11), even when unemployment experience is computed in terms of total time of
Table 7.4
Trade Union Consciousness as Related To Selected Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>low score = 0</th>
<th>high score = 2</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF MONTHS OF UNEMPLOYMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or younger</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or older</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CLASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. degree</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree +</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low score = 0</th>
<th>high score = 2</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.06 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNION MEMBERSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY PROBLEMS INCREASED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.06 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLITICAL CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLITICAL ALIENATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUTHORITARIANISM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.06 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>low score = 0</th>
<th>high score = 2</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indep. Party</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist/Comm.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.1

Trade Union Consciousness With Length of Unemployment (N=266)
(Standard error in parentheses - * denotes significance at .05 level)
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Figure 7.2

Trade Union Consciousness With Ratio of Unemployment (N=266)
(Standard error in parentheses - * denotes significance at .05 level)

\[ R_R = 0.914 \]
\[ R_A = 0.963 \]
\[ R_T = 0.929 \]
Figure 7.2

Trade Union Consciousness With Ratio of Unemployment (N=266)
(Standard error in parentheses - * denotes significance at .05 level)
unemployment to work career, there is no significant relationship between unemployment experience and trade union consciousness. Consequently, hypothesis Ib: Among the unemployed, the greater the length of unemployment, the greater the trade union consciousness, is not supported.

Figure 7.2 indicates age to be strongly negatively related to ratio of unemployment (path coefficient = -.40), while social class identification bears no significant relationship to ratio of unemployment (path coefficient = -.02), and education is negatively and significantly related to ratio of unemployment (path coefficient = -.12).

Table 7.4 indicates there are no significant differences among age groups relative to trade union consciousness. Figure 7.2 also indicates non-significant path (path coefficient = .01) between age and trade union. Hypothesis Ic: Among the unemployed, older individuals will have more trade union consciousness than younger individuals, is not supported.

Trade union consciousness appears not to be significantly different among individuals with different educational levels as indicated in Table 7.4 and Figure 7.2, thus providing no support for hypothesis Id: Among
the unemployed, individuals with higher education will have less trade union consciousness than those with lower amounts of education. However, there is an indication (Table 7.4) that as education decreases, trade union consciousness increases, with individuals having an 8th grade education or less having the highest mean trade union consciousness scores (1.46).

Social class identification is significantly related to trade union consciousness (see Table 7.4 and Figure 7.2). But hypothesis Ie: Among the unemployed, individuals who identify themselves as members of the working class will have higher degrees of trade union consciousness than individuals who identify with other social classes, is not supported. While working class individuals have a significantly higher mean trade union consciousness score (1.33) than middle class individuals (1.17), lower class individuals have the highest mean trade union consciousness (1.58). Hypothesis If: Among the unemployed, individuals who had professional jobs will have less trade union consciousness than individuals with skilled or unskilled jobs, is not supported. As Table 7.4 indicates, there are no significant differences in mean trade union consciousness scores between skilled (1.24), unskilled (1.32) and professional (1.90) job groups. Political alienation is significantly related to trade union consciousness.
consciousness as seen in Figure 7.2 (path coefficient = .13) and in Table 7.4 where those in the high alienation category have the highest mean trade union consciousness score (1.38). Consequently, there is support for Hypothesis Ig: Among the unemployed, individuals with high degrees of trade union consciousness will be more politically alienated than individuals with low degrees of trade union consciousness.

While Table 7.4 indicates non-significant differences between low, medium and high authoritarianism group means and trade union consciousness, mean scores of trade union consciousness do increase as authoritarianism increases. In addition there is a significant path between authoritarianism and trade union consciousness (path coefficient = .16). Thus hypothesis Ih: Among the unemployed, individuals with high degrees of trade union consciousness will be more authoritarian than individuals with low degrees of trade union consciousness, is supported.

Individuals who indicated that family problems have increased since being unemployed (N=123) have a higher mean trade union consciousness score (1.31) than those who indicated that family problems have remained the same (1.33) and those who indicated no increase in family problems (1.19). As one would expect, union membership is significantly related to mean trade union
consciousness scores (see Table 7.4). Union members have a mean trade union consciousness of 1.33 (N=199) while more members have a mean score of 1.15 (N=178).

John Leggett, in his study of economic insecurity and working class consciousness (1964), found that blacks have higher class consciousness scores than whites, and blacks who are members of unions have higher class consciousness scores than blacks who are not union members. The findings of this study tend to support Leggett's earlier findings.

As Table 7.4 indicates, non-whites have a significantly higher mean trade union consciousness score (1.49) than whites (1.22). Table 7.5 indicates that non-whites who are union members have higher mean trade union consciousness scores (1.55) than non-whites who are not union members (1.41), union whites (1.31), and non-union whites (1.13). However, as the weighted means analysis of variance indicates (see Table 7.5), race and not union membership is the main effect producing high trade union consciousness scores.

Political Class Consciousness

Unlike trade union consciousness, political class consciousness was not predicted to increase as length of time unemployed increases. As indicated in Table 7.6, there are no significant differences in political class
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Table 7.5
Trade Union Consciousness Scores
By Union Membership and Race (N=376)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Membership</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-white</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted Means Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>95.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cells</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Membership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>8.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p less than .05
Table 7.6
Political Class Consciousness as Related To Selected Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>low score = 0</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ 0.05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high score = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF MONTHS OF UNEMPLOYMENT**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.76 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGE**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 or younger</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or older</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RACE**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL CLASS**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EDUCATION**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th grade or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. degree</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree +</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level $\leq .05^*$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low score = 0, high score = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.70 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY PROBLEMS INCREASED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADE UNION CONSCIOUSNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL ALIENATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORITARIANISM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.49 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low score = 0</td>
<td>high score = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Probability level ≤ 0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.08 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL PARTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFERENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indep. Party</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist/Comm.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consciousness as length of time unemployed increases.

This finding is also supported by the weak path (path coefficient = .02) between length of unemployment and political class consciousness in Figure 7.3. However, there is a significant relationship between ratio of unemployment experience to political class consciousness as shown in Figure 7.4, where the path coefficient between ratio and political class consciousness is .12. Consequently, while hypothesis II: Among the unemployed, as length of unemployment increases there will be no increases in degree of political class consciousness, is supported with the qualification that if unemployment experience is measured in terms of time unemployed to work career, then there is a significant relationship between unemployment experience and political class consciousness. Consequently, ratio of time unemployed will be used in comparing the path models for trade union consciousness with political class consciousness.

Age is negatively and significantly related to political class consciousness as indicated in Table 7.6 and Figure 7.4 where the path coefficient equals -.22. These findings support hypothesis Ij: Among the unemployed, younger individuals will have higher degrees of political class consciousness than older individuals.

There is also a negative and significant relation-
Figure 7.3
Political Class Consciousness With Length of Unemployment (N=266)
(Standard error in parentheses - * denotes significance at .05 level)
Figure 7.4

Political Class Consciousness With Ratio of Unemployment (N=266)
(Standard Error in parentheses - * denotes significance at .05 level)
ship between education and political class consciousness as indicated in Table 7.6, where individuals with only 9-11 grade education have the highest mean political consciousness scores in comparison to all other educational levels (1.19). In Figure 7.4 the path coefficient between education and political class consciousness is -.20, thus providing further support for hypothesis Ik: Among the unemployed, individuals with lower education will have more political class consciousness than individuals with higher education.

Social class identification is significantly related to political class consciousness with lower class individuals having the highest mean political class consciousness scores (1.18), this finding is also supported by the significant path between social class and political class consciousness in Figure 7.4 (path coefficient = .13). However, while findings indicate that the lower the social class identification, the greater the political class consciousness, these findings do not support hypothesis II: Among the unemployed, individuals who identify themselves as members of the working class will have higher degrees of political class consciousness than individuals who identify with other social classes.

The type of job an individual previously held has a significant relationship to political class conscious-
ness. Individuals who previously held professional jobs have a low mean political class consciousness score of 0.72 while those who held skilled jobs (0.93) and unskilled jobs (0.99) have significantly higher mean political class consciousness scores. This finding supports hypothesis Im: Among the unemployed, individuals who had professional jobs will have less political class consciousness than individuals with skilled or unskilled jobs.

Being a member of a union apparently has no effect on increasing political class consciousness, in fact, non-union members have a slightly higher mean political class consciousness score (0.93) than union members (0.92). Non-whites have a significantly higher mean political class consciousness (1.16) than whites (0.90) thus supporting hypothesis In: Among the unemployed, individuals who are members of racial minorities will have more political class consciousness than individuals who are members of the white race.

There is no significant relationship between authoritarianism and political class consciousness (see Table 7.6), indeed the path coefficient between (see Figure 7.4) authoritarianism and political class consciousness is -.00. Consequently, there is no significant relationship between authoritarianism and political class consciousness, and hypothesis Io: Among the unemployed,
individuals who have low degrees of authoritarianism will have higher degrees of political class consciousness than those with high degrees of authoritarianism; is not supported. Nevertheless, as indicated in Table 7.6, individuals with low authoritarianism have the lowest mean political class consciousness scores (0.88) while individuals with high authoritarianism have the highest mean political class consciousness scores (0.99).

Political alienation is significantly related to political class consciousness. As seen in Table 7.6, individuals with low political alienation have a low mean political class consciousness score of 0.66 while individuals with high political alienation have a high mean political class consciousness score of 1.20. There is also a significant path between political alienation and political class consciousness (see Figure 7.4) where the path coefficient between the two is .33. These findings support hypothesis 1P: Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly politically alienated will also be highly politically class conscious.

Differences Between Trade Union and Political Class Consciousness

The six variables used in the path model for trade union consciousness (Figure 7.2) explain 14% of the
variance in trade union consciousness scale scores. The same six variables used in the path model for political class consciousness (Figure 7.4) explain 30% of the variance in the political class consciousness scores. There are some striking differences in the relationships of age, education, ratio of unemployment, authoritarianism and alienation to trade union consciousness and political class consciousness. Age has no significant relation to trade union consciousness (path coefficient = -.01) while for political class consciousness it is negatively related (path coefficient = -.22).

Education is significantly and negatively related (path coefficient = -.20) to political class consciousness, while it has no significant relation to trade union consciousness. Ratio of unemployment is significantly related to political class consciousness (path coefficient = .12) but not to trade union consciousness (path coefficient = .11). While political alienation is significantly related to both types of class consciousness, its relation to political class consciousness is much stronger (path coefficient = .33) than to trade union consciousness (path coefficient = .13).

Perhaps the most interesting findings with important theoretical implications, is the fact that there is a significant relation between authoritarianism and
trade union consciousness (path coefficient = .16) but no relation at all between authoritarianism and political class consciousness (path coefficient = .00).

Political Alienation

Political alienation is not significantly related to length of unemployment (see Table 7.7) or to ratio of unemployment (see Figure 7.4). While hypothesis IIa: Among the unemployed, the greater the length of unemployment, the greater the degree of political alienation, is not supported, it must be pointed out that those individuals unemployed the longest (10 or more months) have the highest mean political alienation scores (2.69). Race was found to be significantly related to political alienation (see Table 7.7) with non-whites having a mean score of 2.90, while whites had a mean score of 2.57, thus providing support for hypothesis IIb: Among the unemployed, non-whites will have greater degrees of political alienation than whites. Contrary to hypothesis IIc: Among the unemployed, young individuals will have greater degrees of political alienation than older individuals, the findings indicate no significant difference in mean political alienation scores between age groups (see Table 7.7 and Figure 7.4).

Social class identification is significantly
Table 7.7
Political Alienation as Related to Selected Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>low score = 1</th>
<th>high score = 4</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**NUMBER OF MONTHS OF UNEMPLOYMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.18 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 or younger</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.99 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or older</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RACE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL CLASS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th grade or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. degree</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree +</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNION MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY PROBLEMS INCREASED</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADE UNION CONSCIOUSNESS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLITICAL CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHORITARIANISM</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>low score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ 0.05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SELF-ESTEEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ 0.05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ 0.05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indep. Party</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist/Comm.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
related to political alienation, with middle class individuals having a low mean political alienation score of 2.52 and lower class individuals having a high score of 2.79, and working class individuals with a score of 2.70 (see Table 7.7). This relation is also supported by the significant path between social class and political alienation in Figure 7.4 (path coefficient = .15).

These findings, however, do not support hypothesis IIid: Among the unemployed, individuals who identify themselves as members of the working class will have higher degrees of political alienation than individuals who identify with other social classes. Education is also significantly related to political alienation with individuals having less than a high school education having the highest mean political alienation scores. Individuals who have 9-11 grade education have a mean score of 2.91 and individuals with less than an 8th grade education have a mean score of 2.89 (see Table 7.7). Consequently, hypothesis IIe: Among the unemployed, individuals with less than high school education will have greater degrees of political alienation than individuals who have a high school education or more, is supported.

The type of job previously held has no significant relation to political alienation. However, union
membership does have a significant relation to political alienation with union members having a mean score of 2.67 compared to a mean score of 2.53 for non-union members (see Table 7.7). Those individuals who have indicated that family problems have increased since being unemployed have a significantly higher mean political alienation score (2.72) than those who indicate problems are the same (2.55) and than those who indicate no increase in problems (2.54).

