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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Recent rapid growth of the American labor movement has been accompanied by considerable interest in general problems related to union affiliation and leadership. An increasingly common manifestation of this interest has been the attempt to analyze the social - psychological determinants of leadership in unions.

A brief review of the literature shows certain striking confluences. Several investigators report a general superiority among both union leaders and strongly affiliated union members (23, 41, 43, 55, 61, 77). Particularly consistent are findings that in comparison with less active members, union leaders tend to be better educated, come from higher skill and wage levels, are more self-confident, and possess greater plant status. They also evidence greater personal "adjustment." It has been reported, for example, that among auto workers, active unionists are lowest in feelings of political futility, lowest in authoritarianism, highest in satisfaction with life, and lowest in feelings of social alienation (41). These findings are not necessarily an indication that superior union members endorse all aspects of union philosophy. Better educated members have been found
likely to reject certain basic union principles if they feel these principles are a personal handicap to occupational mobility (63).

Considering the above, union leadership, or activity in union affairs, would seem an expression of a general physical and mental superiority, or alertness, accompanied by a desire for self-expression and personal achievement. There is considerable evidence that union "activists" tend to be self-confident persons, oriented toward personal striving (53, 54, 61, 63, 70). C. W. Mills in particular, has argued this point. He maintains that pursuit of personal power and status is a major characteristic of national leaders of labor (53, 54). In contrast, Stagner reports that state labor leaders in comparison with a group of managers possessed less power orientation and evidenced a greater desire for group acceptance, protection and security (75).

The frustration—aggression hypothesis is useful in exploring the question of union leaders' desire for personal achievement. It is reasonable to expect that a wage earner with a strong need for achievement and self-expression would meet obstacles of considerable magnitude in trying to satisfy his need. There are findings which bear out expectations concerning frustration and aggression (37, 44, 67). Union members who later became stewards, in comparison with other members, evidenced superior
intelligence and possessed more self-confidence, but were also relatively dissatisfied with their jobs. A group of local union leaders reported they had become active unionists as a result of resentment against arbitrary treatment by management. Typically, they expressed a desire to "fight back" against the cause of felt grievances.

The picture of the union leader which emerges from the above discussion is one of above average ability, education, and personal striving, with accompanying frustration and a seeking for self-expression. It might well be asked why these characteristics should lead to union activity? It seems just as reasonable to suppose they would result in a struggle to rise into the ranks of management. A possible answer is that potential union leaders see little chance for advancement to management. Studies cited above imply such to be the case (37, 54). Another possibility is that potential leaders possess strong working-class sympathies and ties. Identification with the working class could lead to a union career, even though an able young person perceived ample opportunity for mobility into management. The latter contention is supported by evidence which shows that local union leaders, in comparison with other members, more often identify with workers as a class. They also tend to express a sincere desire to advance the cause and welfare of the "working man" (2, 28, 41, 61).
An added indication of the association of class identity and union activity are findings which have related occupational mobility to middle-class identification and rejection of unionism. Workers who have been either upwardly or downwardly mobile seem less likely to belong to unions and, if members, are not as active in attending meetings as workers who are in roughly the same occupational classification as their fathers. The latter workers seem adjusted to working-class status but feel a need to improve the class position through collective action. They are thus more likely to ally themselves with the labor movement (45).

Desire for group attachment and social relationships has also received attention as a factor leading to participation in union affairs. Several investigators report that persons active in unions tend to be individuals for whom such activity strengthens normal work and leisure-time group attachments (5, 23, 77). Union philosophy and tradition; with its emphasis on "brotherhood," might also attract socially-oriented individuals into union activity. The fact that positions of union leadership are essentially political posts, demanding considerable social interaction, may be another factor.

Summarizing the above discussion then, there is evidence that in comparison with other union members, local union leaders (1) have more education, ability, and self-confidence; (2) evidence greater striving for self-
expression, status, and prestige; (3) show more aggression against management; (4) have stronger working-class sympathies and ties; and (5) evidence greater social interest and adjustment.

Hypotheses

It is reasonable to suppose that attitudes are important factors in guiding an individual into a position of union leadership. The general purpose of the present study was to explore the notion that local union leaders will differ from rank-and-file union members in attitudes related to perception of the economic system, as well as in certain more basic personal characteristics. This study specifically attempted to assess the relative importance of each of six different attitudes which previous research had related to union leadership.

Investigation of attitudes related to the following topics formed the basis of the study: (1) workers' opportunity for occupational mobility; (2) identification with the working class; (3) management's treatment of workers; (4) general trust and confidence in others; (5) personal striving; (6) authoritarianism.

In general, it was hypothesized that in comparison with rank-and-file members, union leaders would (1) evidence greater belief in workers' opportunity for occupational mobility; (2) show greater identification with the working
class; (3) possess less confidence that management is fair, just and interested in employees' welfare; (4) exhibit greater general trust and confidence in other people; (5) evidence greater personal striving; and (6) evidence less authoritarianism.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Questionnaire.

Five of the attitudes under investigation were scaled by the standard Thurstone method (81). Separate scales of fifteen items each were constructed for attitudes related to a worker's opportunity for occupational mobility, management's treatment of workers, identification with the working class, trust and confidence in others, and personal striving. Measurement of authoritarianism was based upon a twelve item shortened version of the F Scale of Authoritarian Personality (1). Three F Scale "item clusters" most appropriate to the study were included. The clusters were authoritarian-submission, anti-intraception, and conventionalism.

A slight deviation from standard procedure was employed in administering the shortened F Scale. In order to make F items correspond to Thurstone items, subjects were instructed to express only agreement or disagreement with the statements, rather than mark them on the basis of the usual six-point scale of agreement-disagreement. It was thus possible to include the items within the body of the larger attitude scale. F items were interspersed among Thurstone items to reduce the possibility that subjects might be threatened by the F Scale and fail to respond to it.  