There is a strong and significant relation between authoritarianism and political alienation. Individuals with high authoritarianism have a very high mean political alienation score of 3.14 (see Table 7.7). Also the path coefficient between authoritarianism and political alienation is .22 (see Figure 7.4). These findings support hypothesis IIf: Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly authoritarian will also be highly politically alienated.

Authoritarianism

Authoritarianism does not increase as the length of time unemployed increases. Table 7.8 indicates that there are no significant changes in mean authoritarianism scores as length of unemployment increases. The path between ratio of unemployment to authoritarianism is also not significant (path coefficient = .08, see
Table 7.8
Authoritarianism as Related to Selected Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>low score = 0</th>
<th>high score = 3</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤.05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF MONTHS OF UNEMPLOYMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or younger</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or older</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.55 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CLASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.60 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree +</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low score = 0</th>
<th>high score = 3</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level &lt;= .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNION MEMBERSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY PROBLEMS INCREASED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRADE UNION CONSCIOUSNESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLITICAL CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLITICAL ALIENATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>low score = 0</th>
<th>high score = 3</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability levels ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.81 NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indep. Party</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist/Comm.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.4). There are also no significant differences in mean authoritarian scores between social classes; however, individuals who identify with the middle class do have the lowest authoritarian score of 1.36 while the lower and working class groups have mean scores of 1.47 (see Table 7.8); additionally, the path between social class and authoritarianism is nonsignificant (path coefficient = .01, see Figure 7.4). Consequently, hypothesis IIIa: Among the unemployed, individuals who identify themselves as members of the lower class will be more authoritarian than individuals who identify with other social classes, is not supported.

There are significant differences in mean authoritarian scores for individuals in different educational levels (see Table 7.8). Individuals with a high school education or less have high authoritarian scores, high school degrees (1.50), 9-11 grade (1.61), 8th grade or less (1.33) compared to mean scores of 1.19 for individuals with some college, and 1.25 for individuals with college degrees. The path between education and authoritarianism is negative and significant (path coefficient = -.21, see Figure 7.4). Thus hypothesis IIIb: Among the unemployed, individuals with less than a high school education will be more authoritarian than individuals with a high school education or more, is supported.
While there are no significant differences between previous job type and authoritarianism, there is the unexpected finding that individuals who previously held skilled jobs have the highest mean authoritarian scores (1.40). Those who held professional jobs have the lowest mean authoritarian score (1.21) while the unskilled have a mean score of 1.31 (see Table 7.8). Consequently, hypothesis IIIc: Among the unemployed, individuals who previously held unskilled jobs will be more authoritarian than those who held skilled or professional jobs, is supported.

As expected, older individuals (over 30) have the highest mean authoritarian score (1.51), however, individuals 21 or younger have a mean score of 1.32 and individuals 22-24 years old have a mean score of 1.36, scores which are higher than for individuals 25-29 years old (see Table 7.8). However, because of the relatively high scores of those 30 and over, hypothesis IIIId: Among the unemployed, older individuals will be more authoritarian than younger individuals, is supported.

Political Party Preference

Length of time currently unemployed does appear to have several effects on workers' political party preferences. As indicated in Table 7.9, 45.8% of the
individuals unemployed 10 months or more have no party preference. This is the largest percent for any group in the no preference category. It is a no preference which is the predominant choice among the unemployed (39%) compared to 13% for the Republican party, 34% for the Democratic party, 13% for the American Independence party, 3% for the Socialist/Communist, and 7% for other parties. Preference for the Republican party sharply decreases as time unemployed increases. Only 8.2% of those unemployed 10 months or more prefer the Republican party. Hypothesis IVa: Among the unemployed, the greater the length of unemployment, the less the preference for the Republican party, is supported.

However, there is no support for Hypothesis IVb: Among the unemployed, the greater the length of unemployment, the greater the preference for the Democratic party and Socialist/Communist parties. As indicated in Table 7.9, there are no significant differences in preference for the Democratic party of Socialist/Communist parties as length of unemployment increases.

Among the unemployed who do prefer some political party, 56% prefer the Democratic party compared to 22% for the Republican party, 6% for the American Independence party (Wallace), 4% for the Socialist/Communist (Socialist Workers Party and Communist Party) and 11% for other parties. Thus, among the unemployed, the
Table 7.9
Expressed Party Preference for 1976 Election by Length of Unemployment (N=384)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Length of Unemployment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 months (or less)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>38.3% (N=44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>15.7 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>33.0 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indep. Party</td>
<td>0.9 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wallace)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist/ Communist</td>
<td>3.5 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.6 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0 (115) 100.0 (95) 100.0 (89) 100.0 (85)

* p greater than .05
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party preferred the most is the Democratic party.

More middle class individuals (22.1%) prefer the Republican party than working class individuals (6.2%) and lower class individuals (0%). While more working class individuals preferred the Democratic party (39%) than middle class individuals (35.8%), these findings support Hypothesis IVc: Among the unemployed, individuals who identify themselves as members of the working class will have a greater preference for the Democratic party rather than the Republican party, (see Table 7.10).

Individuals who preferred the Democratic party have a significantly higher trade union consciousness score (1.34) than all those who prefer other parties, especially the Republican party (1.04), or have no preference (see Table 7.11). This finding supports hypothesis IVd: Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly trade union conscious will prefer the Democratic party over the Republican party. Those who prefer Socialist/Communist parties have a significantly higher mean political class consciousness score (1.52) than all those who prefer other parties or have no preference. Republicans had the lowest mean political class consciousness score (0.64). Consequently, Hypothesis IVe: Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly politically class conscious will prefer
# Table 7.10

Expressed Party Preference for 1976 Election by Social Class (N=340)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Lower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=74)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indep. Party</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist/Communist</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(204)</td>
<td>(113)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p greater than .05
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Table 7.11
Expressed Party Preference for 1976 Election
by Selected Variables
(* denotes significant level .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Trade Union* consciousness mean score</th>
<th>Pol. Class* consciousness mean score</th>
<th>Political* alienation mean score</th>
<th>author. mean score</th>
<th>self-esteem mean score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>M=1.29 (N=104)</td>
<td>1.05 (94)</td>
<td>2.73 (101)</td>
<td>1.40 (102)</td>
<td>1.99 (99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1.04 (52)</td>
<td>0.64 (50)</td>
<td>2.40 (49)</td>
<td>1.44 (49)</td>
<td>1.87 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>1.34 (132)</td>
<td>0.94 (125)</td>
<td>2.57 (126)</td>
<td>1.36 (126)</td>
<td>1.93 (131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indep. Party</td>
<td>1.20 (16)</td>
<td>0.89 (15)</td>
<td>3.05 (14)</td>
<td>1.52 (14)</td>
<td>1.94 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist/Communist</td>
<td>1.20 (10)</td>
<td>1.52 (10)</td>
<td>2.37 (10)</td>
<td>1.33 (10)</td>
<td>2.06 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Socialist/Communist parties over all other parties is supported.

Those who have no party preference had a higher mean political alienation score (2.73) than those who preferred some party, except those who preferred the American Independence Party (3.05). Thus hypothesis IVf: Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly politically alienated will have no political party preference, is not supported.

As expected, individuals who prefer the American Independence Party of Wallace had the highest mean authoritarian score (1.52), while those who prefer the Socialist/Communist parties had the lowest mean authoritarian score (1.33). This finding supports hypothesis IVg: Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly authoritarian will prefer the American Independence Party of Wallace over all other parties (see Table 7.11).

Self-Esteem

Self-esteem was not significantly related to length of unemployment (see Table 7.12) or ratio of unemployment (see Figure 7.5). However, those individuals unemployed 10 months or more did have the highest mean self-esteem score (2.05, the higher the score - the lower the self-esteem, see Table 7.12). Consequently, hypothesis Va: Among the unemployed, the greater the
Table 7.12
Self-Esteem as Related to Selected Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>low score = 1</th>
<th>high score = 4</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF MONTHS OF UNEMPLOYMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.08 NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or younger</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.11 NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or older</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73 NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CLASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.26 NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. degree</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree +</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.12 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>low score = 1</th>
<th>high score = 4</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level ≤ .05*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY PROBLEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCREASED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRADE UNION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSCIOUSNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLITICAL CLASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSCIOUSNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLITICAL ALIENATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.12 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>low score = 1</th>
<th>high score = 4</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Probability level $\leq .05^*$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTHORITARIANISM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL PARTY PREFERENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indep. Party</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist/Comm.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
length of unemployment the lower the self-esteem, is not supported. Age was also not significantly related to self-esteem, although unexpectedly individuals 21 or younger had the highest mean self-esteem score (2.03, see Table 7.12).

There were no significant differences between groups who identified with different social classes in regard to self-esteem, but unexpectedly individuals who identified with the lower class had the highest mean self-esteem scores (2.11), thus indicating they had the lowest self-esteem. This finding does not lend support to hypothesis Vb: Among the unemployed, individuals who identify with the middle class will have lower self-esteem than those who identify with other social classes. Job type previously held, however, is significantly related to self-esteem with the unskilled having the lowest self-esteem with a high mean score of 2.06 and professionals having the highest self-esteem with a low mean score of 1.76, while the skilled had a mean score of 1.92 (see Table 7.12). However, these findings do not support hypothesis Vc: Among the unemployed, individuals who previously held professional jobs will have lower self-esteem than those who held skilled or unskilled jobs.

Self-esteem scores between groups with different educational attainments were significantly different.
Figure 7.5
Self-Esteem With Selected Variables (N=264)
(Standard error in parentheses - * denotes significance at .05 level)
Figure 7.6
Self-Esteem With Trade Union and Political Class Consciousness (N=283)
(Standard error in parentheses - * denotes significance at .05 level)
Those with an 8th grade education or less had the lowest self-esteem with a high mean score of 2.53 (see Table 7.12), but hypothesis Vd: Among the unemployed, individuals with a high school education or more will have lower self-esteem than those with less than a high school education, is not supported.

The six variables of the path model in Figure 7.5 explains 10% of the variance in the self-esteem scores, while the six variables of the path model in Figure 7.6 explains only .04% of the variance in the self-esteem scores.

As indicated in Figure 7.5, authoritarianism is significantly related to self-esteem (path coefficient = .19); also as shown in Table 7.12, those with high authoritarianism have the highest mean self-esteem score (2.21) indicating low self-esteem. These findings support hypothesis Ve: Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly authoritarian will have lower self-esteem than those with low authoritarianism.

Political alienation is also significantly related to self-esteem as indicated by the path between the two (path coefficient = .14, see Figure 7.5), and the fact that individuals with high alienation have a significantly high self-esteem mean score (2.21). Thus hypothesis Vf: Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly politically alienated will have higher self-
esteem than those with low political alienation, is not supported.

Figure 7.6 indicates the relationships between trade union and political class consciousness. Both types of class consciousness appear not to be significantly related to self-esteem. However, Table 7.1 does indicate a significant difference between those with low, medium and high trade union consciousness. Those with high trade union consciousness have a higher mean self-esteem score (1.99) thus indicating low self-esteem. While there are no significant differences between those with low, medium and high political class consciousness, those with low political class consciousness have a lower mean self-esteem score (1.90) indicating high self-esteem, and those with high political class consciousness have the highest mean self-esteem score (2.04) indicating relatively low self-esteem (see Table 7.12). Consequently, hypothesis Vg: Among the unemployed, individuals who are highly politically class conscious will have higher self-esteem than those with low political class consciousness, is not supported.

Summary of Major Findings

Increases in the length of time currently unemployed has not been found to be significantly associated
with any decreases or increases in the various political and social attitudes under investigation. The only direct and significant relation between unemployment and attitudes was found to be the positive association between increases in total unemployment experience to work career and political class consciousness.

However, while various political and social attitudes did not vary with increasing unemployment, the findings did indicate many significant and interesting associations between various independent demographic characteristics of the unemployed and various political and social attitudes.

Empirical support for the distinction between trade union consciousness and political class consciousness was provided. The findings indicate that at least among the unemployed, working class consciousness, measured in either trade union or political class consciousness terms or both, is not absent. Several variables which may be indicators of lesser economic, social and political integration and security, such as young age, high school education or less, and repeated unemployment experience are positively associated with political class consciousness but not associated with trade union consciousness.

Political alienation is also positively associated with factors which may be considered indicators of
lesser economic, social and political integration such as membership in racial minority groups, identification with the lower and working class, and relatively low educational attainments.

While those who have high trade union or political class consciousness also are highly politically alienated, political alienation is also associated with political apathy or support for "right wing" politics such as those manifested by George Wallace.

Authoritarianism is found mostly among older unemployed workers with low educational attainments. Interestingly, while authoritarianism was significantly and positively associated with trade union consciousness, it has no association at all with political class consciousness.

The findings reveal that a large segment of the unemployed have no political party preference. While among those with a political party preference the predominant preference is for the Democratic party.

The self-esteem of the unemployed was not affected by increases in time unemployed. However, low self-esteem was associated with low educational attainments, unskilled jobs, and high political alienation and authoritarianism.
CHAPTER VIII
INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The prime objective of the current investigation was to discover if the empirical relations between unemployment and workers' attitudes would help to clarify some of the theoretical assumptions of the Marxian paradigm. At issue was the validity of the assumption that "social existence determines consciousness". Such an assumption involves epistemological, social psychological and sociological concerns.

While the Marxian paradigm assumes that economic insecurity is a necessary prerequisite for the development of radicalism among the working class, it remains to be empirically verified as to what other economic, political and social factors are also necessary for the generation of radicalism among workers. Does the "social existence" produced by increasing unemployment uniformly affect the attitudes and consciousness of all workers? Marx and other Marxists had assumed that unemployment would either demoralize workers or radicalize them, but left unexamined the characteristics of unemployed workers leading to either state. Too often Marxists have written and spoken as if the working
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class was a homogenous mass, without specifying what workers, under what conditions, would engage in revolutionary action.

The findings suggest some possible answers and explanations of these issues. As the discussion below will indicate, unemployed workers are a heterogenous group who respond to and perceive the economic and social insecurity of unemployment differently.

Unemployment

Increases in the time unemployed, in and of itself, has not been found to be significantly related to any of the political and social attitudes among the unemployed. Even when unemployment was measured in terms of total unemployment experience to work career, only one dependent variable, political class consciousness, was found to be significantly related to increasing unemployment experience.

Without attempting to generalize beyond the group of unemployed workers who are collecting unemployment insurance (up to 65 weeks, at around 50% of their wage when employed), it appears that the length of time out of work does not generate alienation, class consciousness, authoritarianism or low self-esteem. What happens to workers attitudes if they continue to remain unemployed after they exhaust their unemployment
insurance benefits cannot be ascertained by the data in this study. Nor can the attitudes of the so-called "hidden unemployed", e.g., women and elderly men who want jobs but cannot find any, or "discouraged workers" who are not officially considered unemployed because they have left the labor force altogether, be assessed.

While increases in the length of time currently unemployed appears to affect few attitudes among unemployed workers, it cannot be determined if unemployment itself causes changes in workers attitudes without comparing the attitudes of the currently unemployed to the currently employed. But this study has been able to assess the initial impact of increasing unemployment on workers' attitudes and to investigate the correlates of those attitudes.

It can be argued that while capitalism produces structural unemployment, the institutionalization of unemployment insurance programs in the United States after the Depression of the 1930's, has provided at least a temporary economic cushion which mitigates the otherwise precarious economic and social insecurity of unemployment. Marxist assumptions about the radicalizing potential of unemployment in 19th century "laissez-faire" capitalism must certainly be modified to incorporate the impact of social welfare reforms utilized by "monopoly-state" capitalism to blunt and retain the
development of class consciousness among at least one section of unemployed workers.

As indicated in chapter four, many major corporations tend to favor economic assistance to unemployed workers because they realize the political threat which could be generated by the deepened economic insecurity of the working class (Barnet and Muller, 1974:321). A Report of the Committee on Unemployment Insurance Objectives sponsored by the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research describes the primary objectives of unemployment insurance as being:

1. To assure the worker cash support as a matter of right in a dignified and reliable manner during periods of involuntary unemployment.
2. To enable the unemployed worker to maintain his current standard of living to a substantial degree by supplying wage-loss replacement that is adequate in amount and duration.
3. To provide the temporarily unemployed worker, through adequate wage-loss replacement, the time needed to locate or regain employment that takes full advantage of his skills and experience gained in previous employment and training.
4. Through close coordination with appropriate manpower development and employment services, to help the unemployed worker locate job opportunities; and, if he is permanently dislocated from his usual employment, to help him achieve vocational readjustment and overcome other impediments that bar his path to suitable reemployment. (1969:3-4)

From a Marxian perspective such objectives do not
arise essentially out of the humanitarian concerns of the political state or corporations, but rather out of their concern for social control. Not only does unemployment insurance mitigate the economic and social insecurity of the unemployed worker, but it also provides a means of tying the worker to the State which sustains his income and provides the State a means of regulating the behavior of the unemployed worker.

The intervention of the political state into the effects of the structure of economy, in this case on unemployment, is a good example of how superstructural institutions have consequences on the economy. Once the economic consequences of unemployment for workers is mitigated there appears to be an effect on their attitudes, in the sense of retarding their resentment toward the system. The role of unemployment insurance in regulating economically poor workers is well expressed when Piven and Cloward explain:

...mass unemployment that persists for any length of time diminishes the capacity of other institutions to bind and constrain people. Occupational behaviors and outlooks underpin a way of life and determine familial, communal, and cultural patterns. When large numbers of people are suddenly barred from their traditional occupations, the entire structure of social control is weakened and may even collapse. There is no harvest or paycheck to enforce work and the sentiments that uphold work; without work, people cannot conform to familial and communal roles;
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and if the dislocation is widespread, the legitimacy of the social order itself may come to be questioned. The result is usually civil disorder - crime, mass protests, riots - a disorder that may even threaten to overturn existing social and economic arrangements. It is then that relief programs are initiated or expanded. (1971:7)

Nevertheless, the findings do suggest that social welfare reforms in a capitalist society are not entirely effective in blunting and retarding class consciousness among the unemployed. While there were no statistically significant increases in trade union consciousness, political class consciousness, and alienation as length of time currently unemployed increased, there were small increases in each of these dependent variables as length of unemployment increased. Certainly, the Marxian ideal type of working class consciousness, a combination of high trade union and political class consciousness, is not absent among the unemployed. At least 32% (N=120) of the respondents of this study had relatively high working class consciousness scores.

However, there was found to be a statistically significant relationship between the ratio of time unemployed to work career and political class consciousness. Consequently, increased experience with unemployment does facilitate increases in political class consciousness. According to Lenin, political class
consciousness should develop less as a reaction to economic insecurity than as an ideological understanding of capitalism developed by workers engaging in revolutionary activity and by workers being exposed to revolutionary propaganda.

It may not be specifically the economic and social insecurity generated by unemployment which produces political class consciousness. A high ratio of time unemployed to work career appears to be significantly and negatively related to age and education, with age and education also significantly and negatively related to political class consciousness.

The findings regarding the relationship of unemployment experience with various political and social attitudes among the unemployed pose theoretical issues for the Marxian paradigm. The basic epistemological and social psychological axiom of the Marxist paradigm that "social existence determines consciousness" must be clarified in regard to the nature of the social existence of unemployed workers and its relation to the various attitudes among the unemployed.

If increases in length of time unemployed in itself do not basically result in increases of class consciousness or alienation, what then are the circumstances and characteristics of those unemployed workers with high class consciousness and alienation?
There are, of course, other factors which may serve as indicators of economic insecurity or lessened social and political integration aside from unemployment. Age, race, education, job, and social class identification may also be associated with economic insecurity and may also be indicative of lesser social and psychological integration into the dominant social, political, and economic institutions of capitalism.

Trade Union Consciousness

Evidence has been provided that there are at least two major dimensions of working class consciousness: trade union consciousness and political class consciousness, as implied by Marx and Engels and specified by Lenin. For Marx and Engels trade union consciousness was an elementary form of working class consciousness, but a consciousness insufficient to raise workers' struggles against capitalism to a political level (Marx and Engels, 1975:3). Trade union consciousness is in a sense a "knee jerk reaction" by workers to the economic exploitation and inequities of capitalism. Almost all workers will have some degree of awareness of their precarious economic conditions, no matter if they are politically radical, liberal or conservative.

Lenin viewed trade union consciousness as the "spontaneous" response of workers to their economic
insecurity. For Lenin, trade union consciousness represented working class consciousness only in an "embryonic form" (Lenin, 1968:31). Lenin contended that trade union consciousness was an elementary and narrow understanding on the part of the workers of the economic antagonisms between their own interests and that of the capitalists. However, Lenin did not specify what the correlates of trade union consciousness are among any particular segments of the working class.

Increases in the time unemployed or in unemployment experience is not associated with increases in trade union consciousness. If trade union consciousness is basically an elementary recognition of working class economic interests, it appears that increased unemployment for workers receiving unemployment benefits is not perceived as a serious threat to economic interests. And while other studies provide evidence that unemployed workers are generally more "class conscious" than employed workers, it cannot be ascertained, given the limits of the data of this study, whether unemployed workers have specifically more trade union consciousness than employed workers.

Nevertheless, there are certain factors which are significantly related to increases in trade union consciousness among the unemployed. These factors associated with trade union consciousness do clarify and support
certain Marxian assumptions about the development of trade union consciousness.

As would be expected, trade union consciousness was found to be significantly related to union membership. As Lozarsky has pointed out, Marx and Engels, first and foremost, "considered the trade unions organizing centers, centers for collecting the forces of the workers, organizations for giving the workers an elementary class training" (1975:15).

While trade unions are an obvious source of trade union consciousness, Marx had hoped that trade unions might also be a vehicle of revolution and the source of political class consciousness. Marx stated:

If the Trades Unions are required for the guerilla fights between capital and labour, they are still more important as organised agencies for superseding the very system of wages labour and capital rule...

Apart from their original purposes, they must now learn to act deliberately as organising centres of the working class in the broad interest of its complete emancipation. They must aid every social and political movement tending in that direction. Considering themselves and acting as the champions and representatives of the whole working class, they cannot fail to enlist the non-society men into their ranks. They must look carefully after the interests of the worst paid trades...They must convince the world at large that their efforts, far from being narrow and selfish, aim at the emancipation of the downtrodden millions. (Marx, Engels and Lenin, 1967:161)
However, Lenin, who was able to analyze the nature and role of trade unions in the 20th century, concluded that while "trade unions were a tremendous step forward for the working class in the early days of capitalist development", unions could not be a vehicle for revolution nor for the development of political class consciousness (Lenin, 1968:34).

Nevertheless, while economic insecurity contributes to working class consciousness, working class organizations, like unions, are still important in facilitating the development of elementary class consciousness (Legget, 1968:15). As Legget states, unions are still important:

...for they have the most bearing on sustenance, an item of considerable interest to workmen when they contemplate maintenance and advancement of their personal and family interests. Because of this vital connection unions provide the lead on matters conducive to the formation and reinforcement of class opinions. (1968:16)

Whether or not contemporary American unions are radical or conservative and dominated by self-interested bureaucrats, unions do appear to facilitate the development at least of elementary economic class consciousness, more so than the economic and social insecurity of unemployment. On the other hand, union membership does not appear to facilitate increases in political
class consciousness; indeed, the findings indicated that union members had a slightly lower political class consciousness score than non-union members. This comes as no surprise, given what has been reported as the relatively conservative and status quo maintaining perspective of most American unions.

In a recent report on unions, Widick (1975:70) contends that while economic and political militancy was the order of the day for unions in the 1930's, in the 1970's union leadership has often taken a pro-business and status quo stance. Widick quotes George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, as recently stating:

...the AFL-CIO is pretty conservative in certain ways. We believe in the American system. We believe in working within the American system. When we get laws passed over in Capital Hill that we feel are detrimental to us, we just bat away and try to change them. We don't man the barricades, and we don't take to the streets. And we don't call general strikes, and we don't call political strikes. (Widick, 1975:171)

Lenin anticipated that after trade unions played their historically progressive role that, "the trade unions inevitably began to reveal certain reactionary features, a certain craft narrow mindedness, a certain tendency to be non-political, a certain inertness etc.," (Lenin, 1968:34).

Nevertheless, it does appear that the unions do
serve to promote elementary class consciousness, and as another finding indicates, union members are also significantly more politically alienated than non-union members. Thus it appears that the objective condition of unemployment is not as significant in generating trade union consciousness among the unemployed as membership in unions which apparently provide a basic working class frame of reference for workers.

This finding supports the assumption of Marx and Lenin that the objective economic conditions of workers are not sufficient in themselves to generate class consciousness. The economic insecurity which may be generated by unemployment is a manifestation of economic contradictions of capitalism's substructure. But those substructural manifestations which may produce economic insecurity do not automatically result in the radicalization of workers. Apparently, even the elementary class consciousness of trade union consciousness relies for its development, to some extent, on the intervention of working class organizations, e.g., unions. Unions are superstructural institutions which provide not only the physical organization of workers for their economic defense, but also provides for a elementary cognitive reorganization of perceptions of their objective economic interests with an elementary working class ideology.

In previous research (e.g., Leggett, 1964) the
hypothesis that class consciousness is directly related to unemployment and increases in the length of unemployment had been based on the assumption that unemployment results in economic insecurity. In the present situation, as suggested earlier, the payment of unemployment insurance benefits appears to reduce the economic impact of unemployment among those who are eligible for and actually receive benefits. Thus, in the current study, length of unemployment may not be a sensitive indicator of economic insecurity. Perhaps then trade union consciousness may be related to other indicators of economic insecurity.

Leggett (1964) suggests that minority group membership is an indicator of economic insecurity. If this is the case, we can expect minority group members to be more class conscious than whites. Although the percentage of minority group members in the current study is small, making interpretation somewhat difficult, the data strongly suggests that minority group members are more class conscious than whites. Leggett (1964) also suggests that occupational skill level is an indicator of economic insecurity, with unskilled workers being more economically insecure.

An individual's perception of his social class membership may also be an indicator of his economic insecurity. Individuals who perceive themselves as
being members of the lower or working class may do so because they feel economically deprived in relation to others around them.