A copy of the final questionnaire is included in Appendix B.
Sample

Subjects for the study were 134 members of a United Steel Workers local from the Columbus, Ohio, area and 55 local union presidents and secretaries from the same area.

The Steelworkers' local totaled approximately 1,200 members, 50 per cent of whom were randomly selected for inclusion in the study. The total number of questionnaires mailed was 576. Of these, 134, or 23 per cent, were returned. Since questionnaires were returned anonymously, it was impossible to make follow-ups of non-respondents to check the representativeness of the sample. Rough checks were also impossible because of lack of adequate information concerning age, education, or other pertinent characteristics of the population.

All local union presidents and secretaries in the Columbus area were mailed questionnaires. A list of the 214 union officials was obtained with the co-operation of the AFL-CIO city organization. The presidents and secretaries were a heterogeneous group, coming from both industrial and craft-type unions. Sixty-five, or 30 per cent, of the 214 local union leaders returned their questionnaires. Of the sixty-five, ten were female. To guard against possible bias, the females were excluded from the sample. A total of fifty-five leaders was thus available for purposes of analysis. There was no way to check the representativeness of the sample.
With the help of the Labor Education and Research Service of the Ohio State University, under the auspices of which this investigation was performed, official approval and endorsement of the study was gained from both district officials of the Steelworkers, and leaders of the local union. Sampling of presidents and secretaries was sanctioned by the AFL-CIO city organization. Questionnaires were mailed with a covering letter explaining the study and requesting co-operation. A follow-up letter was mailed to all subjects approximately two weeks after the original letter and questionnaire.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

1. Analysis of results depended in part on assessment of differences between union "leaders" and union "rank and file." The sample of union presidents and secretaries was designated the union leadership group, and the sample of Steelworkers, the non-leadership, or rank-and-file group.

As a matter of some interest to the major focus of the present study, the completed questionnaire, with very minor changes, was administered to approximately 150 managers from several different companies in the Columbus area. A rough indication of the validity of the five attitude scales is provided by comparing the responses of the managers to those of the union members. Since unionists and managers have important contrasting interests and differ in social position, the scales, if valid, should indicate attitudinal differences between them. Greatest differences would be expected on working-class identification and attitude toward management. These expectations are borne out as the groups differed in these attitudes, at highly significant levels, when a chi-square test was applied. Managers show less working-class identification and are more favorable in attitude toward management. These findings provide some evidence of the validity of the scales. The chi-square differences between the union samples and the managers are presented in Table 1.
### TABLE 1

**Chi-Square Differences Between a Managerial Group and the Union Samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Managers (N=156)</th>
<th>Managers (N=156)</th>
<th>Local Union Leaders (N=55)</th>
<th>Union Rank and File (N=134)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief in opportunity for mobility</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorableness toward management</td>
<td>15.34*</td>
<td>19.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with working class</td>
<td>18.67*</td>
<td>29.41*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and confidence in others</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal striving</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>10.52*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .01

1. Managers see less opportunity for mobility than union leaders, but more opportunity than rank and file.
2. Managers are more favorable in attitude toward management than either union leaders or rank and file.
3. Managers identify less with the working class than either union leaders or rank and file.
4. Managers have less trust in others than union leaders, but more trust than rank and file.
5. Managers are higher striving than either union leaders or rank and file.
6. Managers are higher F than union leaders but lower F than rank and file.
2. For an indication of the extent to which unionists manifest the attitudes under investigation, it is revealing to examine the means and standard deviations of the scale-scores. Table 2 presents these statistics for the union leadership group as well as for the rank-and-file group. Keeping in mind that all attitudes, except F, were measured on the basis of seven-point scales, certain observations may be made. Considering just the leaders, it is noted that they perceived good opportunity for a worker to be occupationally mobile, were midway between favorableness and unfavorableness toward management, tended to moderately high identification with the working class, had a good deal of trust and confidence in other people, were strong personal strivers, and were moderately low F.

3. Correlational technique was applied for further analysis of the association of attitudes and union leadership. Since the measure of F was not scaled, respondents were separated into high F – low F groups on the basis of total number of agreements with F items. It was thus necessary to treat F, as well as leadership, as a dichotomous variable for purposes of correlation. Phi and point-biserial methods were consequently used when appropriate. The intercorrelations of leadership, the six attitudes, age, and education are presented in Table 3.
TABLE 2
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE SIX ATTITUDES
FOR THE LOCAL UNION LEADERS AND
THE UNION RANK AND FILE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Union Leadership (N=55)</th>
<th>Union Rank And File (N=134)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in opportunity for mobility</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorableness toward management</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with working class</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and confidence in others</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal striving</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means and standard deviations for all attitudes except F represent scores on seven-point scales. The measure of F is an indication of the total number of F items agreed with.
TABLE 3
PRODUCT-MOMENT INTERCORRELATION MATRIX OF THE SIX ATTITUDES, AGE, EDUCATION AND LEADERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief in opportunity for mobility</th>
<th>Favorability toward management</th>
<th>Working Class Identity</th>
<th>Trust in Others</th>
<th>Personal Striving</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief in opportunity for mobility</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorableness toward management</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with the working class</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and confidence in others</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal striving</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .01
Table 3 shows that belief in workers' opportunity for occupational mobility correlates .23 with leadership, a relationship significant beyond the 1 per cent level. At the 5 per cent level of significance, trust and confidence in others correlates .17, and $F$ -.15 with leadership. These correlations indicate that the local union leaders differed from non-leaders by showing more belief in opportunity for mobility, more trust and confidence in others, and less authoritarianism. Three of the general hypotheses of the study are therefore borne out at significant levels. In addition, personal striving and favorableness toward management function with leadership in the suggested directions, but at less than significant levels. Identification with the working class was the only attitude which did not show a tendency in the expected direction. Admittedly, the correlations are not large; nevertheless, they do conform consistently to expectation, and in three cases reach significance. Reasons why larger relationships were not obtained will be discussed in the next chapter.