Non-whites are in most cases less economically, socially, and politically integrated into the institutions of American capitalism. Some American Marxists believe that the precarious economic and social position of blacks and other racial minorities has in recent years generated a nationalist and cultural movement among non-whites as a response to their double oppression as both members of racial minorities and members of the working class. Indeed, some Marxists believe, for example, that Black nationalism helps to facilitate the development of class consciousness. They state:

Unlike some pseudo-Marxists and shallow-minded leftists, we see no contradiction between black nationalist consciousness and class consciousness. In fact, the deeper the penetration of nationalism into the consciousness of Black people, the better will be the development of the class struggle. (Thomas, 1974:25)

Whether influenced or not by black, chicano, American Indian or Asian American nationalism and cultural pride, this study found unemployed non-whites to be significantly more trade union conscious than whites. The combination of being non-white and a union member apparently serves to produce the most trade union consciousness. But even non-whites who are not union
members have more trade union consciousness than whites who are union members.

The role of racial oppression and nationalism in facilitating class consciousness was a factor little developed by Marx and Engels. While there are some contemporary Marxists who do appreciate the relation between racial minority group membership and class consciousness, this relation should be further empirically explored. The findings of this study suggest that racial minority group membership is more important in generating basic economic class consciousness than either length of unemployment or union membership.

Occupational skill level and education may also be indicators of economic insecurity. While job type previously held and level of education attained were not statistically significantly related to trade union consciousness, unemployed workers who previously held unskilled jobs have the highest trade union consciousness compared to those who had skilled or professional jobs, and unemployed workers with less than an 8th grade education had the highest trade union consciousness scores compared to those with higher educational attainments.

Proper identification of one's objective social class membership for workers can serve both as an indicator or a recognition of economic insecurity and as a necessary component of class consciousness itself.
Unemployed workers who identify themselves as members of the lower and working class had significantly more trade union consciousness than workers who identified with the middle class.

While trade union consciousness does not increase with increasing unemployment, it appears that there are key objective and subjective factors which lead to increased trade union consciousness. As Marx contended, unions do provide a subjective class frame of reference for workers, in the sense that unions structure and focus workers' subjective perceptions into elementary class perspectives. On the other hand, the economic insecurity which is generated by membership in racial minority groups, and reflected in social class identification, and to some extent by education and low level jobs, are the objective economic and social factors which appear to facilitate trade union consciousness.

Thus, the consciousness of workers, if not significantly affected by the social existence generated by unemployment, is nevertheless apparently related to social existences characterized by insecurity, as Marx predicted it would be.

There were found to be other attitudes which were significantly related to trade union consciousness and which raise some issues concerning the development and nature of trade union consciousness. Trade union
consciousness is significantly related to political alienation and authoritarianism. As the findings indicated, unemployed workers who are highly trade union conscious are also highly politically alienated. However, the question remains as to whether trade union conscious unemployed workers are alienated from the current Republican administration or if they are alienated from the political institutions and parties of capitalism in general. The findings suggest that highly trade union conscious workers are divided into one group which prefers the Democratic party and another group which has no political party preferences, thus perhaps indicating a rejection or dissatisfaction of the political party system. This issue will be discussed more in later sections.

While authoritarianism was found to be significantly related to trade union consciousness, closer examination of the findings indicate that only certain groups of those with high trade union consciousness are authoritarian. The findings suggested that among the highly trade union conscious it is older individuals with lower educational attainments who are the authoritarians.

Lipset has suggested that working class and lower class economic interests are often identified by working and lower class individuals to be furthered by authoritarianism and extremist movements and ideas.
Lipset grants that the "poorer strata" are more liberal in their economic ideas but are generally more authoritarian in other matters; Lipset states:

The poorer strata everywhere are more liberal or leftist on economic issues; they favor more welfare state measures, higher wages, graduated income taxes, support of trade unions, and so forth. But when liberalism is defined in non-economic terms - as support of civil liberties, internationalism, etc., - the correlation is reversed. The more well-to-do are more liberal, the poorer are more intolerant. (1963:92)

At least, among older and less educated unemployed workers, Lipset's argument is supported by the findings. However, as will be discussed in the section on political class consciousness below, the Lipset contention that authoritarianism is associated with working class consciousness and ideology may require some revision.

In summary, the Marxian contention that many workers will have trade union consciousness has been verified. In addition, as Marx, Engels and Lenin predicted, membership in trade unions does facilitate the development of trade union consciousness. However, unemployment experience appears to have no effect on trade union consciousness, but other indicators of insecurity and lesser social integration, e.g., racial minority group membership, low education, lower job skills and working class identification, do produce increases in trade union consciousness. Consequently, as Marx predicted,
economic and social insecurity does generate trade union consciousness.

That there is a positive relation between authoritarianism and trade union consciousness among older and less educated workers is perhaps confirmation of Lenin's argument that trade union consciousness may sometimes be associated with reactionary ideas. Trade union consciousness is at times associated with progressive ideas and, at other times, reactionary ideas. For as the Marxian Economist, Mandel has pointed out:

Trade-union consciousness is not only negative. Or, to formulate this more dialectically, trade union consciousness is in and by itself socially neutral. It is neither reactionary nor revolutionary. It becomes reactionary when the system is capable of satisfying trade-union demands. It creates a major revolutionary potential once the system is no longer capable of satisfying basic trade-union demands. (1970:523)

Political Class Consciousness

Perhaps one of the most important and interesting finding of this study is the distinction found between trade union consciousness and political class consciousness. The characteristics of those unemployed workers who are politically class conscious in contrast to those who are only trade union conscious raises some very important theoretical insights for the Marxian paradigm.
Lenin had contended that fully developed political class consciousness would, in most cases, be acquired by members of the working class through their involvement in political and social relationships and issues external to their involvement in their work roles and economic struggles (Lenin, 1969:78-79). Lenin further believed that a vanguard party of professional revolutionaries is required to ensure that workers are exposed to theoretical explanations of the social and political abuses of capitalism and also to ensure that the workers' political struggles have proper "Marxist" leadership (Lenin, 1969:78-81). Lenin, had he been a contemporary American revolutionary, certainly would have welcomed the American political and military defeat in Vietnam and the subsequent exposure of the political corruption and abuse surrounding the "Watergate" events, and current exposures of CIA and FBI abuse of civil liberties. For as Lenin stated:

...political exposures in themselves serve as a powerful instrument for dis-integrating the system we oppose, as a means for diverting from the energy his casual or temporary other, as a means for spreading hostility and distrust...

(1969:88)

Lenin's theories imply a certain epistemological assumption regarding the relation between workers' economic conditions and struggles and the full development of workers' political class consciousness. That
assumption was that the economic and work dimension of workers' lives circumscribed the parameters of how far workers' could develop class consciousness. While Lenin's theories apparently have been to some extent verified in terms of the Bolshevik party's successful leadership of the Russian revolution, neither Lenin nor any other Marxist, has attempted to empirically specify what workers with what characteristics have some political class consciousness and/or potential to develop political class consciousness.

However, the findings of this study do provide at least initial empirical information about which groups of economically insecure workers have some degree of political class consciousness. This study has been able to establish that the majority of individuals who have political class consciousness also have trade union consciousness. However, when the specific characteristics of those with political class consciousness are examined, they are found to be significantly different from the characteristics of workers who are simply trade union conscious.

Because Lenin argued that economic interests and struggles can not, in themselves, generate political class consciousness, it was assumed that increases in the length of time unemployed would not be associated with increases in political class consciousness; the
findings support that assumption.

However, there was found to be a significant relationship between total unemployment experience to work career and political class consciousness thus suggesting that repeated unemployment and subsequently repeated social and economic insecurity does generate political class consciousness. But even in this case, it may not be unemployment experience per se which generates political class consciousness. The data indicate that it is young workers and workers with relatively low education who have the most unemployment experience and also have the most political class consciousness. However, age has a much stronger association with political class consciousness than does education or unemployment experience. Age is also one of the factors which was found to be related significantly different to trade union consciousness on the one hand, and to political class consciousness on the other hand.

Unemployed workers under twenty five years of age have the most political class consciousness while workers of all ages were found to have trade union consciousness.

The report of a special task force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled, Work In America, (1973), points out that, "out of a work force
of more than 85 million, 22½ million are under the age of 30" (1973:42). These young workers, the report continues, "are more affluent and better educated than their parents were at their age" (1973:42). The report contends that the expectations of today's young workers transcend what the current economic system offers. Young workers want more than simply a secure job and material security, they want a life which offers intrinsic rewards, self-expression, opportunities to make contributions and jobs which are challenging (HEW report, 1973:44-45).

The labor analyst Stanley Aronowitz offers the following explanation of the attitudes of today's young workers:

In the 1960s, the expansion generated by the Vietnam War, combined with the tremendous rate of retirement among those who had entered the labor force in the decade after the First World War - the workers who had helped build the CIO and won the right to get out of the shop at sixty-five - brought a relatively large number of young workers into industrial plants. As this generation of workers entered the shops and the public bureaucracies, the Depression-wrought issues of job security were pushed to the side in workers' struggles. The new generation of workers was not prepared to endure a working life suffused with repetitive tasks performed with mindless submission. Neither the incentive of two cars in every garage, which had become a compulsion for their parents, not the fear of plunging to the lower depths of poverty, which had pro-
pelled their grandparents, was sufficient to contain their resentment against the betrayal represented by highly rationalized factory or service work. (1973:406)

The forces and pressures which integrated past generations of workers into accepting the dominant economic and political institutions are no longer capable of containing the dissatisfaction of younger workers. As Aronowitz explains:

The old mediations are losing their force. Neither the unions not the anti-Communist ideologies which were nurtured by immigrant fears are capable of containing the discontent. Nor are young workers willing to spend their lives in unremitting labor in exchange for high levels of consumption. (1973:408)

How much more must be the discontent of the young worker who finds himself repeatedly unemployed, the first fired and the last rehired. Not only is the young unemployed worker denied taken for granted fulfillment of his material expectations, but once removed from the work place, he doesn't even have the opportunity to effectively challenge the nature of his job.

There is an additional source of current young worker discontent coming from outside the work institutions to which they belong. That source is composed of what has been called the counter-culture and radicalization of the 1960's and early 1970's. The Report
to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare points out about the counter culture that:

A mistake is made...if one believes that the new attitudes toward authority and the meaning of work are limited to hippies. Judson Gooding writes that young managers both graduates of business schools and executive trainees, "reflect the passionate concerns of youth in the 1970's - for individuality, openness, humanism, concern and change - and they are determined to be heard. (1973:47)

Some American Marxists are well aware of the impact of the radicalization of the 1960's and early 1970's on the consciousness of workers. The Socialist Workers Party, in one of its public and published documents, states:

The specific major areas of struggle that have characterized the developing radicalization thus far - (1) the Black liberation movement, (2) the youth radicalization, (3) the antiwar movement, (4) the Chicano liberation movement, and (5) the women's liberation movement - have occured, in the main, outside the framework of the union movement and in no case have been led by any section of organized labor. Nevertheless, these movements have already deeply affected the consciousness of the working class. According to government statistics, of the total work force in the United States, 22 percent are under twenty-four years old; 28 percent of those between twenty-five and thirty-four have received some college education, with a higher percentage in the under-twenty-five age bracket; 40 percent are women; 11 percent are nonwhite, and this percentage is higher for basic industry. The
Labor Department anticipates that every one of these percentages will increase in the 1970's. These bare statistics alone indicate the potential these movements have in attracting and influencing American workers. (1972:52)

This line of reasoning is certainly consistent with the thinking of Marx and Lenin when they pointed out the purely economic issues and struggles were insufficient to radicalize the workers. Again, it was Lenin who clearly stated the importance of radical political influence in the class struggle when he said:

The fact that economic interests play a decisive role does not in the least imply that the economic (i.e., trade-union) struggle is of prime importance; for the most essential, the "decisive" interests of classes can be satisfied only by radical political changes in general. (1969:47)

But while the relationship between age and political class consciousness is easily explained, the relationship between low educational attainment and political class consciousness among the unemployed is somewhat surprising. Part of the explanation for the discontent of young workers is their relatively greater educational attainments compared to previous generations. Nevertheless, only 16% of the sample of unemployed workers in this study had a college education. At least among the unemployed it appears that high educational attainment is not necessary for the development of political class
consciousness.

A possible explanation may lie in the lesser ideological domination of those who simply have a high school education or less. Also, since higher educational attainment usually brings, in the long run, greater economic and social security and greater cultural integration into the dominant institutions, those with less than a college education are probably more likely to reject the dominant economic, social and cultural institutions. At least one major empirical profile of American youth in the 1970's has found that the young non-college majority of workers have begun to hold beliefs once thought to be held only by a minority of liberal and radical college youths (Yankelovich, 1974:23-24).

Other factors, such as identification with the working and lower class and type of job previously held, which also serve as indicators of economic insecurity and less social and cultural integration into the dominant institutions and ideologies, were also found to be as significantly related to political class consciousness as they were to trade union consciousness.

The significant relations between age, education, job type, social class identification, and political class consciousness do suggest that the precarious
economic and social position of some groups of workers does tend to generate relatively more political class consciousness among these groups. While this study cannot determine, one way or the other, whether the unemployed workers with relatively high political class consciousness have been influenced, directly or indirectly, by the revolutionary propaganda of any American revolutionary groups, the findings do suggest that at least unemployed workers who are economically and socially less integrated into the dominant system are more likely to have some political class consciousness than other unemployed workers.

In the most general sense these findings do suggest that different "social existences" result in different types and levels of consciousness. It appears that not all workers would be equally receptive to the propaganda of a revolutionary party. Economic insecurity and lessened social integration still appear to be a necessary condition for the development of political class consciousness among workers.

It would be a paradox if those with high political class consciousness were not also politically alienated. The findings here have indicated a strong relation between political alienation and political class consciousness.
More important, however, was the finding that authoritarianism was not at all related to political class consciousness, while it was related to trade union consciousness. Those, e.g., Lipset, who have contended that left wing working class radicalism is associated with authoritarianism, have not theoretically distinguished between the trade union dimension and the political dimension of working class consciousness. Consequently, Lipset fails to provide any empirical evidence as to what might be the specific relationships of authoritarianism to components of working class consciousness.

The fact that unemployed workers who are politically class conscious are not authoritarian should come as no surprise to the Marxist. For a worker to have even an elementary appreciation of the political complexities of the nature of a capitalist socio-economic system, versus a socialist socio-economic system, certainly requires more than the simplistic political thought Lipset attributes to the authoritarian worker. Lipset has also contended that, "Working class life as a whole emphasizes the concrete and immediate," and then goes on to suggest that this is why workers are authoritarian (1963:109-110). But Lenin had contended that for a worker to become poli-
tically class conscious, he must transcend the narrow and concrete demands of trade unions and develop a generalized understanding of the nature of the political system of capitalism and also be able to realize not only the immediate interests of the working class but also its long range interests. As Lenin pointed out (1969), to be politically class conscious also implies that one is psychologically and politically flexible enough to appreciate and desire fundamental and radical social changes, which is certainly not the case for the authoritarian.

The finding that authoritarianism is related somewhat to trade union consciousness but not to political class consciousness, provides at least some clarification of the issue of whether the working class and working class left wing "extremism" is actually characterized by authoritarianism. Perhaps the best indication of whether or not political class consciousness was accurately measured is the relation that political class consciousness has with political party preference. After all, if political class consciousness is a general recognition of working class political interests, then that interest should be reflected in political party preferences. The findings suggest such a relation.

Those unemployed workers who preferred the
socialist or communist parties had the highest political class consciousness. And those individuals who had no preference for any of the established political parties had the second highest amount of political class consciousness, this being a reflection of a rejection of the established political electoral system as not representing the political interests of the working class.

Political Alienation

Political alienation did not significantly increase as length of time unemployed increased, but those unemployed the longest were the most politically alienated. However, all segments of the unemployed appear to have relatively high political alienation, thus perhaps indicating that the mere experience of unemployment may be a more important factor influencing political alienation than the duration of unemployment.

Wright, in a recent article on political alienation has argued that it is not currently restricted to any particular group in American society, instead "rising disaffection has touched every group in the society more or less equally." (1976:42). Wright contends that much of the current political alienation in American society reflects "policy failures in the part of the political leadership - the bumbling of American policy
in Vietnam, mismanagement of the economy and most recently, the chicaneries of Watergate" (1976:41).

Nevertheless, there are some groups of the unemployed who are relatively more politically alienated than others. Those unemployed individuals with characteristics which may serve as indicators of economic insecurity and lower cultural and ideological integration into the dominant system, appear to be the most politically alienated.

Given the relatively disadvantageous position of non-whites in America it comes as no surprise that non-whites are more politically alienated than whites. The finding that non-whites are more politically alienated than whites is consistent with the findings of other researchers who indicate that blacks have greater reservation about the effectiveness of American political institutions than white workers (Aiken, Ferman and Sheppard, 1968:142-143; and Sheppard and Herrick, 1972:6-7).

Other factors such as lower educational achievement and identification with the working and lower classes were also related to high political alienation. Low educational achievement may give workers less of a sense of mastery and comprehension of political processes and/or indicate less economic, social, and cultural integration into the dominant system, and thus
generate a rejection of political processes which may be perceived as not fulfilling the interests of these workers.

Earlier the relation between political alienation and political class consciousness was discussed, however, not all those who are politically alienated are politically class conscious. It would be a mistake to assume that the politically alienated are a homogenous political group. Wright points out:

...the phrase, "the politically alienated", has seriously misleading connotations. It suggests, first of all, something more than a mere statistical aggregate by implying a common political outlook or ideology, some mutual awareness of shared experiences and shared interests - in short, it assumes at least a potential basis for political mobilization. It is not so: all the available evidence strongly suggests that the "alienated" do not comprise an especially cohesive social or political group. (1976:40)

As discussed earlier, Marx was ambiguous about the political consequences of workers' political alienation, although Marx did imply that alienation was necessary for the development of class consciousness. The findings of this study did indicate that relatively high political alienation is associated with diverse political preferences.

Surprisingly those unemployed workers who prefer Wallace were the most politically alienated. But
Wright also reports a similar finding stating, "the more alienated respondents were somewhat more likely to have voted for Wallace than were nonalienated respondents" (1976:42). As discussed earlier Wallace is perceived by some workers as representing their economic interests and of providing a more responsive political alternative than the present political institutions. However, more of the politically alienated were found to have no political preferences at all. This finding is also consistent with Wright's discussion of alienation, for as he points out:

Several dozen academic studies of the "correlates of political alienation" confirm the conclusion that, however one defines political participation, those who are disenchanted with politics are far less likely to participate. (1976:43)

The relation between no party preference and political alienation may reflect a rejection of the established political parties, right or left, or it may reflect a certain degree of political apathy and demoralization. One thing is certain, the Marxist paradigm must be cautious in explaining the relation between alienation and political preferences. For even though workers who are class conscious are also politically alienated, political alienation in itself is apparently not sufficient to generate working class consciousness.
The political alienation of workers may lead to political apathy and thus surrender of the working class to the political processes of capitalism.

Authoritarianism

Much of the significant findings regarding authoritarianism have already been discussed in the previous sections dealing with trade union and political consciousness and will be discussed in the section on political party preference below. Thus, this section will be a summary of the findings and explanations regarding authoritarianism.

Like most of the other attitudes examined in this study, authoritarianism was not found to increase with increasing unemployment experience. Rather, authoritarianism appears to be mainly associated with two characteristics of unemployed workers: age and education.

Older workers were found to be more authoritarian than younger workers. Perhaps with increasing age, workers, as do people in other social classes, become more inflexible in their perspectives. It may be more difficult for older workers to be tolerant of different points of view, e.g., like the ones involved in being politically class conscious. Older workers, after years of making adjustments to the industrial and political abuses of capitalism, and after attempting to gain
economic security through the years, may perceive direct, strong, and strict political leadership as the only alternative to protect their threatened economic interests when unemployed. Perhaps this is why those who are highly authoritarian are also highly politically alienated.

Because authoritarians have a basically "black and white" perspective on political phenomenon, one can perhaps begin to understand why those unemployed workers who are authoritarian are in many cases trade union conscious, but not politically class conscious. While being trade union conscious is a necessary aspect of becoming politically class conscious, trade union consciousness, in itself, may lead the working class to right wing movements rather than left wing movements, or to any political movements, like George Wallaces', which offers immediate satisfaction of workers economic needs.

Lipset's contention that authoritarians are individuals with low educational attainments is confirmed by the findings of this study. However, this is not to say that all workers with low educational attainments are authoritarians, for those workers who were politically class conscious tended also to have low educational attainment but were not authoritarian at all. It is essentially older workers with low educational
attainments who are more likely to be authoritarian. Age was a factor Lipset said little about in its relation to authoritarianism; of course, Lipset's discussion of authoritarianism preceded the advent of the new radicalization of the 1960s and 1970s which have affected the attitudes of young workers.

At least one Marxist, Stanley Aronowitz, has suggested, based on the writings of Wilhelm Reich, that some trade union conscious workers are authoritarian because trade unions organizationally reflect the hierarchical and authoritarian relations of capitalist society (1973:55). Additionally, the everyday life routine of many workers is monotonous, repressive, and susceptible to authoritarian attitudes.

Aronowitz, summarizing Reich's explanation of authoritarianism among German workers during the rise of the Nazi regime, writes:

In his view, the working class was predisposed to seek the solution to the world crisis of capitalism in authoritarian institutions because it failed to wage a struggle against authoritarianism within its own organizations. The left-wing parties and the trade unions reflected the hierarchical relations of capitalist society no less than the corporations and the family. Workers were subjected to a consistent pattern of repressed social relations in the entire compass of everyday life. Since workers' consciousness was circumscribed by the problems and the details of ordinary existence, it
mattered little that their parties and unions were ideologically committed to resist fascism and to create a new society of equals. As long as the internal life of these organizations did not oppose the pyramidal configuration of the family and the workplace, the crisis of the existing social order could only be resolved by the replacement of the less effective authoritarianism of the Weiman Republic by the more aggressive and overtly domineering Nazi regime. (1973:54-55)

How authoritarianism related to political party preference and the self-esteem of unemployed workers will be discussed in the following sections.

Political Party Preference

Among those workers unemployed the longest, the majority of them have no political party preference. The problem however, is to determine whether those unemployed workers with no political preference are expressing political apathy or political rejection of established political parties. As C.W. Mills pointed out:

In our political literature, we do not have many attempt to explain the facts of political indifference, perhaps because neither liberalism nor Marxism raises the question to a central position. (1951:328)

On the one hand, the findings indicate that close to 50% of the individuals identifying with the working and lower classes have no political party preference.
It could be argued that identification with the working and lower classes is a reflection of economic and social insecurity and that this insecurity generates political apathy and ignorance. Herrick and Sheppard found that workers who had no preference for either the Democratic or Republican parties were found to be those workers characterized by economic and social insecurity. They state:

The group with the highest percentage rejecting both parties are those workers existing in the worst circumstances - they work in jobs with little employment security, low wages, and with poor tasks (little variety, little autonomy, and so on). More than half of this group reject either party as representing their point of view. (1972:108)

However, the data do suggest that those who have no political preference are not apathetic but rather are rejecting the established political parties and, consequently, perhaps the electoral system. This interpretation is supported by the fact that those with no political party preference are also those individuals with relatively high trade union consciousness, political class consciousness, and political alienation. It seems reasonable to suggest that if the individuals with no party preference were politically apathetic then certainly they would not have relatively high political class consciousness.
For unemployed workers who did prefer some political party, their greatest preference for a party was for the Democratic party. However, while this predominant preference held for unemployed workers no matter how long they have been unemployed, there was no significant increases in preference for the Democratic party as length of unemployment increases. As other studies have suggested (Centers, 1949; Aiken, Ferman, and Sheppard, 1968; Sheppard and Herrick, 1972) it may simply be unemployment itself which generates a predominant preference among the unemployed for the Democratic party which is often perceived as a pro-labor party.

If a political party preference was made, those unemployed workers who selected the Democratic party were found to have the highest trade union consciousness; this is higher trade union consciousness than was associated with those who made no preference. This finding is consistent with the traditional support given by the trade union conscious to the Democratic party, which is perceived as the party which promotes working class economic interests. For example, a recent article in the AFL-CIO News reports concerning the AFL-CIO president, George Meany, that:

Meany contrasted the massive deficits under the Ford and Nixon Administra-
tions resulting from high unemployment with the supposedly "spendthrift" policies under the Johnson, Kennedy and Truman administrations. "Under those earlier administrations, America had something to show for its money. It paid for schools and hospitals, highways and airports, manpower programs, job programs that upgraded the nation's citizens and their standards of living, and improved the quality of American life."

By contrast, Meany said, the deficits under Nixon and Ford have had to be spent "for unemployment benefits and welfare programs...for giveaways to corporations and tax breaks that encourage the export of jobs."

(1976:8)

Preference for the Republican party was seen to dramatically decrease as length of unemployment increased. There is also a dramatic decrease in preference for the Republican party for those who identify with the working and lower classes, with workers identifying with the middle class being most representative of those who prefer the Republican party. These findings are consistent with previous research (Centers, 1949; Aiken, Fermer, and Sheppard, 1968; and Sheppard and Herrick, 1972) which has indicated that economically and socially insecure workers demonstrate little support for the Republican party. Aside from Republican preference being a middle class preference, those who prefer the Republican party had the lowest trade union consciousness, political class consciousness and political
alienation. This association perhaps provides indications of the validity of the measures of trade union and political class consciousness and political alienation. For as Centers had suggested (1949) the Republican party is perceived as the traditionally conservative party and one would not expect those who prefer the Republican party to be in any way left wing.

The findings regarding the characteristics of those who prefer the American Independence party of Wallace are perhaps the most interesting of all. Preference for Wallace does not vary with the length of unemployment and is evenly spread among workers who identify with the middle, working, and lower classes. Contrary to some mass media stereotypes that most workers are red neck Wallace supporters, only 4% of the sample of workers under study prefer Wallace's party over other alternatives. Such small support is consistent with the support Wallace received from workers in the north in the 1968 presidential election in which Wallace received about 8% of the northern working class vote (Levison, 1974:165).