Further considering Table 3, it is noted that age and education function positively with leadership, at significant levels. With the effects of age and education partialed out, the correlations of leadership with $F$ and leadership with trust in others, become -.13 and .13, respectively. These relationships fall just short of the 5 per cent level of significance. Confidence in the validity of the hypotheses
concerning F, and trust in others, must consequently be somewhat tempered when age and education are considered.

A multiple correlation was computed for leadership and the six attitudes plus age and education. The R of .51 was highly significant beyond the 1 per cent level and indicated that 26 per cent of the variance of the leadership criterion was explained by the eight independent variables. Analysis of the squared beta coefficients, which indicates the amount of explained variance which can be attributed to the variance of individual independent factors, showed that age was most important in explaining leadership. Of somewhat less importance were education and belief in opportunity for mobility, in that order. Of the attitudes, belief in opportunity for mobility thus proves to be most important for understanding union leadership.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

1. Certain preliminary observations are necessary before turning to the discussion of results. Sampling was a major difficulty in this investigation, and as such, deserves attention. Considering the rather small percentage of returns and the absence of checks for representativeness, it cannot be assumed that the sample was without bias. Suggestions about the nature of possible bias can be made however. Considering the focus of the study, the endorsement given it by the union itself, and the type of questionnaire, it is likely that the sample of Steelworkers contained a disproportionately large percentage of active, alert, better educated union members. In effect, this would have amounted to having a sample of union supporters and participators, rather than a representative sample of union rank and file. The same factors may have biased the sample of presidents and secretaries. It is reasonable to assume however, that the bias would not have been as large as the Steelworkers', since union presidents and secretaries are a more homogeneous population than a local union. A bias of the type suggested would thus have depressed rather than increased the differences between leaders and rank and file.
2. Despite the problem outlined above, certain defensible generalizations seem possible. A major inference from the findings is that local union leaders tend to be superior in certain respects when compared to non-leaders. The higher educational level of the leaders is marked. This difference is particularly striking considering the leaders possessed greater age as well as greater education, while among all respondents there was a pronounced trend for age to relate negatively to education. Granting that educational attainment requires intellectual ability plus a moderate desire for achievement and self-expression, greater education seems an especially strong indicator of relative superiority. The leaders' belief in opportunity for mobility is perhaps further evidence of a type of superiority, as the attitude could well be a result of personal adjustment and basic optimism. Low F and high trust in others, which are also associated with leadership, indicate a reflective, intelligent, and well-adjusted approach to social relationships. As such, they provide additional support for the relative superiority of union leaders.

There are two possible ways of explaining the leaders' superiority. The obvious possibility is that they are actually superior individuals. On the other hand, indications of superiority may simply be reflections of a basic need for status and achievement. If the latter contention is valid, leaders should show a high degree of personal striving. The
present study did not indicate leaders to be significantly different in striving from rank-and-file members, however. The reason for this finding may reside in the leaders' perception of their union role. Gouldner (28) and Chinoy (15) have both pointed out that an important norm of local union office is self-effacement, indifference to personal importance, and deprecation of the desire to get ahead. Leaders would thus tend to deny personal striving, even though it were actually instrumental in their behavior.

The question is then, are the attitudes of the union leaders an indication of basic superiority, or a result of the influence of repressed or inhibited desires for personal achievement? For example, although belief in workers' opportunity for occupational mobility may be an expression of superior adjustment or optimism, the attitude may also be a result of the leaders' own repressed desires for achievement. As indicated above, educational attainment could be an expression of intellectual superiority. On the other hand, it could also be a product of a need for achievement. The question cannot be resolved on the basis of the present findings.

3. One of the most salient findings of the present study was the substantial association between local union leadership, and the belief in a worker's opportunity for mobility. The leaders believed, not only significantly more
than the union rank and file, but even more than a group of managers, that there is a good chance for mobility. As indicated above, optimism stemming from superior ability and social adjustment may be a factor influencing this attitude; or the attitude may result from the leaders' own repressed desires for personal achievement. Another factor may be that union officials themselves, having been relatively mobile, have lost full awareness of the realities of the opportunities available to a worker of limited capabilities.

Perhaps the most significant social aspect of this finding regarding leaders' attitude toward occupational mobility, is the support it gives to the theory that the American labor movement rejects class consciousness and accepts the notion of an "open society." Union leadership, at least at the local level, endorses the traditional American economic philosophy of equal opportunity for all. Another less expected aspect of the finding is related to the leaders' identification with the working class. Although the leaders did not differ from the rank and file in working-class identification, they showed significantly more identification than a group of managers, and in an absolute sense, scored rather high on the attitude. Belief in workers' opportunity for mobility combined with high working-class identification seems rather paradoxical; it is difficult to reconcile
perception of open class boundaries with an attitude reflecting the notion that workers are a separate class and need to maximize their collective interests. It is more logical to expect that union officials who perceive open class boundaries would also possess limited convictions concerning the special interests of the working class.

It is possible, of course, that the leaders' identification with the working class may simply indicate acceptance of basic union philosophy which embraces the notion of an identity of interest among workers. Nevertheless, belief in chances for mobility combined with strong working-class identification would seem to expose the union leaders to considerable attitudinal conflict. For the most part, local leaders are not paid, and are therefore not definitely committed to a union career. Since they tend to be superior in comparison with other workers and also see a good chance for advancement to the ranks of management, conflict between cultural expectation and the reality of maintaining loyalty to the working class could be great. Gouldner (28) has made an essentially similar observation.

In the light of the possible conflict just suggested, the leaders' perception of management seems more meaningful. It will be recalled that the mean of their attitude toward management fell exactly midway between favorableness and unfavorableness. This could reasonably be interpreted as an indication of ambivalence stemming from attitudinal conflict.
Belief in chances for mobility would be expected to be associated with a favorable attitude toward management. Leaders, being high on belief in mobility, should therefore also be favorable to management. That they are not, would seem partially a result of conflict engendered by limited endorsement of a class-conflict ideology. Ambivalence toward management would also result from the attitudinal combination of basic trust in others and low F. An attitude of basic trust would predispose leaders to an acceptance of managerial intentions while low F, with its indication of rejection of authority, would lead to suspicion and rejection of management.

The conflict suggested above indicates a basic ambivalence in the attitudes of local union leaders. It may reflect, as well, an ambivalence in the American labor movement itself. Although traditional theory maintains that the American labor movement collaborates with the managerial class, the movement itself evidences ambiguity concerning such collaboration. American labor is perhaps uncertain whether it is a class movement or a movement devoted to immediate gains for members, or groups of members, who can achieve them.

The present investigation has shown that local union leadership is associated with attitudes indicative of superior ability and personal adjustment accompanied by a desire for self-expression and achievement. Leaders do not
tend toward radicalism, but rather give evidence of basic acceptance of traditional American economic philosophy. There are nevertheless indications that they may experience conflict stemming from rather strong working-class loyalties, sympathies and ties.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

A sample of union members from a local union in the Columbus, Ohio, area and a sample of local union presidents and secretaries from the same area were surveyed for attitudes related to belief in workers' opportunity for occupational mobility, identification with the working class, favorableness toward management, trust and confidence in others, personal striving, and "F." Attitudes were analyzed for their association with union leadership. Union leaders differed significantly from union rank and file in showing greater belief in workers' opportunity for mobility, greater trust in others, and lower F. They also evidenced a trend toward greater personal striving and less favorable perception of management, but were similar to rank and file in identification with the working class. Leaders were significantly better educated than non-leaders, and were also older. Multiple correlation indicated that age and education, in that order, were most important in explaining leadership. Of the attitudes, belief in opportunity for mobility contributed most to leadership. Analyses of the results indicated that local union leaders evidenced a substantial tendency toward personal superiority. They not only possessed higher education but also seemed to possess greater personal "adjustment"
and optimism. It could not be determined whether the superiority was a basic characteristic of the leaders or a manifestation of a desire for personal achievement and status. Attitudinal conflict among the union leaders was indicated, in that they not only possessed considerable belief in workers' opportunity for mobility but also tended to substantial identification with the working class. Leaders endorsed the notion of an "open society" but also endorsed the antithetical idea that workers are a separate class and need to maximize their collective interests. It was suggested that this ambivalence may represent a basic conflict within the American labor movement itself.
APPENDIXES
The past twenty-five years have witnessed unparalleled growth of the American labor movement. American labor grew 50 per cent in size from 1904 to 1933, but 600 per cent from 1933 to 1958 (78). Although the growth of unions has created substantial interest in labor and its problems, only within recent years has there appeared a significant amount of literature dealing with unions as organizations. The bulk of these articles have dealt with general topics of union affiliation, union participation, and union administration and leadership. A fewer number have been concerned with union political action, union democracy, and attitudes of union members.

A common approach to the topics of union affiliation and participation has been to analyze the behavior of union members in terms of economic motives. Recently however, more emphasis has been given social - psychological determinants of affiliation, participation, and leadership. Studies summarized below are of the latter type. They have been instrumental in guiding thought related to the present investigation.
Studies of Union Affiliation

The following investigations are primarily concerned with motivations leading to union affiliation. Various of the studies also relate to problems of union participation and leadership.

Seidman, London, and Karsh interviewed 114 members of a United Steel Workers' local in the Chicago area (67). Relations between the Union and the Company were characterized as tending toward conflict. The investigators found that 86 per cent of leaders, 83 per cent of active members, and 61 per cent of the inactive rank and file joined the union with conviction or sympathy. Of those who joined with pro-union convictions, three main causes for the conviction were evident: (1) family background, including specific influences such as parental attitudes or convictions, union membership of the father, or family poverty; (2) earlier work or union experience, such as experiences in other plants or belonging to other unions; (3) experiences within the plant, such as specific personal grievances or being "pushed around" too much. Thirty-nine per cent of the leaders, but only 21 per cent of the actives, and 15 per cent of the rank and file reported this last as a reason. Leaders thus seemed persons more likely to resent or reject authority.
Of members who joined the union without strong convictions, informal group pressures were most often given as reasons. Many joined because it was a common expectation of the group and they wanted to be "one of the fellows." Others joined primarily on the basis of expediency, rather than upon any logical analysis of the situation, and still others joined even though they were opposed to unions. The latter most often mentioned coercion and "wanting to avoid trouble." The authors point out that even among those who join without conviction, many later become active and may even form strong convictions.

Lipset and Gordon re-analyzed a labor mobility study made in Oakland, California in 1949 (45). They found occupational mobility to be related to union affiliation. Mobility was measured by comparing the subjects' occupations with those of their fathers. The major finding of the study was that workers who were either upwardly or downwardly mobile were less likely to belong to unions and, if members, were not as active in attending meetings as workers who were in roughly the same occupational classification as their fathers. Lipset and Gordon point out that workers who have experienced mobility more often reflect traditional American values of individual enterprise and achievement, as well as the traditional Protestant ethic of work for work's sake; they are also more often oriented toward the middle class as a reference group.
The investigators suggest the existence of an occupational culture which is transmitted from father to son. Persons who have experienced little mobility are prone to behave in the modal pattern for individuals in their status group. They are adjusted to remaining in the same occupational position but nevertheless feel the need to improve the position through collective action. Lipset and Gordon have in effect stated that individuals who identify themselves with the working class tend to support unions. Those who identify with the middle class are less likely to accept unionism.