Wallace supporters were found to be the most authoritarian and most politically alienated. But most interesting was the finding that Wallace supporters have relatively high trade union consciousness, at least
as much as those who prefer socialist or communist parties. At least one labor analyst has pointed out that Wallace does appeal to workers' sense of economic insecurity and elementary economic class consciousness. Levison, for example, states:

George Wallace's vote, for example, was indeed a sign of reaction, but even 1968 it was recognized that in addition to racism, he skillfully blended in a "populist" or more precisely a "class-conscious" appeal to the discontents of workers. (1974:164)

That trade unionism can be associated with an essentially reactionary political party may be an indication that concrete and short run working class economic interests are not necessarily related to the structural reform of capitalism. The French Marxist Andre Gorz, for instance, points out:

...struggles for immediate economic demands, even very bitter ones, no longer by themselves open up perspectives of revolutionary social change; they even accommodate themselves to the most insipid trade-unionist and reformist ideology. (1968:21)

The small number of unemployed workers who prefer Marxist political parties (Communist Party and Socialist Workers Party) perhaps is an indication of the extent to which the two party system of Democrats and Republicans has been accepted by the working class as the only viable political party alternative. Also, both
the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party have made little inroads into working class politics outside of major metropolitan areas like New York City or San Francisco. But given the large no-preference for political parties among unemployed workers, if the Marxist parties are, at a later date, better able to reach more workers in more areas, support for these parties may increase, given the extent of political class consciousness among unemployed workers.

Self-Esteem

Contrary to what was expected, the length of time unemployed has no statistically significant relation to decrease in self-esteem. However, those unemployed the longest did have the lowest self-esteem. Apparently for workers collecting unemployment insurance, increasing unemployment has little effect on their self-esteem. However, it cannot be ascertained if being unemployed itself causes lower self-esteem as indicated by previous research (Komarovsky, 1940:81; Tiffany, Cowan, Tiffany, 1970:62; Wilcock and Franke, 1963:91; Braginsky and Braginsky, 1975). Of course, from the Marxist point of view, unemployment insurance was intended precisely to mitigate the economic and social insecurity which was often generated by unemployment in
the past. So at least for those unemployed workers collecting unemployment insurance the duration of unemployment has no significant effect on their self-conception.

Nevertheless, there are certain characteristics of the unemployed under study which were found to be significantly related to lower self-esteem. As the educational attainment of a worker goes down, so does their self-esteem. Perhaps, high educational attainment provides workers with more mastery over their personal lives and enables them to secure better jobs. The data do indicate a positive correlation between education and type of job previously held.

Additionally, there were found to be significant differences between job types previously held and self-esteem. Those with professional jobs had higher self-esteem than those who previously held skilled or unskilled jobs; while those who previously held skilled jobs had higher self-esteem than those who held unskilled jobs. This finding was unexpected, because previous research has found that unemployment severely affected the self-esteem of skilled and semi-professional workers (Braginsky and Braginsky, 1975). It appears that professionals are able to maintain their self-esteem even when unemployed. Perhaps because of the lasting
effect of the positive reinforcements they usually receive when working.

More interesting, however, was the significant relation found between lower self-esteem and authoritarianism. This association reflects the fact that those workers who are authoritarian also have low educational attainments. The lessened mastery over ones' life which often accompanies low educational attainment may produce individuals who seek self-direction from external sources rather than from their own resources. Perhaps because those who are authoritarian seek direction from external authorities they have less confidence in themselves and thus lower self-esteem. A similar explanation may account for the relation found between low self-esteem and political alienation. Those individuals who believe they cannot direct their own lives may also feel that they have no power in contributing to the direction of political institutions. However, those unemployed workers who were politically alienated and also politically class conscious do not have their self-esteem significantly affected. Being politically class conscious would not affect self-esteem negatively because when one is politically class conscious, one perceives the source of one's problems as stemming from the social system and not one's own personal short comings.
From the Marxist perspective, given the alienative conditions in which many economically and socially insecure workers live, the association between low level jobs, alienation, and authoritarianism and low self-esteem confirms to some extent Marx's contention that many workers would suffer from "self-estrangement" (Marx, 1961:73).

Summary

The findings of this study do support many of the assumptions of the Marxian paradigm. However, the basic contribution is that the findings provide some clarity and elaboration to the Marxian paradigm.

It appears that increases in length of unemployment, for those unemployed workers collecting unemployment insurance essentially neither results in their demoralization or radicalization. However, they do appear to have class consciousness, supporting most previous research. In support of Marx and Lenin, this study has identified two types of working class consciousness: trade union consciousness and political class consciousness.

Much of the confusion about whether American workers are class conscious or not and much of the contradictory findings concerning the extent of working class consciousness and its correlates may now receive some
initial clarification. Trade union consciousness appears to be generated by union membership, proper social class identification, political alienation, and is associated with authoritarianism. Political class consciousness on the other hand, appears to be generated by proper social class identification, political alienation and relatively low educational attainment. It also appears to be more characteristic of young workers and not associated at all with authoritarianism. Certainly, class consciousness is not randomly distributed among the unemployed. Specific "social existences" seem to be related to specific types and levels of consciousness.

Unemployed workers are a heterogenous group who perceive and respond to increasing unemployment in many different ways. While many have no political preferences, those who do prefer some political party appear to be influenced by the length of their unemployment. Increasing unemployment does not appear to affect self-esteem. This finding may reflect effects of the intervention of the political state in the economy in the form of providing unemployment insurance which appears to mitigate the severe economic and social insecurity which has in the past often accompanied unemployment.

The specific points and areas to which the findings are relevant to the clarification and elaboration of
Marxian assumptions is the concern of the following chapter.

A theme which emerges from the interpretation of the findings suggests an over-all interpretation of the relation of lesser economic, social and political integration and insecurity to the political and social attitudes among the unemployed workers. Economic insecurity of unemployment may be mitigated by unemployment insurance and consequently, unemployment per se may not be a precipitating factor in the development of radical attitudes among workers.

It is of importance to the Marxian paradigm that many unemployed workers are politically alienated, politically class conscious, and appear to be dissatisfied with present political party alternatives, even without the apparent intervention of a revolutionary party of the Leninist type. Apparently such factors as youth, low educational attainments, membership in racial minority groups, and repeated unemployment experience, are objective factors which lead to a propensity toward radicalism, as measured by political alienation, political class consciousness, low authoritarianism and rejection of present political options. One can only imagine how much more "radical" unemployed workers would be if subject to the propaganda
of a revolutionary party which could offer a political alternative and deepen the apparent political and social dissatisfaction of many unemployed workers.
CHAPTER IX
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was undertaken in an attempt to clarify some of the basic themes of the Marxian paradigm relative to the condition and prospects of class consciousness and other political and social attitudes, such as political alienation, authoritarianism, political party preference and self-esteem, among the working class. According to the Marxian paradigm, economic insecurity is a necessary prerequisite but not a sufficient condition for the development of class consciousness among workers. It was hoped that by investigating the condition of class consciousness and its correlates among unemployed workers some clarification would be provided as to what other factors, aside from economic insecurity, facilitate the development of working class consciousness.

This analysis of the political and social attitudes of the unemployed is quite unlike previous analyses. While most previous studies of the attitudes of the unemployed have been limited to samples drawn from only one or a few occupational or industrial groups, this study was based on a systematic sample of 389 recently unemployed workers from a great
diversity of occupational, industrial, and other demographic backgrounds. Through the utilization of a survey questionnaire a large variety of demographic characteristics and political and social attitudes of the unemployed were analyzed with the statistical techniques of analysis of variance, alpha reliability coefficients, chi square, factor analysis and path analysis.

Summary of Major Findings

The findings provide empirical support for many of the assumptions of the Marxian paradigm and empirical clarification as to what are some of the factors which facilitate class consciousness among American workers.

Perhaps the most important finding relevant to the theoretical and political concerns of Marxism is that increases in the time currently unemployed has no statistically significant effect on the political and social attitudes of unemployed workers collecting unemployment insurance. The only direct and significant relation between unemployment and attitudes was found to be the positive association between increases in total unemployment experience to work career and political class consciousness.

While increases in current time unemployed have
no significant effect on political and social attitudes among the unemployed, the findings do provide much information regarding the correlates of working class consciousness and other political and social attitudes among that segment of the American working class which is relatively economically and socially insecure, i.e., the unemployed. These other findings provide clarification as to what other factors, aside from unemployment, may facilitate radicalism among American workers.

The findings provide empirical evidence, through factor analysis and alpha reliability coefficients, that the theoretical contention that working class consciousness can be distinguished by two dimensions, trade union consciousness and political class consciousness, is valid. The data indicate that the unemployed workers under study are one segment of the American working class in which class consciousness, measured either in terms of trade union consciousness or political class consciousness, is not absent. A significant number, (72%) of the unemployed workers had either high trade union consciousness or political class consciousness scores. While 32% of the unemployed had the ideal type of working class consciousness as measured by a combination of both high trade union consciousness and political class consciousness scores.

Not only is there empirical evidence for the
theoretical distinction between trade union consciousness and political class consciousness, but these two dimensions of working class consciousness were found to be associated differentially with various demographic and attitudinal variables among the unemployed.

There are striking differences in the relationships of age, education, ratio of unemployment, authoritarianism and political alienation to trade union consciousness in comparison to political class consciousness.

Age, education and ratio of unemployment have no significant direct relationship to trade union consciousness. However, union membership, authoritarianism, and political alienation are significantly related to trade union consciousness. On the other hand, the data indicate the young workers, union members or not, with a high school education or less, with relatively high unemployment experience, and who are politically alienated, but not at all authoritarian, are most likely to be those unemployed workers with high political class consciousness.

While increases in time currently unemployed has been found not to significantly effect political and social attitudes, other factors which may be indicators of lesser economic, social and political integration into the present socio-economic system, such as lower
education attainment, youthfulness, membership in a racial minority group, identification with the working and lower classes, and repeated unemployment experience, were found to result in relatively high political class consciousness and political alienation.

However, while those unemployed workers with either high trade union or political class consciousness are also highly politically alienated, high political alienation does not always lead to either type of working class consciousness. Political alienation was also found to be positively associated with support for Wallace's "right wing" political party, the American Independence Party, and political apathy, as indicated by preference for no political party with low trade union and political consciousness.

Authoritarianism was found to be associated with the independent variables of age and education. Older unemployed workers with relatively low education attainments had relatively high authoritarian scores. Most important, however, was the significant relation of authoritarianism to trade union consciousness in comparison with political class consciousness. On the one hand, the findings indicated a significant and positive association between authoritarianism and trade union consciousness. But on the other hand, there was no association between authoritarianism and political class
consciousness. This finding has importance not only for the Marxian paradigm, but also provides empirical clarification for Lipset's well known theories concerning the relationship of authoritarianism to working class consciousness.

In regards to political party preference the data revealed that while a large segment of the unemployed have no political party preference, no preference is not necessarily indicative of political apathy, because many of those with no preference had relatively high political alienation and trade union and political class consciousness.

Of those who do have a political party preference, the Democratic party was the predominant choice. Interestingly, the one political party preference which does significantly decrease with increasing time unemployed, was preference for the Republican party.

Like most of the other political and social attitudes investigated in this study, self-esteem did not decrease with increasing length of unemployment. Low self-esteem, however, was associated with low educational attainments, unskilled jobs, and not unexpectedly, high authoritarianism.
Conclusions

While the Marxian paradigm is often characterized as a type of economic determinism in which institutions, values, ideas, attitudes, and ideologies merely reflect economic structures, processes, and interests, as was discussed in chapter two, economic determinism has nothing to do with Marx's conception of society. Rather for Marx, the primary social relationships, in which men and women enter in all societies, past and present, in order to produce and reproduce the essentials of life, constitute the basic social institutions upon which must rest all other social institutions. According to the Marxian paradigm, an appreciation of the role of the primary social relationships is the key to comprehending the historical and social dynamics of any and every society. The relation between the primary institutions which constitute the substructure of society and other social institutions, e.g., the political state, the military, the family, the educational system, etc., which constitute the superstructure of society, is a reciprocal relation, wherein the substructure sets the parameters of the superstructure. But, the superstructure, once established, in time influences the nature of the substructure.

Given this sociological assumption of Marx, it
comes as no surprise, that unemployment, which is one economic manifestation of the substructural contradictions of capitalism, does not produce an automatic and uniform response in terms of the social and political attitudes of unemployed workers. What the findings contribute to the Marxian paradigm is some initial empirical clarification of what are specifically the various responses of different groups of workers to their unemployment.

The findings suggest what may be some of the consequences of the intervention of a superstructural institution, the political state, into the processes and consequences of a capitalist economy. The establishment of various social welfare measures, specifically unemployment insurance, appears to mitigate the economic and social insecurity often associated with unemployment. While being unemployed in itself may have a radicalizing effect on workers, evidence has been presented that for most unemployed workers collecting unemployment insurance, increasing the amount of time unemployed has little effect on changing most of their attitudes toward this society. The Marxian paradigm must reexamine its assumptions about the relation between unemployment and radicalism and consider the impact which capitalist social welfare measures have on continuing to provide economic and ideological mechan-
isms of integration which serve to moderate the development of radicalism among workers.

The Marxian conception of social class while important for providing an interpretation of historical change and a general explanation of the dynamics of society, needs to become more specific in regard to indicating what strata of the working class has the potential to develop political class consciousness. It is misleading and a distortion of social reality, to argue in general that unemployed workers have automatically and uniformly as a group, revolutionary potential in the Marxian sense.