Incentives influencing workers to join unions have been explored by Bakke (5). From interviews with workers who joined and those who refused to join unions, Bakke hypothesizes certain broad determinants of union membership. Broadly speaking, joining a union is seen as a conscious attempt to maximize personal satisfaction with life. Although this is Bakke's main argument, he further maintains that willingness to join a union varies with the degree to which union membership reinforces normal group attachments. Bakke hypothesizes that unions satisfy a worker's desires for (1) the friendship and respect of other people, (2) the degree of material comforts and economic security possessed by his customary associates, (3) independence and control over his own affairs, (4) understanding of the forces which are instrumental in
Writing from lengthy experience with problems of workers and unions, Peterson offers a slightly different analysis of motives leading to union affiliation (59). She proposes that four basic human needs are thwarted in present-day industrial society. These are (1) the urge for self-expression, (2) the desire for personal achievement and progress, (3) the need for group status, (4) the longing for security. Since the above needs are not met by industry, workers seek satisfaction for them through unions. The author maintains, "The motive force which leads workers to join labor organizations is their conviction that their advancement depends upon improving their status as workers; that economic well-being and its accompanying social prestige and privileges should not be contingent upon their becoming employers or self-employed businessmen." Peterson contends that only within the last fifty or sixty years have American workers become convinced of the inevitability of the wage system. With this realization, workers have come to desire status and influence while remaining wage earners. This, they feel, can only be attained through organized effort. Middle-class notions of rugged individualism and advancement through individual effort are therefore rejected for group solidarity. These contentions are quite similar to the findings of Lipset and Gordon (45).
In a somewhat different vein, Chalfen hypothesizes certain psychological consequences of union membership (14). Constructive feelings stemming from membership are seen to be "security, self-integrity, status, altruism, responsibility, strength, social equality, high morale, independence, group consciousness, and co-operation in getting things done." Cathartic manifestations of union membership are also proposed. These are "release of aggression, developing purposive behavior, sense of belongingness, and clarification of the meaning of the social milieu." Chalfen further suggests that certain restrictive feelings may be associated with belonging to a union. Restrictive feelings are "anonymity, abiding by the contrary will of the majority, and suffering because no united front can be presented because of egoistic dissension."

Studies of Union Participation

The following studies are primarily concerned with the general problem of the union member's participation in his organization. Here, as in the previous section, emphasis will be given the social-psychological determinants of member's behavior.

Dean studied three union locals, each of which differed in the type of relationship existing with management (24). One of the locals was characterized as having co-operative
relations with management; the relations of the second were less co-operative; and the third was reported as being in more or less continuous overt conflict with management. The author concludes that where co-operative labor-management relations existed, workers who participated in union meetings were favorable to both the company and the union. In the conflict situation, those who participated in union affairs were hostile toward management and favorable toward the union. In the latter situation, "dual loyalty" to management and the union may have existed in the plant as a whole but the union leaders tended to be highly pro-union and anti-management, and the tenor of union meetings reinforced these views. Dean maintains that union meetings attract workers with specific attitudes. The meetings in turn reinforce the attitudes. The workers selected and the attitudes reinforced depends, in part, on the degree of conflict in the union-management relationship. She hypothesizes that the average factory worker's attitude toward management and the union may derive from a general attitudinal "set." That is, a person whose total personality inclines him to be "optimistic" or "friendly" may tend to report favorableness toward all individuals and organizations he comes in contact with. Similarly, a person with a hostile orientation may tend to generalize his hostility.
In another phase of the same study, Dean compared attenders with non-attenders of union meetings (23). The three most important factors related to attendance of meetings were (1) the extent to which the worker's leisure-time social group was composed of fellow workers from the plant, (2) the length of service in the plant, (3) the degree of satisfaction with the job performed in the plant. She calls these three factors "social integration." The greater the "social-integration," the greater the participation in the union. Even among workers who tended to be less favorable in attitude toward unions in general, or among those who were politically conservative, the more socially integrated were more likely to attend meetings. Well integrated members, favorable in attitude toward unions, or politically liberal, were most likely to attend, however. Considering both studies, Dean's major finding seems to be that members who support their unions are those who are socially adjusted, basically friendly, trusting, and optimistic.

One of the most comprehensive investigations of local union membership and participation has been made by Rose (63). Studying a large Teamster's local in the St. Louis area, he found that the poorest attenders of union meetings were those who felt the union should be controlled by the rank and file but were convinced that it was controlled from the top. Those who felt that the union was and should be run by the
rank and file were good attenders. Other findings of Rose are the following: (1) Although the majority of members felt the union's main role should be higher wages and better working conditions, with increasing length of time as a union member, there seemed to be more interest in general problems of the labor movement. (2) Among members who felt they had a good chance for promotion within the company, 23.5 per cent expressed a desire to become a union official, while only 7.3 per cent of those who felt they had no chance for promotion wanted to become a union official. (3) Members with the least and most years in the union were more apt to see the company as being fair than those with medium years in the union. (4) Better educated members were more likely to reject certain basic union principles if they felt the principles were a personal handicap to occupational mobility. (5) The union was least effective in changing the attitudes of its members when the changes were contrary to the basic values or deep-seated culture patterns of the society as a whole.

Strauss and Sayles intensively studied fifteen local unions (76). They divided regular attenders of meetings into six classes: (1) leaders, (2) personal followers of the leaders, (3) departmental representatives, (4) special interest groups, (5) social cliques, (6) isolates. Observing that meetings were characteristically inefficient, tedious, long
and boring, the authors point out that many regular attenders seemed to enjoy meetings because they enjoyed bickering and liked to talk. Others attended because they felt they could help themselves economically.

Strauss and Sayles have also reported on departmental differences in union participation (77). Findings were that many groups participate as a result of some immediate dissatisfaction with wages or working conditions. Once drawn to participate, a group may gain other satisfactions and continue to do so, but continuing participation is seen as primarily a matter of self-interest. The authors suggest that four major factors are involved in group participation in unions: (1) Homogeneity of the group—men who work closely together under the same supervision, do approximately the same job, are equal in pay, belong to the same ethnic group, and come from the same neighborhood, are likely to participate. (2) Status or prestige of the group in the plant community—high status groups are more likely to participate than low status groups. (3) The technological importance to the company of the job done by the group—the more important the job, the more participation. (4) The nature of the job done by the group—long hours, exhausting work, or a particular shift may discourage participation while a job which permits much talk and social interaction promotes participation. These four factors form a pattern
remarkably similar to Dean's "social integration" (23). They imply that union "activists" are well adjusted, superior individuals.

Kornhauser, Sheppard, and Mayer investigated political and voting behavior, and related attitudes, of some 800 United Auto Worker members in the Detroit area (41). Separating the subjects into "pro-labor" and "non-labor" groups, the authors reported that "pro-labor" subjects with high political interest were the most active union members in terms of attendance at meetings and positions held. "Pro-labor" members with low political interest tended to be low in union activity. The "pro-labor-politicals," or active union members, were above other members in income, occupation, and education. In attitudes they were lowest in feelings of political futility, lowest in authoritarianism, highest in satisfaction with life, and lowest in feelings of social alienation. They were higher in working-class identification than the "non-labor" group. Here are additional findings that active union members tend to be superior, well-adjusted individuals.

Kyllonen, in a more sociologically oriented investigation of a Missouri union, found somewhat similar results (43). He concluded that although active union members came from all skill and wage levels and were members of both long and short standing, they more often came from higher wage
levels, higher production rating levels, higher skill levels, and from union members of long standing. Active unionists were also recruited somewhat more readily from those who were childless-married than married-with-children, from those not in frequent contact with relatives, and from those who tended to be already active otherwise socially. The author states that (1) active membership in a labor union tends to be an expression of mental and/or physical superiority just as is an above average record on the job; (2) active membership in a labor union may represent a seeking for a type of relationship ordinarily found in the complete family; and (3) active union membership tends to serve the same functions as active membership in any other social group.

Union membership in a large meat-packing company was investigated by Purcell (61). From extensive interviews, he proposes four major factors to account for a lack of union allegiance. These factors are (1) dislike of union leadership, (2) too many negroes in the union, (3) good company treatment, and (4) forced entry into the union. Most of the active union members were skilled workers. They seemed to be the cream of the union group in working ability, income, self-confidence, and leadership ability, and were furthermore convinced of the necessity for a union. They had joined the union as soon as they came to work in the plant. Although Purcell saw no definite pattern of motives for union leadership,
humanitarian impulses were strong, as were certain liberal political convictions related to a general desire for social reform. Leaders had a particularly strong desire for self-expression, enjoyed union politics, and wanted to advance the cause and welfare of the working man.

Shepard studied the participation of union members in a Canadian district of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (70). He concludes that the most active participants in the union were workers with strong upward mobility drives. He further suggests that the participation of these workers had been instrumental in promoting strength and democracy within the organization. Evidence of the latter contention was a tendency toward less democracy and strength related to entry into the union of less strongly motivated groups of workers with correspondingly greater apathy toward participation.

**Studies of Union Leadership**

The following are reports of studies dealing directly or indirectly with union leadership and its psychological or sociological concomitants.

Seidman, London, and Karsh, in an investigation of a local union, found that leaders typically joined the union when it was organized and were instrumental in getting others to join (67). They were either sympathetic to unionism.
before entering the company's employ or became sympathetic as a result of experiences with management after being hired. The leaders typically tended to reject authority and arbitrary treatment and seemed to be persons with an urge to "fight back" against the cause of felt grievances. An indication of the leaders' attitude toward authority was their feeling that the major accomplishment of the union had been to do away with arbitrary and "slave like" treatment. Some leaders talked of a desire to "rub it in" to supervision. Others expressed a desire for power, prestige and recognition from company or peers. From observation and the leaders' own reports, the authors propose seven reasons why the leaders had become active unionists: (1) resentment against treatment by management personnel, (2) dissatisfaction with working conditions or wages, (3) failure to receive desired or expected promotions, (4) lack of other available leaders, (5) prior union sympathy, (6) desire to attain power, recognition, or financial gain, (7) unsatisfactory marital or home experiences.

C. W. Mills investigated the personal backgrounds and attitudes of top union officials (55). He surveyed 50 percent of the presidents and secretaries of national and international unions of both the AFL and CIO, and officials of AFL and CIO state organizations. The overwhelming majority of the leaders proved to be sons of fathers who had been
skilled workers and farmers. As a group, the leaders were better educated than the adult male population at large, and had typically started out in jobs or industries represented by the union.

More recently, Mills has commented further on labor leaders (54). He holds that top union officials pursue personal power and status, and identify their interests with those of business groups. He maintains that labor leaders of today are self-made men who, of necessity, have had to have initiative and persistence. Ideological motives among them have declined in comparison to labor leaders of the 19th century. Mills suggests that union leadership presently offers a faster road to power for bright young men of working-class parents than any other career.

Barbash also implies that union officials must have a strong drive for achievement (6). He suggests that only "rugged" people can survive and get ahead as union leaders. He contends that a union leader must have a "will" to leadership, and be toughminded about what he wants and how to get it, but in addition, must be sensitive to the needs and desires of the membership, and recognize the organization and his post as essentially political.