The findings have empirically demonstrated that unemployed workers are a heterogenous group coming from different occupational, age, and racial strata of the American working class. As a consequence, the attitudes of the unemployed are not homogenous but rather unemployed workers are a heterogenous group who perceive and respond to their unemployment in many different ways. Nevertheless, many of the unemployed workers under study are to varying degrees class conscious in both the trade union and political sense. This fact alone may be significant support for the Marxian contention that capitalist society is class divided and working class consciousness is still a relevant factor in American life.
The utilization of Lenin's distinction of two types of working class consciousness, trade union consciousness and political class consciousness, apparently has provided an initial means of clarifying the contradictory findings of various sociologists and political scientists regarding the nature, extent, and correlates of class consciousness among American workers. As discussed in chapter four, researchers have at times measured class consciousness only in trade union terms and other times other researchers have measured class consciousness essentially as political class consciousness. This is perhaps the reason some researchers find some workers to be class conscious and other researchers find workers not to be class conscious at all. The present study, however, has been able to provide initial empirical evidence that Lenin's typology of working class consciousness has a basis in reality and is useful in guiding empirical studies of working class consciousness. Thus, aside from whatever political uses Lenin's working class consciousness typology may have, his typology has certainly proved of value in facilitating the empirical study of one of the major concerns of sociology and political science, i.e., the existence or non-existence of class consciousness among American workers.

The role of working class organizations such as
unions in providing workers with an elementary class consciousness has been affirmed. But the findings also indicate, as Marx and Lenin suggested, that union membership and trade union consciousness is insufficient to raise the consciousness of workers to the level of political class consciousness. Additionally, even increases in the time unemployed appears not to be perceived by workers as a threat to their immediate economic interests. For some Marxist theorists who have emphasized the role of economic insecurity and purely economic interests as being the primary motivation for the radicalization of the working class and the development of political class consciousness, perhaps revision of their theories and political strategies is in order.

However, while immediate economic interests and economic insecurity may not be as central to the development of political class consciousness among workers, evidence has been provided that there are certain characteristics of workers such as low educational attainment, youthfulness, identification with the working and lower class, and membership in racial minority groups, which may be indicators of long term economic insecurity and lessened cultural and political integration into capitalist institutions which do facilitate the development of political class consciousness.
It is the life experiences and problems of young workers and non-whites which may be factors as important as exploitative and alienative work conditions in facilitating political class consciousness and radicalism. It is not simply a worker's relation to the means of production mediated through his particular job which alone will determine his consciousness, but apparently other factors, such as age, education, class and racial identity enter into the formula.

While it comes as no surprise that many unemployed workers are politically alienated, political alienation does not necessarily lead to left wing political attitudes. Marxists have been correct in assuming that political class consciousness involves political alienation, but given the findings of this study, Marxists must recognize the fact that the political alienation of workers may manifest itself in support of right wing politics, such as those manifested by groups supporting George Wallace.

Contrary to Lipset's theory which argues that workers who have a radical left wing consciousness are often authoritarian, some empirical evidence has been provided that this is not the case. By utilizing Lenin's distinction between trade union consciousness and political class consciousness it has been possible to determine what dimensions of working class
consciousness are related to some degree of authoritarianism. Authoritarianism was found not to be related to political class consciousness. Among those demonstrating trade union consciousness, authoritarianism was strongest among the older workers with less than high school education.

Lastly, as was the case with most other attitudes among unemployed workers collecting unemployment insurance, there were no significant increases or decreases in worker's self-esteem as the length of their unemployment increased. This finding contributes to the conclusion that given the social welfare measures of modern capitalism, such as unemployment insurance, at least for many unemployed workers who are eligible for unemployment insurance the relative economic and social insecurity of unemployment is temporarily mitigated.

Future Research

One of the major differences of the present study of the political and social attitudes of the unemployed from previous studies of the unemployed has been the nature of the sample in this study. The current sample under study represented a cross section of unemployed workers from various job backgrounds, different work histories, skills, ages, races, incomes, etc., while most other studies of unemployed workers have been
limited to samples of unemployed workers from one industry, plant, or union. The diverse strata backgrounds of the current sample of unemployed workers has thus provided an unusual opportunity to study the intra-class correlates of the political and social attitudes of one segment of the American working class.

However, many other studies of the attitudes of the unemployed have been able to compare the attitudes of employed workers with unemployed workers. Most of these studies have found, in such comparisons, that unemployment itself leads to increases in class consciousness among workers. Given the limits of the present investigation, a comparison of the attitudes of employed workers from similar diverse backgrounds as the unemployed workers under study was not possible. Such a comparison should be the task of future research in this area. However, there is a methodological problem to be overcome in comparing unemployed workers from diverse backgrounds with employed workers from similar diverse backgrounds. It was possible to draw a sample of unemployed workers from diverse backgrounds, because such unemployed workers can be located at one central gathering point: the unemployment insurance office. Drawing a sample of employed workers from similar diverse backgrounds which would match the sample of unemployed workers would be extremely difficult, and
thus poses issues to be resolved by future research in this area.

Additionally, future research in this area should investigate the political and social attitudes of unemployed workers not eligible for unemployment insurance and unemployed workers who have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits. Such research may find that increases in unemployment for workers not collecting unemployment insurance does have significant effects on their political and social attitudes.

Comparative international studies of the effects of unemployment on the attitudes of workers of different countries may also reveal differences in terms of the effects of various national unemployment welfare measures, different ideological climates, and the influence of different labor and radical movements on the attitudes of unemployed workers of various capitalist societies.

And lastly, future research should attempt to develop political and social behavioral indicators of the effects of unemployment on workers. This would be especially relevant and informative if such research could be conducted in a capitalist society undergoing revolutionary crisis or change, such as in France in May and June 1968, or more recently, in Portugal.
Final Note

The Marxian paradigm has demonstrated its theoretical strength in guiding an empirical investigation of the political and social attitudes of unemployed workers. Many of the assumptions of the Marxian paradigm have found empirical support and received some clarification in the present study. What is undoubtedly the major contribution of the current study to the Marxian paradigm is the empirical evidence provided that contemporary capitalist America is perceived by many unemployed workers as class divided and its political institutions perceived as not viable.

The findings indicate that at least among some segments of the working class there is the potential for the development of a revolutionary movement. Whether the class conscious attitudes of workers - both employed and unemployed - are channeled into organized revolutionary activity which will facilitate a restructuring of the socio-economic structure of capitalistic society is ultimately dependent on the intervention of revolutionary leadership. Such revolutionary leadership would be essential for the transformation of attitudes into organized action.
APPENDIX
March 4, 1975

Mr. James Stuart, Manager  
Michigan Employment Security Commission  
Department of Labor  
1601 S. Burdick  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Dear Mr. Stuart:

A graduate student, Mr. Richard Ropers, spoke to you on February 21 about conducting a research on the attitudes, perceptions and feelings of the unemployed. During the interview you were kind enough to give him, you indicated your willingness to allow him to conduct some interviews at your site.

This letter is to assure you that the proposed research would be conducted through, and with the guidance of the Center for Sociological Research, Department of Sociology, Western Michigan University. The Center will provide facilities and consultation for this research and will, with Mr. Ropers, take care to see that the research is not disruptive and that you receive the research results.

If I can be helpful, please do not hesitate to contact me. I would be glad to meet with you. We are grateful for the opportunity to conduct this research which may help to understand the responses of Americans to unemployment.

Sincerely,

Stanley S. Robin, Director  
Center for Sociological Research

SSR:1k
March 31, 1975

Michigan Employment Security Commission
Operations Bureau
7310 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48202

Dear Mr. Fultz:

This letter is to request permission to conduct a research of the attitudes of the recently unemployed at the Kalamazoo Employment Security Commission. The research would be conducted by Mr. Richard Ropers, a graduate student in the Sociology Department of Western Michigan University, in collaboration with and supervised by Dr. Subhash Sonnad. The research project would be conducted under the administrative aegis of the Center for Sociological Research, Department of Sociology, Western Michigan University.

The intention of this research is to attempt to determine the effects of unemployment upon the feelings and attitudes of those unemployed. Investigation of the changes in motivations, self-concepts, hopes and aspirations should provide valuable information to the Michigan Employment Security Commission, as well as to the researchers, in better understanding and anticipating changes in the clientele served. The proposed research will not be concerned with the functioning of the Employment Security Commission. No questions in this realm will be asked and there is no evaluation of the Michigan Employment Security Commission in the research.

The research is to be conducted at 1601 S. Burdick in Kalamazoo, in such a manner as to avoid any dislocation in the operation of the office. We conferred with Mr. James Stuart, manager of the Kalamazoo branch, about conducting this study. He was good enough to point out that the permission of the Commission might be required as stated on page 7 of the Michigan Employment Security Act ("Subject to such restriction ... the Commission may also make such information available to colleges, universities and public agencies of this state for use in connection with research projects of a public nature.") He has been kind enough to consult with us.
and help us plan the logistics of such a non-disruptive research. Mr. Stuart has been most helpful and is supportive of the conduct of the research. The research would be conducted in full conjunction with Mr. Stuart and be subject to his control pursuant to his duties as manager.

We hope for permission to conduct this research assuming such permission is appropriately required. We will be pleased to supply any further details that may be required for your consultations. Please call me collect at 616-383-1757 for any further information.

Sincerely,

Stanley S. Robin
Professor of Sociology
Director, Center for Sociological Research
May 13, 1975

Mr. Samuel C. Stearn, Director
Research and Statistics Division
State of Michigan
Department of Labor
Michigan Employment Security Commission
7310 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48202

Dear Mr. Stearn:

Enclosed are the forms and questionnaires requested in your letter of April 17. I'd like to reiterate, however, that technically we are not requesting confidential information from the Commission, but rather permission to gather information on site which will be treated confidentially. Please let me know if I can provide any further information.

Sincerely,

Stanley S. Robin, Director
Center for Sociological Research

SSR: lc
enclosures
cc: Mr. Richard Ropers
We are interested in finding out your opinions and attitudes about unemployment. For example, we are interested in the reasons for your unemployment, the problems you are facing as an unemployed worker, what kind of adjustments you have had to make, your opinions as to who or what is responsible for the unemployment in Michigan and any suggestions you have to improve the lot of the unemployed. In order to better understand your opinions we will also ask you some background questions.

Your answers will remain completely anonymous and confidential. Please answer the questions as frankly and quickly as you can. In most cases you only need to place a check mark before the answer that you want. Please check with us if you have any questions at all.
Social and Political Attitudes of the Unemployed

1) How old were you on your last birthday? ____________

2) What is your sex?
   1. ___ male  2. ___ female

3) What church do you go to?
   1. ___ Methodist  2. ___ Baptist
   3. ___ Lutheran  4. ___ Presbyterian
   5. ___ Catholic  6. ___ Jewish
   7. ___ Other (write in) ____________

4) How often do you go to church?
   0. ___ Never  1. ___ Once a year or on holidays
   2. ___ Once a month  3. ___ Once a week
   4. ___ More than once a week

5) What is your race?
   1. ___ White  2. ___ Black  3. ___ Chicano
   4. ___ American Indian  5. ___ Asian American
   6. ___ Other (write in) ____________

6) What social class do you think that you belong to?
   1. ___ Upper class  2. ___ Middle class
   3. ___ Working class  4. ___ Lower class
   5. ___ Other (write in) ____________
   9. ___ Don't understand what "social class" means

7) What is your marital status?
   1. ___ Not married  2. ___ Married
   3. ___ Separated  4. ___ Divorced
   5. ___ Widowed  6. ___ Engaged

8) What was the highest grade you completed?
   1. ___ 8th grade or less  2. ___ 9 to 11
   3. ___ 12 (high school degree)
   4. ___ some college  5. ___ college degree
   6. ___ Masters' degree  7. ___ above Masters'

9) What was your total family's income before you became unemployed?
   1. ___ Under $4,000  2. ___ 4,000 to 5,999
   3. ___ 6,000 to 7,999  4. ___ 8,000 to 9,999
   5. ___ 10,000 to 11,999  6. ___ 12,000 to 13,999
   7. ___ 14,000 to 18,999  8. ___ above 20,000
10) How many people do you support - not counting yourself?

11) What was your hourly wage on your job?
   1. ____ less than 2.00 per hour
   2. ____ 2.00 to 2.50  3. ____ 2.51 to 3.00
   4. ____ 3.01 to 3.50  5. ____ 3.51 to 4.00
   6. ____ 4.01 to 4.50  7. ____ 4.50 to 5.00
   8. ____ more than 4.00

12) How many hours a week did you work at your previous job?

13) Are you a veteran?
   1. ____ yes  2. ____ no

14) Were you laid off, fired, or did you quit your previous job?
   1. ____ quit  2. ____ laid off  3. ____ fired
   4. ____ discharged from service

15) Was your place of work closed down or was business or production down?
   1. ____ closed down  2. ____ business down
   3. ____ production down  4. ____ none of the above

16) What kind of job did you have when you were employed?
   1. ____ skilled productive
   2. ____ skilled service
   3. ____ unskilled productive
   4. ____ unskilled service
   5. ____ professional (teachers, social workers, etc.)

17) Name or describe your previous job. ____________

18) Have many others been fired or laid off at the place you used to work?
   1. ____ none  2. ____ yes  3. ____ no

19) How long have you been unemployed? ________ months

20) How many jobs have you had in the last 10 years?
   1. ____________

21) How many times have you been unemployed in the last ten years, including this time? 1. ____________
22) Since what age have you been working full time? 
1. _________________

23) How many times in the past, not including this 
time, have you collected unemployment insurance? 
1. _________________

24) During all your working career what is the total 
time you have been unemployed, including the 
present period? 
1. _________________

ANSWER THE NEXT FOUR QUESTIONS ONLY IF YOU ARE MARRIED.