Lieberman studied the personality characteristics of rank-and-file workers who became union stewards (44). Employing a follow-up design in which tests were administered
both before and after advancement to steward, Lieberman found that as rank-and-file workers, the potential stewards, in comparison with other workers, were relatively dissatisfied with their jobs. They also gave evidence of superior intelligence, felt they had more ability than their associates, and reported having read the union contract oftener than their fellow workers. The implication is that the stewards were individuals of above average motivation who were subject to frustration and dissatisfaction.

Imberman has similarly characterized labor leaders (37). He suggests that leaders are highly motivated individuals with a strong desire for social acceptance and prestige. Prevented from achieving these goals, leaders react with aggression and hostility. Imberman assumes, with seeming justification, that whereas managers are freely accorded social status, union leaders are not. Phelps has offered concrete evidence of the latter point (60).

Additional support for findings concerning frustration among union officials is provided by Golden and Ruttenberg, who express the belief that union leadership often provides an outlet for frustrated desires to express knowledge and creativity (27). These writers maintain that leadership also requires dedication, an adventurous nature, and few outside responsibilities. Discussing motives for union affiliation, they see psychological and social motives to be
of equal importance with economic motives. Psychological needs satisfied by union membership are freedom of action, self-expression, and creativity. Social needs are the ties and bonds of group relations and community life.

Gouldner reports a study of "progressive" union leaders (28). The subjects were officials of a local union from the New York City area. Participant observation and depth interviews comprised the method of the investigation, which was based upon the notion that union leaders can be divided into two types, the business unionist, and the "progressive" unionist. The business unionist is characterized as a middle-man involved in the sale of labor power to an employer. He is an entrepreneur seeking money, security, and prestige. The "progressive" leader, on the other hand, places great importance on responsibility to the obligations of his office. He is self-effacing and indifferent to personal importance, and deprecates the desire to get ahead or to be a "big shot." For these leaders, trade union office is a personal "calling." Gouldner suggests that the progressive leaders often repress the norms of the larger society, especially those relating to family life, leisure, and the accumulation of wealth. Among the progressives, role conflict is appreciable. Adjustment to the union's values is especially difficult for those progressive leaders who feel they have the ability to succeed in terms of the socially current norms.
Chinoy has characterized union leadership in somewhat the same vein (15). He proposes three types of union leaders: accidental, ambitious, and ideological. He suggests that all types may become ideological to a degree after attaining leadership status. Chinoy, as well as Gouldner, sees selflessness as an important norm of union leadership.

Personality characteristics of labor leaders have been investigated by Stagner (75). Union officials at the state level were compared with a group of managers in a test of the desire for individual power and achievement. In general, managers evidenced a greater power orientation, whereas the unionists were characterized as desiring acceptance in a group, protection, and security. In a follow-up of the investigation, engineering students were divided, by a union-attitude scale, into pro-union and anti-union groups and given the same projective instrument. In this case, the pro-union students' pattern of response to the projective test resembled the union leaders' responses. Anti-union students more closely resembled managers. This finding suggests that the union officers' orientation toward power was not simply a manifestation of attitudes resulting from occupancy of union roles, but rather a basic aspect of their personalities which had originally attracted them to union careers.
Certain strikingly similar findings concerning the social and psychological characteristics of union leaders and activists can be drawn from the above studies.

Briefly reviewing the more pertinent agreements between studies, Dean (23), Kornhauser, Shepard, and Mayer (41), Kylonnen (43), Mills (55), Purcell (61), and Strauss and Sayles (77), present findings which seem to indicate a general social and psychological superiority among union leaders and activists. Leaders tend to be better educated, come from higher skill and wage levels, and possess greater status in their group. They also seem better adjusted socially and psychologically than less active members. There were contradictory findings concerning the relationship of union activity to belief in opportunity for occupational mobility. Rose (63), and Purcell (61) link leadership to self-confidence and a positive belief in opportunity for personal mobility. Mills (54), Imberman (37), and Lieberman (44) suggest, on the other hand, that leaders tend to see closed occupational boundaries. The latter two authors also report frustration and aggression among union leaders. Union activity and leadership is related to a desire for personal achievement by Mills (54), Shepard (70), Purcell (61), and Imberman (37).

Participation is related to identification with the working
class by Lipset and Gordon (45), Purcell (61), Kornhauser, Shepard, and Mayer (41), and Gouldner (28). Seidman, London, and Karsh (67), and Kornhauser, Shepard, and Mayer (41), indicate local union leadership is associated with an anti-authoritarian attitude. Lastly, several authors report that a desire for social relations and group acceptance seems important for union activity. Dean (23) and Bakke (5) make special points of this relationship. Strauss and Sayles (77), Kylonnen (43), and Chalfen (14) also support the contention.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

The following is a copy of the questionnaire used in this study. The F-Scale items have been marked with an asterisk (*) and the sub-scales have been labeled in parenthesis, E. G., (OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY), for the purpose of reader identification. This practice was not followed in the actual questionnaire.

SURVEY OF UNION MEMBER OPINIONS

1. QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU: (Please check or fill in the blanks.)

1. Are you:
   - a man
   - a woman

2. Are you:
   - single
   - married
   - separated, divorced, or widowed

3. Is your religious preference:
   - Protestant
   - Catholic
   - Jewish
   - None

4. Are you a member of:
   - the white race
   - the negro race
   - other race

5. How many years of school have you completed?
   - 8 or fewer
   - 9 - 11
   - 12
   - 13 - 15
   - 16 or more
6. How old were you on your last birthday?
   - under 25
   - 25 - 35
   - 36 - 50
   - over 50

7. How many persons do you support?
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5 or more

8. Was your father ever a member of a labor union?
   - yes
   - no

II. QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR JOB: If you have more than one job, please check here and answer the questions about your main job.

9. What is the name or title of your present job?

10. What do you do in your job?

11. How long have you worked for your present employer?
   - less than a year
   - 1 - 5 years
   - 6 - 10 years
   - 11 - 20 years
   - over 20 years

12. Have you ever held any of the following jobs?
   - foreman
   - sales person
   - office worker
   - farmer (full time)
III. QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU AS A UNION MEMBER

13. How long have you been a member of your local union?

14. Have you ever belonged to any other union?
   - yes   - no
   (If yes, for how long?)

15. Have you ever held an official position in your local union?
   - yes   - no
   (Do you hold a position now?)
   - yes   - no
   (What is the highest position you have ever held?)

IV. The following statements express various opinions about subjects of interest to nearly everyone. Would you please read the statement, place the letter A beside each statement that you are in agreement with, and place the letter D beside the statements with which you disagree. (If you cannot make a decision about a statement, mark it with a question mark.) Since people differ in their opinions, there are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate how YOU feel about the statements.

(OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY)

( ) The U. S. is truly a country of unlimited opportunity for everyone.

( ) Without a college education a person has little chance of ever earning top money.

( ) If a worker has topflight ability, there is a chance that he'll get a top management job some day.
*( ) Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.

( ) No matter how hard a worker tries, he can never get a job better than foreman.

( ) Even if the average worker has initiative, he needs some mighty good breaks to get better than a foreman's job.

( ) If a worker has ambition, works hard, and gets the breaks, he still has a chance to become a rich man.

( ) The average worker never had a good chance to achieve success and wealth.

( ) The average worker today has to work much harder to get ahead than the average worker 30 years ago.

( ) If the average worker has ambition, there are many ways to get ahead.

( ) There's no limit to how far an ambitious young worker can go.

( ) A high school graduate with a lot of ability has as much chance as a college graduate to get a top management job.

( ) A worker is foolish to think that he might someday be wealthy.

( ) It is impossible to go "from rags to riches" in this day and age.

*( ) Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
The average worker's chances of getting ahead are not as great as they used to be.

(MANAGEMENT PERCEPTION)

As a rule, management tries to treat employees right.

Managers are not interested in employees' welfare.

Management deserves more loyalty from employees.

Management tends to treat employees as if they were inferior.

Management does very little to make jobs more interesting.

Management would like to control its employees' lives if it could.

Management always lets the employee "have his say."

Management is usually willing to listen to reason.

Management treats employees like dirt.

One the whole, the aims of managers and employees are not the same.

If management is given half a chance, employees will be treated fairly.

Management does everything possible to make a job interesting.

Management is not much concerned with what happens to the average worker.
Workers ought to have more say about how a plant is run.

As a rule, management is a good friend of the employee.

(CLASS IDENTITY)

A working person ought to be as interested in helping all workers get ahead as he is in helping himself get ahead.

In order to be a success, a person must get out of the working class.

A worker is foolish to believe that his own welfare depends on the welfare of all workers.

Wage earners in the U. S. have all the influence they need in government.

It would be against everything this country stands for if working people formed a separate political party.

It is to a person's advantage to try to imitate upper class people.

The working people of the U. S. have too much influence in business.

This country needs more laws which would benefit the wage earner.

Individual workers need to realize that all workers have the same economic goals and interests.

The average wage earner deserves more money and respect when compared to what the upper classes have.
Income taxes ought to take a lot more away from rich people.

It would be bad for our country if working people considered themselves to be in a class separate from owners and managers.

As a rule, working people do not have enough influence in community affairs.

It's a good thing for wage earners to feel they belong to a separate working class.

What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.

(SOCIAL TRUST)

The finest thing a person can do is to give a helping hand to others whenever it is needed.

The trouble with most people is that they can't be trusted.

A person who has bad manners, habits and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.

Meeting people and making new friends is the most interesting thing in life.

Trying to like everybody is a good rule, but it just doesn't work.

It is a good aim to try to be of service to other people, but it can be overdone.
If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

Most people can be trusted if you give them a chance.

Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.

Most of the people I work with are good friends to have.

It is best to give the other fellow the benefit of the doubt.

No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

People are out to get what they can for themselves, and they don't care what happens to the other fellow.

One of the toughest things in life is to find friends you can depend on.

The average person has no sympathy for others who need help.

Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.

Most people you meet are hard to get to know.

Life is a matter of "dog eat dog."

It's hard to find people who have things in common with you.
(PERSONAL STRIVING)

( ) As long as I can make a decent wage, I don't need to accomplish anything else to be happy.

( ) As a rule, trying for a job with more prestige is not worth the effort.

( ) I'm pretty well satisfied with what I have in life, and trying to do better is not worth the time and trouble.

( ) I would feel like a more useful person if I had a job with more responsibility.

( ) The only way to make life interesting is to improve yourself to make the best use of your knowledge and ability.

**( )** When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.

( ) I couldn't keep my self-respect if I didn't use my spare time to do useful things.

( ) I wouldn't want the responsibility of a more important job even if I had the ability to handle one.

( ) It's hard to feel worthwhile if you don't keep trying for more responsibility and importance.

**( )** The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.

( ) I'll never be satisfied unless I can make an important achievement in life.
I'd be willing to spend a great amount of extra time and effort to get a job with more responsibility and importance.

Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.

"Let George do it" is the best policy because it keeps you out of trouble.

If I had more ability, I might try to get a more important job, but as it is, I'm satisfied with what I have.

Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up, they ought to get over them and settle down.

The worry and responsibility of a big job is not worth the extra money.

A person who accepts the responsibility of doing something he wouldn't have to do is just "sticking his neck out."
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