25) Is your wife or husband employed? 
1. ____yes 2. ____no

26) Is your wife or husband also unemployed? 
1. ____yes 2. ____no

27) Is your wife or husband collecting unemployment 
insurance? 
1. ____yes 2. ____no

28) How long has your wife or husband been unemployed? 
1. ________________months

29) How long do you expect to remain unemployed? 
1. ________________years 2. ________________months

30) How long have you been collecting unemployment 
insurance? 
1. ________________months

31) What percentage of your previous paycheck do you 
get or expect to get from your unemployment checks? 
1. ____3/4 2. ____1/2 3. ____1/4

32) How long had you been working for your previous 
employer? 
1. ____less than 1 year 
2. ____1 or more years but less than 5 
3. ____more than 5 but less than 10 
4. ____more than 10 but less than 15 
5. ____more than 15 but less than 20 
6. ____20 or more years
33) Would you be willing to move to another town or city for employment?
   1. _____yes  2. _____no

34) Would you be willing to move to another state for employment?
   1. _____yes  2. _____no

35) If you are collecting any other state, federal or other types of benefits, which ones?
   1. _____V.A. benefits  2. _____Social Security
   3. _____Food stamps  4. _____Medicare
   5. _____Medicaid  6. _____Union benefits
   7. _____Other (write in) _______________________

36) Do you have medical insurance?
   1. _____yes  2. _____no

37) Do you have life insurance?
   1. _____yes  2. _____no

38) Do you have other sources of income? Check which ones you have.
   1. _____savings  2. _____stocks
   3. _____stocks  4. _____investments
   5. _____houses  6. _____rent
   7. _____farm income  8. _____parents
   9. _____inheritance  10. _____relatives
   11. _____children

39) Do you think your level of education had something to do with your becoming unemployed?
   1. _____yes  2. _____maybe  3. _____no

40) Do you think your skill level had something to do with your becoming unemployed?
   1. _____yes  2. _____maybe  3. _____no

41) Do you think your age had something to do with your becoming unemployed?
   1. _____yes  2. _____maybe  3. _____no

42) Do you think your race had something to do with your becoming unemployed?
   1. _____yes  2. _____maybe  3. _____no

43) Do you think your appearance had something to do with your becoming unemployed?
   1. _____yes  2. _____maybe  3. _____no
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44) Do you think your sex had something to do with your becoming unemployed?
1. ___yes  2. ___maybe  3. ___no

45) Do you think that the fact that more women are working today had something to do with your becoming unemployed?
1. ___yes  2. ___maybe  3. ___no

46) Have you ever or do you now belong to a labor union?
1. ___yes  2. ___no

47) If you were a labor union member how many years did you belong to a union?
1. ____________years  2. ____________months

48) Do you think your union is very helpful to its members?
1. ___very helpful
2. ___fairly helpful
3. ___sometimes helpful
4. ___mostly not helpful
5. ___not at all helpful

49) Do you think the union could be doing more for its members than it is now, in terms of unemployment?
1. ___yes  2. ___no

50) Are you a member of any type of political organization?
1. ___yes  2. ___no

51) If you belong to a political organization, which one?
1. ________________________________ (write in)

52) Do most people get ahead more as a result of?
   (which one)
1. ___luck
2. ___education
3. ___knowing the right people
4. ___working at it

53) In regard to the question above, do you think that it is more true today than it was about 10 years ago? Less true today? Or is it about the same today as it was 10 years ago?
1. ___more true today  2. ___less true today  3. ___the same  4. ___don't know
54) In his work, all a person should want is a secure, not-too-difficult job, with enough pay for a nice car and home. Do you?
1. _____ strongly agree 2. _____ agree
3. _____ disagree 4. _____ strongly disagree

55) Nowadays a person has to pretty much live for today and let tomorrow take care of itself? Do you?
1. _____ strongly agree 2. _____ agree
3. _____ disagree 4. _____ strongly disagree

56) When a person is born, the success he will have is in the cards, so he might as well accept it. Do you?
1. _____ strongly agree 2. _____ agree
3. _____ disagree 4. _____ strongly disagree

57) It is best to have a job as part of an organization all working together, even if you don't get individual credit. Do you?
1. _____ strongly agree 2. _____ agree
3. _____ disagree 4. _____ strongly disagree

58) Don't expect too much out of life and be content with what comes your way. Do you?
1. _____ strongly agree 2. _____ agree
3. _____ disagree 4. _____ strongly disagree

59) Planning only makes a person unhappy since your plans hardly ever work out anyway. Do you?
1. _____ strongly agree 2. _____ agree
3. _____ disagree 4. _____ strongly disagree

60) There's little use in writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man. Do you?
1. _____ strongly agree 2. _____ agree
3. _____ disagree 4. _____ strongly disagree

61) The way people vote is the main thing that decides how things are run in this country. Do you?
1. _____ strongly agree 2. _____ agree
3. _____ disagree 4. _____ strongly disagree

62) People like me don't have any say about what the government does. Do you?
1. _____ strongly agree 2. _____ agree
3. _____ disagree 4. _____ strongly disagree
63) These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on. Do you?
   1. _____strongly agree  2. _____agree  
   3. _____disagree       4. _____strongly disagree

64) In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting better, not worse. Do you?
   1. _____strongly agree  2. _____agree  
   3. _____disagree       4. _____strongly disagree

65) It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future. Do you?
   1. _____strongly agree  2. _____agree  
   3. _____disagree       4. _____strongly disagree

66) The most important thing to teach children is absolute obedience to their parents. Do you?
   1. _____strongly agree  2. _____agree  
   3. _____disagree       4. _____strongly disagree

67) Any good leader should be strict with people under him to gain their respect. Do you?
   1. _____strongly agree  2. _____agree  
   3. _____disagree       4. _____strongly disagree

68) A few strong leaders could do more for this country than all the laws and talk. Do you?
   1. _____strongly agree  2. _____agree  
   3. _____disagree       4. _____strongly disagree

69) Have family problems increased since you have been unemployed?
   1. _____yes  2. _____same  3. _____no

70) If you have children, do you spend more or less time with them since your unemployment?
   1. _____less  2. _____same  
   3. _____more  4. _____does not apply

71) If you are married, do you spend more or less time with your husband or wife since your unemployment?
   1. _____less  2. _____same  
   3. _____more  4. _____does not apply

72) Do you feel less optimistic about the future since you have been unemployed?
   1. _____yes  2. _____same  3. _____no
73) Do you feel more or less confident about yourself since you have been unemployed?
   1. less  2. same  3. more

74) Do you feel more or less confident about the Federal government's ability to solve the current rise of unemployment?
   1. less  2. same  3. more

75) Do you think unemployed people might turn to crime for survival?
   1. yes  2. maybe  3. no

76) Would you engage in illegal acts to get food or money if your situation gets worse while you are unemployed?
   1. yes  2. no

77) Do you think there is an increase in unemployment because big business wants to make more profits?
   1. yes  2. not sure  3. no

78) Do you think the rise in prices is so big business can make more profits?
   1. yes  2. not sure  3. no

79) Are you more angry now, since being unemployed, at the Federal government?
   1. yes  2. no

80) Are you more angry now, since being unemployed, at your union?
   1. yes  2. no

81) Are you more angry now, since being unemployed, at big business?
   1. yes  2. no

82) Do you blame your unemployment on some personal defect you may have?
   1. yes  2. no

83) Do you blame your unemployment on Big Business?
   1. yes  2. no

84) Do you blame your unemployment on inflation?
   1. yes  2. no
85) Do you blame your unemployment on Federal government?
   1. _____yes  2. _____no

86) Do you blame your unemployment on the State government?
   1. _____yes  2. _____no

87) Do you blame your unemployment on the "System"?
   1. _____yes  2. _____no

88) What about your Health since you became unemployed; is your health:
   1. _____worse  2. _____same  3. _____better

89) In comparison to your social position at the time you got married, your present social position is:
   1. _____much higher  2. _____a little higher
   3. _____about the same  4. _____a little lower
   5. _____much lower  6. _____other; specify

90) Do you think that today, in comparison to ten years ago, it is much easier, easier, about the same, more difficult, much more difficult for a person to improve his social position:
   1. _____much easier  2. _____easier
   3. _____about the same  4. _____more difficult
   5. _____much more difficult  6. _____other; specify

91) In your opinion, wealth increases the prestige of a person:
   1. _____very much  2. _____considerably
   3. _____a little  4. _____not at all
   5. _____other; specify

92) Do you think the government should initiate large-scale work programs like the ones in the 1930's?
   1. _____yes  2. _____no

93) Do you think we are in a Depression?
   1. _____yes  2. _____no

94) Do you think we are going to have a Depression?
   1. _____yes  2. _____no

95) Do you think the wealth of this country should be redistributed to all equally?
   1. _____yes  2. _____don't know  3. _____no
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96) Working people should stick together to protect themselves.
1. ___ agree 2. ____ don't know 3. ___ disagree

97) Working people make all the things we need to live.
1. ___ agree 2. ____ don't know 3. ___ disagree

98) Unions are one good way for workers to protect themselves.
1. ___ agree 2. ____ don't know 3. ___ disagree

99) When workers go on strike for higher wages this is good.
1. ___ agree 2. ____ don't know 3. ___ disagree

100) Under Capitalism the workers have little power.
1. ___ agree 2. ____ don't know 3. ___ disagree

101) Capitalism is a bad social system.
1. ___ agree 2. ____ don't know 3. ___ disagree

102) The ruling class has all the power.
1. ___ agree 2. ____ don't know 3. ___ disagree

103) Socialism is a good social system.
1. ___ agree 2. ____ don't know 3. ___ disagree

104) Of the following list of possible presidential candidates, which one do you think you would vote for in 1976?
1. ___ Henry Jackson 2. _____ Gerald Ford
3. ___ Nelson Rockefeller 4. ____ Edward Kennedy
5. ___ Peter Camejo 6. ____ Hubert Humphrey
7. ___ Other (which one) __________________________
9. ___ none

105) In the coming 1976 presidential election do you think you will vote:
1. ___ Republican
2. ____ Democratic
3. ___ American Independence Party
4. ___ Communist Party
5. ___ Socialist Workers Party
6. ___ Other (which one) __________________________
9. ___ none
106) In your opinion, the level of living of your family in the last ten years has:
1. ______ improved greatly
2. ______ improved a little
3. ______ remained the same
4. ______ become a little worse
5. ______ become much worse
6. ______ Other; specify ____________________________

107) In your opinion, which of the following phrases best describes the social and economic progress of the U.S. during the last ten years?
1. ______ rapid progress
2. ______ encouraging progress
3. ______ some progress, but it could have been better
4. ______ very slow progress
5. ______ no progress at all
6. ______ we have gone backward
7. ______ Other; specify ____________________________

108) In your opinion, in comparison to today, opportunities for young people ten years from now will be:
1. ______ much better
2. ______ better
3. ______ same as today
4. ______ worse
5. ______ much worse
6. ______ Other; specify ____________________________

109) In comparison to others you know, your chances to get ahead in life are:
1. ______ better
2. ______ the same
3. ______ worse
4. ______ Other; specify ____________________________

110) In your opinion, are there strong social differences in the U.S.?
1. ______ yes
2. ______ no
3. ______ don't know

111) During the last ten years, social differences in the U.S. have:
1. ______ increased greatly
2. ______ increased slightly
3. ______ remained the same
4. ______ diminished slightly
5. ______ diminished greatly
6. ______ Other; specify ____________________________
112) When a person is trying to get ahead in life, he is hindered by other persons:
1. ____ very much 2. ___ considerably
3. ____ a little 4. ___ not at all
5. ___ Other; specify __________________________

113) In your opinion, which of the following is the greatest impediment for one who is trying to get ahead in life?
1. ____ those who are already ahead
2. ____ those who are at the same level
3. ____ those who are below
4. ___ Other; specify __________________________

114) I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
1. ___ strongly agree 2. ___ agree
3. ___ disagree 4. ___ strongly disagree

115) I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
1. ___ strongly agree 2. ___ agree
3. ___ disagree 4. ___ strongly disagree

116) All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
1. ___ strongly agree 2. ___ agree
3. ___ disagree 4. ___ strongly disagree

117) I am able to do things as well as most other people.
1. ___ strongly agree 2. ___ agree
3. ___ disagree 4. ___ strongly disagree

118) I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
1. ___ strongly agree 2. ___ agree
3. ___ disagree 4. ___ strongly disagree

119) I take a positive attitude toward myself.
1. ___ strongly agree 2. ___ agree
3. ___ disagree 4. ___ strongly disagree

120) On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
1. ___ strongly agree 2. ___ agree
3. ___ disagree 4. ___ strongly disagree

121) I wish I could have more respect for myself.
1. ___ strongly agree 2. ___ agree
3. ___ disagree 4. ___ strongly disagree
122) I certainly feel useless at times.
1. ____ strongly agree  2. ____ agree
3. ____ disagree  4. ____ strongly disagree

123) At times I think I am no good at all.
1. ____ strongly agree  2. ____ agree
3. ____ disagree  4. ____ strongly disagree

124) How would you go about solving the unemployment problem?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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